SIXTH WORKING GROUP

FINANCING OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

Chairman: Dr. W. GASE (Geneva)

Secretary : Dr. R. FREEMAN (Netherlands)

This working group discussed the co-operation in the financing of migration between receiving and sending countries and the participation of the international fund.

53

Financing of International Migration

by Dr. WALTHER E. GASE (Geneva)

AN EXCHANGE OF VIEWS CONCERNING THE financing of international migration is very valuable, as financial questions are becoming more and more a central problem of international migration. We may say that the volume of internationel migration will depend on the extent to which the financial question will be solved.

Now, after we have overcome the usual difficulties of the growing period of our organizations, it must be avoided that because of financial difficulties the utilization of the existing possibilities be confined or prevented.

Before we start the discussion you may wish to have a brief outline of the present methods of financing the internationally-organized migration.

We have several main sources:

1. the governments of the emigration countries,
2. the governments of the immigration countries,
3. the intergovernmental committee,
4. the international voluntary societies and their national counterpart agencies,
5. the migrants themselves.

None of the sources alone can be strong enough to meet all the financial requirements. Therfore, some or all of them together contribute financially in the course of migration procedure. Thus a many-fold system has been developed which is not easy to review. There are different principles in the financing of the various services rendered in the movement of migrants from their old home to the resettlement place in the new country; these are different for the „mass schemes" as well as for the „individual cases", sponsored by Voluntary Agencies.

We have to distinguish between three different phases in the migration procedure:

1. the pre-embarkation costs,
2. the costs of the overseas transportation,
3. the post arrival costs.

THE PRE-EMBARKATION COSTS.

These comprise the processing costs up to embarkation, which include: the costs for pre-selection, for selection, for medical examination and for transportation within the emigration country to the port of embarkation.

These costs as far as government (mass) — schemes are concerned, are generally covered by the government of the emigration country. They are allotted in their budgets and are much higher than usually considered to be. The average value of the services amounts to about $ 55 per capita. In total the governments of the emigration countries have rendered services which can be estimated at $ 7.88 million in the years 1952 and 1953, for schemes assisted by the Committee. In 1954 the expenses will probably amount to about $ 5.5 million, an amount which, in 1955 will probably be increased due to the anticipated greater volume of migrants.

This is a considerable financial contribution, all the more so, if we take into account that all European emigration countries have to carry other heavy financial burdens for the post war refugees in their countries.

The *individual migrants* have to pay the pre-embarkation costs themselves. Only in cases in which migrants are beneficiaries of social subsidies, the governments are generally prepared to cover the pre-embarkation costs. Other indigent migrants, if they are sponsored by the Voluntary Agencies, are supported by loans from them granted for these costs.

These loans are collected on the basis of a promissory note by the counterpart agency after the resettlement. Here we have the first form of financial support by Voluntary Agencies which will be generally dealt with later on. The total amount spent by the Voluntary Agencies for this purpose of migration is very difficult to find as the amounts of these loans are included in the total loan amount for all services. Because of systematical reasons let us defer the following phase (the costs of transportation overseas) and first analyse the post arrival costs, the phase of placement and resettlement in the immigration country.

THE POST ARRIVAL COSTS

The financing of this final phase of migration is based on the same principles as the part of pre-embarkation which we have just regarded. The post arrival costs comprise mainly transportation costs from the port of debarkation to the new residence, as well as the costs of placement which are administrative costs for finding a working place for the migrant and subsistence costs up to the beginning of employment.

These costs for *government (mass)-schemes* are paid by the government of the immigration country. We calculate these costs on the average of roughly $ 20 for each migrant. In total the post arrival services of the receiving governments can be estimated at $ 2.35 million for the years 1952 and 1953. In the current year the expenses will probably amount to $ 2.1 million.

The *individual migrants* have to pay these costs themselves. However, they are very often unable to meet these requirements because many of them debark with a small amount of cash money only, due to their financial position or due to the still existing foreign currency transfer restrictions[1]). Therefore, the financial support by the Voluntary Agencies — if the migrant is sponsored by them — is even more important here than in the case of pre-embarkation costs. Here it is only the financial support by the Voluntary Agencies which often solves the problem.

[1]) The valid foreign currency and export facilities for migrants can be outlined as follows:

1. from Austria : 30 US or Canadian Dollars for Canada, £ 15 for Australia; $ 10 for other overseas countries.
2. from Greece : US $ 40. (or £ equivalent for £ area).
3. from Italy : a. US $ area: $ 50 in cash and $ 210 in letter of credit;
   b. £ area: £ equivalent of $ 28 in cash and $ 210 in letter of credit;
   c. South America: currency of the immigration country equivalent to $ 48 in cash and $ 160 in letter of credit.
4. from Germany: equivalent of $ 357 per head in the currency of the immigration country.
5. from Holland : roughly the equivalent of $ 1052 respectively $ 526 for dependents in the currency of the immigration country.

THE OVERSEAS PASSAGE COSTS

These represent the main part of the costs of migration and the principles of their financing are more complicated.

The passage costs vary according to the route, and in the North Atlantic, to the tariffs of „high" or „off" season.

The lowest rates are from Germany to Canada, which the Committee can offer at present at $ 150; somewhat higher are those to the U.S.A. The highest rates are from Europe to Australia with

$ 365 from Germany,
$ 335 from Mediterranean ports.

Between these amounts are the rates to

a. South America — East coast
   $ 210 from Hamburg,
   $ 270/290 from Mediterranean ports,
b. Chile,
   $ 310 from Mediterranean ports.

The passage costs for the *government (mass)-schemes* are in the first line being covered by the Committee. However, the possibilities of the Committee are limited to the extent to which it obtains contributions to meet the operational budget requirements. The so-called „free contributions", i.e. contributions not related to specific programs, have mainly been made available by the generosity of the Government of the United States of America. In 1952 and 1953 the United States have granted about $ 14.2 million. In addition, some smaller amounts were granted mainly by sympathising member governments of the Committee who are neither emigration nor immigration countries.

However, these voluntary „free contributions" put at the disposal of the Committee do not fully meet the requirements. Therefore, so-called „specific contributions" for programs which are considered to be desirable have been established to be paid by those countries directly interested in sending or receiving certain categories of migrants. These contributions are paid not only for government schemes but even for individual cases sponsored by the Voluntary Agencies and moved under

a. the Revolving Fund Plan
b. the USEP — (United States Escapee) Program,

provided that the government has approved the cases. We shall refer to both cases when speaking of the financing of individual migration.

In principle, each of the emigration countries as well as each immigration country concerned is supposed to make such contributions, as both of them profit from migration. But in practice this principle could not be applied fully and sufficiently.

On the part of the emigration countries it has now been achieved that even those countries who find themselves in an extremely difficult budgetary situation like Austria and Greece, pay contributions

for specific programs. The fixing of the amount was based on the idea to divide the average costs for overseas passages between the three partners: Emigration country, Immigration country, and Committee.

When computing the amount, for several reasons no pro rata contributions have been chosen, but preference was given to the per capita basis without consideration of the concrete passage costs. In principle a per capita contribution of $ 60 has been established. In special cases the per capita amount has been calculated on the lower basis of $ 30. For the emigration from Holland special conditions are existing which probably will be outlined in a Dutch report.

With regard to the immigration countries we have not yet fully achieved the aim to obtain specific contributions:

Per capita contributions are already paid by the Governments of Australia, Argentina, Brazil and Israel. For Israel and the two South American countries this contribution is lower than $ 60: For Argentina $ 43 (per adult), Brazil $ 20, and Israel $ 45 per head. Canada pays on the basis of the fully assisted scheme, the details of which will be mentioned later on.

The United States, as already stated, carry the main burden of the free contributions. Apart from these they pay specific contributions for refugees coming from the countries behind the iron curtain moved within the US Escapee Program ($ 125 per head up to the full costs).

For the years 1952 and 1953 the sending countries paid about $ 6.5 million, and the receiving countries paid $ 7.4 million as specific contributions or a total of approx. $ 14 million. One of the financing problems of the Committee is to increase the revenues from „specific contributions" especially by achieving that the still hesitating six South American member governments of Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela also make contributions of this kind, and by increasing the amounts of the contributions which the Committee already receives. At present they do not nearly reach the planned and desirable division of the costs: the Committee Pays for example 62 — 72 % of the costs for the emigration to Australia, Venezuela and Chile.

The situation is quite different with respect to movements to Canada. Under the „fully assisted scheme" the Canadian Government pays the full amount of the ocean transportation costs. These costs are to be reimbursed by the migrants after resettlement. This is the only case of a loan basis for government (mass) — schemes contrary to all other mass-schemes which are financed without any participation of the migrant.

These were the general lines for the financing of passage costs for government schemes.

And now we have to deal with the financing of passage costs for *individual migration*. Here, as far as the individual migrants are sponsored by Voluntary Agencies, these help to finance the passage costs by means of loans, however, only on a subsidiary basis, if the migrants are not able to pay themselves.

You are familiar with the conditions in detail for the granting of such loans and the usual procedure applied for decision on granting loans, the signing of a promissory note and the collection in the immigration country. The 11 Voluntary Agencies interested in migration have funds available from different sources for these loans:

a. own funds;
b. grants from the IRO Trust Fund;
c. The Revolving Fund subsidised by grants from the Committee. Incidentally: the fact that the Committee pays these grants to the Voluntary Agencies is the reason for the payment of specific contributions being made to the Committee by the governments also for these cases.

The proportion of their own means to the amounts granted by the Committee differs considerably amongst the various Voluntary Agencies. In the years 1952 and 1953 loans were garanted by:

HIAS & AJDC: $ 1.4 mil. own means, $ 760.000 out of the Committee grants;

LWF: $ 375,000 own means, $ 800.000 out of the Committee grants;

WCC: $ 250.000 own means, $ 560.000 out of the Committee grants.

The two Catholic Voluntary Agencies, ICMC and NCWC granted:

$ 330.000 own means — $ 880.000 out of Committee grants.

In total the 11 Voluntary Agencies have granted loans of $ 5.7 million during this period. Thereof, $ 2.5 million originate from own means while the greater part of $ 3.2 million was covered by grants from the Committee.

Regarding the Revolving Fund system you know

1. for which cases it is especially applicable;
2. that the Voluntary Agencies obtain from the Committee grants of $ 90 per head (up to 1st July 1954: $ 100) under the condition that the Voluntary Agencies have spent at least an average of $ 40 out of their own means;
3. that the Voluntary Agencies collect the loans from the migrants after resettlement, by using their counterpart agencies for collections;
4. that all the collected amounts shall again be utilized for new loans.

Now we have to deal with the *Contribution by the migrant himself*. For our purpose we may exclude the migrants who are able to defray the full passage costs either from own means or for instance through payments from overseas employers. These „self-

payers" are not entitled to the Committee's and the Voluntary Agencies' financial assistance, although they may use the shipping services of the Committee or technical services of the Voluntary Agencies.

The self-payers who emigrated unassisted out of European countries in 1952 and 1953 may be estimated at roughly 330.000 whilst the assisted movements by the Committee amount to 165.000 during this period, out of which 30.000 have been sponsored by the Voluntary Agencies[2]).

We have only to deal with migrants who are not able to pay the full amount of the costs but only part of them, and we also have to consider migrants who are completely destitute (for instance foreign refugees or persons who have been unemployed for a long time).

For the *government (mass)-schemes* we have at present, as explained before, no financial contribution from the migrant. He has neither to make a pre-payment nor a reimbursement. The costs are fully covered by the Committee and the governmental contributions to the specific programs. We noticed, however, already one exception to this principle in the case of Canada. A further exception is the family reunion scheme for South America, under which pre-payments of the passage costs are required from the migrants who call forward their dependents. They vary between $ 20 and $ 30 for adults, depending upon the country of destination.

The *individual migrants*, however, are supposed to contribute to their passage costs within the following schemes:

1. The Voluntary Agencies' passage loans (Revolving Fund Plan);
2. Refugee movements under the IRO Trust Fund from the Far-Middle-and Near East by Voluntary Agencies;
3. Movements under the American Refugee Relief Act of 1953;
4. The assisted individual migration from Italy to South America (EFI = Emigrazione Finanziale Individuale) : under this scheme the migrant has to reimburse the costs in full for himself and in part for his dependents ($ 25 for adults).

If in future we want to increase the movement figure over 120.000 as anticipated for the current year, the financial resources mentioned before will not be sufficient. We therefore will have to consider the financial participation of the migrant within the government (mass)-schemes too.

Of course, objections against this may be raised; e.g. that the migrants' limited financial resources should be saved in order not to endanger the chief aim of migration, i.e. the rapid resettlement and assimilation of the migrant and not to discourage him to emigrate.

However, not only financial but also some psychological and even moral reasons may be in favour of contributions by migrants:

Would not a migrant after having participated in the passage costs try more seriously to strive for success in the new country? Would it not prevent people from taking careless decisions for migration if they have to put their own money in?

The migrants will have a chance for new possibilities at the expense of their governments. Does not fairness and parity with regard to migrants who have to pay under other schemes require the introduction of contributions by migrants also within the mass schemes?

Of course, such a system would have to be built up carefully in every detail in order to minimize all objections. I would like to stress some points which must be considered in this connection.

1. The first problem would be to find a right and reasonable amount to be contributed by the migrant.
2. Furthermore, should there be a more or less uniform contribution, regardless of the actual shipping rates to the country of destination, thus avoiding a discrimination of the countries which are farther away and the danger that the migrants might choose countries at closer distances because of the lower contribution amount involved? On the other hand, would not a too uniform quota result in an unequal proportion between contribution and shipping rates?
3. Should not the family status be also taken into account and accordingly the quota for the dependents be fixed at a lower level?
4. In which form shall the migrants' contribution be established: pre-payments, reimbursements, or should both forms be applied?
   If so, the establishment of the proportion between pre-payment and reimbursement would have to be considered very carefully as well.
5. Should the pre-payments be as high as possible or low?
6. Would it not be advisable to establish
   a. a very limited compulsory pre-payment, perhaps with a certain exception for completely destitute persons (refugees, unemployed, etc) and,
   b. a voluntary additional pre-payment (perhaps with certain discounts).
   This may perhaps be a solution to all conflicting points of view.
7. If a minimum pre-payment seems to be indispensable in principle, shall a uniform amount be fixed for all countries or should a difference be

[2]) If we add to the 330.000 and 165.000 the roughly 44.000 government assisted movements out of the Netherlands and 11.000 government assisted movements out of Italy, we come to 550.000 as the total volume of the migration out of Europe in 1952 and 1953 since the establishment of the Committee.

made, depending on the wages in the country of emigration?

8. How shall the same question be answered with regard to the monthly instalments on reimbursements, without endangering the migrants resettlement in the country of immigration?
9. How shall the procedure for the collection of both contribution parts (pre-payments and reimbursements) be established? By local authorities, banking institutions or Voluntary Agencies?

If the general financial contribution of the migrant should be introduced, the question which would particularly concern you will be raised, as to whether and to what extent a modification of the other contributory systems which I mentioned before, will be necessary and also to what extent they will have to be adjusted to the new contribution policy. You as the experts in the field of migration are in a position to give valuable views on all the problems which I took the liberty to present to you. The result of our discussions will be extremely useful for the decisions to be taken in the near future, which also might influence the activities of your organizations.

54

Memorandum on the Financing of Voluntary Migration

by Dr. J. A. U. M. VAN GREVENSTEIN (Netherlands)

THIS MEMORANDUM, WHICH MAY SERVE AS A small contribution to the discussions of the working group for „the financing of international migration" of the I.C.M.C. Congress at Breda, does not deal with aspects concerning the financing of the emigration of refugees.

I would like to touch here on a few points only, which bear upon the financing of voluntary migration and, in my opinion, deserve more thorough consideration than is possible in this memorandum.

The fact, that the financing of voluntary migration is to be discussed, immediately gives rise to the question why we can speak here of a problem. If the emigration referred to were voluntary in the full meaning of the word, it could be left to settle itself, and then there would be no question here of a financing problem.

Although the emigration of people other than refugees can be called voluntary migration, one must on the other hand not lose sight of the fact that it is founded to a considerable extent on a necessity. In many cases there is a necessity for the migrants themselves, because it is of great importance that they should be able to make their life correspond more to what they are entitled to expect of it. If it is not the migrants' own circumstances which drive them to emigrate, it is the importance of being able to give their children a better future than their homeland can offer.

Then there is the necessity for the emigration country of bringing the structure of its population into harmony with the opportunities and the space which it has to offer. And not the least important factor is the urge in the immigration countries to increase their economic and social possibilities.

A review of the parties which have an interest in voluntary migration provides the answer to the question as to which parties should take a share in its financing. However, it is also important to indicate the extent to which each party will have to participate. A few remarks are given below with regard to the respective interests of the migrant, the sending country and the receiving country in voluntary migration, and an endeavour has been made to indicate to some extent the limits of the contribution of each of these parties to its financing.

THE MIGRANT'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINANCING HIS EMIGRATION

In view of the fact that the migrant himself is never the only party interested in migration, the attitude that the migrant himself is fully responsible for the costs of his emigration cannot be justified. If carried through to its logical conclusion it would mean that, in cases where the applicant is unable to produce the necessary funds before his departure, he would not be able to emigrate at all.

In practice, this is never the case. Nevertheless, the idea at the root of it, viz. that the migrant himself bears the responsibility for the costs of his emigration, is over-emphasized. In cases where the deficiency is made up by means of a gift, this is often reflected in the extent of the financial sacrifice demanded of the migrant before his departure. Where it is obtained not by means of a gift but of an advance, one adheres in point of fact to the view that the

migrant alone must bear the costs of his emigration. Hence the importance of answering the two following questions with regard to the share which the migrant will have to take in financing his emigration:

a. To what extent will the migrant have to contribute *before* he emigrates?
b. To what extent will a possible advance have to be repaid *after* he has emigrated?

re a.

The position of the emigrant in the first instance is extremely weak, compared with that of persons remaining in their home country and that of the inhabitants of the immigration country. The migrant must therefore not be required to turn all he possesses into money and arrive in the immigration country on the brink of destitution.

One of the migrant's greatest difficulties is that he has to leave behind everything with which he is familiar, and that he is loosened from former ties. It is most important that he should as soon as possible be in a position to regain his feeling of security.

The migrant must never be so burdened that his start in the immigration country is jeopardized. He must not be made to feel that he has been cast out without a cent, but he must be able to arrive in the immigration country with a certain social prestige. The migrant must therefore not be deprived of his necessary possessions.

re b.

It must be made possible to satisfy the migrant's urge to regain as soon as possible a certain degree of security. The burden of a debt which has still to be paid will be prejudicial to his assimilation into his new surroundings. It cannot be denied that the migrant's moral welfare is often dependent upon the material success of his emigration.

From an economic point of view also it is very important that the migrant's position during the initial period be as strong as possible. In this way he will be a better producer and a better consumer and will more quickly become a valuable member of the new community. If migrants are obliged during the initial period to sacrifice all their savings to repay the advances made to them, they will remain longer on the fringe of the new community. This will lower the prestige of the immigrants in the receiving country. It will also cause an increase in the number of failures, which will be reflected in a dwindling interest in the emigration countries.

Moreover I take the view that in every case the emigrant will have, before he leaves, to make a financial contribution to his expenses, which he will have to feel, but which must never exceed the limit defined above.

On the other hand, I am of the opinion that it is unfair to demand this contribution from him after he arrives in his new homeland.

It is in the interest of the migrant himself, as well as that of the receiving country and the sending country, that his emigration becomes a success as soon as possible.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SENDING COUNTRY FOR THE FINANCING OF EMIGRATION

Starting from the principle of necessity for emigration, it is clear that the sending country should take a share, where necessary, in the financing. When fixing this share it should be borne in mind, on the one hand, that the nation as a whole has obligations towards those to whom it can offer no future, whilst on the other hand it must not be forgotten that the nation has made sacrifices for the upbringing and education of the migrant, which will not result in any future productivity.

The necessity for migration involves the departure from the emigration country of a large number of persons who have some means, as well as of those who have none. The most important contribution which the emigration country can make in this connection is that of permitting the exportation of capital. As this is essential if the migrant is to be given a good start, it is of primary importance that the sending country permit this exportation of capital on as large a scale as possible.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RECEIVING COUNTRY

Amongst the parties which have an interest in migration, the receiving country undoubtedly occupies the most favourable position. Whereas the sending country must endeavour to prevent, by means of emigration, a further drop in the standard of living, the receiving country is fortunate enough to be able to raise its standard of living by immigration. The strong position of the receiving countries makes it possible for them to determine more or less for themselves what categories of immigrants they will admit. They can also decide what age groups and what size of families will be acceptable. As the structure of their economy progresses, the emphasis will fall more on the categories of workers who cannot easily be spared by the emigration countries. In my opinion the advantage of the receiving countries in being able to strengthen their economy cheaply is not as a rule sufficiently reflected in their share of the costs of migration.

DETERMINATION OF THE SHARE OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES IN THE FINANCING OF MIGRATION

On the grounds of what has been stated above, the following conclusions could be drawn:

a. It is reasonable that the migrant himself should in all cases contribute to the costs of his emigration.

b. This minimum contribution should be fixed at a low sum per head and per family.
c. Each migrant, according to his means, will have to contribute further to the costs of his emigration, but never so much that he would have to convert necessary possessions such as clothing, household and personal effects into money.
d. The sum which cannot be raised by the migrant will have to be issued to him without the obligation to repay.
e. Both the sending country and the receiving country will have to bear a reasonable share of the remaining costs.

The above are the minimum requirements which I feel should apply to the financing of voluntary migration.

I would like also to devote some attention to two other subjects.

THE INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENCES IN TRANSPORT COSTS ON THE CHOICE OF THE IMMIGRATION COUNTRY

It is obvious that many persons refrain from applying for emigration to far distant countries on account of the high costs of transport involved. The choice of the immigration country may be influenced by this fact. This is a great disadvantage, as one country offers more suitable living conditions for one migrant, and another country for another. It is therefore important that this factor in the choice of the immigration country be eliminated.

This can be done by fixing the costs of transport for all destinations at the level of those of the nearest immigration country. The difference which has to be paid will naturally have to be borne in this case by the other parties interested in this migration.

THE LEVELLING OF MIGRANT'S POSSESSIONS BY MAKING THEM CONTRIBUTE TO THE COSTS OF EMIGRATION ACCORDING TO THEIR MEANS

In the system set out in point 4 contribution according to means leads, especially in the case of large families, to the levelling of migrants' possessions. The question is, whether this must be considered justified for families with some savings and other assets, and whether it can be considered wise from the point of view of migration policy.

It seems more correct to endeavour to maintain the differences in material welfare thus making emigration more attractive for the larger families with some means.

The fact, that in practice those countries which stand to benefit by the solution of the European population problem and the maintenance of social stability in Europe also have a share in financing migration, has hitherto been left out of consideration. These countries contribute for this purpose to the operational fund of the ICEM. This fund is of a limited nature, so that the ICEM cannot always provide the balance needed to cover the costs of emigration. In cases where the ICEM cannot make up the deficiency, the contributions of the sending and the receiving countries will have to be increased, whilst no contribution should be made by the ICEM if the sending and the receiving country do not participate.

55

Le Financement de l'Emigration Individuelle

par Dr. G. LUCREZIO MONTICELLI (Italie)

UN DES PRINCIPAUX OBSTACLES QUI, DANS L'ORDRE pratique, s'opposent aux mouvements migratoires, est, de toute evidence, le coût de l'émigration. Le problème devient encore plus grave si l'on considère que l'émigration ne doit pas entrainer la séparation de la famille mais que tous les membres de la famille doivent émigrer ensemble; ou bien, dans la pire des hypothèses, que tous les membres de la famille se réunissent au chef, dans le plus court délai.

En effet, — et les catholiques n'ont pas manqué d'insister en toute occasion sur ce fait — il est de la plus haute importance que l'émigrant reste éloigné de sa famille le moins longtemps possible, pour peu de mois seulement; et cela dans l'intérêt de la famille, dans l'intérêt du pays d'émigration et de celui d'immigration.

Toutefois, cette nécessité comporte un surcroît immédiat de dépenses pour les partants, même si tout se résoud rapidement en un avantage d'ordre économique.

Lorsque l'émigrant n'a pas la possibilité de faire face aux dépenses de l'émigration de ses propres moyens, il n'y a que deux solutions aptes à surmonter l'obstacle soit par l'obtention d'un prêt, qui permettrait à l'intéréssé de faire face aux dépenses en question, soit de faire endosser les dites dépenses directement, ou indirectement par l'Etat.

Dans la plupart des cas, et particulièrement dans le secteur de l'émigration individuelle, la seconde

solution ne semble pas la meilleure, ni la plus „éducative".

Mettre à la disposition de tous ceux qui le desirent, ou de tous ceux qui appartiennent à des catégories déterminées, la possibilité de se transférer dans d'autres pays, aux frais de l'Etat, peut être une aide à l'émigration, mais cela peut devenir également un encouragement à courir l'aventure sans réflexion, — ou bien encore, ce qui est pire, à faire de l'emigration une sorte de „tourisme".

D'autre part, ce système entraîne une humiliation de la dignité humaine; il peut apparaître comme une des formes dégradantes de l'assistance répandue dans l'après-guerre laquelle consiste à accorder purement et simplement un secours qui prend facilement l'allure d'une aumône. Ce n'est certainement pas le meilleur moyen de secourir ceux qui sont dans le besoin et que nous devons toujours considérer comme nos frères, revêtus de toute la dignité des êtres humains.

Ce n'est pas non plus le moyen le plus indiqué pour enseigner aux hommes comment affronter l'émigration, enthousiasmante mais non facile, très souvent nécessaire mais toujours dure.

La solution du „don"serait donc à conseiller, mais seulement dans certains cas de mouvements en masse (refugiés,, ,émigration assistée", réunions de familles). Cependant dans ces cas également, il semble opportun qu'au moins une contribution symbolique soit versée par les intéressés.

Lorsque le prêt est accordé à bonne fin et avec l'esprit de fraternité chrétienne, il ne peut pas humilier la nature humaine, et il place l'ouvrier en face de sa responsabilité, en constituant un dernier argument pour lui faire comprendre le sérieux et la noblesse du pas que représente l'émigration.

Une organisation appropriée pourra, avec les sommes récupérées au fur et à mesure des recouvrements, constituer un fond de roulement qui permettra à l'action assistantielle de se prolonger dans le temps, avec de moins en moins de frais et de risques pour l'organisme financier et, en même temps, de faire bénéficier du prêt un plus grand nombre de personnes; il permettra également à ceux qui ont été aidés et qui payent maintenant leur dette, de contribuer à secourir leurs frères qui se trouvent actuellement dans la même nécessité où ils se trouvaient jadis eux-mêmes.

En plus, le prêt a une fonction éducative qui n'est pas à négliger: il aide l'émigrant à s'aider lui-même; il lui fait sentir sa propre responsabilité et sa propre dignité, il l'encourage, par l'engagement qu'il entraîne, à surmonter les difficultés inévitables des premières années de la vie dans sa nouvelle patrie.

Etant donné l'opportunité, disons mieux, la nécessité que, par une organisation adéquate soit mis à la portée de tous ceux qui en ont besoin, le moyen d'obtenir, dans les meilleures conditions, un prêt qui leur permette de faire face aux dépenses de l'émigration, il est indispensable de considérer brièvement quelques-uns des aspects pratiques du problème.

COÛT DE L'EMIGRATION

Les dépenses inhérentes à l'émigration sont, dans les grandes lignes, les suivantes:

1. Frais de voyage.
2. Frais de documents, de visites médicales, visas, voyage jusqu'aux lieux de sélection et d'embarquement, etc.
3. Frais de „trousseau" et d'outillage pour pouvoir affronter le voyage et la première période de résidence dans le pays de destination.
4. Frais d'installation dans le pays de destination (comportant l'achat d'outillage, vivres, etc.).

Il faudrait également considérer les pertes financières qui sont inévitables quand on est obligé de réaliser en peu de temps le peu que l'on possède, poussé par le besoin d'argent liquide destiné aux dépenses de l'émigration. Pensons, par exemple, aux conditions auxquelles sont vendus les pauvres objects que possèdent les émigrants, à quelles conditions ils doivent se soumettre lorsqu'ils sont obligés de recourir à l'usurier pour se procurer l'argent dont ils ont besoin.

Parmi les dépenses mentionnées ci-dessus, la première est, en général, la plus lourde et celle pour laquelle, dans la plupart des cas, le prêt est accordé. En effet, selon la destination, pour une famille moyenne devant payer trois passages entiers, cette dépense varie de 500 a 1500 dollars.

Ainsi qu'il a été pratiqué dans bien des cas, il serait opportun d'adopter le critère général étendant le prêt également au second point des dépenses, lorsque ledit prêt est consenti dans le pays de départ. Dans les pays de destination, les émigrés devraient trouver la possibilité d'obtenir des prêts leur permettant de subvenir aux frais indispensables de première installation.

LES BÉNÉFICIAIRES DES PRÊTS

Puisque le prêt doit être consideré comme un moyen d'encouragement pour la bonne — et non la mauvaise — émigration, il ne devrait étre consenti qu'à ceux qui inspirent une plein confiance. Avant tout, il faudrait s'assurer de l'existence d'une réelle possibilité de vie et de travail pour l'émigrant dans le pays de destination; en général, il faudrait s'informer et s'assurer qu'il existe en sa faveur un contrat de travail ou la certitude qu'il pourra en trouver à son arrivée au pays de destination. Il faudrait également s'assurer de l'existence dans ledit pays de bonnes possibilités de logement et d'un train de vie décent pour toute la famille.

Quant à l'émigrant, il devra prouver qu'il est une personne sérieuse pour laquelle il vaut la peine de

risquer de l'argent. On ne peut pas prétendre qu'il soit à même de fournir toutes les garanties qu'une banque aurait le droit et le devoir d'exiger mais il faudra exiger qu'il puisse donner de solides garanties morales.

On ne devra pas non plus poser comme condition essentielle que le candidat soit dans un état d'indigence absolue; l'indigence, en effet, peut être la conséquence de la situation générale ou de la malchance; mais il peut se faire que quelqu'un y soit tombé à cause de son incapacité ou de son indolence; et ceci n'est pas un bon indice pour un émigrant.

Il faut, en somme, venir en aide au bon émigrant soit dans le cas où il est réduit à la pauvreté absolue, soit dans celui où il dispose d'un peu d'argent, mais insuffisamment pour faire face aux frais d'émigration, pourvu qu'il constitue un „bon risque".

Il va sans dire que les recherches dans ce secteur ne sont pas des plus faciles. Le recours aux procédés habituels peut s'avérer insuffisant. On ne peut juger un homme d'après le fait qu'il a ses documents en règle, mais il est nécessaire d'aller au fond des choses, avec l'esprit de fraternité chrétienne, et cependant avec fermeté.

Dans ce secteur, les organisations bénévoles peuvent apporter une aide précieuse, et un exemple frappant a été donné par tout ce qu'elles ont déjà fait avec les prêts consentis, grâce aussi au revolving fund du CIME, permettant le départ de milliers de personnes en leur consentant des prêts pour plusieurs millions de dollars, tout cela, avec un minimum de dépenses générales. Cela leur a été possible grâce à leur profonde organisation, et également au fait qu'elles sont unies en des Organisations Internationales, ce qui leur permet, à travers les diverses Agences nationales réunies, de percevoir facilement les crédits dans les pays d'arrivée, d'effectuer sur place le contrôle des références et des garanties, ce qui est difficile à réaliser pour les autres types d'organisation, specialement en dehors de leur propre territoire.

CARACTÉRISTIQUES DU PRÊT

Les prêts devront être toujours consentis sans intérêts et les remboursements échelonnés équitablement par rapport au montant du prêt et à la situation économique des pays de destination. En général, les paiements mensuels ne devraient pas être inférieurs à 10 dollars, ni supérieurs à 30 dollars. Le cas échéant des facilités successives doivent être prévues en cas de réelle impossibilité de la part de l'intéressé de faire pleinement face à ses engagements.

Au moment de la concession du prêt, l'intéressé devra signer une promesse de paiement. A ce sujet il existe deux tendances diverses: la première voudrait que ladite promesse de paiement soit un véritable titre exécutoire, valable dans le pays de destination (traite etc.), la seconde voudrait se contenter d'une déclaration écrite ayant surtout la valeur d'un engagement moral.

Une solution intermédiaire qui permettrait à l'organisation qui a consenti le prêt, de pouvoir agir de quelque façon contre les personnes qui, sans raison, ne rempliraient pas leurs engagements, même sans avoir les caractéristiques d'un véritable titre exécutoire, serait peut-être le plus efficace.

Dans chaque cas, il est nécessaire que la restitution du prêt soit garantie par une personne résidant dans le pays d'origine, et également, autant que possible, par une autre personne résidant dans le pays de destination. Il serait opportun de fixer un modeste intérêt de retard pour les cas où le remboursement du prêt se trouverait retardé sans justification plausible.

A l'approche de l'entrée en vigueur des plans d'émigration en masse relatifs à certaines catégories d'émigrants et à certains pays déterminés et prevoyant le transport gratuit des émigrants, il sera opportun de suspendre toute concession de prêt. En effet, du point de vue psychologique, ces plans influent négativement sur le recouvrement des prêts.

ORGANISATION DE LA CONCESSION DES PRÊTS

Il est évident que la concession des prêts aux émigrants doit être confiée à une organisation internationale ayant la possibilité d'agir tant dans les pays d'origine pour la concession des prêts que dans les pays de destination pour le recouvrement des sommes avancées et pour la concession de prêts supplémentaires.

Le C.I.M.E. est l'organisation qui a affronté le problème sur la plus grande échelle, s'appuyant, en ce qui concerne l'assistance à l'émigration individuelle, presque exclusivement sur les organisations bénévoles à caractère international.

En Italie, tout dernièrement, un plan de financement en faveur des émigrants individuels les plus pauvres a été mis à l'étude en se basant de préférence sur la collaboration directe entre le Gouvernement italien et le C.I.M.E.

LE FONDS CATHOLIQUE INTERNATIONAL POUR LES PRÊTS AUX ÉMIGRANTS

Comme nous l'avons déjà dit, le C.I.M.E. est l'organisation qui a, au cours de ces derniers temps, le plus développé la possibilité de la concession de prêts en faveur des émigrants individuels, fournissant des sommes aux organisations assistancielles bénévoles, sommes destinées à la constitution d'un fond de roulement pour la concession de prêts à cette catégorie.

Les organisations catholiques qui ont reçu ces fonds sont: la Commission Internationale Catholique pour les Migrations (I.C.M.C.) et le War Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference (W.R.S.—N.C.W.C.).

En vue d'éviter des formalités coûteuses et inutiles dans les administrations pour l'attribution de la concession, et spécialement dans le recouvrement des prêts I.C.M.C. et N.C.W.C. ont réuni leurs ressources en créant le Fonds Catholique International de Prêts aux Emigrants (I.C.M.L.F.).
L'I.C.M.L.F. a été constitué officiellement le 1er août 1952 par un accord spécial signé par Mgr Edward E. Swanstrom et Mr. James J. Norris (représentants du WRS—NCWC) et par l'ing. Jean Baptiste Vicentini et le Dr Johannes Schauff (représentants de l'I.C.M.C.).
Toutes les organisations affiliées à l'I.C.M.C. et les filiales de l'N.C.W.C. sont autorisées à présenter et à recommander à l'I.C.M.L.F. les demandes de prêts aux émigrants en vue de pouvoir faire face aux dépenses nécessaires pour émigrer.
Les intéressés particuliers doivent adresser leurs demandes de prêts aux organisations nationales autorisées et opérant dans les pays où les candidats ont leur résidence.
La constitution de l'I.C.M.L.F. a encore pour but — important au point de vue de l'assistance technique — d'éviter que les organisations catholiques bénévoles réunies ne soient finalement considérées comme de simples sociétés de crédit ou des banques. Après la formation de l'I.R.O. cette conception s'était répandue largement parmi les organisations bénévoles et menaçait de compromettre toute possibilité de relations franches et amicales qui doivent exister entre elles et l'émigrant. Grâce à la constitution du Fonds, la tâche des organisations bénévoles n'est que de recommander la demande de prêt et non de l'accorder.
L'I.C.M.L.F. consent ses prêts sans aucun intérêt, et le remboursement en est effectué par versements mensuels dans le pays d'immigration.
Normalement, l'I.C.M.L.F. demande que l'émigrant commence le remboursement du prêt deux mois après son arrivée dans la nouvelle patrie, et que le remboursement total puisse avoir lieu dans deux ou trois ans. Dans les pays d'immigration les organisations bénévoles perçoivent, pour le compte de l'I.C.M.L.F., les versements mensuels. Lorsque les circonstances l'exigent, ces organisations peuvent modifier les modalités du remboursement, de façon à ce qu'elles ne créent pas de difficultés à l'émigrant dans l'effort qu'il doit soutenir pour sa propre installation et celle de sa famille.
L'I.C.M.L.F. effectue ses prêts sur les bases de roulement afin que l'argent prêté à une famille d'émigrants, une fois remboursé, puisse permettre à une autre famille d'être aidée à son tour et de la même façon. Le prêt est consenti avec joie et en plein confiance en la promesse de remboursement que fait l'émigrant, et avec la conviction qu'il se rendra compte de l'importance du rôle qui lui est réservé dans cet admirable effort de collaboration catholique.

L'expérience que les organisations catholiques ont acquise dans ce champ, durant les années de travail et d'activité du Fonds Catholique International pour les Prêts aux Emigrants, nous a inspiré les quelques considérations de la présente note qui n'a pas la prétention d'être originale ni complète, mais qui entend seulement démontrer la volonté de contribuer à l'étude de cet aspect essentiel que revêt le grave problème de l'émigration.

56

Migrazione di Capitali e Utilizzazione in Loco delle Forze di Lavoro

per il Professore TOMMASO SALVEMINI (Italia)

Molti Paesi, ad esempio l'Italia, soffrono di una disoccupazione cronica e di un basso tenore di vita delle classi meno abbienti a causa del divario esistente tra popolazione, risorse e possibilità di impiego, e, soprattutto, a causa della scarsezza di capitali da investire.
Viceversa esistono nel mondo capitali in cerca di investimento, terre capaci di essere colonizzate, risorse naturali da sfruttare che potrebbero formare altrettanti sbocchi di lavoro.
Occore quindi cercare di riunire il capitale al lavoro in modo che insieme attuino i loro compiti.
Ora è lapalissiano che per far ciò o si spostano entrambi dai posti dove sono attualmente verso le zone di colonizzazione, o si sposta la massa lavorativa verso la zona dove c'è il capitale per incrementare lì la produzione (salvo a spostare poi questa verso le zone di consumo), o, infine, si sposta il capitale verso le zone dove esiste la disponibilità di lavoro per una utilizzazione in loco di queste forze esuberanti.
E'difficile stabilire quale dei tre spostamenti debba avere la priorità.
Da un punto di vista umano non dobbiamo dimenticare gli inconvenienti che il trapianto di persone in

altre località porta al fisico (per ragioni di adattamento), al morale e allo spirito degli individui (per l'isolamento e l'allontanamento dal proprio paese). Nè va dimenticato il caso che l'allontanamento dei capi di famiglia può disorganizzare e a volta travolgere il nucleo familiare, così come non vanno dimenticati i casi di ritorni in patria in condizioni peggiori di quelle di partenza e i casi in cui l'emigrazione è riuscita fatale a chi l'ha tentata.

Sotto il profilo economico va pure considerato l'enorme costo di trasporto degli uomini.

Oggi sono rimaste terre marginali da colonizzare, dove occorrono capitali ben più elevati di quelli che servirono ai colonizzatori europei d'America, anche per sopperire al minore spirito di sacrificio e alle più alte esigenze degli uomini di oggi.

Nei Paesi dove abbondano i capitali la politica corrente è quella di sfruttare al massimo quel danaro per aumentare la produttività, con lo scopo finale di ridurre la fatica dell'uomo e aumentare il suo tenore di vita.

Nel quadro di questa politica di benessere è difficile pretendere dagli uomini il sacrificio dei pionieri dell' America: si dice che le grandi imprese non si ripetono mai.

Occorre, dunque, che il capitale si metta a servizio non soltanto degli uomini dei Paesi ricchi, ma anche degli altri uomini che hanno bisogno di lavorare per vivere, per uscire da uno stato di estrema indigenza. E' un dovere morale, come ha richiamato il Sommo Pontefice nel radiomessaggio, per il 50/ della Rerum Novarum, nel quale affermava tra l'altro „l'inderogabile esigenza che i beni da Dio creati per tutti gli uomini, equamente affluiscano a tutti, secondo i principi della giustizia e della carità". Ma è anche necessità e garanzia di sicurezza perchè è bene evidente che non si possono lasciare gli uomini compressi in spazi dove esiste disquilibrio tra mano d'opera, risorse naturali e capitali disponibili, senza il pericolo che avvengano esplosioni i cui effetti sarebbero sentiti anche da chi sta bene.

A tal riguardo è ben noto che tale squilibrio è considerato un fattore latente di guerre.

Occorre quindi vagliare caso per caso, giacchè è difficile fissare norme generali, se e dove spostare gli uomini, se e dove spostare i capitali. Essenziale è porre l'uomo al centro delle preoccupazioni di chi deve decidere delle forma organizzativa, e muovere gli altri elementi in funzione della esigenza di dare il più possibili stabilità all'uomo.

In altre parole l'emigrazione di uomini va considerata come l'estrema valvola di sicurezza a cui far ricorso, ove si siano esauriti tutti i tentativi di *utilizzazione in loco* delle forze di lavoro disponibili.

Esiste anche la possibilità che i capitali raggiungano prima la mano d'opera nel paese dove essa c'è, in modo da costituire aziende complete da trasferire poi, come unità economica, verso le zone di colonizzazione. Ciò è tanto più da esaminare ove si tengano presenti le difficoltà di valorizzazione delle terre incolte. Un periodo di precedente prova per la messa a punta di uomini e di macchine può evitare lunghi e a volte incerti e pericolosi periodi di assestamento. E'appena il caso di aggiungere, che un paese povero di capitali non può impunemente depauperarsi ulteriormente di risorse; detta prospettiva richiede quindi l'apporto di capitali esteri per l'approntamento delle attrezzature per la formazione di maestranze e di tecnici.

E'doveroso riconoscere che anche per i capitali occorre salvaguardia e garanzia. Non si può pretendere una generosità senza fine. D'altra parte è noto che nelle zone ad economia arretrata è molto bassa la remunerazione del capitale e che gli investimenti non rispondono ad uno stretto principio economico. Ma c'è l'aspetto sociale e umano che esige che i capitali siano posti a disposizione del lavoro con oneri di interessi molto bassi e di ammortamenti differiti fino al momento del loro rendimento. Se una terra è meno fertile di un'altra non per questo la si abbandona col pericolo di far sorgere lì condizioni antisalubri nocive alla vita delle stesse zone fertili. Altro esempio che si può portare al riguardo è quello dell'Olanda. Lì l'apporto di capitali notevoli è riuscito a trasformare l'agricoltura in modo da costituirne il principale cespite di entrata per una popolazione con una densità di 298 abitanti per Kmq.

Per la complessità dei problemi detti si sono già creati organismi supernazionali, per ora in settori particolari, col compito di curare la distribuzione internazionale delle materie prime, delle forze di lavoro e dei capitali.

Questi organismi hanno però bisogno di essere affiancati da altre organizzazioni perchè si crei l'atmosfera favorevole alla esplicazione delle loro mansioni per il rispetto dei principi cristiani.

Ora si deve riconoscere che molto è stato fatto per la organizzazione di centri adatti per migliorare le migrazioni degli uomini. Ma ben poco, per non dire nulla, è stato fatto per facilitare le migrazioni di capitali verso le zone dove c'è esuberanza di mano d'opera.

A mio avviso occorre che le organizzazioni cattoliche per l'emigrazione studino la possibilità di istituire nel loro ambito degli uffici che raccolgano documentazioni e informazioni sulle possibilità di sviluppo economico della zona, e nel caso dei paesi ricchi, sulle disponibilità di capitali che potrebbero essere occupati altrove.

Tali uffici dovrebbero quindi cercare di favorire, mediante opportune segnalazioni, le possibilità di impiego dei capitali dove c'è esuberanza di mano d'opera. Nello stesso tempo dovrebbero fare opportuna azione a carattere nazionale e internazionale perché ci sia una giusta ripartizione dei guadagni,

riducendo i rischi per i capitali, ricorrendo eventualmente a forme assicurative a carattere internazionale (da studiare opportunamente nell'ambito della Banca Mondiale e del Fondo Monetario Internazionale).

A tale scopo occorre far in modo che il capitale sia salvaguardato:

1. da rischi tecnico-economici;
2. da rischi politici interni a ciascun paese (nazionalizzazione, ecc.);
3. da rischi di carattere internazionale (guerre, rotture di rapporti internazionali, ecc.).

Come si sono escogitate opportune garanzie alle „migrazioni" delle merci, cosi si possono studiare garanzie per le migrazioni di capitali. Queste garanzie sono certo meno complesse di quelle che occorre dare all'uomo per la salvaguardia della sua personalità.

Esistono già delle leggi che regolano le migrazioni di capitali. Altre se ne possono promuovere, a base delle quali non ci sia l'egoismo e il tornaconto individuale o nazionale: esse dovrebbero essere ispirate al principio di sicurezza collettiva, di collaborazione internazionale e, soprattutto, al bene spirituale degli uomini.

Il problema non è semplice ed è per tal motivo che propongo al Congresso di discuterlo.

57

Financing of World Migration

by Dr. PAUL SCHULER (Geneva)

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR European Migration (ICEM) was created in 1951 by the common will of 18 Governments, now increased to 24, to take care of the dual problem of men without land and lands without men. It is in fact a concretisation, in one specific field, of the tendency of our age to find international solutions to regional problems, heretofore left more or less entirely to their natural, and often, alas, miserable development, in accordance with the creed of liberalism „Laissez faire, laissez aller", or expressed more crudely: „the free fox in the free chicken-run." The Committee, as such, cannot, and is not supposed to carry out all European migration movements, but it should act as a catalyser to prompt and help these movements. When dealing with the financial problems of migration, one has to distinguish two main categories, on the one hand financing of the movements as such, including the processing costs in the sending countries and the reception costs with the transportation to the ultimate destination in the receiving countries; on the other hand the financing of settlement and integration in the immigration country.

FINANCING OF THE MOVEMENTS

a. The crude fact is that just those persons who ought to migrate are in general not able to pay for their passage, or if they are, they would not find the means to defray the passage costs for their dependents, with the result of separation of families. Furthermore, by the fact that the means at their disposal are scarce, there is a tendency to choose the nearest possible country of resettlement, such as for Germans and Dutch, for instance, to select Canada, though perhaps opportunities or actual needs would make it preferable for them to go to more distant countries such as South America, Australia or New Zealand. Moreover, there is a possibility on a somewhat smaller scale of intra-European migration which should not be under-estimated.

b. What are those would-be migrants in general, who do not have sufficient means to pay for their transport and other costs? Unskilled, or semi-skilled workers, farm workers and refugees, often with large families. They have had little opportunity to save, and this is particularly true in countries like Greece or Italy where the average per capita income is notably low.

c. The question arises who should provide the financial means. The obvious answer which comes first to ones mind is: the political entity to which these migrants belong, because by enabling them to depart, the State will alleviate its own social security budget and provide for more possibilities for those who remain, just because sums formerly devoted to unemployment relief can be freed for other purposes. On the other hand, however, it can be truly said that with the arrival of any immigrant, if he is not too old to work, the receiving country benefits by a substantial capital gift. Julius Isaac in his book. „Economics of Migration"[1]) quoting Lotka & Dublin[2]) arrives at a figure of 9.862 dollars as being the total private investment in educating a child to the age of 18. It is also true, that in new countries the arrival

[1]) Julius Isaac — page 229.
[2]) A. J. Lotka & L. I. Dublin — The money value of man.

of any newcomer necessitates on the part of the receiving State an additional capital investment, in the form of housing, roads and other facilities. In Australia, for instance, according to Sir Douglas Copeland, the importance of this additional investment amounts to as much as 1.000 Australian pounds (approximately 2.240 dollars). Note however that this is capital and not outright expenditure. This leads to the conclusion that both the emigration and immigration countries might contribute to the cost of movements of migrants.

The migrant himself, wanting to improve his conditions by moving to a new country, may be called upon to contribute also to the cost of his transportation (including his family) either prior to his departure or after his resettlement. This method has not only the advantage of reducing the participation of public funds in movements costs, but also includes a psychological benefit, inasmuch as it makes the migrant feel, by the most appropriate and sensitive means (his own purse), that he is a beneficiary of an action collectively financed both by his own old community, and by others. Self-responsibility is an important factor.

d. In practice, under the catalysing influence of ICEM, the financing is developing towards this tripartite participation: emigration country, immigration country, and the migrant himself. The ideal solution, not reached as yet, would be that both the receiving and sending countries contribute and that the balance be made up by payments from the migrants themselves, either prior to departure or after resettlement. In the latter case, the actual financing would only amount to advances out of international funds towards future refunds by the migrants. Even if the ideal solution of the tripartite contribution were reached, public international moneys would have to be available, to bridge over the gap between the time of actual spending and the recoveries.

e. Let us consider first only the contributions by emigration and immigration countries. In a fully developped scheme, both participate in the costs of movements.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE SENDING COUNTRY

I. The *sending* country has to provide the so-called processing costs, which include sometimes consular visa fees, medical examination charges, inland transportation to the port of embarkation and subsistence there until sailing time. These costs are estimated to be approximately double those of the reception countries which, will be dealt with later on. In addition, and principally, the emigration country should participate in the actual costs of transport. But there must be no misunderstanding with regard to the word 'actual'. It does not mean that a country's contribution should only represent a portion of the effective costs of the movements which have taken place, but rather of the overall movements. In other words: If only short distance movements are contemplated, or if they represent the majority of them, it does not necessarily follow that the contribution must be based on these movements alone, otherwise the financing of other long distance movements will become problematic. The emigration country's contribution should therefore be based on over-all movements, taking into account that at certain times and from certain points, emigration goes to further destinations.

This contribution may fall out if, as will be seen later, the immigration country is financing the full emigration cost, although even in this case, there may be arguments in favour of maintaining the emigration country contribution in view of the over all programme achievements. This is particularly true if, for instance, the immigration country only covers the full cost of transportation of the head of family and not the one of the family or dependents. Then it would be perfectly reasonable that the emigration country pays its contribution for all departures in order to compensate for the missing amounts in respect of the families.

In practice, however, up to now, it has not been possible to secure the adequate participation of all the sending countries, and there is one instance where, in the absence of such participation, international funds have to be used to compensate it. In other cases the participation is insufficient, and there again one is compelled to have internationally contributed funds.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE RECEIVING COUNTRY

II. The *receiving* countries must bear the selection costs in the sending countries if their regulations foresee such a machinery and must provide for adequate reception facilities upon arrival of the newcomers. They must also arrange for inland transportation from the port of arrival to the final destination. Apart from this, and again principally, they have to participate in the cost of actual movements. In this case also, to repeat, the participation can and should not relate to the effective costs which have taken place to each individual migration country, but to the over all movements.

III. It may be, as is the case for Canada at present, that the immigration country contributes the full cost of passage for its selected immigrants. These are then requested to reimburse, by monthly instalments after their resettlement, the amount thus advanced, and it therefore represents more a method of financing the migrant's share than an actual governmental contribution. In actual practice, this type of movement frees the sending country from the obligation of paying its share, as it is assimilated to

self-paying movements. In the light of all the above, this method is not really justified, because it does not take into consideration the principle of the financial 'melting pot', so important in the world migration field.

IV. To summarize there are:

a. cases which have to be fully subsidized out of international funds, because at present neither the emigration nor the immigration countries contribute anything. This is true in particular for Greek movements to all South American countries except Argentina and Brazil.

b. cases where only the emigration countries contribute. This applies to migration ex Austria, Germany, Italy and Trieste to all the South American countries, with the same exception of Argentina and Brazil.

c. cases where only the immigration countries contribute, for instance Greek movements to Argentina, Brazil and Australia.

d. cases where the immigration countries reimburse the full cost of the movement. This applies to Canada only where the selected migrants receive warrants issued by the Canadian immigration authorities.

e. cases where both emigration and immigration countries contribute. This applies for movements ex Austria, Italy, Germany, Trieste to Argentina, Brazil and Australia.

f. the United States take a particular position in this respect, inasmuch as they do not directly contribute to specific movements to their country, but participate predominately in the international financing of migration. The United States' contribution constitutes the overwhelming part of the so-called „free contributions" not directly tied to specific movements.

Other free contributions are at present given by Australia, Belgium, Israel and Switzerland. These free contributions do in fact constitute the international funds, previously referred to, used to replace the existing shortages in the tripartite contribution pattern. Certain other free contributions were received or promised, to be used only for Near and Far East movements. These are coming from Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

g. In addition, the United States Escapee Programme (USEP) contributes to the cost of specific movements of selected escapees to the United States and elsewhere in following way: $ 125.— from Europe overseas, full cost for intra-European and Near East movements and $ 450.— for Far East movements everywhere.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE MIGRANT HIMSELF

f. We now come to the third source of financing: the *migrant himself*. This aspect was the object of long and arduous studies at the last Session held in spring 1954 by ICEM in Geneva. Who should pay, how much and when ?? In the plenary meeting, some Delegates stated their belief that a contribution should be required from a migrant, since his moral responsability for his migration would thus be engaged, and that if he could not pay the agreed amount in full before departure, he should be requested to reimburse the balance after his resettlement. It was recognized that special facilities for payments should be accorded to families. Considerable support was expressed for the principle that a migrant should be required to make a payment before leaving, but a number of Delegates were not in favour of requiring him to make reimbursements after resettlement, when in their view, he would need all his savings to build up a new future for himself and his family.

Obviously deep humanitarian and social considerations must be given to all types of circumstances in this field. The instalments must be spread over a conveniently long period so as not to represent a heavy burden or cause hardship.

Account has to be taken of the percentages of expected collections, or rather of non-collections, and of the underlying principle of the „melting pot". The individual migrant's contribution cannot be set in exact relation to the actual costs of the movements, otherwise a family emigrating from say Germany to Australia would have to contribute three times more than a family going to Canada. This would inevitably kill any sound trend of migration.

Furthermore, obviously such individual contributions should not reduce the importance of the governmental contribution of sending and receiving countries.

The so-called EFI plan of ICEM (Emigrazione Finanzata Individuale), just about to be initiated in Italy, can be considered as a time limited test for the overall system to be instituted later. Italian citizens with a certificate of poverty and refugees with a certificate of residence in an Italian camp can benefit from this special plan.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF INSTITUTIONS

g. The place of the migrant in the pattern of the financial coverage can be taken by another party, either a public, semi-public or a private institution.

1. In Italy we have for instance the Instituto Nazionale di Credito per il Lavoro Italiano all'Estero (ICLE), established already in 1923, in the form of a limited company with a strong governmental influence and control. As its title indicates, it has been created to finance Italian workers abroad. As such, it has also given loans to migrants and in 1952, for instance, 9.000 individual loans were granted to people going to Australia. The migrant does not

make prepayments and does not sign promissory notes to ICEM. ICLE steps in his place.

11. In a very similar way, we find at present the various Voluntary Agencies advancing money to the individual migrants. For this purpose the so-called „Revolving Funds" were created, largely subsidized by ICEM, with the idea that as the migrants reimburse their debts, new funds will become available for financing additional movements. ICEM is giving administrative support to these Voluntary Agencies for their work. It now looks as if the ICEM will take over, later on the heavy burden from the Voluntary Agencies, leaving them only the responsibility of the preparation of movements and of the resettlement and reception through the human touch, which is so important and essential in migration and for which they are much better equipped than any other official public agency could ever be.

FINANCING OF SETTLEMENT

As said before, the Australians reckon that additional capital investment of £ Aus. 1.000 is necessary for every migrant arriving in that country. The same applies also to countries in full agricultural and industrial development. Private capital and public funds must be made available to provide for this investment.

The *first* obvious factor would be to enable the migrant to transfer his savings or the proceeds of the liquidation of his assets to his new home land. This, however, meets often various obstacles in many countries. However the Benelux has recently agreed on a free transfer from one country to another in cases of resettlement from and to the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg. This action — an important phenomenon of progress — may be extended to other countries and continents.

The Netherlands in particular have repeatedly arranged migrants' movements together with transfer of capital, machinery and cattle. We must not overestimate such special and probably expensive transfers (costs of transportation of cattle, etc.), but realize the advantages of such examples.

In the *second* place international investments, on an official public or private basis, have to be made in the receiving countries. As a rule, however, the reception countries seem to have no sufficient formation of saving which could be used for such capital investments. Canada and of course, the United States do not have such a problem of lack of capital. But it does exist in the South American countries, and somewhat less in Australia. These countries do not either dispose of sufficient public funds to draw upon for useful investments, without dangerously setting into motion the inflationary process.

In the third place, long term credits may be opened by the industrial countries of Europe for the gradual equipment of the new countries to which their nationals have emigrated. This would of course have the advantage of securing additional activity for their own industries which will then be called upon to manufacture production goods in order to equip the farms or factories where their emigrants are working.

Last but not least, we must think of the investment capital constituted by the loans given to the countries by international banking institutions, of which by far the most important is the International Bank of Reconstruction & Development. Projects soundly drawn up and having adequate provisions for rentability can be financed by such institutions. However, as far as land settlement projects are concerned, it is rather difficult to determine costs, timing and profits. And yet it must be possible to explore this field, more profoundly and to study thoroughly what can be done on behalf of land settlement planning. Preparation of the land offers more resettlement possibilities, and in addition to an increased migration, such an activity has manifold social and economic advantages. It helps to solve in a substantial measure political and nutrition problems for the entire world.

Emigration and immigration are still an almost unwritten chapter in the field of economics. Universities and research centres would therefore be well inspired if related subjects could be chosen for theses and monographs. Out of these would gradually emerge a doctrine which at present is lacking.