

desirable to send, in addition to the delegate, at least one adviser who could assist him with subjects of which he may have no special knowledge and act as his deputy at meetings at which he may be unable to be present. Such advisers are sent by many of the countries represented, and in some cases a sufficient number are present to enable representation to be secured on all or most of the Committees. (The Constitution of the International Labour Office provides that each delegate may be accompanied by as many as two advisers for each item on the agenda of the Conference. At the Conference which I attended, therefore, the maximum possible number of advisers in a single delegation would have been twelve for each delegate, or forty-eight for the complete delegation.) Moreover, if a particular individual could attend the Conference in one year as adviser and in the following year as delegate he would be in a much better position to take an active part in the work of the Conference than any delegate who is present for the first time. In a Conference of this kind, with a complicated procedure and a long history of previous consideration of the subjects on its agenda, previous experience and acquaintance with delegates who have been attending successive sessions is of enormous value. So long as New Zealand continues to send only one workers' delegate, it is scarcely to be expected that the same man will be able to attend more than, say, two successive sessions of the Conference. If continuity in the personnel of the workers' representatives is to be secured, it is therefore essential that the number of such representatives at each session should not be less than two.

Although, as I have noted, this proposal has already been put forward by previous workers' delegates from New Zealand, it does not as yet appear to have received serious consideration. It is most desirable that such consideration should now be given to it in time to enable a larger delegation to be sent to the 1939 session of the Conference. So far as I am aware, the only objection to its adoption which has been put forward is that it would involve additional expense. The sum involved seems scarcely large enough to justify a refusal, on this ground alone, to send advisers. If, however, it is regarded as a serious obstacle, the trade-union movement and the Government should press for the adoption at the earliest possible moment of a proposal which has been put forward with the specific object of overcoming this difficulty. This is to the effect that the expenses of the four delegates sent by each country, together with the expenses of a limited number of advisers, should be paid out of the general funds of the International Labour Organization. The cost of representation at the International Labour Conference would then be shared by all the principal States in the same proportions as the rest of the International Labour Organization budget, instead of being, as at present, much greater for those countries which are distant from Geneva than it is for countries near at hand. A system of this kind is already in operation as regards the travel expenses of members of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization; and countries such as New Zealand, which are at a disadvantage under the present system, would be fully justified in pressing actively for the adoption of a similar arrangement for delegates to the Conference and their advisers. On grounds of equity and fairness the case for such an arrangement is unanswerable; but it must be realized that unless these countries make it their business to take the initiative in the matter nothing will be done. It is therefore desirable that the New Zealand Government delegates to future sessions of the International Labour Conference and the New Zealand delegates to the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations should be asked to take steps to ensure that proper consideration may be given to this proposal, with a view to its adoption as soon as circumstances may permit.

#### NEED FOR MORE PUBLICITY.

Adequate representation at future sessions of the International Labour Conference would enable New Zealand to play a more active part in the work of the Conference and to benefit to a greater extent from the experience and contacts which the Conference provides. Some of the disadvantages involved in New Zealand's great distance from the seat of the Conference and the International Labour Office would thus be reduced. Further steps must be taken, however, if New Zealand is to share to the full in the advantages of membership in the International Labour Organization. As I ventured to point out in a speech at the Conference, there is need for much more publicity for the work of the International Labour Organization and for more constant and regular contacts between the International Labour Office and the trade-union movement in New Zealand. The International Labour Office should make its work known to the workers of this country by radio and cinema publicity, by vividly presented and readable publications, and by regular visits of its officials to New Zealand. There should also be some regular arrangement by which suitable trade-union representatives could be invited to spend some months on the staff of the Office to learn all about its work and then go back to their own countries to tell the workers what is being done and how to use the resources of the Office more effectively.

I am well aware that publicity work of this kind will cost money, and I have no doubt that lack of funds is the main reason why more has not been done in this connection in the past. There is, however, no reason why funds should not be made