

will be defeated; but such policies are usually well cleared up by lengthy discussion. Quite a lengthy discussion took place on Dumbarton Oaks last year, and every member in the House had an opportunity to discuss the question, and when a conclusion was reached there was a clear-cut demonstration of foreign policy.

Mr. PICARD: I do not think in any country in the world that foreign policy can be outlined in a book from A to Z. Foreign policy varies from time to time, and it is up to the government of the day, when these events occur, to formulate an opinion and to decide on the policy of the government concerning that matter. I do not think any nation can come forward and say that this is our foreign policy. It is impossible. No government could try to do it.

The CHAIRMAN: Following up what Mr. Jaques has in mind, I would like this committee to be a living body which would help to formulate although not to absolutely crystallize those policies.

Mr. PICARD: Under our parliamentary system parliamentary committees have not this power, while in the United States they have.

Mr. JAQUES: As far as the knowledge of this House and of the general public is concerned, all we know is what we read in the newspapers or what we hear on the radio, and I have lost all faith in that sort of thing. The only way in which I can arrive at an intelligent decision is to hear witnesses for both sides of a case. We have to undertake the responsibility of making up our minds on these issues as they arise. Somebody sent me a cutting from an American paper containing a scathing attack on British policy in Palestine. Are we in any position to rebut such statements? I do not think so. We have no discussion of these questions here in the House. All these things are important. We have no power in the matter, and we have nothing to do with guiding the policy one way or another.

Mr. SINCLAIR: We were appointed by the House for a specific purpose, and our first duty is to discuss estimates, which we have not started yet.

The CHAIRMAN: I should explain that at a meeting of the steering committee it was decided to go ahead with the estimates and in the meantime to study all questions brought before the committee too.

Mr. JAQUES: Had I known that I would not have gone into this.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion has not been a futile one. I shall have to see you personally.

The WITNESS: Do you wish me to turn to the second question now?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: As I recall it, the other question was to indicate to the committee the relationship between the information division of the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Information Service. The information division of the department is a fairly new creation, and possibly its name is a little misleading. We debated for some time before the name was agreed on. The name used for corresponding activities in the Department of State at Washington is the Cultural Relations Division, which strikes me as being rather high-sounding and not a particularly significant title. So we adopted, perhaps, the most nondescript title to indicate the portion of the department which was concerned with a collection of duties connected with providing data and answering inquiries and so on. It is not used as a channel for giving information out to the Canadian public and the Canadian press. We get a large volume of correspondence, sometimes originating from our own representatives abroad, sometimes from representatives of foreign countries in Canada; and sometimes from other sources at home or abroad, asking for data on various aspects of Canadian life. We also receive a considerable number of inquiries, quite properly, from individuals and organizations in Canada desiring background