

the very great opportunity they provided me to continue my education in international affairs.

Canada's delegation to the Conference was the largest ever sent to UNESCO, and I think the reason for that was the particularly grave situation existing in Asia today. Many nations are not committed, or at least not committed as much as we would like them to be, toward the democratic world. The leader of the Canadian delegation was that distinguished gentleman Leonard Brockington, Q.C., and H. E. Morley Scott, High Commissioner to Pakistan, was Deputy Leader. The other members of the delegation were Col. F. T. Fairey, M.P. for Victoria; Lionel Bertrand, M.P. for Terrebonne; Freeman Stewart, Secretary, Canadian Teachers' Federation; Dr. Leon Lortie, Professor of Chemistry, University of Montreal; Dr. Jean C. Falardeau, Department of Sociology, Laval University; John Parkin, President, Canadian Arts Council; Mrs. Florence Bird, of Ottawa—probably better known as Ann Francis; Melvin Clark, of Geneva; H. E. Escott Reid, High Commissioner to India; Miss Mary Dench, Information Office, Department of External Affairs, and myself.

I wish to go out of my way to pay a compliment to Mr. and Mrs. Reid for the magnificent job they are doing for Canada in a very heavy and difficult post. I have been told by Indian publicists, educators, and politicians, that in India Mr. Reid's advice is sought after and listened to more than that of any other representative of a foreign nation. I can assure honourable senators that the advice is given with typical Canadian forthrightness, but his sincerity and his dedication to his job are greatly appreciated by those with whom he is working.

The Canadian delegation was very representative, and I think it gave a fairly good account of itself during the five weeks of the conference. It is certainly true that, out of the hundreds of addresses that were delivered, the two which captured the imagination of the conference to a greater extent than any others did were those of the leader of our delegation, Mr. Brockington, at the opening and closing sessions.

Perhaps I should take a moment or two to describe the setting of the conference, and the political climate of the first week or ten days. Before doing so, however, I wish to pay tribute to India, to her leaders and people. No delegate to the conference could help but be impressed by the magnificence of the arrangements made for the comfort and convenience of the delegates, and by the imaginative plans which were made for the delegates to meet the leaders of Indian thought in every

walk of life—political leaders, educators, members of the judiciary, journalists, artists, businessmen and working people from every walk of life; and, what was equally important to us, for opportunities to get to know members of other delegations. Literally dozens of cultural programs of a national and international character were arranged to coincide with the conference, and this in itself made the visit to New Delhi a stimulating and rich educational experience.

The physical arrangements for the conference were on a splendid scale. The Indian Government had not only built, in readiness for the conference, the finest conference hall I have ever been in, but they built two hotels, the Janpath—a modest but comfortable hotel—and the still incompleting Ashoka, which when finished will be one of the finest hotels in the world. Their organization of transportation, in a city of great distances, left little to be desired. And to the fine physical arrangements there were added the graciousness and courtesy of a great people, who are, fortunately for us, in the vanguard of a significant democratic experiment in Asia.

Since my return from Asia I have been somewhat concerned at the tendency to be critical of India and of her leader, Mr. Nehru, a tendency which I have found to be prevalent among some individuals and in certain sections of the press. At the risk of wearying you I think I must take a few moments to give my assessment of India's role in the world today as I see it and feel it, after a careful and considered attempt to assess the situation. However, I ask honourable members to bear in mind that I had only six weeks of first-hand study.

To begin with, India is a big country whose distances are in many instances comparable to those we are familiar with in Canada. For example, it is 1,000 miles from Calcutta, in the south eastern Bay of Bengal, to Delhi. It is 800 miles from Delhi to the southwestern port of Bombay. It is 900 miles northward across the Delhi plain and desert to Karachi, just across the border in Pakistan. It is 700 miles north of Delhi to Simla and Darjeeling in Kashmir, and the same distance eastward to Benares. It is 1,800 miles south from Delhi to Colombo in Ceylon. These instances will give you some idea of the physical distances.

In this great subcontinent there are 376 million people, speaking 35 languages. In the Indian Parliament there are 645 members, of whom only 35 are communists, and I am told the expectation is that after the new elections in March the number of communists will be substantially reduced. It is interesting to a Canadian to learn that English is the main language of the Indian Parliament.