

doc
CA1
EA
74C12
ENG

DOCS
CA1 EA 74C12 ENG
A Canadian foreign affairs record
: a report prepared for Historical
Division
43230339

b1854471

LIBRARY DEPT. OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRESA CANADIAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS RECORD ?

A report prepared for Historical Division by
Charles J. Woodsworth

In the past month I have conferred with some 40 persons, including External Affairs officers; those officials of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs most directly concerned; the present editor and three former editors of "International Canada"; and a variety of university professors of history or political science whose speciality is Canadian foreign policy and who make constant use of the documentation available in this field.

The first question that needs to be answered, it seems to me, is: "Is "International Canada" an adequate record - a permanent record - of Canadian foreign policy? Is it one that is genuinely helpful to our missions abroad, and to those also in our own Department and other Departments in Ottawa who are actively engaged in one aspect or another of foreign policy. Finally, in addition to interested segments of the public, is it an adequate record for the purposes of the academic world - professors of international relations, historians, researchers and so forth who are dependent in their work now and in the future on comprehensive and readily accessible documentation?

Without minimizing the valuable aspects of "*International Canada*", and unquestionably there are some, the concensus is that the publication does not constitute such a record.

"*International Canada*" is useful because of its scope. From the international point of view it covers the waterfront; not just the activities of External Affairs but those of all departments in Ottawa. No other publi-

43-230-339

cation tries to cover that ground. It picks up our Minister's speeches and those of other ministers; it publishes press releases; and once a year it carries budgetary figures relating to foreign affairs estimates and foreign aid grants. In addition to official government pronouncements it includes opposition party reactions to those pronouncements, in Parliament and outside it. It tries also to reflect provincial government activities in the field of foreign affairs. And it includes press comment on major international issues. To sum up, it provides a bird's eye view of Canadian foreign policy developments suitable for those who want what they can get in this field in conveniently packaged form.

And to do "*International Canada*" justice, the academicians are the first to acknowledge that it has provided them with almost the only record that exists of these non-official - but significant - aspects of foreign policy. On the official side also, researchers have found it valuable; looking back to past years they have found in it at least sign posts to material which it has been frustratingly difficult for them to locate elsewhere.

But for all its virtues "*International Canada*" has serious deficiencies. Firstly, it doesn't cover the ground comprehensively. For example, take Mr. Sharp's speeches as reported in last February's issue. Of the Minister's four speeches which were covered by press releases in February only two were mentioned in "*International Canada*", and they were mentioned only in the form of summaries.

Secondly, as our revered editor emeritus of *"International Perspectives"* who is here will confirm, *"International Canada"* on occasion resorts to using secondary sources of information such as newspaper reports. No matter how reputable a newspaper may be, its reporters' versions of official statements, often stripped to the bone and possibly distorted by omission, do not constitute reliable documentation for historians or others.

I might point out, however, that if there is to be a complete record, the use of press reports may at times be unavoidable. Official texts of ministers' addresses - and particularly their comments to the press which are sometimes highly significant - just don't exist. Often the only record is to be found in the newspapers. This is just one of the snags if you're trying to compile a record which is both comprehensive and authoritative.

Incidentally, in its efforts to record provincial government activities in the sphere of foreign affairs *"International Canada"* has had to rely almost entirely on press reports. Its editors say that except for Manitoba, the provincial governments do not seem to have central information offices from which official texts and other documents can be obtained.

Again, in this officially bilingual country of ours, *"International Canada"* is published only in English.

Some of the reasons for *"International Canada's"* shortcomings aren't hard to find. Like most such organizations, the CIIA is short of money and staff. The initial editing is a sideline activity of Peter Dobell's Parliamentary Centre for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade for

which - and other services - it gets currently \$6000 annually from the CIIA. The editors - there has been a rapid succession of them - have other duties, which frequently means delay in the preparation of "*International Canada*" copy. Some of the editors have been experienced writers, some not, and some have had widely different concepts of what content and style should be.

The mechanics of publishing "*International Canada*" are not conducive to either high quality or speed. The present editor, who in his turn is on the verge of being replaced by yet another, puts aside during each month the material he considers should be used in the next issue. Near the end of the month he dictates the various items into a machine: a re-writing job he figures he can do in two days if his other duties don't interrupt. His dictation is transcribed in typewritten form by a secretary and is then mailed to CIIA headquarters in Toronto.

There, a long delay ensues - anywhere from three to four or even six to eight months - before "*International Canada*" is ready for distribution. This is not the fault of Marion Magee, the assistant editor of "*International Canada*". A CIIA employee, she does a conscientious job of checking all the material sent from Ottawa. But she has many other publications to edit, among them "*Behind the Headlines*". The principal reason for the delay is that, to save typesetting costs, the CIIA has the copy typed on a special machine by a woman who works at home. She charges only half the commercial rate, but often she has to set "*International Canada*" copy aside for higher priority jobs.

Small wonder that, as Arthur Blanchette will tell you, our missions complain that when "*International Canada*" reaches them - months late - it's of no use to them.

These comments are not aimed at the CIIA or its staff in any unfriendly way. The points I've noted, however, reinforce the opinion many in the Department appear to share that perhaps the time has come when we should think of bringing into being a new official record of Canadian foreign policy, more comprehensive and accurate than anything the CIIA is in a position to undertake.

I shall return later to how this proposed development might affect "*International Canada*" and how CIIA officials view it.

In my survey I have tried to ascertain what the various individuals think is the kind of official record of Canadian foreign policy our department and the other departments need; what it should contain; how the question of bilingualism should be handled; what should be the format; how often should it be issued; who should be responsible for producing it; and to whom should it go.

It is generally agreed, I think, that if a new-type record is produced it should include major foreign policy material emanating not just from External but from all federal government departments.

Details relating to the contents would have to be decided, but the nature of the main items seems clear enough. In brief, these would include the customary statements and speeches on foreign policy of the Prime Minister, other Ministers and senior officials (the criterion for their inclusion being importance); press releases; visits by VIP's from

abroad - heads of state, prime ministers, foreign ministers; joint communiqués; a listing of the more important international conferences; senior appointments within the foreign service, including No. 2's, who often act as chargés; treaty information; and once a year the highlights of the Department's annual budget, and the foreign aid grants of all departments,

In addition, it would seem to me that we might take a leaf from the U.S. State Department's weekly bulletin and include important statements made by our Canadian representatives at the U.N.

With reference to Statements and Speeches, our Chairman (Mr. Pearson) considers that either full texts should be used, or extracts, but not summaries. Extracts must of course be carefully selected if they are not to distort by omission, but at least they contain the original wording used. From the historians' point of view this is essential. The dangers inherent in summaries are obvious.

I might note here that our present publication, Statements and Speeches, doesn't contain all statements covered by press releases; hence as a record it isn't complete. And the academics get only the Statements and Speeches, not the press releases.

Referring again to the contents, there are many points that would have to be decided. For instance, I have been asked would the record contain Defence Department statements involving foreign policy aspects? In regard to major international conferences, could the conference agendas be included? For some reason, university researchers digging into past events, seem to have had difficulty in obtaining them. And what about foreign aid programs?

These, however, are matters that could be settled later.

When I began this survey it seemed to be taken for granted by most that any new foreign policy record would be issued in booklet or pamphlet form, and on a weekly, bi-monthly or quarterly basis. The advantages and disadvantages of the various suggested timings ("periodicity" for those who like jargonese) were debated.

Then Arthur Andrew came up with an attractive idea. Why not adopt - or rather adapt - the pattern of Keesing's, the British weekly diary of world events, or its U.S. counterpart, "Facts on File"? These, as you know, are loose leaf systems. Recipients are provided with binders into which the material, already perforated, is inserted as it is received. All material indicates the date it originated, though the indexing is done according to page. Cumulative indexes are issued fortnightly, and quarterly, and progressively discarded, so that only the year-end complete index is finally retained. Then it would seem advisable that each year's volume should be bound.

For us, this system would seem to have some important advantages, including flexibility, speed of distribution, selective mailing lists for those receiving only a part of the record, and possibly, in some respects, lower production costs. For example, all material destined for the record could be printed on a uniform type of paper. This would obviate re-typing or re-printing such things as Statement and Speeches - the mailing list for which would probably be much larger than for the complete record.

The loose-leaf system would also eliminate delays in distributing material immediately available in both languages. Other material requiring translation could follow when ready.

This introduces the question: to what extent would the contemplated record have to be bilingual? Would it have to appear in its entirety in two separate versions - one English, the other French?

This Department turns out certain items such as Selected Documents and Selected Reports in the language of origin only. These, however, are internal documents, not intended for public distribution. Again, because of the difficulty of getting precise translations, and the long delay involved, special permission was granted for the later volumes of "Documents on Canadian External Relations" to be published in the language of origin only. But in the case of the proposed new foreign policy record, which would be available to all who wished to see it, there appeared at first to be no possibility that it could be brought within these special categories.

However, Marcel Roussin, the Department's bilingual adviser, who is here today, came up with an interesting compromise formula which he thinks Mr. Spicer would find acceptable. It is one used by a number of bilingual or multi-lingual publications in Canada and abroad. Briefly, it is this: in the case of statements and speeches which are not automatically translated into the other language (as most of them are today) the record would carry the text in the language of origin only. However, with that text would be an abstract in the other language. Thus in the years to come researchers would at least have a text (it might be in English or it might be in French) which could be readily translated if text, or abstract, indicated that the matter was of sufficient interest.

Mr. Roussin would, I'm sure, be happy to elaborate on this suggestion should you wish him to. I'll only add that D'Iberville Fortier, when

I mentioned it to him, agreed en principe, but observed that if in practice a reasonable quantitative balance of material was not achieved there could be trouble.

The text-plus-abstract formula could save both time and printing costs. But whether or not it were found acceptable, the loose-leaf system would, as I see it, permit a steady flow of material to our posts and elsewhere. Telegrams containing the text, or summaries, of important foreign policy statements would continue to be sent to the posts as they are now, with the printed loose-leaf versions following by bag or airmail.

The question of whether the record should be produced monthly, bi-monthly or quarterly would thus disappear. Production would, so to speak, be continuous.

It has been suggested that logically Information Canada should be responsible for producing the new record. But to most minds, Information Canada's poor track record weighs heavily against that thought. There is general agreement that if it's going to be done, External should take the job on. But which Division? Arthur Andrew was certain it should be the responsibility of Historical. Arthur Blanchette wasn't quite so sure. He and almost everyone else, with the notable exception of Allan Roger, thought it should go to Information.

However, like good diplomats, Allan and Arthur believe in compromise. Allan thinks his division has enough on its plate without taking on more. But apparently he's willing to contribute from his division's budget some part of the production costs if Historical accepts the job.

Mr. Blanchette, on the other hand, maintained initially that FAH has neither the manpower nor the money to undertake the production. He offered however to provide and pay for an indexer - a key person in this enterprise - and provide also some of the typing help required. Later, his generous nature drove him to declare that while he hasn't the means to produce the record this year, he hopes his division's budget is going to be substantially enlarged next year, and if it is he might take on the whole thing.

Would the proposed new record entail higher costs, more man years, for External? Essentially, the new record would be a consolidation of present material. Hence, at first blush, it would seem that other than the cost of additional material from other departments, and minor items such as binders for the posts, extra expense should not be great.

There are, however, certain other factors to be considered. As I see it, in the beginning at least, the operation would require two key people: an intelligent, experienced and discriminating editor with a well-developed sense of history capable of selecting truly important material for the record; and secondly the indexer, already referred to. Indexing is a tedious task, but the efficient use of a record of this kind is dependent on the user being able to locate not only a single isolated item, but related items which ante-dated it. That takes patience and a long memory, as well as the ability to index items under headings or in categories where they can be found. Presumably there are people already in External whose talents qualify them for these jobs. Alternatively, Mr. Blanchette has

suggested that one of our Departmental library staff, just retired, would make an excellent indexer.

While it would seem wise to start by hand indexing, we might wish later to move to computer indexing if the items became too numerous and the cross-indexing too complex. On this point, I conferred with two senior officials of the National Library, Mrs. Jacqueline Giesbrecht, editor of "Canadiana", and Louis Forget, of the Library's Research and Planning Branch. Canadiana's index, formerly hand-produced, is now being done by computer. Mr. Forget is an expert at devising specialized computer indexing systems. If we were to present him with concrete samples of what the record would contain, and how extensive it would be, he would be happy to give us his opinion of whether or not we would need to get into automation. If we did so, production costs would almost certainly be higher. How much so would depend largely on volume. But Mr. Forget thought that until we had gained some experience we should do the indexing by hand.

If we were to go into automation we should certainly consult the National Library. Unfortunately, there is almost no uniformity to the computer systems of the various Departments in Ottawa; they were developed individually. But the National Library is hoping to achieve some degree of coordination.

Both National Library officials considered the loose-leaf system for the proposed record as thoroughly practical, and the indexing system I tentatively suggested - modified from Keesing's - as sound.

Another word about indexing: it would seem essential that whatever the degree of bilingualism in the contents, the entire index should be in both English and French. Mr. Roussin can tell you of the misunderstandings

that can arise over a seemingly simple matter such as the titles of international conferences if official translations are lacking.

Beyond automation for the index only, looms the possibility of printing the entire record by computer. This would have great advantages - boiling material into small type, perhaps two or three columns to a page, uniformity of type style, the ease and speed of making corrections - but it's doubtful that the Department would wish to assume the very considerable cost involved.

To revert to the pre-computer theme, if the proposed new-type record were to be undertaken, no great changes in present Departmental publications seem likely. *"International Perspectives"* might be modified in one respect. With the exception of the list of Books and Periodicals, the Reference Section of *"International Perspectives"* might be switched to the Record. Mr. Goldblatt, though he is no longer editor of the journal, sees no objection to this proposal. However, he did vigorously oppose a suggestion that the non-official material which now appears in the CIA's *"International Canada"* - such things as opposition party views and press comment on major issues, which many people would like to see preserved - should be incorporated into *"International Perspectives"*. Almost all of us, I think, would agree with Mr. Goldblatt's view that this would be like "mixing apples and oranges." *"International Perspectives"* present formula is succeeding wonderfully well, and few would wish to tamper with it. For similar reasons, I would question the wisdom of another suggestion made to me: that this same material might be incorporated into the CIA's *"International Journal"*.

Just how the proposed new record would affect "*International Canada*" calls for close consideration, for it was the CIIA's financial concern about their publication that touched off this inquiry. I was a little worried when I went to Toronto a fortnight ago that our CIIA friends there might be upset by the step we were at least meditating. I need not have been. They could not have been more cooperative and understanding.

I discussed the situation with Bob Reford, President of the CIIA; Mrs. Marion Magee, who as I noted earlier, edits several CIIA publications and is the assistant editor of "*International Canada*"; and Rod Byers, associate Dean of Arts at York University, and chairman also of the CIIA's Research Committee.

All three Institute officials consider that "*International Canada*" provides a unique service to a wide variety of people interested in Canadian foreign policy, and they would very much like to see it continue. But the prospect that it might fold isn't new to them. "*International Canada's*" deficit is well over half the total deficit incurred on CIIA publications as a whole, and some time ago it narrowly escaped extinction at the hands of those primarily concerned with CIIA financing.

Professor Byers told me he had tried unsuccessfully to get a Canada Council grant for "*International Canada*". But as it is primarily a record of foreign policy, "*International Canada*" isn't eligible; Canada Council grants are available to publications, such as the CIIA's "*International Journal*", which are devoted to comment and analysis. Professor Byers suggested that if External were to undertake an official record, the Institute might convert "*International Canada*" into such a journal of opinion; publish only two issues a year instead of the present eleven;

and hopefully qualify thereby for a Canada Council grant.

This suggestion met with no support from either Bob Reford or Mrs. Magee. The latter maintained it would be wrong in principle to tailor a publication to certain specifications in the hope of getting a grant. In her opinion also, it would mean higher production costs: paying a high-priced editor and a name writer to provide comment that would attract subscribers. And neither she nor Bob Reford thought that the CIIA's directors would go for the idea.

Both doubted that in the event of our producing a record, any decision would be taken immediately regarding "*International Canada's*" fate. In a year and a half to two years, they believed, the matter would resolve itself one way or the other.

There is no doubt, however, that they feel the publication of an official record would likely hasten "*International Canada's*" demise. As Mrs. Magee remarked, librarians don't have much money to purchase publications, and if it came to a choice they would almost certainly plump for the official record which presumably External could produce more cheaply than could the CIIA its "*International Canada*".

Nevertheless, as I've indicated, there was no disposition on the part of any of the CIIA officials to criticize External for tentatively considering putting out its own record. All three acknowledged unhesitatingly that an official policy record would be of inestimable value to scholars, as well as to External and other federal departments.

But like so many of the people I have talked with in External and outside it, they would hope that if "*International Canada*" dies, some way

could be found of continuing to publish the non-official material it contains: the views of opposition parties as expressed in major Parliamentary debates; the proceedings of some of the Parliamentary sub-committees; the foreign policy sections of labour organization briefs to the Cabinet.

Prior to my Toronto visit our Chairman had speculated whether, if we were to put out a record, "*International Canada's*" deficit might not be cut by eliminating duplicating material, shortening the publication, and reducing the number of issues.

Mrs. Magee agreed that given an official record, certain items would probably disappear from "*International Canada*"; for example, the section which appears in the December issue each year regarding Canadian voting at the U.N.; the full text each June of the NATO meeting declaration; the budget figures regarding federal department foreign aid grants; official visit communiqués. Cutting out these and other items might result in reducing the volume of published material by perhaps 10% - an inconsequential saving. And Mrs. Magee agreed that publishing six times a year instead of eleven might have some merit. But she doubted if these measures would substantially reduce "*International Canada's*" deficit. According to her, the big cost involved is typesetting or electric machine typing, and here the savings wouldn't be large.

No one I have talked with either here or in Toronto thinks that "*International Canada*" could navigate if it were to leave the official side of the record to External and restrict its publication to only those non-official items which are so highly regarded in some quarters. There's general

agreement that this would be totally uneconomic.

So what to do? Here are some interesting proposals.

Professor Goldblatt thinks "*International Canada*" might possibly survive - even against official competition - if it were better edited, produced and distributed more quickly, and the number of issues cut to six per year.

I was intrigued by some views expressed by Peter Dobell. Mr. Dobell is understandably anxious that "*International Canada*" should survive, as it is his Parliamentary Centre, as I noted, that does the initial editing. But beyond that he believes - sincerely I think - that the cause of historical research would be seriously disadvantaged if the non-official material now published in "*International Canada*" were to disappear.

Ideally, Mr. Dobell would like External to drop the idea of an official record and devote whatever sum it would save by such abstinence to improving "*International Canada*".

Failing that, he would hope that instead of charging for subscriptions to libraries and other potential recipients, we would give the new record to them gratis. Hard-up librarians would not then have to choose between competing publications. There is the danger, of course, that they might elect to accept the free one and not renew their subscription to the other. But the risk of External's publication killing "*International Canada*" would be greatly lessened.

I might point out that to make the record available to university and other libraries without charge would be less costly than perhaps it sounds.

It's a well known fact in the publishing business that initial production represents the major cost; after that, running off additional copies is relatively inexpensive.

The most interesting proposal, however, came from a group of political science professors at Carleton University. They met last week at the invitation of Doug Anglin, whom most of you know, and with whom I had spoken of this matter. They emphasized the importance as they see it, in any record we might undertake of retaining non-official opinion of the type that now appears in "*International Canada*". They maintained that this was the more important as Canada - so they claimed - has no newspaper which is indexed. There was therefore, they said, no reference source to matters researchers might wish to check.

(As I later learned, they were wrong in this contention. Laval University does an index of *Le Devoir* which has recently been enlarged to include some articles from *Le Soleil* and *La Presse*. A subscription to the index costs \$500 a year.)

But no matter. What the Carleton political scientists proposed was this: If External is to produce a loose-leaf record, the CIIA or some other body should be asked to prepare an analysis of non-official opinion in the same format, so that it would fit into the same binder. And it would have a common index, though the pages might be of a different colour.

To sum up, a big majority of those with whom I have discussed the pros and cons of inaugurating a new-type foreign affairs record have strongly approved the proposal. Included is one of our senior Depart-

mental librarians, who observed that from the professional standpoint it would be a great asset.

If it's decided to go ahead with it, I would recommend that however bug-proof any system adopted may seem in advance, it should be tried out thoroughly on an experimental dry-run basis. This could avoid mistakes that would be awkward to rectify later. Experimentation could demonstrate, for example, whether hand-indexing would be adequate, or whether it would be advisable to go for automation from the start, and just possibly computer printing of the entire record.

I would like to add my personal hope that the proposal, which has been urged in many quarters, to include in the record at least some types of non-official opinion, be given close and sympathetic consideration. Whatever the criticism, political or other, that might be incurred (and careful ground rules would have to be agreed on in advance) I don't see how the record could be considered complete without it. And certainly with it, it would be of infinitely greater interest and value, both currently and in the future.

Finally, if we do proceed with a record, you might like to consider for title the plain but comprehensive "Canadian Foreign Affairs Record". Obviously, we can't decently use "External Affairs Record" if other departments are to be in the picture. And the title I suggest would be the more appropriate, and durable, if some day we follow the lead of Australia and change our name to Department of Foreign Affairs.

A CANADIAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS RECORD?

Report No. 2

Production Plan and Estimate of Costs

by Charles J. Woodsworth

*Could some
combination
absorption of
existing resources
Facilitate take
place*

At our last meeting on September 10 there appeared to be general support for the proposal that this Department should produce a permanent foreign policy record of some kind -- a record which would include foreign policy developments in all federal government departments and which might include non-official as well as official matter.

I was asked to formulate a production or organization plan, including type and number of staff required, and to draw up estimates of what might be the costs involved.

You will recall that I was attracted, as I think we all were, to producing the record on a loose-leaf binder system, possibly a modified form of Keesing's Contemporary Archives. You will remember also that I thought we might find it advisable to produce at least the index by automation, and -- unless it proved prohibitively expensive -- to go whole hog and employ computerized printing for the entire record.

Personally, from my limited researches into the wonderful world of automation, I would hope that we could, and would, go the whole way. I am happy to report that virtually all of us in this Department share this view, from Bruce

Williams, who admits he doesn't know the first thing about computer printing, to Tom Farley, of our Information Division, who does.

There are certain basic matters such as the primary purpose of the record, its scope, and which division should have the responsibility for producing it, that I would like to bring up for your consideration later. But let's look first at how the production of a record might be organized and what the costs involved might be.

You will remember I suggested that in order to reduce the amount of re-typing required, material destined for the posts and other recipients might be typed on uniform-size paper and, as far as possible, in a uniform style. It was my thought at the time, and that of others I believe, that this material, already perforated, could be placed immediately in the waiting binders. Because of the loose-leaf system, changes or substitutions decided on by the editor could be easily made later, and a monthly or quarterly cumulative index be added.

You will remember also that I listed the kind of items it was agreed that a foreign policy record might contain: the customary statements and speeches on foreign policy of the Prime Minister, and of our Minister and other Ministers and senior officials; press releases; visits by VIP's from abroad; joint communiqués; a listing of the more important international conferences; senior appointments within the foreign service; treaty information; the highlights of External's annual budget;

(pass comment)

1.2.1

the foreign aid grants of all departments; and the more important statements made by our Canadian representatives at the U.N.

When I began to collect this material for sample months it became quickly apparent that the volume, done on uniform-size paper or not, would in a very short time be much too great to be contained in any one annual volume; that binder after binder would rapidly stretch out on the library shelves, and, from a space standpoint, soon become unmanageable. This because normally only one side of a sheet of paper is used; a large amount of white space is devoted to margins; press releases and personnel appointments may often be only a paragraph or two in length; and paper used is rarely of airmail thinness.

It did not seem to me feasible for an editor, through whom this material might be channeled, to put it into shape for the record before it was sent out; select what he thought was sufficiently important; decide when full texts, or just extracts, should be used; arrange for abstracts where texts would appear only in the language of origin; and get done whatever re-typing was required, especially of material from other departments. In addition there would be the indexing and continuous pagination to look after, and not least, to arrange for translation where needed. All this would mean prolonged delay in getting out the material.

I concluded that the raw material, so to speak, of the record should continue to go forward to the posts as it does now; that the editor of the record should receive copies of pertinent material emanating from our Department, and material from other departments and the U.N. as well. He would then proceed on a monthly basis to put it into shape for the record. At the end of each month (or in the middle of the succeeding month, so that the preceeding month's material could be relatively complete) he could forward a final version of the record, complete with index, to the recipients.

So much for official material. Leaving for the moment the question of the method by which the final version would be produced, let us turn to the moot point of whether non-official material should be included, and if so how this might be done.

Once again you will recall that the hope was expressed in many quarters that if External were to bring out an official record, the non-official material that now appears in the CIIA's "Internation Canada" might somehow be preserved. This non-official material, as you know, includes such things as the reactions of opposition parties to official foreign policy statements, the foreign policy views of labour organizations and the C.M.A., press opinion on important issues, and so forth.

This material is undoubtedly part -- and an important part -- of Canada's foreign policy picture. From a group of

Carleton University political scientists, you'll remember, came the suggestion that External should contract the CIIA, or some other body, to prepare an analysis of non-official opinion, and incorporate this as a part -- though a separate and well-identified part -- of any record we might produce.

Since our September meeting I have tried to ascertain whether the CIIA would be willing to enter into such an arrangement. I have discussed the matter with the same three CIIA officials I visited six weeks ago in Toronto: Bob Reford, national president of the Institute; Mrs. Marion Magee, the assistant editor of "International Canada" and a staff member of the CIIA; and Rod Byers, associate Dean of Arts at York University and chairman of the CIIA's Research Committee. I have also consulted Peter Dobell, whose Parliamentary Centre here does the initial editing of "International Canada".

There is a great reluctance on the part of all of those mentioned to commit themselves on the issue of a partnership with a government department in this matter, or -- until we come forward with a definite proposal -- to sound out the views of the CIIA's directors, either formally or informally. The Institute has already been criticized by some of its directors and supporters for accepting the present government subsidy of \$50,000 on grounds that this undermines its position as an independent body. The four individuals mentioned above were

afraid that if the CIIA were to accept the partnership proposal, this criticism would sharpen. They also questioned whether from the technical standpoint an arrangement of the kind suggested would work.

There is no doubt that what these representatives of the CIIA would really like us to do is drop our scheme and either subsidize them further so that they could produce a higher quality "International Canada" more quickly or give the CIIA the contract to do the whole record -- official and non-official -- with of course an enlarged grant. In view of the in-built strategic position External occupies in regard to collecting official material from our own and other departments I think most of us would consider it quite inadvisable to employ an outside body to do something I'm sure we can do better.

I should add that the CIIA officials are more than ever convinced that if we bring out an official record "International Canada" will die. They maintain further that even if they were to cooperate with us on a joint record, the ultimate product would not fulfill the function that "International Canada," as they see it, performs now: i.e. provide a bird's eye view of Canadian foreign policy developments for the general reader as contrasted to the specialists, but at the same time provides a record of value to those specialists.

With all respect to the CIIA officials and Peter Dobell, it seems to me and others with whom I have spoken that they exaggerate the value of "International Canada" and the importance attached to it by its subscribers. In my earlier report I noted that because issues of "International Canada" are frequently late by as much as eight months, our External officers, here and abroad, consider it virtually useless. It is hard to believe that the 500 busy executives who receive "International Canada" free with their companies' corporate memberships find it any more useful in their efforts to keep abreast of Canadian developments in the international field. Or that the 800 or 900 others to whom the publication goes are any more impressed with it. As for the academics, for whom it is claimed to be an indispensable tool, Prof. Douglas Anglin, of Carleton University, confided to me, "I pay my \$10 annual subscription more out of a sense of loyalty to the CIIA than because it is of any great use to me."

One might argue from the foregoing that "International Canada" might disappear without causing irreparable loss to anyone. Nevertheless, I am personally convinced that the unofficial material it contains, if better edited and published promptly, could be of real and lasting value.

Obviously, it would be relatively simple for us to produce a purely official foreign policy record; forget the non-official side and, like the U.S. State Department's weekly bulletin, stick to the speeches and documents originating from government and government-accredited sources. Let those who will disseminate the non-official side, and if no one considers that effort worth the time and money involved, tant pis!

Among those who incline to this view is a no less perceptive and experienced practitioner than our former "International Perspectives" editor, Murray Goldblatt. No doubt his view is influenced by the thought which we have in common but to which we give a different direction -- that "International Canada" might survive if it were better edited and produced more quickly.

2, | If the CIIA's conscience won't permit it to join with us, in a cooperative enterprise, we needn't be stuck. We might, for example, offer the non-official contract to Carleton University's School of Journalism, which might be happy to undertake it as a project, or to the same university's School of Political Science, or to a combination of the two. In charge of the Journalism School there are experienced writers, and classrooms of eager young beavers to assist them. I'm not at all sure that they wouldn't do a better job than the Parliamentary Centre -- CIIA set-up, and be in a better position

to meet deadlines.

Let's return now to how, if we do decide to include non-official material, the operation might be conducted.

I had thought originally of a close working relationship between the editors of the two types of material. And the original proposal of the Carleton University political scientists, you'll remember, was for a common index, though the pages of the official and non-official material would be differently coloured. I had even considered these might be interleaved, so that non-official reactions and attitudes could follow closely on the official.

On further consideration it seems to me preferable to have two separate sections; different coloured paper, yes, but with separate indexes, except for the year-end index which, for the convenience of readers on in the future, could be a common one. Otherwise -- and here I agree with Arthur Andrew in his memo to me of September 13 -- in trying to coordinate the two sides "either we or they would be chained to the other's production difficulties. One could affect the output of the other."

? X
It seems to me that once a modus operandi was agreed on, each side could work on the same monthly schedule toward the same deadline. Our side of the record would contain the official statements or documents; the other, with brief explanatory precedes or indexed references to our material, where required, would give the non-official side of the picture. Some technical

difficulties would no doubt be involved, but neither Murray Goldblatt nor I think these would be insuperable.

Two things I think External would have to undertake for the non-official sections: (1) the indexing, and (2) the translation of its material into French. This last would almost certainly be the case if the Parliamentary Centre did the job for us. As you know, with rare exceptions such as minor-length quotations, "International Canada" is published only in English. In fact CIIA headquarters admits they get complaints if much French appears in the publication!

To turn now to the all-important matter of costs. I propose to concentrate first on what these might be if we were to go in for automation, as expenditures involved in conventional printing methods are better known and easier to calculate.

My researches have brought me into contact with quite a number of experts in the field of computerized printing. We have in External several staff members who have been engaged for some time, either directly or indirectly, in putting out publications by automation: Everett Haner and Ken Checkland in Central Services, and J.B. Coutu in Management Services, to mention the leading ones. I have also consulted with R.G. Robinson, of Alphatext; Louis Forget and Edwin Buchinski, of

the National Library's Research and Planning Board; Joe Wieczorek and Ted Whicker, of the Printing Products Branch of DSS; and Bob Loucks, of the Prices Review Board.

Time does not permit to dilate on any but the elemental technicalities of automated printing. Suffice it to say this this Department, like others in Ottawa, makes use of the facilities of Alphatex Limited, a private firm at 233 Gilmour Street, to put out such publications as "Canadian Representatives Abroad," the "Records Classification Guide," "Information for Canadians Travelling Abroad" and the "Biographical Register of Officers". And Historical Division is arranging to have the next Volume - Volume 8 - of "Documents on Canadian External Relations" produced by automation.

The system in brief is that material intended for computer processing is typed on an IBM terminal installed by Alphatex in our building and connected with ^{the} Gilmour Street Centre by telephone line. The IBM terminal has an ordinary typewriter keyboard, and is operated by an External typist trained by the firm at its expense to use the special coding required. As soon as the text, either in French or English, is typed, back from the Centre comes a high-speed print-out, on which the operator or editor makes whatever corrections or other changes are required. The alterations are done by the computer with astonishing swiftness and a final print of camera-ready copy is

shot back, to be turned over to the DSS printing plant for printing.

To those unfamiliar with the process, its speed and flexibility are uncanny. It is this speed -- and the consequent saving of staff time -- that accounts in part for the favourable financial showing that in some operations computerized printing can make relative to that of conventional methods.

The basic cost of Alphatext service, including installation of the IBM terminal and monthly rental charges amounts to some \$735 per month for full-day service. We have already one IBM terminal in this building, and consideration is being given to installing a second one. Mr. Haner, of Central Services division, was confident at first that if the second installation was made the two terminals could handle his division's foreseeable requirements and ours as well. In the light of my later calculations, however, he was less certain than previously whether two terminals could handle the total volume. How this would work out in practice, and what our share of the cost of terminal facilities might be, cannot be determined with any accuracy in advance.

Much the same situation applies in regard to the operators of the terminals. We now have two External typists-operators (their official description is "office composing equipment operators"). Both are bilingual and trained by

Alphatext, and they share the typing, each on a half-day basis. If a second terminal is installed, and we proceed with the record, there might be need for a third operator. Here again some kind of sharing arrangement of the operators' time could no doubt be worked out.

The cost of photocomposing, as the automated process is called, is based primarily on the number of computer characters in the material typed into the terminal. Each letter, each space, and each punctuation mark counts as a computer character. To estimate the overall cost of a project one must know the approximate volume of the material one intends to use, say on a monthly basis, and the total estimated number of characters it will contain. One must then decide on the size of page and type one wants to use, as these have a bearing on the cost per page and therefore on the overall cost.

In the annex to this report I have described in detail the procedures I followed to arrive at the conclusion that the photocomposing bill for the proposed record, containing 40 to 45 pages per month, might amount to \$500 to \$560 monthly, or between \$6000 and \$7000 a year.

Experts of the Printing Products Bureau of DSS with whom I checked my findings warned that while they^{so} were theoretically close to the mark, the actual costs might be considerably higher. They noted that after corrections and changes are made

on the first print-out it is very often necessary to make further alterations, and that these can be costly. Our Mr. Haner, however, maintains that judging by his experience, these extra costs can be exaggerated.

On top of the bill for the camera-ready copy, whatever it might be, would come that of the DSS for printing. The DSS bill would depend mainly on the number of copies we would require. Here quite a few decisions regarding distribution would have to be made before any realistic total could be reached.

A tentative list of recipients might include our 120 posts abroad (a word about that in a moment); our Department and other government departments (the number to each to be determined); the national and provincial archives; the libraries of the 70 universities in Canada (they're said to always want two copies of everything); a selected list of public libraries (some 350 in English-speaking Canada, 75 in the French-speaking areas); some of the 40 to 50 institutions like the CIA in Canada; a few, possibly, of the larger newspapers; a certain number of private individuals (some researchers don't like to have to depend on libraries but want copies of their own). There would also undoubtedly be a certain distribution to libraries, etc., abroad.

Regarding the posts, the production plan I outlined proposed that they would continue to receive the material they get now in its original form, that is, before it is edited in a

final version for the record. If this final version were not sent to them each month, what they would lack would be most of the official material emanating from other departments, and the non-official material, if that is to be included. Some may ask, do the posts really need this other material? Would they read it? Would they ever need to refer to the annual volumes of the record as these began to accumulate on their shelves? Among those who are familiar with the habits of posts there are skeptics. And one must bear in mind that the posts do already get a good deal of current information from newspapers, magazines and other material sent them. And in the welter of day-to-day developments the need to look up historical data may come only rarely.

In any event, if the record were not distributed to the posts, except perhaps to a few of the larger and more important ones, some part of the duplication in printing and mailing charges involved in this plan for producing a permanent record could be avoided.

However, as I noted in my earlier report, in the publishing business the initial costs are the heavy ones; once the page prints are obtained it costs relatively little to run off extra copies. And because the final version of the record, compactly edited, would be printed ~~in type~~ on

both sides of lightweight paper, the costs of both the paper itself and mailing charges would be proportionately less. Moreover, while files and library shelves at the posts tend now to get cluttered up quickly with piles of official material, no great effort would be required to slip a slim packet of 20 or so double-sided pages in a loose-leaf binder. At year's end the annual volume containing perhaps 250 to 300 pages, complete with index and bound -- one would hope in hard covers -- would not be too bulky an addition to the post library.

Another factor in the cost picture would be, who would be charged for the record, and how much? If the CIIA were to agree to compile a non-official section for the record, "International Canada" would of course go out of existence. There would then be no need to consider Peter Dobell's plea that we at least limit our operation to an official record and distribute it free to the libraries -- this so that "International Canada" would not have a competitor for the scarce dollars of librarians. But if that consideration disappears, is there any reason why we shouldn't charge the libraries so much for the record and offset our production costs? That's a policy matter to which I don't know the answer.

In any event, until decisions of this kind are made it's impossible to arrive at any real estimate of what

our printing bills would be. I did, however, obtain from the Printing Products Branch of DSS some figures on which cost calculations might be based once we had determined the number of copies of the record required. Printed on both sides of 8" x 11" lightweight paper, 25 sheets (50 pages) would cost approximately \$250.00. An additional 200 copies would run about \$100. Pages would be punched with three holes for the loose leaf binders, banded in sets, and packed in cartons.

Thus if our distribution list was 500 copies, the DSS printing bill would be \$3000 a year; if 700 copies, \$3900. And on top of this, of course, there would be mailing charges.

To get some idea of the total annual printing costs involved (not including staff salaries) let us assume that our share of the basic cost of Alphatext service would amount to one half the monthly charge of \$735 for one terminal, i.e., roughly \$368. (If Mr. Haner's second-guessing is well-founded, the terminal time we required -- and therefore our cost -- might be somewhat greater.) But accepting the \$368 figure tentatively, the yearly cost would be \$4416. Photocomposing charges might total \$7000 (or possibly more depending on the extent of additional corrections). And the DSS printing bill for 500 copies would be \$3000. Adding these figures together one arrives at something in the neighborhood of \$15,000

annually.

Finally to be included in the reckoning is the size and nature of staff required. In my earlier report I observed that the two key people in putting out a record would be the editor and the indexer. If a thoroughly bilingual editor could be found, the one senior person might suffice, though he would have to have at least a part-time deputy. But just as in the case of "International Perspectives" it seems more than likely that two editors be required -- one English, one French -- though again one of the two might be needed only part-time. Also required would be two indexers, one English, one French, though with luck a primarily French-speaking indexer might be found who could also do whatever translation - English into French - might be needed, particularly in connection with non-official material. A last item in the staff cost-accounting picture would be our share of a bilingual terminal operator's time.

*bilingual
BTend
TYPIST*

??
Contract

I have noted what I think would be the need for two indexers. Parallel indexing in English and French is a complicated matter. It is, so I'm told, virtually useless to try to translate an index prepared in English directly into French. A literal translation is of course possible but the true meanings of the words used can become badly distorted. Apparently the only satisfactory method is for a French-speaking

indexer, say, to be provided not only with the English index he is to translate, but the actual texts of the material indexed. Only in that way can he achieve meaningful translations.

I would conclude this report with a number of observations and recommendations.

(1) Several persons skilled in modern printing and processing techniques have suggested that we should consider microfilming in producing the proposed foreign policy record. According to the persons concerned, we could either forget about a record printed on paper and use microfilm exclusively, or use a combination of the two methods, bearing in mind that libraries today use microfilm extensively.

I refer to this suggestion only in order -- I hope -- to dismiss it. Many of the recipients of the record would not have the equipment needed to use microfilm. Again researchers like our resident historian Dr. Donald Page who have spent endless hours studying microfilmed documents are emphatic regarding its inconvenience. Finally, there are ways to index microfilm, but nothing that approaches page indexing in speed or ease. And as extra copies of the printed record can be run off relatively cheaply once the page prints are prepared, it would seem to me only a costly complication to divide the operation into two.

(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

developments -- compact and comprehensive -- could be of very great value. After all, we already produce a variety of costly volumes the sole value of which is as works of reference and repositories of our history. Why -- for expenditures which in terms of money and staff are not of any great magnitude -- should we not produce a record which would not duplicate others but would perform an equally important function?

(4) For those whose chief concern is costs, I might note that any who may regard modern printing techniques with suspicion and feel that conventional methods must be cheaper should look more closely into the available data. There is a tendency to overlook the fact that the cost of conventional typesetting has risen enormously in recent years, and now far outdistances that of photocomposing. I mentioned that Historical Division has decided to produce the next volume -- No. 8 -- of "Documents on Canadian External Relations" by automation. This decision follows on a survey made by Mr. J.B. Coutu of Management Services Division which concluded that while the total cost of getting Volume 5 set up on the press and ready for actual printing by conventional hot-type technique was \$27,426, that same volume could be produced today through use of Alphatext facilities for \$9487 -- a saving of some \$15,000. Any number of similar examples might be cited. The Food Prices Review Board, which was putting out

its publications by conventional methods has recently switched to Alphatext. Board officials told me that because of several factors -- lower printing costs, the smaller size of paper needed to contain the same material, and lower mailing charges -- they project savings of \$115,200 in producing 48 100-page documents over the next eight months.

(5) The Printing Products Branch of DSS, which as I noted checked my findings, offers a service under which it will carry out detailed printing costs surveys for other government departments at \$200 a day. While they considered the cost estimates I had come up with accurate in the main, they suggested that Alphatext costs may be higher than necessary and that there are alternative methods of producing the record which might be cheaper. These alternative methods, I gather come within the sphere of automated printing but are less sophisticated than the Alphatext system, which in terms far too technical to explain here, offers a range of services in a handy "package deal."

The Printing Products Branch experts made it clear that they would (like greatly) to have a look at how we in External produce all our publications and advise us on what changes we might profitably make. However they would be willing to examine the one project in which we are particularly

interested at the moment -- the foreign policy record -- and do a cost analysis of how it might be produced by various alternative methods. They could do this, they think, in about ten days; i.e., for around \$2000. I don't think it is possible for a layman to examine these alternative methods on his own and come up with any sensible cost estimates. All are complex, and much experience is needed to understand and apply them. But if there are efficient methods of producing the record cheaper than those offered by Alphatext I think we should look into them. The \$2000 fee would be soon absorbed if any substantial savings were possible, and over the long haul it would be a small sum indeed.

(6) Sometime or other, if we go ahead with the record, a decision will have to be taken as to which of External's divisions should have the primary responsibility for producing it. As you know, some think the job ought to go to Information, others that Historical might be more appropriate. Our chairman, ^{today,} Allan Roger, is strongly opposed to the proposed record going to his division, which he maintains has all the work it can possibly handle now and for a long period ahead. He is, however, prepared to help from his budget in funding the project if another division were to take it on. At the risk of making a mortal enemy of Mr. Roger, I would express my personal belief that the logical division to

produce the record would be Information, this for reasons I would be happy to elaborate if asked to do so.

However the question for the moment is largely academic. Certainly we are not going to plunge in and start producing the record -- if we do it at all -- without a great deal more thought and preparation. From the standpoint of the libraries, who would be among our most important recipients, cataloguing convenience dictates that if at all possible a publication of this kind should make its bow at the beginning of a year -- January 1. It is ~~far~~ too late now to think of starting the operation at the beginning of 1974. There are too many factors -- money and staff among them -- involved. Hence to me the date toward which we should think and plan would be January 1, 1976.

Annex to "A Canadian Foreign Affairs Record?"

(Report No. 2)

In the main body of this report it was noted that the cost of photocomposing is based on the number of computer characters in the material typed into the terminal, and that each letter, each space, and each punctuation mark counts as a computer character.

In the light of this, my first move in the attempt to estimate the photocomposing costs involved in producing the proposed record was to estimate the volume of material that might be included in it for given periods.

More or less at random I picked two months, May of this year and November of last. One is a spring month: this avoids the summertime doldrums, if any. November is one of the three main months when the U.N. General Assembly is in session, and material from this source would therefore be included.

From the divisions concerned I collected spare copies and photostats of all the material it has been agreed should be contained in the record -- Statements and Speeches, press releases, etc. Having assembled the two collections I counted the total number of words in each. This it turned out, was a wasted effort. I had expected there would be some simple arithmetic

formula to convert, say, a thousand words into the much larger number of computer characters. Strangely enough, as I found out, there is no accurate formula to accomplish this conversion. Texts vary greatly in nature; some employ many longer words than others. Hence a rule of thumb sometimes cited -- that one can estimate five computer characters to each word -- can lead one badly astray. The computer doesn't guess; it counts the characters as the text is typed into the terminal and presents the operator instantly with the total.

So I began all over again and counted characters directly, totalling them for each of the two months.

So much for the input from External Affairs. The next problem was to estimate how much material might have been contributed during the same two months by other government departments.

A study of "International Canada", which as I noted in my first report does try to cover the Ottawa waterfront, makes clear that foreign policy material -- other than that emanating from External -- originates for the most part from only a limited number of departments. These include Environment, IT&C, EM&R, Finance, and M&I; to a lesser extent Agriculture, Health and Welfare, and Consumer and Corporate Affairs; and one Agency, CIDA.

The same study indicates that External, on a proportionate basis, contributes about one-third to one-half of the material published in "International Canada". The rest comes from the departments mentioned and from non-official sources -- opposition parties, newspapers, organizations, etc. Mrs. Magee, the assistant editor of "International Canada", and Mr. Goldblatt, a former editor, agree that these findings coincide with their impressions.

Thus if we decide to include only official material in the record it seems safe to deduce that material from other departments and from the U.N. would amount to about half the volume of External's input. (U.N.O. Division, when I inquired, estimated that important Canadian material originating from the U.N. during the normal three-month Assembly session might total 3000 words per month.)

If we were to include non-official material, we could add another quarter (perhaps somewhat more) of the volume that originates from External. In other words, the combined contribution of the other government departments, and non-official material from other sources, would about double External's input.

Finally one would have to make allowance for two other factors: the translations into French of virtually all non-official material, and the monthly and quarterly cumulative indexes.

Taking all these into account I came up with estimated grand totals of computer characters for each of the two sample months analyzed.

There remained the question of how these grand totals would translate into numbers of printed pages.

Keesing's Contemporary Archives, it seems to me, provides an admirable format on which to base an initial calculation. Their weekly diary is published on pages two columns wide, printed on both sides. The two-column page is ideally suited to the purposes of the record as it permits of French and English texts being run in parallel -- a format preferred by researchers and others who like to compare texts. French language texts, as you know, normally take some 17 to 25 per cent more space than do the same texts printed in English. And here computer photocomposing has an advantage in that the computer can automatically adjust the spacing to make the length of the two texts come out evenly.

It may be that the 8-point type and single-line spacing in the Keesing's photostated page attached may be thought by some to be too difficult to read, too hard on the eyes. No problem: a wide choice of type sizes and print styles is available. It should be kept in mind, however, that the record would be used mainly for reference and not for steady reading.

LIBRARY E / BIBLIOTHEQUE A E

3 5036 20026268 4

ALBERTA

DOCS
CA1 EA 74C12 ENG
A Canadian foreign affairs record:
: a report prepared for Historical
Division
43230339


60984 81800