

1 the Belgian approach was rejected as not being appropriate
2 for Canada.

3 Well, I don't have to tell you that Belgium is
4 a Unitary State. We are a Federal State. And the notion
5 that we could divide the Public Service in kinds of parallel
6 French and English Departments just appeared to be impractical
7 for Canada.

8 So our line of approach has been to evolve --
9 make our Public Service at the Federal level evolve in terms
10 of a capacity or capability of providing services in
11 both languages by individuals who are in a situation where
12 they are in contact with both language groups. These have
13 been our efforts. This means, in effect, that all of the
14 senior officers in the Public Service are becoming bi-lingual--
15 or at least have what we call a "passive" capacity in both
16 languages. That is, the capacity of being able to read and
17 listen--if they don't have the capacity of communicating
18 with the other language as much.

19 MEMBER OF THE PRESS: What is the difference you
20 see between the Canadian/Quebec situation, and the Brussels
21 situation? We have 80% French speaking people in Brussels,
22 and 20% Flemish people.

23 What is the difference--in your mind?

24 MINISTER LALONDE: Well, the size of the two
25 Countries is just so different that it is almost two