

Committee, New Zealand was represented. Practically all questions of fundamental interest fell to be considered by the Committee on Policy before being finally disposed of in plenary sessions of the Council. Lengthy statements were submitted to a plenary session by representatives of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, the Combined Production and Resources Board, the Combined Raw Materials Board, and the Combined Food Board.

In the report of the New Zealand delegation to the first meeting of the Council the problems of UNRRA were discussed under five main headings. A similar classification will be convenient for commenting upon the business of the second session.

(i) THE SCOPE OF UNRRA'S ACTIVITIES

It has never been seriously questioned that the two R's in UNRRA were intended to be given a rather narrow interpretation; this view was reinforced at Montreal by the acceptance by the Council as "consistent with the provisions of the Agreement and Resolutions on Policy of the Council" of the reservation of the United States Congress which affirmed, *inter alia*, that "rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief." In estimating the practical significance of this limitation, it should, however, be borne in mind that military exigencies will demand in certain areas the reconstruction of transport and of some industrial equipment which will, before UNRRA is asked to undertake any responsibilities on its own account, go a good deal beyond the scope of "rehabilitation" thus narrowly defined.

But UNRRA is also conscious of the fact that relief by itself will not be enough, and, on the initiative of the Czech member of the Council, a resolution was adopted drawing the attention of member Governments "to the importance and urgency of the need to provide means whereby the problems of continued rehabilitation may be jointly considered and, through the co-operation of the nations, successfully resolved." In the discussion of this resolution, moreover, the Canadian representative drew attention to the fact that effective measures for general rehabilitation must embrace the whole world.

Several resolutions on the Council's agenda raised points of importance affecting the geographical scope of UNRRA's work. The problem of famine in certain United Nations' territories, which had aroused considerable interest at Atlantic City, had induced both the United States and the Indian Legislatures to register reservations to the UNRRA Agreement, which were met at Montreal by the adoption of a resolution authorizing the Administration to make its benefits available in "any United Nations area under the control of any of the United Nations which is of importance to the military operations of the United Nations and which is stricken by famine or disease." The prior consent of the local Government is necessary in this as in all other cases.

A further resolution defined more precisely the responsibilities of UNRRA for the removal or repatriation of "persons of enemy or ex-enemy nationality who have been intruded into homes in liberated territory."

Steps were also taken to render more precise the responsibilities of UNRRA in relation to the care and repatriation of displaced persons. The Atlantic City resolutions had covered such persons of United Nations nationality who happened at the conclusion of hostilities to be in either liberated or enemy or ex-enemy territories, but had made no provision either for displaced persons of United Nations nationality in territories never occupied by the enemy, or for persons of enemy nationality who were favourable to the cause of the United Nations. At Montreal account was taken of both these categories. The Administration was authorized to assume responsibility for "the care and repatriation or return of displaced persons (of United Nations nationality) who are in territories which have never been occupied by the enemy," but with the limitations that it should "allot its resources mainly in favour of congregated groups of displaced persons rather than in favour of displaced individuals," that it should deal only with "persons who are necessitous and who lack the resources to return to their homes," and that it should operate "only in areas where the resources for their maintenance are inadequate or cannot continue to be made available." The second category was dealt with in two resolutions, one sponsored by the representative of the United States authorizing the Administration similarly to operate in enemy or ex-enemy territories for the care and repatriation of "persons who have been obliged to leave their country or place of origin or former residence or who have been deported therefrom, by action of the enemy because of race, religion, or activities in favour of the United Nations," and the other, sponsored by the representative of the United Kingdom, extending this authorization to persons described in the same terms, "of other than United Nations nationality, or stateless persons, who are found in liberated territory." These resolutions were understood to refer mainly, though not exclusively, to Jews; and though it was widely felt that the provision made for Jewish refugees was still merely a partial solution of a wide and perplexing problem, it was unanimously agreed that UNRRA should not be debarred from attempting some alleviation of their plight.

While no objection was taken on principle to these proposals, there was an understandable anxiety on the part of some of the European members of UNRRA lest even small extensions of its work should hamper its activities in fields which they regarded as more urgent. "It is very easy," said the Netherlands member of the Council, "to extend the work of the Administration, and many a field could be found where useful work could be