

I suggested that perhaps I should speak to a few departmental officers about this and to certain academics, such as Col. Stacey, one of Canada's most accomplished historians, a former head of the historical services of the Department of National Defence, who had retired from the army and was teaching at the University of Toronto. Ed's response was typical. "Arthur," he said, "you can consult anybody you like. But I want you to consult Jim Eayrs."

I might explain—for the benefit of those of our non-Canadian guests tonight who may not be aware of Prof. Eayrs—that he was, and still is, one of Canada's foremost authorities in the foreign and defence policy fields. He was also the severest critic of the department's restrictive access policy. I was already seeing him a good deal. He was the first researcher to have access to our records under the new procedures and we would often have coffee or lunch together and talk things over. Those of you who may be interested in knowing just how drastically the department had cut itself off from researchers may wish to read the prefaces of two of his books: *Diplomacy and its Discontents* and Volume III in his superb series entitled *In Defence of Canada*.

My consultations with departmental officers produced what, in retrospect, can only be viewed as a highly amusing reaction. "Arthur", several said to me, "you can't do this. If you do, we'll no longer be able to report with candour, or write honestly and objectively, if it's all going to be made public some time down the line." When I told Ed about this, it produced one of the biggest shrugs and highest raised eyebrows I have ever seen. But the sequel is rather funny. Later, when new volumes came out, some of those very officers would check to see whether any of their reports or recommendations had been selected or whether their names appeared on any documents. Needless to say, when that happened, they were quite pleased. So much for candour and objectivity!

The new guidelines took off with Volumes 7 and 8 (1939-1941), edited by David Murray, and are still followed today.

Incidentally, several Australian and Japanese colleagues, who had heard about our new services and procedures, came to Ottawa at the time to find out more about them.

Another highlight was the project concerned with the history of the department, which in essence is another way of opening it up and making it known. It was Prof. Glazebrook, I believe, who was at the origin of the idea, many years before my time in Historical Division. Delays occurred and it was decided to concentrate on the *Documents* series instead. I recall having spoken to Mr. Ritchie about it in the mid-