

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL****CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**E/AC.15/2  
30 September 1946  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON FINANCES OF THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 25 September 1946 at 2:45 p.m.

## Present:

Chairman:	Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai	(India)
	Mr. Riddell	(Canada)
	Mr. Cheng Paonan	(China)
	Mr. Perrier	(France)
	Mr. Sen	(India)
	Mr. Colbjørnsen	(Norway)
	Mr. Patino	(Peru)
	Mr. Tepliakov	(Soviet Union)
	Mr. Pitblado	(United Kingdom)
	Mr. Warren	(United States)
	Mr. Mates	(Yugoslavia)
Observers:	Mr. Malin	Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees
	Miss Gibbons	UNRRA
Secretariat:	Sir Raphael Cilento	Director, Refugee Division

Statement by the Delegate for China regarding Chinese Displaced Persons and Refugees.

Mr. Cheng PAONAN (CHINA) recalled to the Sub-Committee's attention the fact that the Committee on Finances has been unable to set down complete figures for refugees and displaced persons as there was insufficient information regarding the category of "Overseas Chinese". His Government was now in a position to give a detailed report on the Chinese displaced persons problem.

Some forty million persons had been internally displaced in China as a result of the last war. The entire responsibility for the care of these persons had been assumed by the Chinese Government with the exception of a certain amount of welfare work carried out by UNRRA. This category would not become the concern of the IRO.

204,567 persons had registered as "Overseas Chinese" awaiting repatriation to various regions of South East Asia, and it was calculated that there were a further 204,168 persons in this same category who had not registered. In reply to the delegate for Yugoslavia, Mr. Cheng PAONAN explained that there were three reasons why this groups had not registered:-

- (a) because of the financial difficulties of the Chinese Government, it had not been possible to provide adequate registration facilities;
- (b) conditions in the areas to which these people wished to return were still extremely unsettled; and
- (c) the attitude of the authorities in these areas to the return of former Chinese residents was still the subject of negotiations between them and the Chinese Government.

Of the estimated total of 408,735 "Overseas Chinese", roughly 100,000 would be able to be repatriated through their own efforts and another 42,000 would be repatriated by UNRRA before the close of its work in the Far East. This left a residue of 266,735 persons who would become the concern of the IRO.

Mr. Cheng PAONAN calculated that it would cost about \$30,000,000 to repatriate this residue of "Overseas Chinese", if the provision of ninety days rations were to be accepted.

Their places of former residence were Burma, Borneo, Malaya, the Philippines, Indo-China, Siam, Indonesia and Hongkong and it was to be hoped that negotiations for the return of displaced Chinese would be successfully concluded before 1947. In this connection, it was also to be hoped that 1947 would see a considerable improvement in the shipping situation.

A third group of Chinese displaced persons were the 10,000 individuals stranded in various parts of the world, but as yet no details were forthcoming as to the estimated cost of their repatriation.

Mr. Cheng PAONAN announced that he would submit a written statement on the Chinese displaced persons problem.

Continuation of the General Discussion on the Draft Budget of the  
IRO (E/PLF.FIN/23)

THE CHAIRMAN hoped that it would be possible to agree on certain basic assumptions for the operational budget; to decide, for example, on the numbers of persons to be resettled under Part I, Operations other than Large-Scale Resettlement, and under Part II, Large-Scale Resettlement, and to take a decision on the budget for care and maintenance under Part I. In this connection, he asked why it had been laid down that the IRO should bear the whole cost of care and maintenance when in the case of UNRRA, the occupying authorities had borne the lion's share of the expense. Also why had no provision been made for a contribution from indigenous sources.

Mr. PITBLADO (UNITED KINGDOM) pointed out that the refugee problem was international in character and as such the expense presumably would be borne by more than three nations. To insist that the military authorities should cover the costs of care and maintenance was simply to readjust the scale of contributions. It was necessary to get as big a contribution as possible from Germany, but it must be remembered that the occupying authorities were having to import food into the country to maintain life, Germany no longer being in the position to pay for imports with exports.

The delegates for Norway, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union were much disturbed by the idea that the military authorities could offer no financial assistance to the IRO though they were providing food for the Germans. It almost seemed as if any money which would be spent on the refugees and displaced persons would at least indirectly alleviate the position of the German people.

In reply to the delegate for the Soviet Union, Mr. WARREN (UNITED STATES) stated that whatever could be taken from the German economy had already been deducted from the budget estimates. The figures laid down in E/PLF.FIN/23 referred to what was needed over and above any possible German contribution.

Mr. COLBJORNSEN (NORWAY) wished to know the comparable proportions paid

by the military authorities and UNRRA towards the care and maintenance of the refugees and displaced persons. In his opinion it was roughly 85% to 15%.

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS) wished to know how much of the 85% contributed by the military authorities was being paid for out of the German economy.

Mr. WARREN (UNITED STATES) confirmed the fact that the occupying authorities were bearing at least 85% of the cost of DP operations in Germany, but was unable to state exactly what proportion of this figure was being paid for by Germany. The German contribution covered the cost of various items such as transportation, housing, fuel, etc., while the figure of \$153,370,000 referred to imported food, medical supplies, clothing and certain overhead costs which would be incurred in transporting supplies to the various camps.

Mr. COLBJORNSEN (NORWAY) suggested that the occupying authorities should pay half the \$153,370,000 set aside for the care and maintenance of the refugees and displaced persons. Mr. WARREN (UNITED STATES) made a counter-proposal that the 67¢ calculated per person per day should be reduced to 57¢.

Decision: It was agreed that the Secretariat would work out fresh calculations for a year's budget on the basis of 57¢ per person per day. The figures for Chinese displaced persons would be incorporated in this new budget.

Consideration of the Explanatory Chart on the Number of Refugees and Displaced Persons for whom Provision has been made in the Operational Budget of the IRO (E/REF. FIN/23, p.55).

Column (1).

Mr. TEPLIAKOV (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS) reserved his position with regard to assistance to German and Austrian refugees in Shanghai. At the same time he also reserved his position with regard to the German and Austrian refugees in Spain, mentioned in Part I of the Operational Budget. In the category "Refugees and displaced persons in the Middle East and in India and in Mexico" the words "and in Mexico" were deleted, as the United States

Government has assumed responsibility for this small group.

Column (2).

These figures were accepted without comment.

Column (3) and (4).

After some discussion as to the desirability of replacing the figure 150,000 by the figure 400,000 as suggested by Mr. La Guardia, Director-General of UNRRA, it was decided to include a more optimistic figure of 300,000.

Column (5).

At the suggestion of Mr. MALIN (INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON REFUGEES), the figure 50,000 for overseas emigration of family units and individuals was increased to 75,000.

Mr. WARREN suggested an increase of a further 25,000 to the emigration of family units and individuals to adjacent countries, but the French delegate, having made a reservation with regard to this proposal, it was decided not to add to the original figure.

Column (6).

In reply to the Soviet delegate, Mr. WARREN (UNITED STATES) explained that it had been found very effective with regard to local re-establishment to advance small loans of \$200 which would later be recoverable. The Sub-Committee decided to include in this column a note to the effect that such loans would be recoverable.

Column (7).

Having been requested to express an opinion, Mr. MALIN (INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON REFUGEES) suggested that the figure of 100,000 should be reduced to between 10,000 to 15,000. The delegates for the United States and the United Kingdom would have preferred 30,000 but in view of the increases made in the category of resettlement by family units and the lack of concrete offers from the possible receiving countries, the Sub-Committee agreed on a figure of 12,500.

The meeting rose at 6:05 p.m.

-----