

was one in the French zone. It would be their duty to facilitate and encourage the voluntary return of refugees. Not many were expected to return to Germany but a number were expected to return to Austria. It is hoped soon to start the Migration and Settlement Division of the Directorate, and an officer was to visit South America to encourage settlement there. He called attention to a recent declaration of policy in regard to the reunion of families made by the British Government, the substance of which I understand has been sent to Ottawa by Canada House.

5. In regard to travel documents, the Director apologized for the delay in the circulation of necessary papers, which was due to printing difficulties.

2nd SESSION

6. The 2nd Session, on the afternoon of the first day, was devoted to a useful discussion of the Director's Report. The more important points raised included the following:

7. A number of delegates, especially the Russian, were anxious to ensure that as much as possible is being done for Spanish refugees. The effect of the discussion will probably be to stir the Directorate to fresh efforts in this direction.

8. Several delegates spoke in favour of the early return of German and Austrian refugees to their homelands. The French delegate said his Government was prepared to instruct its officials in the French Zone and to talk with the Allied Control Commission in regard to the other Zones. The Director maintained here and in other Sessions that it was inadvisable to press for the return of any refugees to their homelands until conditions exist in those lands which would guarantee them a full and free life. He supported the voluntary principle. It was the duty of Governments and not primarily of the I.G.C. to bring about these conditions. These views met with no opposition, though the U.S.S.R. delegate refrained from endorsing them.

9. Linked with this question was that of "protection." This term during the Sessions acquired the meaning of political or consular support given by the I.G.C. Committee to refugees who had returned to their homelands or to those still in other countries. In France, the I.G.C. had become the official protector of Spanish, German and Austrian refugees, and in other countries it had for a long term been acting informally as a kind of protecting power.

10. From this point the discussion moved into the question of the Committee's mandate - the most delicate subject raised during the meetings. The U.S.S.R. delegate maintained consistently that the I.G.C. had been set up to look after victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution. Insofar as these duties have been fulfilled, the I.G.C. might then turn its attention to such people as the Spanish refugees. There appeared to be some evidence, he said, that the I.G.C. was interesting itself in persons who ought to be punished rather than helped. No other delegate supported this view, and the Australian delegate (the Australian Minister in Paris) took by implication the opposite stand. The Director's viewpoint was that the mandate was sufficiently wide to cover all possible classes of refugees whose plight arose through the European situation.