

staff, a resolution, sponsored by Brazil, France, India and one other country whose name I have forgotten at the moment, was introduced to increase the budget ceiling by one million dollars. No one votes against Santa Claus. A UNESCO conference is no different from others in that respect. The resolution was carried by a vote of 27 for, 19 against, with 20 abstentions,—a most unsatisfactory way of arriving at a decision. Honourable senators can imagine the effect on the conference of suddenly having a million dollars more than it had planned to spend. All the "have-not" nations of Latin America and South-East Asia put forward their own pet projects and asked that the money be spent on this, that, and the other, while those with projects in being demanded that their grants be increased. The result was great confusion in the conference, and a veritable blitzkrieg of proposals to spend money. Never in my experience have I been subject to such a variety of resolutions, draft resolutions and the like. The pile of documents that I have before me represents only one-half of the mass of material of this kind to which we were exposed. Anybody who has had experience of a political or other convention knows that, when a lot of resolutions are submitted from the floor many of them are repetitive, or overlap and a screening process is very necessary. As the one whose misfortune it was to be elected rapporteur of the conference, I was in a position to appreciate the disadvantages of a non-screening procedure.

Under these circumstances the Canadians, I believe, played an effective role. Some of the delegates were rather critical of our people because, they said, Canadians always look at the dollar; but that attitude, I suggest, is sometimes very useful.

Two suggestions made by Canadians were accepted by the conference. One was, that there should be a general overhaul of the conference procedures so that succeeding conferences should not be exposed to a blitz of paper. The second suggestion was more difficult to get approved, and great credit is due to Frank Fairey, M.P., of Victoria, and to Mel. Clark, of the Finance Department, at Geneva. They pointed out that UNESCO had been in existence for ten years and had a spending budget in excess of \$21 million, so it would be a good idea to engage an outside firm of consultants to examine the organization's administrative procedures. That idea, as I have said, took a lot of selling, and the original resolution was substantially watered down, but finally a motion to that general effect was accepted. It will, I believe, have good results. Another point which should be kept in mind in connection with the vote to

increase the budget is that the nations whose representatives voted for the increase are responsible for providing only 15 per cent of the funds, while the nations whose representatives were opposed to it contribute 85 per cent. Another point with which Western democracies must be concerned is that since last summer 16 more nations have been admitted to membership in the United Nations. While this, I agree, is a good thing, from now on the so-called Western democracies can be outvoted on any issue when the Latin American countries decide to vote as a bloc with either the Soviet or the Afro-Asian bloc. This may lead to complications in the days to come.

I will take no more than a short time to allude to some of the details of the program. I wonder whether it would be possible, without reading detailed figures, to put a statement into the record.

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Cameron: First, education. Under this heading is included a variety of programs, of which some are carried out by UNESCO itself, but more are carried out in co-operation with agencies within the member states. Here are some examples:

I) Sponsoring an international conference on public education	\$ 38,000
II) Improvement of school curriculum ..	18,500
III) Assistance to educational reform	32,100
IV) Technical and vocational education ..	15,000
V) Associated school projects in education for international understanding	19,000
VI) Education for women and girls	10,000
VII) Participation in member states' activities in school education	220,000

Fundamental Education

I) Teaching, reading and writing	\$ 6,000
II) Producing reading materials for new literates	41,000
III) Fundamental education centre for Latin America (Patscua, Mexico) (CREFAL)	295,000
IV) Fundamental education centre for Arab states (ASFEC)	338,800
V) Participation in member states, activities	88,000

Adult Education

I) Assistance to adult education projects	\$ 34,000
II) Participation in member states, activities	26,000

Work With Youth

Emergency Educational Assistance

I) Educational assistance to Palestine Arab refugees	\$ 13,000
II) Educational assistance to Egypt	} 200,000
III) Educational assistance to Hungary	

Major Project Extension of Primary Education in Latin America

I) Training of primary school teachers in L.A.	\$186,000
II) Assistance in educational research and training of educational specialists in L.A.	109,000
III) Fellowships for extension of primary education	100,000