

and where work is more specialized, they might have a continuing need for the language, if you see what I mean. I think it makes it difficult in our case to get a number of people proficient in the language and to keep them that way.

Mr. ROBERTSON: If we could keep up the advantage of having a man in training all the time, that builds up a pretty good backlog of people with language facilities in the service, whether stationed here or in the field in the far east. In the middle east we started from scratch a few years ago, and I think by now we have had four or five people go through the Arabic language centre in Beirut. That is showing itself in the building up of a small corps of knowledgeable people with new accomplishments which they did not have before their service there.

Mr. STINSON: I am aware of this, but my concern is that not infrequently people who become trained in some of the harder languages are sent to other posts where those languages are not in regular use and where their training is, therefore, of no particular value to Canada.

Mr. ROBERTSON: This is a question of balance to which the minister addressed himself last week, of trying to strike and keep a proportion between the need for specialists and the desirability of having a pretty well maintained rotational service. Obviously, you are not going to dissipate around the world a handful of people who have now become familiar with Arabic. The same thing is true of people with Chinese and Japanese, but these language qualifications are not the individual's only working capabilities. You can have somebody with other qualities and interests and I do not think you can regard it as a prima facie waste if someone who is studying in Japan, and who familiarizes himself with the language and culture of that country, should show up in our embassy in Washington or in our office in London. That is not really a waste of results, to my mind.

Mr. KUCHEREPA: I should like to ask one final question. How does our program in this particular field compare with that which the United States carries out? I want to know is our progress in line with that being carried out by the United States in that particular field?

Mr. ROBERTSON: I think we are probably coming in behind on a rather more modest scale. I think it has been true in the past that in Japan we have had the cooperation of the United States in accepting our students in special language training facilities which they have financed and set up. Again, the scale of our requirements is not big enough to warrant that kind of departure.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I wonder if I may ask the under secretary this question? During the past four successive committee studies of the department's estimates, members have expressed concern, or hope, that there would be a greater attempt made by the department to explain to Canadians, first of all, the contributions which Canada makes to under developed countries, including various technical assistance to such countries. In reply to a recent question you indicated that we do not have a press relations officer and I think, if we have an information division at all, it is very small. And at the risk of having someone suggest that I am talking about self-glorification of a government policy, I am not. I am speaking of explaining to Canadians what the department does. Would it not be of some benefit to the department to have an information division which would convey the work carried out in the department to the Canadian public, rather than leaving this largely to the responsibility of the individual officials of the minister making speeches or to the U.N. society carrying out its particular functions?

If you feel that this question is one of policy, and you prefer to refer it to the minister, that is fine, but I am concerned with the fact that we do