

it; I am asking for information about it—would be a smaller document in simplified form. It would not go into detail. It would attempt to give a picture of what is going on without going into detail. It would be a simpler, shorter report.

The CHAIRMAN: A summary of this report.

Mr. FLEMING: But not exactly a summary. It is written to be read by a wider audience.

Mr. BOUCHER: Do I not understand Mr. Fleming to mean something of this nature? Would this not answer his problem? Should this not be considered as a technical tabulation of the proceedings of the United Nations brought out as an official document by the Department of External Affairs in the faith and trust that the Canadian Information Service, The Canadian Institute of International Affairs and other voluntary organizations may be guided as to the various aspects in which they are interested and will enlarge upon it in more detail and in a more popular manner? It is actually a compendium of facts rather than a publicity document. Is that not correct?

The WITNESS: I think the report is a little more interpretative than the previous report Mr. Fleming mentioned, the report of the San Francisco meeting. It is written in somewhat simpler language than the report on San Francisco and gives rather more of the background. I would have thought that one of the main purposes of the report was to give information to parliament on what the attitude of the Canadian delegation was at the Assembly on the various questions which were discussed so that parliament can form its own opinion on whether or not that attitude was proper. In order to make it possible for parliament to decide whether or not the government has carried out properly its stewardship it is necessary in some respects to go into more detail than one would in a popular report, and to give, as we have done in this report, very voluminous appendices in which the statements of policy by the representatives of the Canadian government are given in full.

Mr. COPE: Are we not taking one thing for another? As far as this report is concerned it is one of the best that could be produced. I do not see what correction could be made in it. It is an official report of the proceedings made by the government. It is one thing for the department to do that. The other matter which Mr. Fleming has mentioned—and it might very well be taken up—is the question of propaganda with which I do not think the department has very much to do. If popularization of this report is to be carried out—and I think it should be—I am inclined to believe it should be done by other organizations or the press or the radio, all the media of popularization and of propaganda, if we may call it propaganda, on behalf of the United Nations. I think, so far as the department is concerned we could hardly ask the department to mix in the propaganda side of the question, and at the same time publish an official report which has to come from the officials to parliament and the varied bodies which may desire an official report. I think there are two completely different objectives to be reached in this particular field, one is the official report and the other is the popular report. I do not think the Department of External Affairs' objective is to accomplish the latter.

Mr. CROLL: May I suggest that one of the things which would popularize the report is the removal of the fifty cent price. It occurs to me, if our purpose is to acquaint the people of Canada with the work of the United Nations, we might very well make an investment in it. If, for instance, a member was furnished with 25 copies which he would distribute to his constituents under the frank, you would get a very wide circulation amongst the people in the constituency, rather than amongst the people referred to by Mr. Fleming and others. The report would be read in the homes. It would be referred to by the children