

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.