

(2) If there is to be a non-official section in the record with its own editor, is that editor to have the final say into what goes into his section, or is the editor of the official section to be given overall responsibility? One can imagine a situation in which a cabinet minister, say, might object to a scathing newspaper attack on him being included in the permanent record. Nevertheless if we were to give the contract for preparing the non-official section to an outside body, I don't see how we could justifiably restrict his editorial powers. Were we to do so we could no longer take refuge in the excuse that the non-official section was prepared by an independent body and that External was not responsible for the selection of the views and comment it contained. And that surely is the main reason why we would not wish to undertake the preparation of non-official material ourselves.

(3) Whether we proceed to produce a foreign policy record or not will depend on how valuable we consider such a record to be, now and in the future, and in relation, of course, to the cost involved. We have got along in our existence thus far without such a permanent record, and presumably we could continue to do so. But I think all of us would agree that for the benefit of those who come after us, particularly the historians, a record of foreign policy