

Canada is in favour of the first option; although at first glance the second seems more attractive, it is also far less practical. The next chapter of our response will explain what we feel should be included in the Plan. For now, we can explain our choice by the fact that we feel it is essential for the Plan to have signposts that are specific to UNESCO: education; science; culture; communication, information and informatics; and social and human sciences (including human rights and international development).

B. Structure of the Programme and Budget for 1996-1997

The response of Member States on the structure of the Programme and Budget is extremely important, for it will largely determine the operations of the Secretariat.

We have thus addressed this problem with a consideration to the daily life of the Organization.

1. Place, purpose and operation of interdisciplinarity/intersectorality in the Organization

We have decided to address the issue of interdisciplinarity/intersectorality before responding to the matter of the structure proper of the Programme and Budget because it is in many ways the cornerstone of the programme, and must be thoroughly examined before determining the future presentation of the 28 C/5.

Let us be clear on this: interdisciplinarity/intersectorality is what UNESCO is all about. Every day, both at Headquarters and within the Member States, we deal with education and citizenship; education and human rights; education and the environment; women; youth; and so on. However, the reality of the Secretariat rejects the intersectoral approach that guarantees the successful study and resolution of these problems. We could give a number of examples under this heading, but such is not the purpose of this document.

The UNESCO sectors are airtight universes, and all too often, those in different sectors who are working on the same issues do not even communicate.

What can we do to make interdisciplinarity/intersectorality work properly? The introduction of new terminology is not the answer, and we regret the introduction of the term "transdisciplinarity", which leads to confusion more than anything else. Why not stick with the term we are already familiar with, and which means the same thing? In the Programme and Budget for 1992-1993 there were Mobilizing Projects whose nature was unquestionably interdisciplinary/intersectoral. They were doomed to failure and obscurity. It would be important to know and understand the reasons prior to venturing into new fields. The current Programme and Budget (1994-1995) includes an ambitious project enthusiastically supported by a large number of Member States, including Canada, at the 27th Session of the General Conference. This is the interdisciplinary and inter-agency co-operation project: "Environment and population education and information for