

The problems of administration, even for a department so small in size, are pretty complicated because you have to consider the conditions of living and separate establishments in many different countries. We have to have probably a higher proportion of senior officers than most of the other departments of government. In mentioning senior officers I am not making any distinction between the permanent members of our service like Mr. Pearson, and those who have been appointed from outside the service like General Odlum. People are required who can speak with authority and with tact and distinction, to head our missions abroad, as well as for the normal hierarchy of our departmental staff in Ottawa, who direct the operations of the missions abroad and who handle the questions of external affairs in Ottawa itself.

It is necessary that the Department of External Affairs should work in very closely with a number of other departments of government, perhaps, in particular, with the Department of Trade and Commerce and with the Department of Finance, and with the Defence Departments in present conditions. I can say that in the course of two or three months, matters relating to every department in Ottawa cross my desk in the Department of External Affairs. We operate through a system of interdepartmental liaison, some unofficial, and not formalized, and some through standing official committees. I do not know if I can go much further than that. Perhaps it would be easier if members should ask me questions on specific points.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that would be easier.

Mr. BOUCHER: Mr. Wrong, will you first explain to the committee about the various status of foreign representatives such as ambassadors, ministers, high commissioners and so on, and the countries that are included in our representation?

Mr. WRONG: Well, I am not sure that I can give from memory a complete list of the countries. On your first point there is no practical distinction between the status of an ambassador and that of a minister. We originally started our representatives abroad with the rank of minister but during the war, in 1943, I think, the minister in Washington was raised to the rank of ambassador. That was done through the mutual desire of President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister. The functions are indistinguishable now. I think I can say that the rank of minister is in course of disappearance. It seemed absurd for the United States government to exchange ambassadors with all the Latin American republics, but to have Canada represented by a minister, whereas San Salvador and the Dominican Republic were represented by ambassadors. In most countries there is no real difference in status between the two ranks. We treat ambassadors and ministers in exactly the same way in Ottawa, except on the rare occasions when the diplomatic corps forms up in order of precedence, when the ambassadors come before the ministers. I think, in time, they will all be called ambassadors.

We have ambassadors in five Latin American countries: Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico and Peru. We have a minister in Cuba. In Europe we have ambassadors in Paris and Moscow and Brussels, and we have a minister in The Hague. In Asia we have an ambassador in China. I think that is the complete list of ambassadors.

Mr. KNOWLES: What about Washington?

Mr. WRONG: Yes, I forgot the most important of them. At Washington we have an ambassador, of course. I was thinking only of Latin America. Now, turn to the other type, the high commissioners. That is a rather cumbrous title, but it is one now sanctioned by long use. We have had a High Commissioner in London now since the eighteen-eighties, sixty years about. We treat, in practice, high commissioners appointed between countries of the British commonwealth in much the same, or in exactly the same way as we treat the heads