

Exchange of Information. According to the Director-General's report, it had been constituted as a general service unit for the entire Organization. "It supplies not only information in a restricted sense, but also maps and a statistical service, and organizes book collections for seminars, work camps, &c. 'Information' may consist of existing printed materials, or be supplied in the form of abstracts, of reports on special topics, or of lists of organizations in particular fields. In addition, the department is responsible for UNESCO's Library."

The New Zealand delegation admitted that a central library and documentation service was necessary, but it thought that the service was being developed on too large a scale, and that it implied much overlapping with the work of other departments, most of which have their own information services. It seemed hard to justify a staff of fifty-three (including twelve specialists) and a budget allocation of nearly \$400,000.

In answer to criticism from the United Kingdom delegation and others, the Head of the department explained that information was supplied only at the request of programme sections, and that in fact there was no duplication of services. Nevertheless, the Committee passed a resolution inviting the Director-General "to reconsider as soon as possible the organization and title of the Department of Exchange of Information and the work-plan suggested for 1949, with a view to possible reduction in the scope of its activities, especially those concerned with the provision of information services to the programme departments by specialists and those concerned with statistics. In order to avoid the danger of duplication, certain of these activities might, if necessary, be transferred to the appropriate departments."

The New Zealand delegate supported the resolution after trying unsuccessfully to obtain a stronger wording. He argued that it was not enough to avoid "the danger of" duplication, and that there should be a definite request for a reduction of personnel and budget allowance. It became evident, however, that notice had been taken of the discussion, for the Budget Sub-Commission reduced the department's allocation for 1949 by \$100,000.

When the resolution came before a plenary meeting, an amended version was proposed by the South African delegation which eliminated all reference to the suggested economy in personnel and finance. New Zealand opposed the amendment, and moved that the original and full text of the resolution be adopted. The proposal was supported by the United Kingdom and France. The New Zealand motion was treated as an amendment to the South African motion, and adopted by the Conference. This meant, in effect, that the