

of the sea. The total extent and impact of our information work can only be assessed by listing almost all our officers, and taking into account the collective effect of a large part of their day-to-day activities, integrated as these are with information work in so many ways, as I have tried to explain.

Apart from our Department's own resources, we very naturally give a great deal of attention to direct liaison with other departments and agencies concerned with information abroad. We have developed close personal contacts with the officers in charge. While this may not be very impressive on paper, in practice, the results are very substantial. On a day-to-day basis, for instance, we are in close touch with the Directors of the International Service of the CBC, the Exhibition Commission, the National Gallery and the Canada Council. I have already mentioned my membership of the National Film Board and of the Executive Committee of the UNESCO National Commission.

Let me give you one example of what this sort of liaison means in practical terms. While there is no chance that the Department of External Affairs could hope to obtain from Treasury Board the necessary resources to produce a film on the Colombo Plan, the Columbia, the Seaway, we have been successful, through our contacts with the National Film Board, in having films on just these subjects produced to meet the requirements of our information abroad. If you ask how much money the Department of External Affairs is spending on film production, you get a negative answer, and yet there is nothing that gives a more inaccurate idea of the real situation. I could give you other examples. The point is that we are in close touch with other information outlets, and, in planning their operations, they are good enough to take account of our policy and practical requirements.

To get back to my own Department, my next point is that our information operations should be assessed not only quantitatively -- in terms of the resources we are able to allocate to them -- but qualitatively. I am glad to say that we assign to this Division our very best officers. I welcome this opportunity of paying tribute to one of the early Heads of the Division, Dr. Geoffrey Andrew, whose opening address has just shown us how firm a grasp he has of information problems generally. His skill and experience were of immense help to the Division in the formative years just after the war. We are delighted to have him back in Ottawa once again, although in another capacity, because we know we may continue to rely upon his advice in case of need. The present Head of the Division is Mr. Southam, who was such an outstanding representative of our country in Poland. Before him we had Mr. Berlis, one of our most distinguished officers, whom the Government has just appointed as our High Commissioner in Tanganyika. And let me say that over the years those who have headed our Information Division have made their mark in the service. I need only mention such outstanding officers as Mr. Andrew, now our Ambassador to Israel, and Mr. Tremblay, Head of our Permanent Mission to the United Nations in New York.

This surely illustrates my point about integration. Our heads of mission are sometimes more effective because of their experience in information work; and, as heads of mission, they are unlikely to underestimate information work if they have been involved in it. This would not happen if information work was left to a few specialists who, in a service like our own, could never represent more than a small proportion of our whole establishment.