

of the Conference. Many of them, therefore, could not complete their discussions before the topics in which they were specially interested were dealt with by the full Programme Commission.

On paper this was a very commendable scheme, and was in general terms adopted by the Conference. But it soon proved quite unworkable. The experts and scholars, assembled in working parties, insisted on thinking of themselves as sub-commissions and on passing resolutions and putting forward programme plans for consideration by the full Commission. One important country went so far as to insist that, if the distinguished scholars who formed part of its delegation were not permitted to take a direct part in the main Conference deliberations in this way, the whole delegation might be compelled to withdraw. As a result, the plenary session passed a resolution that no topic was to be discussed by the Programme and Budget Commission until a report on it had been received from the appropriate working party or parties.

This in effect turned working parties into sub-commissions, and the Conference, as a result of its efforts to avoid six sub-commissions, found itself faced with fifteen, which, by subdivision, soon became twenty. The situation seemed hopeless, and two or three days of complete frustration followed, but the problems were eventually solved piecemeal by many administrative devices. It must be admitted, however, that the programme, greatly improved though it is, still shows signs of what one might term its multiple parentage. We feel strongly that the experiment must not be repeated. The combining of programme and budget matters in one Commission is essential; but it may be necessary in future conferences to return to the system of programme sub-commissions used at the Paris Conference. A unified programme, we believe, can be achieved only by careful preparation by the Secretariat beforehand and by the presentation to the Conference of a tight and closely-knit draft programme for its consideration. Some division into sectional interest groups is inevitable at such a conference, and division matters little if the basic programme documents given to them have the inner unity that comes from having passed at some stage through one mind.

Small delegations such as ours found it particularly difficult to cover all the working parties. Mr Nash was freest for this work, and took a full part in the working parties on science, libraries, and museums. Mr Forsyth specialized in education, fundamental education, social science, and National Commissions. Miss McPhee had time for only one working party—reconstruction. For the rest, the New Zealand delegation had to concentrate on the two Commissions. We would strongly recommend that any future delegations have secretarial assistance. The sheer burden of managing papers at a conference is too much for busy delegates to carry.