

Geneva, September 3rd, 1936.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NANSEN INTERNATIONAL OFFICE FOR REFUGEES

(under the Authority of the League of Nations)

REPORT OF THE GOVERNING BODY FOR THE YEAR  
ENDING JUNE 30<sup>TH</sup>, 1936

ON THE RUSSIAN, ARMENIAN, ASSYRIAN, ASSYRO-CHALDEAN,  
SAAR AND TURKISH REFUGEE PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I. — ACTION TAKEN BY THE ASSEMBLY AND COUNCIL, AND BY THE  
VARIOUS ORGANS CHARGED WITH THE REFUGEE WORK.

(a) ASSEMBLY ACTION.

The Assembly, at its sixteenth ordinary session in 1935, adopted the following resolutions on the report submitted by the Governing Body on the work of the Office for the year ending June 30th, 1935, and on the question of international assistance to refugees referred to it by the Norwegian Government:

I.

“ The Assembly,

“ (1) Having noted the report of the Governing Body of the Nansen International Office for the year ending June 30th, 1935, on the work done for Russian, Armenian, Assyrian, Assyro-Chaldean, Saar and Turkish refugees (document A.22.1935.XII):

“ (2) Expresses its gratitude to the Office and to the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for the valuable services rendered to the Governments and to the refugees by improving the position of a very considerable number of refugees in spite of great economic and other difficulties;

“ (3) Thanks the Governments which have given effect to the recommendations made at its last session concerning the communication to the Office of refugee settlement possibilities; the placing of credits at the disposal of the Office for a definite solution of the refugee problem in their territories; the general application of the Nansen stamp system, and the adoption of proposals for the issue of surcharged postage stamps for the benefit of the funds of the Office;

“ (4) Recommends the Governments to ratify the 1933 Convention;

“ (5) Again urges Governments not to expel refugees unless they have obtained entrance visas for another country;

“ (6) Requests the Governments of the immigration countries to continue to co-operate with the Office by informing it of the possibilities of settlement in their territories;



“ (7) Recommends the Governments to consider the advantage of capitalising their expenditure on refugees and of placing such funds at the disposal of the Office for the settlement of refugees;

“ (8) Requests the Governments which have not already done so to adopt the Nansen stamp system;

“ (9) Recommends Governments to consider the plan of issuing surcharged postage stamps in accordance with suggestions made by the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees at its session of March 15th, 1935.”

## II.

“ (1) The Sixth Committee has examined the question of international assistance to refugees referred to the Assembly by the Norwegian Government.

“ (2) It noted, first, that the Assembly contemplated arrangements for the winding-up of the Nansen International Office within a specified time-limit and according to definite budgetary rules.

“ (3) It considers that the League of Nations has already done useful work in the matter of assistance to refugees, but realises the great complexity of the refugee problem, which has political, legal, humanitarian, administrative and financial aspects, and which requires further examination within the limits of the existing decisions of the Assembly.

“ (4) It considers that, subject to any future decisions, this examination should be limited, for political and financial reasons, to the categories of refugees already under the Nansen Office and the High Commissariat in London.

“ (5) The Sixth Committee also considers that no new additional expenditure should be incurred without explicit permission from the Assembly.

“ (6) Having regard to the foregoing considerations, the Sixth Committee proposes that the Assembly should ask the Council to appoint a small committee of competent persons to report on the above-mentioned question. The committee should collect all useful evidence, particularly that of the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees. Once in possession of this report, the Council will be able to take any measures that it may think desirable, even before the meeting of the ordinary Assembly in 1936, to which, however, the question will have to be submitted.

“ (7) In order to enable the above-mentioned committee to be set up, the Assembly leaves it to the Council to appropriate a sum of 5,500 Swiss francs from the budgetary allocation of the current financial year.”

### (b) COUNCIL ACTION.

In conformity with the Assembly resolution quoted under paragraph (a) II, above, the Council, at its eighty-ninth session, in September 1935, created a Committee to report on the whole question of international assistance to refugees.

That Committee met in Geneva from November 28th to December 7th, 1935. The Governing Body requested the Joint Committee of the Office, with M. Golden, to represent it before that Committee. M. Raphaël and M. Golden having been prevented from accepting the invitation of the Governing Body, the Joint Committee requested Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Swift to replace them, and the Secretary-General to form part of its deputation. That deputation, which, with Senator François, also formed the deputation of the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees, was the first to appear before the Council Committee, and submitted a memorandum on the history and competence of the Office and of its predecessors, with an outline of the organisation of the Office and of its co-operating committees, and, at the request of the Council Committee, memoranda containing proposals from the legal, political, administrative and financial points of view for the solution of the refugee problems, with recommendations concerning the future organisation of the League work for refugees.

The proposals made by the Council Committee fell into two parts—those relating to temporary measures and those relating to a subsequent organisation.

The Council, at its ninetieth session, on January 24th, 1936, had those proposals under consideration and adopted a resolution thereon, of which the following is a relevant extract:

“ The Council of the League of Nations,

“ Being anxious not to anticipate in any way the decisions which will have to be taken by the Assembly itself:

“ Confines its present decisions to measures of a strictly provisional character;

“ Refers to the Assembly the report of the Committee on International Assistance to Refugees and particularly those parts of this report setting forth proposals relating to measures of a permanent character;

“ Decides as follows:

“ A. *As regards the Nansen International Office for Refugees:*

“ The Council appoints M. Michael Hansson to act for the time being as President of the Governing Body of the Nansen International Office for Refugees, without prejudice to the Assembly's prerogative as regards the subsequent appointment of this President in accordance with the Office's Statute.

“ The mission of the Acting President of the Governing Body is defined in the Committee's report.<sup>1</sup>

“ During this provisional period, the Acting President of the Office, with a view to the drawing-up of the revised programme of liquidation recommended by the Committee, may have recourse to the technical assistance of the services of the Secretariat, and may occasionally procure the advice of experts.

“ The duties of the Acting President of the Office shall begin on February 1st, 1936, and shall terminate as soon as the Assembly takes its decision.”

(c) INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES.

The Commission held its eighth session on October 9th and 10th, under the presidency of M. RAPHAËL (Greece), when it gave general indications to a special Sub-Committee appointed to represent it before the Committee on International Assistance to Refugees,<sup>2</sup> had under consideration the annual report of the Office and the progress made with the ratification of the 1933 Convention, and proceeded to the appointment of M. SOUBBOTITCH (Yugoslavia) and M. MOMTCHILOFF (Bulgaria) as member and substitute member respectively of the Governing Body of the Office in succession to M. Fotitch (Yugoslavia) and M. Antonoff (Bulgaria), respectively, who had resigned.

(d) MEETINGS OF THE GOVERNING BODY AND OF THE VARIOUS ORGANS OF THE OFFICE.

The Governing Body of the Office held its twelfth and thirteenth sessions on October 30th, 1935, and April 29th, 1936, respectively. At the latter session, M<sup>e</sup> Rubinstein was appointed to the vacancy on the Managing Committee of the Office created by the death of M. Goulkévitich.

The Joint Committee of the Governing Body, consisting of the Managing Committee and the Finance Commission, held nine meetings during the year under review.

At its session in April 1936, the Governing Body created three special Committees to examine questions of legal status, colonisation and the raising of additional funds for the refugee work.

(i) *Legal Committee.*

This Committee, consisting of the Chairman, M. E. Giraud, a member of the Legal Section of the League Secretariat, and M<sup>e</sup> Rubinstein, met for the first time on June 9th, 1936. It was called upon to examine various questions of a legal nature dealt with in the special report which the President of the Governing Body of the Office was requested to draw up for the next Assembly of the League of Nations.

(ii) *Emigration Committee.*

This Committee met for the first time on June 25th, 1936. At this meeting Mr. Childs, of the International Labour Office (formerly delegate of the High Commissariat for Refugees in South America), was good enough to give the members—the Chairman, M. C. Čurčin, a member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and M<sup>e</sup> Rubinstein—an account of his experiences in that country. The Committee exchanged views on the problem as a whole. It confined itself exclusively to the problem of the emigration of Russian refugees, the advisability of settling in oversea countries (chiefly in Paraguay) refugees from the Saar desirous of being transferred to those countries having already been recognised by the French Government and the Governing Body of the Office. As for Armenian refugees, their transfer to Soviet Armenia appears most suitable.

This Committee will continue its work as soon as the mission of the International Labour Office—consisting of the Deputy Director, M. Maurette, and M. Siewers—to Brazil and the Argentine has returned to Europe. In the meantime, the representatives of the Office will be asked to compile, on the basis of the material in their possession, statistics relating to Russian refugees desirous of settling in South America and other oversea countries.

<sup>1</sup> “ (a) To act as temporary President of the Nansen International Office for Refugees;

“ (b) To initiate any reforms or adaptations which may be required in the internal management of the Office or its representations abroad, as also in connection with its general activities (relations with Governments, settlement, emigration and assistance, juridical status, etc.);

“ (c) To submit a special report to the Assembly with a revised winding-up programme on constructive lines.”

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* Chapter I (b).

(iii) *Finance Committee.*

Arrangements have been made for this Committee, consisting of the President, Senator François and M. Golden, to meet at Brussels on July 18th to consider the question of raising additional funds for the refugee work.

(e) ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF PRIVATE ORGANISATIONS FOR REFUGEES.

The Committee met at Geneva on October 8th, 1935, under the presidency of M. Raphaël, Acting President of the Governing Body of the Office, when it had under consideration, *inter alia*, the annual report of the Office to the Assembly and the Norwegian Government's proposal for the organisation of international assistance to refugees. The Committee also renewed the mandates of M. Golden, M. Petersen and Mr. MacKenzie as experts to the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees, and appointed in that capacity M. Maklakoff to the place rendered vacant by the death of M. Goulkévitch.

The Committee furthermore nominated M. Rubinstein to replace M. Goulkévitch as member of the Governing Body of the Office, and M. Fedoroff to succeed M<sup>e</sup> Rubinstein as substitute member of that organ.

The meeting of the Sub-Committee appointed by the Advisory Committee in December 1933, to consider the question of the existence of the Committee, its functions and membership, which had been postponed owing to the illness and subsequent decease of its President, the former President of the Governing Body, was further postponed, owing to the death of one of its members, M. Goulkévitch, and to the resignation of two other members, Mr. Sidney Brown and M<sup>e</sup> Rubinstein.

The composition of the various organs dealing with the refugee work is given in Appendix IV.

CHAPTER II. — ACTION ON THE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY AT ITS SIXTEENTH ORDINARY SESSION.

(a) CONVENTION OF OCTOBER 26TH, 1933, RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF REFUGEES.

This Convention has now received the ratification or adhesion of the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Italy and Norway. The French Chamber has also voted a Bill authorising the ratification of the Convention with some reservations, and there is reason to hope that the Senate will confirm that ratification in the near future.<sup>1</sup>

The reservations made by the Bulgarian, Czechoslovak and Norwegian Governments were reported in the Governing Body's report to the last Assembly. Those of the Danish and Italian Governments are as follows:

(1) **Denmark.**

The Danish Government made reservations regarding Articles 7 and 14 of the Convention.

(2) **Italy.**

1. Article 3 of the Convention cannot restrict the right of the Italian authorities to expel refugees on grounds of national security and public order.

2. In acceding to the Convention, the Italian Government assumes no obligation in respect of its colonies and possessions.

The Belgian Government has intimated its intention of submitting shortly to the Chamber a draft law for the approval of the Convention.

The Estonian, Finnish, Greek, Iraqi, Swedish, Swiss and Yugoslav Governments have stated that, although, for various reasons, they are not able, at the present time, to ratify the Convention, they intend to apply its essential principles in their countries.

The Spanish Government has also informed the Secretary-General of the League of its intention to adhere to the Convention.

The Governing Body noted with gratitude, at its last session, a statement made by the President that he had devoted particular attention to this question and that, as a result of personal and written appeals made by him to interested Governments, he was encouraged to expect further ratifications of the Convention in the near future.

---

<sup>1</sup> The ratification of the Convention was voted by the French Senate, without modification, on August 11th, 1936.

(b) EXPULSIONS OF REFUGEES.

The practice of many Governments of expelling refugees, often on the slightest pretexts, and thus exposing them to great unnecessary hardship, is still causing the Office the gravest anxiety, although its efforts to remedy the situation have been attended by a certain measure of success. Thus, an enlightened solution of this problem has been initiated by the Belgian Government (Arrêté royal dated February 20th, 1936), which the Office commends to the benevolent consideration of other interested Governments. This solution consists of the creation of an Inter-Ministerial Commission for the consideration of the cases of all refugees threatened with expulsion. That Commission is presided over by a judge of the Court of Appeal and comprises delegates of the Foreign Office, of the Economic Department, the Department of Labour and Social Assistance, as well as of a representative of the refugee relief organisations chosen by the interested refugee from a list drawn up by the Minister of Justice. The representative of the police participates in the deliberations, but without the right of voting.

The Governing Body was also glad to note, at its April session, that, in future, refugees cannot be expelled from France without the personal decision of the Minister of the Interior. Further reference to this problem appears under Chapter III (a) in the comments on the replies to the questionnaire sent to the Governments.

(c) OVERSEAS SETTLEMENT.

Interesting possibilities for the settlement of refugees in Paraguay have been opened up as a result of a small mission, sent by the Office to Paraguay towards the end of last year.

The Paraguayan Government granted important facilities to the Office, including the concession of 13,000 hectares of fertile fiscal land at about 10 Swiss francs per hectare, free visas, exemption from the payment of the entrance guarantee of 50 gold pesos per head, free accommodation for a week after arrival and free transport from Asunción to the settlement area, and credit arrangements for the purchase of stock and agricultural implements. Thanks to those facilities, the Office has been able to draw up a plan for the transport to, and settlement in, Paraguay of an average refugee family, consisting of three adults and two children, for the comparatively modest sum of 2,000 Swiss francs. That sum includes the transport of the family from a European port to Asunción, the purchase of twelve hectares of land, the cost of clearing one hectare, the construction of a modest house, with furniture and outhouse, a well, agricultural implements, seeds and live-stock, as well as the maintenance of the family for the first year.

Satisfactory arrangements have also been made with the Government concerning the questions of religion, military service, naturalisation, education and the administration of the colonies.

Similar offers have been obtained from various colonisation concerns in Argentine and Brazil, but the Office is, at present, limiting its overseas settlement activities to the prosecution of the Paraguayan scheme, pending the deliberations of the special Emigration Committee created by the Governing Body to consider the whole question of overseas settlement, and referred to in Chapter I, (d), (ii) above.

(d) CAPITALISATION OF EXPENDITURE ON REFUGEES.

As will be seen from the replies to the questionnaire sent to Governments (No. 9 of Appendix I), the majority of Governments are not prepared to adopt the recommendations made by the Assembly that Governments should capitalise their yearly expenditure on refugees and place the credits thus obtained at the disposal of the Office for the constructive settlement of some of the refugees from their countries. This is due, in a certain measure, to the fact that the direct refugee expenditure incurred by most Governments is on behalf of unemployable refugees who could not be settled on a constructive basis. Nevertheless, the French Government has endorsed that recommendation by contributing 375,000 French francs towards the cost of the transfer of 1,783 Armenian refugees from France to Erivan, and, in view of its expenditure of about 9,000,000 French francs on the maintenance of some 4,000 Saar refugees in France, contemplates placing a credit at the disposal of the Office for the settlement of some of those refugees in Paraguay.

Enquiries in the same sense from two other Governments are also under consideration.

The Office ventures to commend once more this recommendation to the benevolent attention of other Governments, and especially to those incurring expenditure on behalf of unemployed refugees.

(e) RAISING OF FUNDS FOR THE REFUGEE WORK BY THE ISSUE OF SURCHARGED POSTAGE STAMPS.

The Norwegian and, subsequently, the French Government responded to an appeal made by the Office, and endorsed by the Assembly and Council, that Governments would issue postage stamps bearing a surcharge in favour of the funds of the Office. The issue made by the Norwegian Government consists of a series of four stamps of postal values of 10, 15, 20 and 30 öre, each bearing Dr. Nansen's portrait, and a surcharge on these stamps has realised about 30,000 Swiss francs during the first three and a half months.

The French Government made an issue of a 75-centime stamp with a surcharge of 50 centimes, one-half of the proceeds of which are to be transferred to the Office, the other half being reserved for refugee relief in France. The Office has already received a remittance of 44,605 French francs in respect of its share of the first two months' proceeds from that surcharge.

In response to the questionnaire on this subject (No. 10 of Appendix I), it is gratifying to note that the Governments of the Netherlands and the United States did not send negative replies, but intimated that the proposal was not feasible at present.

CHAPTER III. — GENERAL ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE.

(a) SURVEY OF THE REFUGEE PROBLEMS.

The Committee for International Assistance to Refugees confirmed the existence of the difficulties reported from time to time by the Office of obtaining accurate statistics concerning the refugee problems. As a matter of fact, after an exhaustive examination of all the evidence on the subject it was able to collect during its enquiry, the Committee was constrained to confine its report on refugee statistics to the statement that the following refugees were dealt with by the Nansen Office:

(a) Russian . . . . .	700,000-800,000
(b) Armenian . . . . .	240,000
(c) Assyrian and Assyro-Chaldeans . . . . .	7,000
(d) Turkish . . . . .	150
(e) Saar . . . . .	4,000

In an attempt, once more, to remedy that situation, the Office addressed early this year a pressing appeal to seventy-three Governments, urging them to furnish full replies to a questionnaire on the refugee problems and thus enable the Governing Body to present an accurate survey of those problems in its report to the Assembly. The questionnaire, which, with a résumé of the replies, forms Appendix I, dealt with the numbers of the refugees; of those unemployed or unemployable; of bearers of Nansen passports; of those in receipt of relief, and of those requiring relief but not obtaining it, as well as with the sums expended on refugee relief. Governments were also invited to say whether they would be prepared to capitalise some of that expenditure and place the credits thus obtained at the disposal of the Office for the permanent settlement of some of the refugees. Governments were, moreover, requested to afford information on the vexed question of expulsions and on the important matters of naturalisation facilities for refugees and their exemption from restrictions against foreign workers. They were, furthermore, requested to consider the possibility of increasing the revenue of the Nansen stamps, whilst at the same time securing more accurate refugee statistics, by generalising the Nansen passport system in respect of refugees over 18 years of age.

Finally, Governments were invited to state what steps they contemplate taking for dealing with the refugee problem after the liquidation of the Office in 1938.

The replies received to that questionnaire up to the time of the preparation of this report only serve to confirm the opinion expressed by the Committee on International Assistance concerning the difficulty of obtaining accurate statistics regarding the numbers and situation of refugees in various countries. This is due very largely to the fact that, in many countries, persons without nationality are classified under one heading, and it is thus impossible for the Governments to state, exactly, the numbers of the various categories of refugees under the protection of the Office.

The replies so far received (supplemented by those supplied by representatives of the Office) state that there are 445,312 Russian refugees, 234,406 Armenian refugees, 15,237 Assyrian and Assyro-Chaldeans, 3,334 Saar refugees, and 275 Turkish refugees. Those figures, however, do not include many thousands of refugees reported to exist in several European, North and South American countries. Moreover, the latest reports from the representative of the Office in France suggest that the number of Russian refugees in that country, formerly estimated at from 200,000 to 250,000 (*vide* letter addressed by the French Government to the Secretary-General of the League on November 15th, 1935 (document C.A.I.R.47)), does not now exceed 71,500.

As regards the numbers of refugees unemployed though able to work, replies to this question have not been received in respect of the refugees in the Far East, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany and Syria, where there are about 466,000 refugees, or nearly two-thirds of the total number of refugees reported. Nevertheless, in view of the restrictions on foreign labour in so many countries, it is highly probable that the number of unemployed refugees constitutes a very large percentage of those able to work.

A similar state of affairs obtains in so far as the aged, invalid and child refugees are concerned; but the partial returns received are sufficient to stress the gravity of this distressing aspect of the refugee problem. Thus, the aged and invalid refugees are estimated at 25,979, and the number of refugee children under the age of 15 years at 21,880, excluding those in China, France and Syria, whence no replies have been received.

It is gratifying to note that restrictions against foreign workers have been relaxed in the case of refugees in Australia, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, India, Iraq, Lithuania, Norway, Roumania, Sweden and the United States of America, whilst Latvia reports that it has no unemployed refugees. Belgium, Ireland, Monaco, the Netherlands, Palestine and Roumania, however, state that refugees must obtain special permits to work.

Assistance to unemployable refugees or to children under the age of 15, either direct by Governments or through Red Cross or other philanthropic organisations, is afforded in Belgium, the United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Latvia and Roumania.

With reference to the naturalisation of refugees, replies from Governments (No. 11 (a) of the questionnaire) indicate that the majority of countries submit them to the regulations applicable to foreigners in general, although the Bulgarian and Czechoslovak Governments accord refugees liberal treatment, in practice, in this connection. Moreover, refugee children born in Australia, the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, India, Iraq, Norway, Palestine and Sweden are entitled to the respective nationalities of those countries. On the other hand, the regulations in force in Finland, the Netherlands and Roumania do not admit of similar facilities.

The few definite replies given to No. 12 of the questionnaire indicate that no special measures are contemplated by the majority of the Governments to deal with the refugee problems in their countries on the liquidation of the Office.

In response to question No. 14, concerning the expulsion of refugees, the replies indicate that such measures are not taken against refugees unable to obtain entry visas to other countries by the Governments of Australia, the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Iraq, Ireland, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Palestine, Roumania and the United States of America. The Governments of Finland, Latvia, Monaco and Sweden, however, state that they are obliged to expel refugees in exceptional cases.

Although the survey of the refugee problems given in this report is, for reasons explained, necessarily inadequate, it is sufficient to indicate that the situation of the refugees in most countries is far from enviable and often by no means tolerable. Voluminous documentation received from the representatives of the Office and from numerous refugee organisations which appeal daily for assistance demonstrate the disabilities from which the refugees suffer even compared with the most unfortunate foreigners.

#### (b) VARIOUS SOLUTIONS.

Failing repatriation possibilities, naturalisation and assimilation still remain the most important means of solving the refugee problems.

As far as the Armenian refugees are concerned, mention is made in Chapter IV (a) of a further transfer of Armenian refugees to the Erivan Republic, and of the prospects of securing a final solution of the Armenian refugee problem by settlement in that country.

Similar facilities not being open to the Russian refugees, the Office has devoted attention to the other two solutions—*i.e.*, naturalisation and assimilation. Negotiations have been entered into with the Yugoslav Government for the naturalisation of a number of Russian refugees, especially students, who have expressed the desire to obtain Yugoslav nationality, and possibilities are being examined of prosecuting this policy in other countries.

Those countries, however, where, for various reasons, the naturalisation of the refugees presents certain difficulties, can facilitate to an important degree the work of the Office by assimilating, for most practical purposes, the refugees to the conditions obtaining for their own nationals. That is one of the main purposes of the Refugee Convention of 1933.

#### (c) PROVISIONAL MEASURES.

In addition to the special activities of the Office mentioned in the following chapter, the Office and its representatives or correspondents in Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, China,

Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Roumania, Syria, Turkey and Yugoslavia are called upon daily to afford individual refugees and their families very numerous and varied forms of assistance. Such interventions, amounting in all to more than 121,000 throughout the year,<sup>1</sup> include assistance in obtaining Nansen passports; entry, exit and transit visas; in preparing and certifying a wide variety of documents; legal assistance; interventions on behalf of expelled refugees; in favour of tax exemption; in connection with employment, including daily advances to refugees to enable them to start small businesses; in obtaining exemption from foreign labour restrictions; naturalisations; and in securing admission to hospitals, schools and other institutions, etc. 7,609 refugees have been enabled to obtain employment, and 437 heads of families have been established, on average advances of 200 Swiss francs, in a vast variety of small businesses.

The above-mentioned placings have, moreover, provided for the maintenance of 1,922 members of the families thus established (*vide* Appendix II).

In addition, many thousands of destitute and infirm refugees have been helped by the Office by means of important grants, amounting approximately to 250,000 Swiss francs, to organisations in various countries working for the refugees (*vide* Appendix III). The assistance thus afforded consists of that for employment and employment agencies, professional training, holiday camps—especially for weak children—crèches, meals, lodgings, assistance to the aged, infirm, sick and to war invalids, schools, hospitals, clinics, dispensaries, sanatoria, convalescent homes, workshops, orphanages, mutual credit institutions, co-operatives, clothing, fuel, women's homes, unemployment assistance, provident sickness funds and life insurance, small businesses and libraries.

Some idea of the value of the assistance thus rendered may be gathered from the following extracts from letters, typical of many received from refugee organisations:

(i) *Central Committee for the Assistance of Russian University Students abroad.*

“The assistance of the Nansen International Office was most valuable, however, in the month of May, when it prevented the breakdown of our efforts, several of our subscribers having informed us that, owing to the critical and troublous times through which they were passing, they were unable to continue their subscriptions.”

(ii) *Russian Zemstvos and Towns Relief Committee.*

“Under the very difficult conditions prevailing at the present time, the considerable legal and material assistance afforded by the Office to Russian refugees in 1935 and 1936 was of special value. The protection of the Nansen Office improved the juridical status of Russian refugees, which was in some cases intolerable. The grants made by the Office literally saved the most essential organisations for the relief of Russian refugees (orphanages, boarding-schools, homes, etc.) from closing down, as they would otherwise have been compelled to do, and preserved the unfortunate inmates (children, invalids, old people) from further suffering and imminent danger.

“The Committee considers it its duty to state frankly that, without the legal and material assistance of the Nansen International Office, it would have been impossible for even the most vitally essential institutions of the Russian relief organisations to carry on their work and to assist even those children who have lost both their parents or have sunk to the lowest depths of poverty.

“The Russian Zemstvos and Towns Relief Committee would take this opportunity to express once again to the Nansen International Office its most sincere and deep gratitude for the constant and generous help it has afforded to Russian refugees, and particularly for the assistance it has given to the relief organisations for the children of Russian refugees, which are run and subsidised by the Committee in France, in Estonia and in Poland.”

(iii) *General Directorate of the Federation of Russian Disabled Ex-servicemen abroad.*

“Under these disastrous conditions, the assistance afforded by the Nansen Office to the unfortunate Russian war victims of no nationality is of the greatest importance and value. The grants made to refugees by this international charitable organisation show them that they are not forgotten by the conscience of mankind, and that their sacrifices during the war and their present condition have aroused the sympathy of just and charitable men.”

(iv) *The Russian Relief Committee.*

After explaining the present difficulties connected with the question of assistance to refugees, this Committee goes on to state that “the efforts of private organisations are not sufficient to solve this problem. They can relieve poverty to some extent, but are incapable of removing its causes. We have no doubt that the Nansen Office is in possession of abundant and eloquent documentation on this subject, and we shall continue to urge it to take the most vigorous action to defend the right of Russian *émigrés* to live. The vital interests of hundreds of thousands of

---

<sup>1</sup> Not to mention 78,935 interventions in connection with the issue of the Nansen stamp.

men demand the extension of this action and the development of the activities of the Nansen Office, which, with its wide powers and international authority, is alone capable of dealing with the question of stateless *émigrés* as a whole and securing for them a tolerable existence. The League of Nations, which devotes its attention to social questions in the international sphere and organises special services for this purpose, cannot overlook the vital question of refugees, which is possibly more urgent than any other and should be entrusted to a special institution such as the Nansen International Office."

#### CHAPTER IV. — SPECIAL REFUGEE PROBLEMS.

##### (a) TRANSFER OF ARMENIAN REFUGEES TO ERIVAN.

On May 9th, a further convoy of 1,783 Armenian refugees, chosen from a list of 7,000 who had registered for settlement in Soviet Armenia, were transferred from France to Erivan, where the Armenian Soviet Government had made arrangements for their employment and accommodation. This transfer was effected in close co-operation with the competent French and Soviet Armenian authorities, and with the Armenian refugee organisations in France. The cost of the concentration of the refugees and of their transport to Batum was defrayed by the French Government, the Office and the Armenian refugee organisations in France; whilst, at the request of the Office, the League of Red Cross Societies and the French Red Cross assumed responsibility for the medical care of the refugees during their concentration in France and their embarkation at Marseilles.

The total number of refugees so far transferred by the Office to Erivan amounts to 10,280, the previous transfers having been effected principally from Greece and Bulgaria.

It is interesting to record, in this connection, the following account furnished by an Armenian refugee organisation, of the reception afforded to the convoy of Armenian refugees transferred to Erivan in May last:

"*At the Other End.* — A telegram sent from Erivan states that the Government of Armenia had formed a Commission under the Chairmanship of Comrade R. Dashtoyan, the Secretary of the Central Executive Committee, to receive the immigrants at Batum, to carry them to Haiastan and settle them at their destinations. The Federal Government of Transcaucasus and Ajaristan will kindly offer housing accommodation and other help pending the transport from Batum to Armenia. In Erivan itself, the city council has arranged the means of reception and settlement. The returning people will be settled in Nor Teseroa, Nor Malatia, Nor Arabker and other new cities erected by the Hairenaksakan Unions of the same name. Houses, co-operative shops, etc., have been prepared for in the course of the last few years. Local industries and vast farms are already in operation to absorb the new arrivals. Hundreds of scattered families and relatives will thus be reunited and new cells of happiness and production of wealth constituted. In my view, that is the only road to 'collective security'. Civilisation will benefit by such practical acts.

"*Nor Bewthania.* — At the southern outlet of the city of Erivan, a block of buildings was completed last summer. It forms the nucleus of Nor Bewthania, assigned to the immigrants who returned from Greece five years ago. Beautiful buildings are gradually rising from the sands. Five years ago, the ground was a useless steppe; now nearly 2,000 people live in their own properties endowed with all conveniences. As you approach the settlement, you see from a distance the inscription on one of the tallest buildings. It reads: 'Nor Bewthanian Michnakark'dprots'—the secondary school of Nor Bewthania. It is a happy and thriving community. The children who five years ago were hopelessly wandering in the streets of Piræus are now a healthy and enthusiastic set of pupils at learning and gymnastics. Their parents work in factories and institutions. In the mellow and bracing air of Haiastan in the spring you hear songs and music from every house. In Nor Bewthania alone, there are 1,620 children in the schools; many of them attend from the neighbouring quarters."

The Republic of Erivan is understood to be willing to receive several more thousands of Armenian refugees, and to provide them with employment, if external funds can be obtained for their transport to, and housing in, Erivan. The Office is studying carefully this interesting possibility of accelerating a final solution of the Armenian refugee problem, especially on behalf of some ten thousand Armenians in Greece who are reported to be anxious for transfer to Erivan.

##### (b) LIQUIDATION OF THE ARMENIAN REFUGEE PROBLEM IN SYRIA.

The Governing Body, in agreement with the mandatory Power, had decided to terminate the work of Armenian refugee settlement in Syria at the end of 1933. In view, however, of the

precarious situation of a considerable number of Armenian refugees at that time, it was found necessary to adjourn, successively, for the years 1934 and 1935, the application of that plan. By the end of 1935, the Office had assisted more than 30,000 refugees to settle in urban quarters or agricultural colonies, for total advances of 11,355,132 French francs.

There still remain, however, about 1,050 families in the Aleppo camp, and some 642 families in hutments in Beirut, of whom 833 require assistance but have not been able to take advantage of the settlement loans made by the Office, seeing that their material and physical conditions afford no hope that they would be able to reimburse, more than partially, funds employed for their settlement. The Office has, therefore, addressed a pressing appeal to international and national phil-Armenian organisations for the comparatively modest sum of approximately 80,000 Swiss francs, estimated to be sufficient to rescue those refugees from their unhappy situation.

The Armenian Benevolent Union most generously responded immediately to this appeal with a promise of 75,000 French francs and an intimation of a further contribution.

In view of the precarious situation of the refugees still remaining in the Aleppo and Beirut camps, and of the imperative necessity of clearing up those camps without further delay, the Office has appealed to the contributors to the Armenian Refugee Settlement Fund in Syria to adjourn, once more, the liquidation plan, to enable the reimbursements effected this year by the refugees already settled to be applied to the settlement of the refugees still remaining in the Aleppo and Beirut camps.

With reference to the future status of the Armenian refugees in Syria, the Governing Body has urged on the League and the mandatory Power that the interests of those refugees should be taken fully into consideration when the time arrives to establish the future political status of the mandated territories.

An important task now remaining for the Office in Syria consists of recovering the advances, amounting approximately to 12,000,000 French francs, made to the refugees for their settlement and of transferring the title-deeds of their properties to the refugees as and when they liquidate their indebtedness to the Office. According to the liquidation plan, the funds thus reimbursed were either to be refunded to the donators or employed for the social welfare of the refugees in accordance with the donators' wishes. In view, however, of the critical situation of the refugees in the Aleppo and Beirut camps, the Office is, as stated above, urging that the cost of their settlement shall constitute a prior charge on this year's reimbursements.

As regards the administrative side of the work, it should be mentioned that an arrangement has been made, in response to the request of the Council Committee for the Assyrians, for the major portion of the time of the Office representative in Syria to be utilised by the Board of Trustees created by the Council for the settlement in Syria of the Assyrians from Iraq.

### (c) FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE RUSSIAN REFUGEE PROBLEM IN TURKEY.

The final liquidation of the Russian refugee problem in Turkey, which has occupied the attention of League Assemblies for some fourteen years, is now definitely in sight.

This problem had been reduced by the Office, by settlement in other countries, from many tens of thousands to about 2,000 refugees, who had elected to remain in Turkey, where they had succeeded in earning their living. Unfortunately, the Turkish Government found it necessary to introduce legislation to protect national workers, with the result that the refugees remaining in Turkey were exposed to unemployment and consequent destitution.

In response, however, to pressing appeals from the Office, the Turkish Government generously agreed to naturalise the majority of those refugees, representing, with their dependants, some 1,800 persons, and thus enable them to resume their occupations. But the Turkish Government imposed a condition that about 150 who were not admitted to naturalisation should be transferred by the Office to other countries.

For various reasons, including the fact that the majority of the refugees to be evacuated from Turkey belonged to categories of workers in little demand, the Office experienced very considerable difficulty in complying with the conditions imposed by the Turkish Government. Thanks largely, however, to the co-operation of the Belgian, Greek and Yugoslav Governments, the Office was finally able to obtain temporary asylum for the refugees in question in those countries. Letters received from the refugees concerned state that the humanitarian measures taken by the Office on their behalf encourage them to believe once more in the protection of the unfortunate and give them hope to face the future.

The Office would seize this opportunity of expressing its gratitude to the Greek Red Cross, which once more afforded, in this connection, valuable medical assistance to the refugees in transit.

The Turkish Government has already approved the first list of some 1,250 refugees for naturalisation.

The fees for the naturalisation of the refugees have been advanced as to 75,000 Swiss francs by the Office, and the remaining 25,000 Swiss francs by the American Committee, which has for so many years co-operated with the Office in Istanbul. As regards the cost of the temporary accommodation of the refugees in Belgium, Greece and Yugoslavia, this sum, also, amounting to 10,000 Swiss francs, has been advanced from Office funds.

An urgent appeal has been made by the Office to the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish Governments to receive permanently those of the refugees who do not obtain permission to

remain definitely in Belgium, Greece and Yugoslavia, and the Norwegian Government has already agreed to receive nineteen of those refugees from Greece and Yugoslavia.<sup>1</sup>

(d) SAAR REFUGEES.

The situation of the Saar refugees has caused the Office very grave anxiety, owing largely to the entire absence of funds for their relief and settlement.

It will be remembered that, when the League, in the spring of 1935, requested the Office to assume responsibility for some 4,000 refugees who left the Saar Territory on the occasion of the plebiscite, the Governing Body accompanied its acquiescence by a request for an advance of 200,000 Swiss francs to enable it to make an immediate start with the relief and settlement of those refugees. Although the Council was not able to accede to that request, the Office, in anticipation of funds being obtained elsewhere, at once carried out a census of the Saar refugees, and, on the basis of that census, drew up three plans for their settlement in South America, which were accepted by some hundreds of those refugees. For various reasons, a credit for the purpose provided by the French Government could not be utilised. Thanks, however, to the generosity of that Government, which has already expended about 9,000,000 French francs on the maintenance of those refugees in France, the Office is encouraged to hope that, in the near future, it may be able to arrange for the settlement of about 200 Saar refugee families in Paraguay.

The Office was so impressed by the gravity of the situation of the Saar refugees in France, and by the urgent necessity of making a commencement with their settlement, that, as an exceptional measure, it made an advance for the immediate transfer of some of those refugees to Paraguay. Twenty Saar refugees left for Paraguay under that arrangement on July 5th, and a further convoy left Marseilles on August 5th.

The Council of the League, at its eighty-fifth session in May 1935, decided to extend the Nansen passport system to the Saar refugees. The Governments of Australia, the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, India, Irish Free State, Italy, Latvia, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Switzerland and South Africa have notified their adhesion to that system.

The Austrian, Hungarian and Turkish Governments have intimated their willingness to recognise the Nansen passports issued by other Governments to Saar refugees. On the other hand, the Czechoslovak and Swedish Governments have expressed the opinion that, as far as passports are concerned, the Saar refugees should be assimilated to German refugees.

CHAPTER V. — FINANCE.

(a) COMMUNICATION TO THE LEAGUE OF THE OFFICE ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR 1935  
AND OF THE BUDGET FOR 1937.

The Governing Body, at its thirteenth session on April 29th, 1936, approved the budgetary and relief funds accounts for the year 1935, and transmitted them to the League in conformity with the Office Statutes (document A.3(a).1936.X).

The liquidation plan approved by the Assembly in 1931 contemplated a total budgetary grant to the Office from the League of 234,153 Swiss francs in respect of the two years 1937 and 1938. In order to maintain, as long as possible, the present efficacy of the Office organisation, the Governing Body decided to ask the Assembly to allocate 169,197 francs of that sum for the year 1937, an allocation which, even then, falls short of the contribution for 1936 by 80,803 Swiss francs. To enable the requisite sum to be provided for the essential services of the Office for the year 1937, the Governing Body was obliged to draw on its exiguous reserve fund to the extent of 63,250 Swiss francs. The normal budget for 1937 amounts to 270,948 Swiss francs, compared with 288,501 Swiss francs for 1936.

The Governing Body also requested the Assembly to renew for 1937 the special administrative grant of 20,000 Swiss francs for the Saar refugees.

(b) GENERAL.

The relief funds obtained by the Office during the year ending June 30th, 1936, amounted to 536,006.90 Swiss francs, including about 342,000 Swiss francs from the Nansen stamps and 145,902.60 Swiss francs reimbursed by refugees in respect of advances made for their settlement. A total sum of 491,622.50 Swiss francs was distributed by way of advances and outright grants to refugees and to refugee organisations (see Appendix III and the audited accounts for the year 1935).

<sup>1</sup> The Danish and Swedish Governments each propose to ask Parliament to vote a contribution of 20,000 crowns towards the settlement expenses of these refugees in other countries.

In view of the repercussion of the crisis on the economic situation of the refugees, the Governing Body decided, at its April session, to increase from 10% to 50% the proportion of its funds devoted to the relief of refugees by outright grants. The revenue derived from surcharged stamps is, however, excluded from that arrangement.

Appendix I.

RÉSUMÉ OF REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE REFUGEE PROBLEMS

(The word "territory" is intended to comprise also mandated or colonial territory. No entry is made in cases where Governments have been unable to furnish desired information.)

Question 1. — What is the total number of:

- (a) Russian,
- (b) Armenian,
- (c) Assyrian and Assyro-Chaldean,
- (d) Turkish,
- (e) Saar

refugees on your territory?

(Figures communicated by Governments and/or Representatives of the Office. No statistics in reply to this question were furnished by the Governments of Italy, Japan, Lithuania, North, Central and South American countries, Switzerland, United Kingdom and certain British Dominions where refugees are known to exist.)

Countries	Russians	Armenians	Assyrians and Assyro-Chaldeans	Turkish	Saar
* Austria . . . . .	2,500	200	—	—	—
Belgium . . . . .	8,000	800	—	—	—
Bulgaria . . . . .	15,793	14,328	—	—	—
Cyprus . . . . .	11	2,701	17	—	—
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	8,100	900	—	—	—
Danzig (Free City of) . . . . .	747	—	—	—	—
Denmark . . . . .	600	4	—	—	2
Ecuador . . . . .	15	12	—	—	2
* Estonia . . . . .	5,283	—	—	—	—
* Far East . . . . .	130,000	—	—	—	—
Finland . . . . .	7,932	—	—	—	—
* France . . . . .	71,500	63,000	435	—	3,300
* Germany . . . . .	45,000	—	—	—	—
Greece . . . . .	2,205	11,911	1,292	—	—
India . . . . .	103	—	—	—	—
Irish Free State . . . . .	5	—	—	—	—
Latvia . . . . .	14,000	—	—	—	—
Malta . . . . .	1	—	—	—	—
Norway . . . . .	147	—	—	—	—
Peru . . . . .	39	2	—	27	—
Poland . . . . .	90,000	—	—	—	—
* Roumania . . . . .	11,000	6,000	—	18	—
Sweden . . . . .	2,500	—	—	—	30
* Syria . . . . .	620	134,466	13,482	200	—
Trans-Jordan . . . . .	—	62	6	—	—
Turkey . . . . .	1,211	—	—	—	—
Yugoslavia . . . . .	28,000	20	5	30	—
Totals . . . . .	445,312	234,406	15,237	275	3,334

Note. — The Governments of Iceland, Liechtenstein, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Palestine and Sudan state that there are no refugees in their countries.

\* Figures supplied by Representatives of the Office.

*Question 2.* — *What is the number of refugees capable of working but unemployed, or employed on casual or temporary work, with general indications as to the occupations—past and present—of those refugees ?*

(See Chapter III.)

*Question 3.* — *Is it possible to find work for those unemployed refugees within the territory, and, if so, to what extent ?*

*Australia.* — In view of the very small number of refugees in the country, no reply can be given.

*Belgium.* — Foreigners may be recruited in the absence of nationals able to carry out any specific task.

*United Kingdom.* — Resident foreigners are under no restrictions in the matter of seeking employment. If unemployed or indigent, they receive public relief on the same footing as any British subject.

*Bulgaria.* — Owing to general unemployment in the country, the Government cannot undertake to establish new refugees.

*Cyprus.* — Refugees do not require to work, as they are maintained from abroad.

*Czechoslovakia.* — Instructions have been given that all requests by employers to engage refugees are to be given sympathetic consideration, and that the taxes for subsequent authorisation should be calculated on the lowest basis.

*Estonia.* — There is no unemployment in this country.

*Finland.* — Refugees resident in Finland enjoy the same advantages as the nationals.

*Greece.* — No discrimination is made between nationals and refugees. Unemployed refugees can obtain work permits without difficulty.

*Irish Free State.* — There is no refugee problem in this country.

*Latvia.* — No unemployed refugees at the present time.

*Lithuania.* — Unemployed foreigners without nationality receive the same treatment as the nationals. When possible, they are employed on public works.

*Monaco.* — No, if a national unemployed can do the work.

*Netherlands.* — In a general way, it is not possible to furnish employment for refugees.

*New Zealand.* — No refugees.

*Peru.* — There are no unemployed refugees.

*Roumania.* — Roumanian enterprises are generally in a position to employ refugees within the limits fixed by the law for the protection of national labour.

*Sweden.* — Refugees have now been absorbed into the labour market, and, if unemployed, share the same advantages (assistance, etc.) as the nationals.

*Turkey.* — The number of unemployed refugees is insignificant.

*Yugoslavia.* — As a general rule, refugees enjoy special facilities for their establishment. Russian refugees who reached the country prior to April 30th, 1935, are assimilated, as far as employment is concerned, to the nationals.

*Question 4 (i).* — *Number of refugees incapable of earning their living on account of age, disability or other reason, stating the numbers of refugees who are war invalids, or are under 15 years of age.*

(See Chapter III.)

*Question 4 (ii).* — *How, and by what means, is relief being given to those refugees ?*

*Belgium.* — General assistance is afforded when necessary to all indigent refugees, of whatever nationality.

*United Kingdom.* — See reply to Question 3.

*Bulgaria.* — By the Government through the representative of the Office, in collaboration with the Comité des Réfugiés russes and the Conseil diocésain arménien.

*Cyprus.* — No relief is required.

*Czechoslovakia.* — They receive assistance from the Red Cross.

*Danzig (Free City of).* — Assistance is afforded by the City Relief Office and by private contributors.

*Denmark.* — Foreigners receive the same treatment as nationals.

*Finland.* — Indigent, sick and aged refugees are generously assisted by the Finnish authorities.

*Greece.* — Refugees have a right to assistance granted by insurance funds for certain categories of workers, and, without any discrimination, to the benefits of social insurance. Refugees in the professions or trades most affected by the crisis receive in this way the same indemnities and subsidies as the nationals.

*Haiti.* — No refugees.

*Iceland.* — No refugees.

*Irish Free State.* — There is no refugee problem in this country.

*Latvia.* — Refugees are assisted either by means of donations or by hospitalisation in homes for invalids.

*Lithuania.* — In the same way as nationals.

*Malta.* — There is only one Russian refugee, engaged on casual work.

*New Zealand.* — No refugees.

*Norway.* — Some are supported by public assistance, others by their relatives.

*Palestine.* — No refugees.

*Peru.* — See reply to Question 3.

*Poland.* — Refugees enjoy the same treatment as nationals.

*Roumania.* — The unemployment committees make no distinction between refugees and nationals.

*Sweden.* — See reply to Question 3.

*Trans-Jordan.* — None required.

*Yugoslavia.* — Unemployed refugees receive assistance from the Labour Exchanges, from the State Commission for Russian Refugees and from various charitable organisations.

*Question 7.* — *In view of the difficulty experienced in securing accurate refugee statistics, would your Government agree, with a view to remedying that difficulty and to increasing the revenue derived from the issue of the Nansen stamp, to generalise the Nansen passport system in your country in respect of refugees over 18 years of age ?*

*Australia.* — Resident aliens are not required to have passports. There are very few refugees in the country.

*Belgium.* — On request, the Nansen passport is issued to all refugees over 15 years of age who are domiciled in Belgium. The Government does not consider it advisable to compel refugees who do not need to travel to obtain a Nansen passport.

*United Kingdom.* — The proposal cannot be adopted in this country.

*Bulgaria.* — The Nansen passport system is compulsory since November 1st, 1926.

*Czechoslovakia.* — No difficulties having arisen from the present system, the Government sees no reason to modify the *status quo*.

*Danzig (Free City of).* — No objection to the generalisation of the Nansen passport system.

*Denmark.* — The generalisation of the Nansen passport does not appear to be feasible; see reply to Question 6.

*Estonia.* — The Government agrees to generalise the Nansen passport.

*Finland.* — The generalisation of the Nansen stamp system would be a useless burden for the many indigent refugees in this country.

*Greece.* — The Government would be disposed to consider this question, and to agree to it in the event of the other interested Governments taking a favourable decision thereon.

*Haiti.* — No refugees.

*Iceland.* — No refugees.

*India.* — The number of refugees is too small.

*Irish Free State.* — There are only four refugees in Ireland.

*Latvia.* — This has already been done.

*Liechtenstein.* — No refugees.

*Lithuania.* — The Government is disposed to generalise the Nansen passport if such a step is not in contradiction with the laws of the country.

*Malta.* — There is only one refugee in Malta.

*Monaco.* — There are only two refugees in the Principality.

*Netherlands.* — Cannot contemplate this proposal.

*New Zealand.* — No refugees.

*Nicaragua.* — No refugees.

*Norway.* — The generalisation of the Nansen passport cannot be contemplated for the time being.

*Palestine.* — No refugees.

*Poland.* — The generalisation of the Nansen passport cannot be contemplated.

*Roumania.* — All refugees over 15 years of age must hold a Nansen passport. The Nansen stamp system is general.

*Sudan.* — No refugees.

*Sweden.* — In view of the present precarious situation of the refugees, a modification of the existing system cannot be taken into account.

*Turkey.* — The Nansen passport system has not been introduced in Turkey.

*United States of America.* — There is no system of passports for refugees.

*Question 8.* — *Approximate amount of annual expenditure incurred either directly or indirectly by your Government owing to the presence of the following categories of refugees on its territory:*

- (a) *Russian,*
- (b) *Armenian,*
- (c) *Assyrian and Assyro-Chaldean,*
- (d) *Turkish,*
- (e) *Saar.*

*Australia.* — No expenditure.

*United Kingdom.* — No expenditure.

*Bulgaria.* — 9,000,000 leva.

*Cyprus.* — No ascertainable expenditure.

*Czechoslovakia.* — More than 3,000,000 kroner.

*Danzig.* — About 10,000 gulden.

*Estonia.* — No account has been kept of such expenditure.

*Finland.* — 6,231,419 marks.

*Haiti.* — No refugees.

*Iceland.* — No expenditure.

*Iraq.* — Heavy capital expenditure in connection with the Assyrians.

*Irish Free State.* — No expenditure.

*Latvia.* — 400,000 lats.

*Liechtenstein.* — No expenditure.

*Malta.* — No refugees.

*Monaco.* — No expenditure.

*Netherlands.* — Amount unknown.

*New Zealand.* — No expenditure.

*Nicaragua.* — No expenditure.

*Norway.* — Approximately 10,000 crowns, direct expenditure.

*Palestine.* — No refugees.

*Peru.* — No expenditure.

*Poland.* — The amount cannot be determined.

*Trans-Jordan.* — Nil.

*Yugoslavia.* — Monthly subventions (amount not indicated) are made to the State Commission for Russian Refugees.

*Question 9.* — *Would your Government be willing to comply with the recommendations of the fifteenth Assembly of the League and capitalise some of the expenditure at present effected on behalf of refugees and place the credits thus obtained at the disposal of the Office to enable it to settle in permanent employment some of the refugees willing to be transferred to other countries?*

*Australia.* — No expenditure.

*Belgium.* — Not for the moment.

*United Kingdom.* — The proposal is not applicable in the United Kingdom.

*Bulgaria.* — The annual Government subvention, being utilised only for refugees whose situation is particularly difficult, cannot be used for other purposes.

*Czechoslovakia.* — No. The present system is satisfactory.

*Denmark.* — No funds available for this purpose.

*Ecuador.* — No expenditure.

*Estonia.* — The Government expects to liquidate, in a few years' time, the refugee problem, and cannot, therefore, contemplate the capitalisation of its present expenditure.

*Finland.* — The proposal is not feasible.

*Greece.* — Negative reply.

*Haiti.* — No expenditure.

*Iceland.* — No expenditure.

*India.* — There are no funds for the relief of refugees.

*Iraq.* — The proposal is not practicable.

*Irish Free State.* — No expenditure.

*Latvia.* — The refugees have no tendency to leave the country.

*Liechtenstein.* — No expenditure.

*Lithuania.* — No.

*Monaco.* — No expenditure.

*Netherlands.* — See reply to Question 8.

*Nicaragua.* — No expenditure.

*Norway.* — No refugees express the wish to leave the country.

*Peru.* — No expenditure.

*Poland.* — This arrangement is not contemplated.

*Roumania.* — No.

*United States of America.* — The proposal is not feasible, seeing that assistance to indigents, in normal times, is provided by the local and State authorities and not by the Federal Government. The establishment of uniform rules would create serious difficulties.

*Yugoslavia.* — For technical reasons, the Government has not yet taken a decision in this connection.

*Question 10.* — *Would your Government consider the possibility of following the example of the French and Norwegian Governments and make an issue of postage stamps bearing a surcharge in favour of the settlement funds of the Office ?*

*Australia.* — No.

*Belgium.* — The postal authorities do not consider this an opportune moment for a surcharged postage stamp in favour of refugees, owing to the recent issue of " Queen Astrid " mourning stamps.

*United Kingdom.* — Cannot depart from their settled practice.

*Bulgaria.* — No.

*Czechoslovakia.* — No.

*Denmark.* — No.

*Estonia.* — An organisation for social assistance, of a national character, has the sole authorisation to issue special stamps.

*Finland.* — Such issue is not considered necessary.

*Greece.* — No.

*India.* — The number of refugees is too small.

*Iraq.* — The proposal is impracticable.

*Latvia.* — No.

*Lithuania.* — No.

*Netherlands.* — Cannot consider the suggestion at present.

*Norway.* — An issue of special stamps has already been made.

*Poland.* — Does not foresee the possibility of making such an issue.

*Roumania.* — No.

*United States of America.* — The suggestion is not considered feasible at the present time in view of the large sums now spent by local, State and Federal agencies in relief activity in the United States, both for citizens and for aliens.

*Yugoslavia.* — No decision has yet been taken in this connection.

*Question 11 (a).* — *Under what conditions may refugees on your territory acquire naturalisation ?*

*Australia.* — The same conditions as for other aliens.

*Belgium.* — The provisions for the naturalisation of refugees are those of common law defined in Articles 11 to 17 of the co-ordinated laws regarding the acquisition, loss and recovery of Belgian nationality.

*United Kingdom.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners. Residence of five years is necessary.

*Bulgaria.* — Bulgarian nationality may be acquired by naturalisation:

(a) By aliens authorised by the law to have their permanent domicile in Bulgaria after a residence of three years at least from the date of the registration of their request;

(b) By aliens who can establish that they have resided in the country for ten years without interruption;

(c) By aliens who have been authorised to have their permanent domicile in the country after residence of one year, provided they have rendered eminent service to the State and to industry;

(d) By aliens who marry Bulgarian women; also after residence of one year following an authorisation to have their permanent domicile in the country.

*Cyprus.* — Refugees may become British subjects under the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914.

*Czechoslovakia.* — There are no special provisions for refugees. The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Danzig (Free City of).* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Denmark.* — The same conditions for refugees as for other foreigners. Fifteen years' residence is necessary.

*Estonia.* — Refugees who have been domiciled in this country less than ten years may obtain naturalisation on the same basis as other foreigners—that is to say:

- (a) Residence of two years prior to the request;
- (b) Residence of one year following the request;
- (c) Obligation to speak the language of the country;
- (d) Payment of a fee of 20 to 30 crowns.

However, in the case of refugees who have lived in the country for ten years at least, conditions (b) and (c), and in certain cases (d), are waived.

*Finland.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Greece.* — The same as for foreigners, but, in practice and as a general rule, refugees are not admitted to naturalisation.

*India.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Iraq.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners. Three years' residence is required, but can be waived.

*Irish Free State.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Latvia.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners. Five years' residence.

*Lithuania.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners. Any special facilities would be contrary to the Constitution.

*Netherlands.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Norway.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Palestine.* — Two years' residence out of three; good character; adequate knowledge of either the English, Arabic or Hebrew languages; intention to live in Palestine.

*Poland.* — Refugees are subject to the same conditions as other foreigners.

*Roumania.* — The same conditions as for other foreigners.

*Sweden.* — All foreigners and unmarried foreign women born in Sweden become Swedish citizens at 22 years of age.

*Trans-Jordan.* — Two years' residence in Trans-Jordan; good character; intention to continue to reside in the country, and a knowledge of Arabic.

*Turkey.* — The same conditions as for all foreigners.

*United States of America.* — The same conditions as for all foreigners.

*Yugoslavia.* — Certain concessions are made to Russian refugees; thus, they are not obliged to forfeit Russian nationality, nor to have resided in the country for the usual qualifying period of ten years.

*Question II (b).* — *Do children of refugees born in your territory acquire automatically the nationality of your country?*

*Australia.* — Yes.

*Belgium.* — The legislation at present in force does not automatically confer Belgian nationality on children born to refugees on Belgian territory. These children, however, have the right of option to this nationality.

*United Kingdom.* — Yes.

*Bulgaria.* — Yes, unless they renounce during the year following their coming of age.

*Cyprus.* — Yes.

*Czechoslovakia.* — No, if the parents have remained stateless.

*Denmark.* — Children who have resided in the country without interruption up to the age of 19 years automatically become Danish citizens.

*Estonia.* — No.

*Finland.* — No.

*Greece.* — Yes, (a) if born in Greece of Armenian parents; (b) if, up to December 31st of the year in which they reach their twenty-second year, they have remained in the country, and (c) if their parents took refuge in Greece during the years 1920 and 1923 after leaving the same country as the Greek refugees.

*India.* — Yes.

*Iraq.* — Children, within one year after attaining their majority, may declare to choose Iraqi nationality, on certain conditions.

*Irish Free State.* — Yes.

*Latvia.* — Children born in Latvia of refugee parents do not acquire automatically the citizenship of the country. Minors domiciled in Latvia who are not holders of national passports are considered as Latvians if the homes and nationalities of their parents are unknown.

*Netherlands.* — No, a few rare cases excepted.

*Norway.* — Children who have resided in the country until the age of 22 automatically become Norwegian citizens.

*Palestine.* — Any person born in or out of lawful matrimony in Palestine who does not, by his birth or by subsequent legitimation, acquire the nationality of another State or whose nationality is unknown is considered to be a Palestinian citizen.

*Poland.* — No.

*Roumania.* — No.

*Sweden.* — See reply to Question II (a).

*Trans-Jordan.* — No.

*Yugoslavia.* — No.

*Question II (c).*— *Would your Government consider affording refugees on its territory increased naturalisation facilities, and, if so, of what nature?*

*Australia.* — This is not necessary.

*Belgium.* — Russian and Armenian refugees benefit already from a special regime ensuring them important facilities for obtaining the documents necessary for their naturalisation. The Government does not contemplate the introduction of a more favourable regime for the refugees.

*United Kingdom.* — Such a step would not be necessary in view of the replies to Questions II (a) and (b).

*Bulgaria.* — Russian refugees who came to Bulgaria prior to January 1st, 1929, were authorised to acquire Bulgarian nationality. The fees in these cases were reduced from 6,000 to 500 leva.

*Cyprus.* — This is a matter for His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

*Czechoslovakia.* — No; but, in practice, liberal treatment is often given to refugees in this matter.

*Estonia.* — See reply to Question II (a).

*Finland.* — There is no reason to grant further facilities.

*Greece.* — No.

*India.* — There is no reason to afford special facilities.

*Iraq.* — There is no necessity for such facilities.

*Irish Free State.* — Such facilities would not be approved.

*Latvia.* — Special facilities are not considered necessary.

*Lithuania.* — No.

*Netherlands.* — No.

*Norway.* — No reason exists for granting special naturalisation facilities to refugees.

*Palestine.* — The facilities granted being especially favourable, there is no justification for further advantages.

*Poland.* — No. See reply to Question 11 (a).

*Roumania.* — All foreigners, under certain conditions, are granted facilities.

*Trans-Jordan.* — The present qualifications are not thought to be too exacting, and special facilities are already permitted by law in certain circumstances.

*United States of America.* — The law is the same for all foreigners.

*Yugoslavia.* — Juridically, there is no means of affording increased naturalisation facilities. Legislation in this matter cannot be altered.

*Question 12.* — *What steps does your Government contemplate for dealing with the refugee problem on its territory after the liquidation of the Nansen Office in 1938 ?*

*Australia.* — No action is necessary.

*Belgium.* — The Government cannot take a decision in this respect at present. The necessary measures will, however, be taken to ensure for the refugees the favourable conditions they have hitherto enjoyed.

*United Kingdom.* — The problem does not arise.

*Bulgaria.* — The Government considers this question to be premature, and regards the matter as one essentially of international interest, seeing that countries still offering hospitality to large numbers of refugees require the assistance of an international organisation for their transfer to countries able to employ them. If the Nansen Office is liquidated in 1938, its humanitarian functions should be assumed by another international organisation co-operating with the League.

*Cyprus.* — The problem does not arise.

*Czechoslovakia.* — Will maintain the existing state of affairs within the limits of the 1933 Convention.

*Danzig (Free City of).* — There will be no modification to the present treatment of the refugees.

*Denmark.* — No special measures will be necessary.

*Estonia.* — The Government will continue its efforts in favour of the refugees.

*Finland.* — The situation of the refugees will not be modified.

*Greece.* — This question is still under consideration.

*Latvia.* — Russian refugees will continue to be given agricultural work when otherwise unemployed.

*Lithuania.* — Part of the Russian refugees will be naturalised and the remainder given unlimited permits to reside in the country.

*Netherlands.* — Will take no special measures.

*Norway.* — No special measures will be necessary.

*Poland.* — The Red Cross is now, and will be in the future, charged with the care of refugees.

*Roumania.* — Refugees will continue to be considered as foreigners and will be subject to the laws on the control of aliens and the protection of national labour.

*Question 13.* — *What restrictive measures have been taken by your Government with regard to foreign labour? Do these measures apply to the refugees? What exceptions are made in the application of these measures to the refugees?*

*Australia.* — There are no restrictive measures with regard to foreigners already in the country. Others are subject to the ordinary immigration regulations.

*Belgium.* — Refugees, in common with other foreigners, have to obtain an employment permit and their employers an authorisation to engage them. In practice, however, such permits are not refused to refugees.

*United Kingdom.* — There are no restrictions on the employment of resident aliens.

*Bulgaria.* — Refugees require a special authorisation to work, which is granted with certain difficulty.

*Cyprus.* — No restrictive measures exist.

*Czechoslovakia.* — See reply to Question 3.

*Denmark.* — Refugees are subject to legislation concerning foreign workers, but, in practice, experience no difficulty in obtaining labour permits.

*Estonia.* — Foreigners, and, therefore, refugees, must obtain special permits to work, except those: (a) who have lived without interruption in the country since February 24th, 1918, and (b) who established themselves in Estonia prior to April 1st, 1932, and who are employed in certain social organisations, in agriculture, etc., and as non-qualified workmen; (c) who join Estonian ships as sailors outside the territory of the Republic.

*Finland.* — Foreigners must have a special permit to work, issued for three years, and renewable, authorising them to work in a given place. Those enjoying the right of sanctuary are given unlimited permits allowing them to work anywhere.

*Greece.* — See reply to Question 3. Foreigners are not employed if nationals can perform the work, but refugees are exempt from this restriction.

*India.* — There are no restrictive measures.

*Iraq.* — Special provisions are made in the law enabling refugees to practise certain trades.

*Irish Free State.* — Special permits are required of all aliens.

*Latvia.* — There are no restrictive measures applicable to refugees.

*Lithuania.* — Legally, both foreigners and employers have to obtain special authorisations, but in practice refugees are exempt from that restriction.

*Monaco.* — See reply to Question 3.

*Netherlands.* — An employer must apply for a special permit to engage a foreigner. No exceptions are made in favour of refugees.

*Norway.* — Refugees enjoy the right to work.

*Palestine.* — Foreign labour is controlled by the Immigration Ordinance, 1933, but refugees receive sympathetic treatment.

*Peru.* — The refugees in this country are all employed.

*Poland.* — All foreigners, except those who have been in Poland since 1921, are subject to the laws ruling the labour market.

*Roumania.* — Professional permits are easily obtained when the percentage of paid foreigners in each trade is not exceeded.

*Sweden.* — Foreigners have to obtain permission to work, which is never refused to refugees.

*Trans-Jordan.* — No specific measures have been taken.

*United States of America.* — No discrimination is made between foreigners admitted for permanent residence and nationals.

*Yugoslavia.* — See reply to Question 3.

*Question 14.* — *Are expulsion orders made against refugees by your Government? What measures are taken against refugees who, not possessing visas for another country, are unable to obey expulsion orders?*

*Australia.* — No. Should, however, an alien infringe the immigration laws, steps would be taken, before deportation is enforced, to ensure the permission to re-enter his country of origin or of prior domicile.

*Belgium.* — Expulsion measures are rarely taken in Belgium against refugees. The Government is elaborating a draft law which will ensure that refugees unable to comply with an expulsion order shall be dealt with by appropriate internal measures.

*United Kingdom.* — It is not the practice to deport a refugee who is considered a resident.

*Bulgaria.* — Refugees are expelled only when a menace to public order, and after obtaining a visa for another country.

*Cyprus.* — There are no special expulsion orders made against refugees.

*Czechoslovakia.* — Refugees are expelled only if they are a menace to public order. Careful consideration is always given to refugee cases. Should the visa of another country not be obtainable by an expelled refugee, the authorities act according to circumstances. The creation of an Inter-Ministerial Commission for refugees is not desirable.

*Danzig (Free City of).* — Refugees are only expelled if they are a danger to public order and only after obtaining a visa for another country.

*Denmark.* — If a refugee has no visa for another country, he is not expelled. If he is domiciled in another country, he is sent back to that country. Refugees domiciled in Denmark are expelled only if a menace to public order.

*Estonia.* — Yes, if they are a menace to public order. However, should the expulsion of a refugee not be possible, or should he desire to remain in the country, he must remain in a fixed locality designated by the authorities.

*Finland.* — Very few refugees have been expelled. Of those who received expulsion orders and were unable to obtain a visa for another country, some were authorised to remain in the country whilst others were sent back to Russia.

*Greece.* — No, if the carrying-out of an expulsion order is a practical impossibility. In this case, in the interests of public security, refugees may be forbidden the right of residence.

*India.* — Yes, in the case of undesirables, but no such cases have arisen.

*Iraq.* — Yes, but no measures are taken against refugees who are unable to obey expulsion orders for the reasons mentioned in the question.

*Irish Free State.* — No effort would be made to deport a refugee unless some other country would be willing to receive him.

*Latvia.* — Yes, but only if their conduct is a menace to public order. Refugees who cannot obtain the visa of another country receive a warning.

*Lithuania.* — Refugees domiciled in the country are not expelled; but, in case of need, they are obliged to remain within a certain fixed territory.

*Monaco.* — All undesirables, including refugees, are liable to expulsion.

*Netherlands.* — In a general way, the expulsion of refugees is not possible.

*Norway.* — Refugees in possession of a permit of residence will not be expelled if they cannot obtain the visa of another country.

*Palestine.* — Foreigners infringing the Immigration Ordinance, 1933, may be deported. Those whose travel documents are not in order cannot be deported, but are subject to penalties on conviction under the immigration laws.

*Poland.* — Refugees are expelled if a menace to public order, but they are never returned to their country of origin. If a visa cannot be obtained, they must remain in a district fixed by the authorities.

*Roumania.* — Up to the present, no cases of expulsion have been recorded.

*Sweden.* — Bearers of Nansen passports or of permits of residence only expose themselves to expulsion if they are a menace to public order.

*Trans-Jordan.* — No case has arisen in which the Government has ordered the expulsion of a refugee.

*Turkey.* — Refugees are liable to expulsion if they become undesirable.

*United States of America.* — Yes, if found to be in the country illegally. No alien is, however, deported unless possessing proper documents for admission to another country.

*Yugoslavia.* — In principle, foreigners are not expelled if their papers are in order. Those who enter the country illegally, or without a visa, are only liable to expulsion should such a step be deemed an urgent necessity.

*Question 15.* — *What measures are contemplated by your Government in execution of the recommendations made by the seventh session of the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees ?*

*Australia.* — The matter is still under consideration.

*Belgium.* — (1) Expulsion and rejection measures are only contemplated if the refugee constitutes a menace to public order and security.

(2) A Royal Decree of February 20th, 1936, created an Inter-Ministerial Commission, to which refugees may appeal.

(3) Effect has been given to this recommendation by the Ministry of Justice.

(4) The competent authorities are allowed to prolong the validity of refugees' residence permits.

*United Kingdom.* — The matter is still under consideration.

*Bulgaria.* — Short-term entry and transit visas are delivered on special authorisation. The Government has no objection to a uniform type of Nansen passport. See replies to Questions 9 and 14.

*Czechoslovakia.* — In view of the liberal treatment given to refugees, the Government considers it unnecessary to contemplate measures in execution of these recommendations.

*Denmark.* — No special measures have been taken in this connection.

*Estonia.* — The points of view exposed in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of these recommendations correspond entirely with the prescriptions of Estonian legislation.

Expulsions. — See reply to Question 14.

Visas. — Entry visas are granted to persons who have obtained return visas to another country. They are granted to refugees who are not liable to require official assistance. They are refused to refugees whose intention it is to seek employment; those who cross the frontier with that intention are turned back. The representatives of the Government abroad are authorised to grant transit visas only. Applications for entry visas must be submitted to the central authorities.

Nansen passports. — The Estonian Government has no objection whatever to the adoption of a uniform Nansen passport.

Settlement of refugees. — The Government cannot admit any further refugees into the country.

Surcharged stamps. — See reply to Question 10.

*Greece.* — The matter is still under consideration.

*India.* — None.

*Latvia.* — Paragraph 3. — See reply to Question 14.

Paragraph 4. — Transit visas may be granted by the Latvian representative abroad, without application to the central authorities, when the bearer of the passport has obtained a visa authorising him to continue his journey. Entry visas may likewise be given in urgent cases. In all other cases, the previous authorisation of the central authorities is necessary.

Paragraph 5. — Nansen passports are issued in booklet form, the text being established in accordance with the model drawn up by the League of Nations in 1922.

Paragraph 6. — See reply to Question 9.

Paragraph 7. — See reply to Question 10.

*Lithuania.* — This matter is still under consideration.

*Netherlands.* — The Government does not contemplate taking special measures in this connection.

*Norway.* — The Government refer to their reply to Question 14. Norwegian Legations and Consulates are authorised to visa Nansen passports without reference to the Central Passport Office in the case of refugees in transit or who wish to remain for a short period in Norway, and have no intention of seeking employment.

*Poland.* — Owing to the state of the labour market, the Polish Government cannot entertain the admittance of new refugees into the country.

*Roumania.* — Certain of the recommendations will shortly be put into force; the others are still being considered.

*United States of America.* — No special measures are contemplated in this connection.

*Yugoslavia.* — Owing to certain technical difficulties, the Government has not yet taken measures in this respect.

---









Appendix III.

ADVANCES AND SUBVENTIONS MADE BY THE OFFICE TO ORGANISATIONS FOR GENERAL ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES, FROM JULY 1ST, 1935, TO JUNE 30TH, 1936.

PART I. — BY DIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE OFFICE TO ORGANISATIONS.

Organisations	Amount Swiss francs		Number of refugees assisted
Bureau central de bienfaisance, Geneva . . . . .	2,000	For the maintenance and lodging of refugees in Geneva pending the regularisation of their situation (854 nights, 1,151 meals).	
Association des Scouts orthodoxes russes en Tchecoslovaquie . . . . .	130	Towards the organisation of a summer camp.	35
Comité d'initiative d'immigration au Paraguay, Paris . . . . .	3,037.50	Travelling and other expenses of their representative attached to the Office mission to Paraguay.	
Comité des Zemstvos et Villes russes, Paris (Swiss francs) . . . . .	2,000 2,000 2,000 6,600	In aid of their homes for children, orphanages, etc., outside France. Yearly care of children of refugees.	395
Colonie des Kalmouks, Yugoslavia . . . . .	400		
Maison des Marins russes, Antwerp . . . . .	500	To enlarge their church.	390
Institut Polytechnique ukrainien, Prague . . . . .	2,000	To feed and lodge five sailors out of employment.	5
		To enable the Institute to increase the number of its pupils.	16
Fédération des associations des travailleurs chrétiens russes, Rives (Swiss francs) . . . . .	1,000 1,000	For the co-operative of the Federation, and for advances and subventions to its members.	331
Association des travailleurs chrétiens russes, Grodno . . . . .	600		
Fédération des associations des travailleurs russes, Sofia . . . . .	3,200	For the creation of a co-operative society.	150
Union des travailleurs chrétiens russes, Mukacevo . . . . .	300	For general assistance to Russian workmen in Bulgaria.	338
Association professionnelle des travailleurs russes en Suisse . . . . .	750	For the erection of a small canteen for school-children, giving permanent work to five refugees.	5
Maison russe de Sainte-Geneviève . . . . .	2,000	For the creation of a mutual credit society.	35
Comité d'aide aux malades. Section orthodoxe . . . . .	2,000	For assistance to aged and invalid refugees.	37
		For the assistance and maintenance of sick refugees.	250
Comité central de patronage de la Jeunesse universitaire russe, Paris, (Swiss francs) . . . . .	750 2,000 1,500 2,000 2,000	For educational fees and scholarships.	439
Fédération des Invalides mutilés de guerre russes à l'étranger, Paris (Swiss francs) . . . . .	8,000 2,500 2,500 2,500		
Maison des vieillards, Asnières . . . . .	1,200	Towards the upkeep of their various organisations outside France	1,076
Comité d'aide sociale aux réfugiés russes, Paris	3,500		
Réfectoire russe, Berlin . . . . .	1,200	Towards the upkeep of this home for refugees.	
Asile des réfugiés russes, Mesched . . . . .	200	For general assistance to Russian refugees in Paris.	
Société humanitaire des Femmes russes . . . . .	600	Organisation which has served during the last five months 8,770 meals.	
		For the relief of Russian refugees in Persia.	
		For the creation of a home and a crèche for children.	
Comité central des Réfugiés arméniens, Paris (Swiss francs) . . . . .	1,000 1,000	For general assistance to Armenian refugees.	
Section des Sœurs de charité de la Croix-Rouge russe en Bulgarie . . . . .	1,000		
Dispensaire de la Croix-Rouge russe, Berlin . . . . .	450	For the creation of a refectory.	180
Comité de colonisation russe, Paris . . . . .	6,496	For food and medicine for indigent refugees.	371
		For the transport of 14 refugees to Chile, where work has been obtained for them.	14
Comité russe de secours en France . . . . .	1,500	For general assistance to Russian refugees.	
Comité de protection des émigrés russes en Pologne . . . . .	1,740	For the creation of a mutual credit society.	
Commission agricole du Comité des Zemstvos et Villes russes, Paris . . . . .	600	For the publication of an agricultural magazine for refugees.	
Association des Infirmières de la Croix-Rouge russe, a.o., Paris . . . . .	1,500	For upkeep, training and employment.	250
Croix-Rouge russe, ancienne organisation, Paris (Swiss francs) . . . . .	2,000 4,000	Towards the upkeep of their homes, sanatoria, etc. (40,329 cases dealt with).	
Croix bleue arménienne, Paris . . . . .	2,400		
		To send convalescent children to the south of France.	35
<i>Carried forward.</i> . . . .	85,653.50	<i>Carried forward.</i> . . . .	4,352

PART I. — BY DIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE OFFICE TO ORGANISATIONS (*continued*).

Organisations	Amount Swiss francs	Object	Number of refugees assisted
<i>Brought forward.</i>		<i>Brought forward.</i>	
Union des peintres en bâtiment, Greece . . . . .	3,000	For the creation of a co-operative society.	4,352
Union des Cosaques, Greece . . . . .	2,500	To purchase a farm for the members of the union.	150
Société des Amis de la Chanson ukrainienne . . . . .	2,000	For the expense of a concert tour.	60
Miss Roberts, Syria (Swiss francs) . . . . .	2,272.50	For assistance to Armenian refugees and the upkeep of her home for lunatics.	40
	2,290.50		
Comité de Secours aux Juifs russes en Allemagne	2,500	For general assistance.	
Association d'aide aux Réfugiés, Prague . . . . .	800	For general assistance to refugees.	
Union générale arménienne de bienfaisance, Paris . . . . .	20,000	For assistance to some hundreds of Armenian refugee families. This amount was distributed as follows: 4,000 francs in Aleppo; 4,000 francs in Beirut; 4,000 francs in Athens; 4,000 francs in Salonica; 4,000 francs in Plovdiv.	
Centre d'aide aux Réfugiés russes, Paris . . . . .	1,500	Assisted in Beirut alone.	1,180
Special grants for urgent needs:		For small grants, meals, and general assistance.	
To the representative of the Office, Paris . . . . .	406	For the small urgent needs of refugees, such as travelling expenses, meals, lodgings, regularisation of papers, etc.	46
To the representative of the Office in Germany . . . . .	300		
To the representative of the Office in Czechoslovakia . . . . .	600		
To the special representative of the Office in France for the Saar refugees . . . . .	406		
Grants to various representatives of the Office in connection with the evacuation of Russian refugees from Turkey . . . . .	36,234		
Towards the evacuation of Armenian refugees from France to Erivan . . . . .	3,000		
Total . . . . .	163,462.50	Total . . . . .	7,836

PART II. — SUBVENTIONS GRANTED BY THE COMMITTEE OF RUSSIAN ORGANISATIONS SET UP IN PARIS TO ADMINISTER 40 % OF THE REVENUE OF THE NANSSEN STAMP RESERVED FOR RUSSIAN REFUGEE RELIEF IN THAT COUNTRY.

	Amount French francs	Object	Number of refugees assisted
(a) For the care of sick and aged refugees (grants to three organisations) . . . . .	12,500	For surgical operations, clinical treatment and medicine.	226
(b) For refugees suffering from tuberculosis (grants to two organisations) . . . . .	29,500	Towards treatment in sanatoria.	53
(c) For assistance to the aged and crippled . . . . .	50,300	For care in homes and towards the upkeep of homes. Grants to indigent, crippled and unemployed refugees, for food, coal, rent, etc.	182
(d) For unemployed refugees (grants to six organisations) . . . . .	74,000	For meals (640 per diem), lodgings, medical care, small grants, etc.	1,422
(e) For war invalids (grants to three organisations) . . . . .	39,000	For care, maintenance, and general assistance, purchase of artificial limbs, etc.	72
(f) For refugee students (grants to two organisations) . . . . .	31,000	For meals, rent, etc. Also towards the upkeep of an hostel for students, for medical care, and for small grants.	24
(g) For refugee children (grants to ten organisations) . . . . .	75,500	For the upkeep of crèches and homes. For meals, assistance, school fees and general education.	223
(h) For holiday camps and holidays generally (grants to nine organisations) . . . . .	26,500	To enable weak and convalescent refugee children to recuperate in the country.	1,027
(i) To Ukrainian organisations (grants to four organisations) . . . . .	15,250	Towards the cost of sending 100 children to Switzerland; of crèches and homes for children.	100
(j) To various . . . . .	64,750	For general assistance to indigent refugees.	717
Total . . . . .	418,300	Total . . . . .	4,046

Appendix IV.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY.

President appointed by the Assembly of the League of Nations: M. Michael HANSSON, Former President of the Egyptian Mixed Court of Appeal; Norwegian Member of the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration; Member of the Mixed Roumano-Hungarian Arbitral Tribunal in Paris, etc.

Vice-Presidents: His Excellency M. C. ANTONIADE, Mr. L. B. GOLDEN.

I. MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES.

1. *Members:*

His Excellency M. C. ANTONIADE, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Roumania accredited to the League of Nations.

His Excellency M. R. RAPHAËL, Greek Minister at Ankara.

His Excellency M. P. DE REFFYE, Sub-Director of Chancelleries and Administrative Litigious Matters, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Paris.

Dr. I. SOUBBOTITCH, Permanent Delegate of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia accredited to the League of Nations.

2. *Substitute Members:*

Mr. C. A. EDMOND, British Consul at Geneva.

His Excellency M. J. FELDMANS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of the Latvian Government accredited to the League of Nations.

His Excellency M. N. MOMTCHILOFF, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of Bulgaria accredited to the League of Nations.

M. Guido ROMANELLI, Consul-General, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Rome.

II. MEMBER APPOINTED BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

M. J. AVENOL, Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

III. MEMBER APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

Mr. H. B. BUTLER, Director of the International Labour Office.

IV. MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF PRIVATE ORGANISATIONS FOR REFUGEES.

1. *Members:*

Mr. L. B. GOLDEN, British United Committee, London.

M. L. PACHALIAN, Comité central des réfugiés arméniens, Paris.

M. J. RUBINSTEIN, Commission centrale pour l'étude de la condition des réfugiés russes, Paris.

2. *Substitute Members:*

M. M. FEDOROFF, Comité central de patronage de la Jeunesse universitaire russe à l'étranger, Paris.

M. C. HANEMIAN, Office des réfugiés arméniens en France, Paris.

Mr. W. A. MACKENZIE, Save the Children International Union, Geneva.

V. MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE NANSSEN INTERNATIONAL OFFICE.

His Excellency Senator G. CIRAOLO, President of the Executive Committee of the International Relief Union, Rome.

M. Albert FRANÇOIS (Substitute), Member of the Executive Committee of the International Relief Union, Brussels.

Mlle. S. FERRIÈRE, International Migration Service, Geneva.

M. B. DE ROUGE (Substitute), Interim Secretary-General of the League of Red Cross Societies, Paris.

*Managing Committee.*

1. Members:

M. Michael HANSSON, *Chairman.*  
His Excellency M. P. DE REFFYE, M. J. RUBINSTEIN.

2. Substitute Members:

M. L. PACHALIAN, His Excellency M. R. RAPHAËL.

*Finance Committee.*

M. Michael HANSSON, *Chairman.*  
His Excellency M. C. ANTONIADE, His Excellency M. R. RAPHAËL.  
His Excellency M. P. DE REFFYE, M. J. RUBINSTEIN.

---

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ADVISORY COMMISSION  
FOR REFUGEES.

DELEGATES OF GOVERNMENTS.

- Belgium:* M. Albert FRANÇOIS, member of the Executive Committee of the International Relief Union.
- British Empire:* Mr. C. A. EDMOND, British Consul, Geneva.
- Bulgaria:* His Excellency M. N. MOMTCHILOFF, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of Bulgaria accredited to the League of Nations, Geneva.
- China:* M. CHEN TING, First Secretary of the Permanent Bureau of the Chinese Delegation accredited to the League of Nations, Geneva.
- Czechoslovakia:* His Excellency M. R. KÜNZL-JIZERSKÝ, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of the Czechoslovak Republic accredited to the League of Nations, Berne.
- Estonia:* His Excellency M. A. SCHMIDT, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Estonian Legation, London.
- France:* His Excellency M. P. DE REFFYE, Sub-Director of Chancelleries and Administrative Litigious Matters, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Paris.
- Greece:* His Excellency M. R. RAPHAËL, Greek Minister at Ankara (*President of the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission*).
- Italy:* M. Guido ROMANELLI, Consul-General, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Rome.
- Latvia:* His Excellency M. J. FELDMANS, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Delegate of the Latvian Government accredited to the League of Nations, Geneva.
- Poland:* M. W. KULSKY, Councillor of Legation, Polish Delegation accredited to the League of Nations, Geneva.
- Roumania:* His Excellency M. C. ANTONIADE, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Roumania accredited to the League of Nations, Geneva.
- Yugoslavia:* Dr. Ivan SOUBBOTITCH, Permanent Delegate of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia accredited to the League of Nations, Geneva.

ADVISORY MEMBERS.

- M. J. AVENOL, Secretary-General of the League of Nations, Geneva.  
Mr. H. B. BUTLER, Director of the International Labour Office, Geneva.  
M. Michael HANSSON, President of the Governing Body of the Nansen International Office for Refugees, Geneva.

ADVISORY MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

- M. G. ČURČIN, Secretary-General of the Confederation of Industrial Corporations of Yugoslavia, Belgrade.  
M. Ch. TZAUT (substitute), Vice-President of the Central Union of Swiss Employers' Associations, Geneva.  
M. Z. ZULAWSKI, Secretary-General of the Polish Union of Professional Syndicates, Warsaw.  
M. Ch. SCHÜRCH (substitute), Secretary of the Swiss Syndical Union, Berne.

TECHNICAL ADVISERS.

- Mr. L. B. GOLDEN, British United Committee, London.  
His Excellency M. A. KHATISSIAN, Delegation of the Armenian Republic, Paris.  
Mr. W. A. MACKENZIE, Save the Children International Union, Geneva.  
M. B. MAKLAKOFF, Office central des réfugiés russes en France, Paris.  
Baron B. NOLDE, Council of Former Russian Ambassadors, Paris.  
M. L. PACHALIAN, Comité central des réfugiés arméniens, Paris.  
Major C. PETERSEN, League of Red Cross Societies, Paris.  
M. J. RUBINSTEIN, Commission centrale pour l'étude de la condition des réfugiés russes, Paris.

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NANSEN OFFICE.

*Austria:*

M. E. KOMERS	Honorary representative	Austrian	23, Herrengasse, Vienna.
--------------	-------------------------	----------	--------------------------

*Belgium:*

M. R. COUBAUX	Honorary representative	Belgian	30, rue d'Italie, Brussels.
---------------	-------------------------	---------	-----------------------------

*Bulgaria:*

M. B. SERAFIMOFF	Representative	Russian refugee	18, Chipka Street, Sofia.
------------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------------------

*Czechoslovakia:*

Dr. A. G. MASARYKOVA	Honorary representative	Czech	17, Rubesova, Prague.
----------------------	-------------------------	-------	-----------------------

*Finland:*

M. F. M. GRIPENBERG	Honorary representative	Finn	2 A. 13, Malmbrinken, Helsinki.
---------------------	-------------------------	------	---------------------------------

*France:*

M. M. PAON	Representative	French	38, boulevard Raspail, Paris (VII).
M. E. GALLATI	Representative for Saar refugees	Swiss	15, rue Chomel, Paris (VII).

*Germany:*

Representation in Germany (being wound up) M. FALKOVSKY		Russian refugee	103, Saarlandstrasse, Berlin, S.W.1.
--	--	-----------------	--------------------------------------

*Greece:*

M. A. KOTELNIKOFF	Representative	Greek	9A, rue Metropoléos, Athens.
-------------------	----------------	-------	------------------------------

*Roumania:*

M. S. POKLEWSKY-KOZIELL	Honorary representative	Russian refugee	1, Strada Dimitrie Sturdza, Bucharest.
-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	--







