

that reason the C.I.S. operator abroad must feel a primary responsibility to the Head of Mission and act accordingly.

If at the same time, as is equally necessary, the Head of Mission has a lively understanding of the functions and the use and importance to him of the Information Officer, this relationship should not in any way limit the freedom or enterprise of the Information Officer. On the contrary, it should give it considerably more scope." The question of authority and responsibility had also been dealt with by Mr. MacDermot in a memorandum of September 6, 1945, noting that when a full time Information Officer was appointed, the Head of Post and other officers would largely be relieved of information duties: "But the Heads of Mission and the Department of External Affairs will still be responsible for information policy itself and the effects of the operations of the Information Officer on policy.

Not unnaturally, the W.I.B. people who became the staff of the C.I.S. had a rather different approach to the chain of responsibility. In a discussion paper of September 18 for a meeting of the W.I.B.,⁽¹¹⁾ the thesis was advanced that information policy would be formulated by the C.I.S. Supervisory Committee, an interdepartmental organ, rather than by External Affairs. This paper did acknowledge, however, a special sort of position for and relationship with External. It recognized that External Affairs was to be represented on the C.I.S. Supervisory and Working Committees and asserted that "all decisions regarding policy and operations, current or