

of different mould, not quite to be trusted. From the memories of departmental officers in touch with the situation at the time, this attitude of superiority combined with mistrust was prevalent in the Department. (It did not cease to be prevalent long after C.I.S. had become the Department's own Information Division.)

After discussing the problems of relationships envisaged abroad between members of the C.I.S. and members of the foreign service, each responsible to a separate master, Mr. MacDermot concluded:

It is not irrelevant to add that the C.I.S. organization is not yet conducted on the same lines as the Department. Distribution practice, rules governing channels of communication, security regulations and habit--these differ in the two administrations, and this fact contributes further toward increasing the difficulties of bringing the operations of both into line.

Mr. MacDermot went on to express with some precision his formula for division of the information function and the preservation of External Affairs' responsibility for representation abroad. It also contained a personnel policy which would obviate some of the problems C.I.S. was meeting in determining status and emoluments for its staff outside Canada and of recruiting new personnel:

I suggest, therefore, that in drafting the Bill for C.I.S. consideration be given to confining its staff to the Ottawa office, and appointing all Information Officers abroad as members of External Affairs. As the Statute would in any case bring all members of C.I.S. into the Civil Service there would be no