

RUSSIAN, ARMENIAN, ASSYRIAN, ASSYRO-CHALDEAN AND
TURKISH REFUGEES.

RECOMMENDATIONS FORMULATED BY THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL
ADVISORY COMMISSION FOR REFUGEES DURING ITS FIFTH SESSION
(JANUARY 1933).¹

20A/6789/697

REPLY FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

Pretoria, August 24th, 1933.

With reference to your Circular Letter No. 118.1933, of June 26th, 1933, I have the honour to state that there are no Russian or Armenian refugees—in the strict sense of the word—in the Union of South Africa. Any Russians or Armenians who have entered the Union have done so as ordinary immigrants and have complied with the requirements of the Immigration Law

With regard to Chapter V of the Commission's report on the work of its fifth session, I have the honour to inform you that very few Nansen passports are issued by the Union Government, but when such are issued they are usually made valid for the holder's return to the Union within a period of two years from the date of issue.

(Signed) J. B. M. HERTZOG,
Minister for External Affairs.

20A/6666/697

REPLY FROM THE DANISH GOVERNMENT.

Geneva, September 12th, 1933.

In reply to your Circular Letter No. 118.1933, of June 26th, 1933, I have the honour, acting on instructions received from my Government, to inform you that, as regards the above-mentioned recommendations, it abides by the statements on questions (a), (c), (d) and (g) contained in its memorandum forwarded with my letter of May 6th, 1931,² and that, for the rest, the report does not give rise to any other observations by the Danish Government.

(Signed) Henning HERGEL.

20A/7723/697

REPLY FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FREE CITY OF DANZIG

(through the intermediary of Poland).

[Translation from the German.]

Danzig, September 27th, 1933.

With reference to the wishes of the League of Nations as stated in the Geneva report of the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees, dated May 18th, 1933 (document C.266.M.136.1933), we still consider a special settlement of the legal position of Russian refugees to be unnecessary from a police point of view as the way in which this question, raised by the League of Nations, has hitherto been dealt with in the Free City of Danzig has not given rise to any complaints on the part of the Russian refugees.

With regard to Point III of the Geneva report, we would point out that refugees whose permits to enter the country lapse during residence in the Free City of Danzig, and in the case of whom the period of validity of the passport or re-entry visa cannot be extended, are provided by the

¹ See *Official Journal*, October 1933 (Part I), pages 1169 to 1172.

² See *Official Journal*, June 1931, page 1007.

Free City of Danzig with a personal certificate to which, in accordance with Section V of this report, a re-entry visa may be affixed for the period of the validity of the certificate, in order to enable the refugee to leave at any time.

The question of the Armenian refugees (Point IV of the report) does not arise in practice in the case of the Free City of Danzig, as, up to the present, no Armenian refugees have come to Danzig.

We are unable to accede to the suggestion of the League Commission (Point IX of the report) that, in the case of all refugees, including non-Russian refugees, the Nansen certificate should be adopted as the uniform passport.

(Signed) GREISER.

Dr. KLUCK.

20A/7138/697.

REPLY FROM THE ICELANDIC GOVERNMENT.

(through the intermediary of Denmark).

[Translation.]

Geneva, October 4th, 1933.

With reference to your Circular Letter No. 118.1933, of June 26th, 1933, I have the honour, acting on instructions received from my Government, to inform you that the recommendations in question have no practical significance in the case of Iceland.

Consequently the Icelandic Government desires to reserve its attitude with regard to that question until it has ascertained the attitude adopted by the other countries with regard to the said recommendations.

(Signed) William BORBERG.

20A/6732/697.

REPLY FROM THE LITHUANIAN GOVERNMENT.

[Translation.]

Kaunas, September 13th, 1933.

With reference to your letter of June 26th, 1933 (Circular Letter No. 118.1933), I have the honour to state that the Lithuanian Government, while considering it possible to give effect to Recommendations V and IX, is unable to agree to Recommendations III and VI. The persons referred to in Recommendation IV will be treated in Lithuania in the same way as persons in possession of the Nansen certificate.

(Signed) ZAUNIUS,

Minister for Foreign Affairs.

20A/1794/697.

REPLY FROM THE YUGOSLAV GOVERNMENT.

[Translation.]

Geneva, August 7th, 1933.

Acting upon instructions from the Royal Ministry for Foreign Affairs and pursuant to Circular Letter No. 118.1933, dated June 26th, 1933, of the League of Nations Secretariat, the permanent delegation has the honour to forward herewith to the Secretariat the following reply from the Yugoslav Government:

Ad III.

The Royal Government has made a fresh study of the problem of the expulsion of Russian and Armenian refugees unable to obtain permission to enter an adjoining country.

It has come to the conclusion that the only appropriate internal measure that could be applied to them would be compulsory domiciliation in a specific locality with a prohibition to leave that locality without previous authorisation, in this way effect would be given to the recommendations embodied in this chapter of the report.

Ad IV

The Royal Government shares the Commission's views, embodied in this chapter, with regard to Armenian refugees.

Ad V

As regards the clause giving a right of re-entry the Royal Government regrets that it cannot alter the procedure hitherto applied, which has been brought by it to the knowledge of the League of Nations Secretariat in previous communications on the same subject.¹

Ad VI.

The Royal Government, as it has duly informed the League of Nations Secretariat, has always applied the recommendation embodied in this chapter.

¹ See *Official Journal*, September 1931, page 1881 June 1932, page 1147.