

thier views and awareness of the U.N. and its system of organizations, and of Canada's involvement. Such a survey would be fairly simple to design, and to minimize costs could be "piggy-backed" on one of the regular monthly national "omnibus" surveys conducted by the private sector. Total costs would still likely amount to at least \$15,000, however, and the value of the information collected is (at this point) uncertain.

- (d) The fourth rather more ambitious alternative would attempt to evaluate the cost and benefits or utility of being a member of particular U.N. agencies such as ILO or UNESCO, or of providing financial support to particular U.N. programs. This alternative would use the same basic approach as in the recommended study, namely, interviews with a wide range of experts both in and out of the government, and with some foreign experts as well. All available data, both quantitative and qualitative, would be collected and assessed. The evaluation emphasis would not be on the program or organization itself, but on the benefits Canada derives from its membership or support. Although an idea well worth considering, the alternative was rejected because it is more of a policy evaluation than a program evaluation and should be carried out as part of a broader review of membership in U.N. affiliated programs and organizations.

Such evaluation(s) would also be quite expensive in many cases, and it is doubtful whether External Affairs could (or should) undertake one except in close cooperation with the other government departments more directly aligned with a particular agency (e.g., Labour Canada for the ILO).