

control. These funds originated from reparations, loan repayments and wartime compensation. They could be spent only in the debtor country and could not be converted to Canadian currency. For this reason they appeared in the annual estimates as only a nominal sum. By 1952, \$1,860,000 of these blocked funds had been spent without any parliamentary approval and another \$7,190,000 in equivalent Canadian funds was available to the department in five currencies.<sup>6</sup> When the committee learned that \$239,499.32 of this "windfall" had been spent on a residence in Paris and an even greater expenditure anticipated for one in Rome, there were understandable charges of extravagance over what the Government defended as good real estate deals. The best the opposition could manage was eventually to have some of the blocked funds diverted to scholarships for Canadians studying abroad.<sup>7</sup>

Certainly departmental expenditures in this period were more closely scrutinized by the committee than at any other time. With the exception of meetings at which the minister was present to give his overview of the international situation and the special hearings on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's International Service in 1953-54 and the Columbia River Basin in 1955, no subject brought out so many members of the committee. (See Table 2). Administration also engaged more members in the debate than did foreign policy issues. At the beginning of 1956 and after an examination of the questions asked in the committee over the previous three years indicated "very strongly the perennial interest of members in regulations and statistics", the minister and his staff decided to forego the preparation of the ministers handbook on policy questions likely to arise in parliament.<sup>8</sup> Even before this, those officials working on the foreign policy handbook had been instructed to focus on subjects involving Canadian expenditures and contributions. The administrative handbook continued as it was. With a change in Government in 1957, however, the department reverted to its old practice of including both foreign policy and administration, presumably in recognition that an inexperienced minister would need a more comprehensive briefing when he faced the committee.<sup>9</sup> In spite of