

particular fields, or particular geographical areas, to the exclusion of others. There should be no functional or geographical area where either French- or English-speaking officers cannot be asked to serve. This in itself will entail for the future a solid competence in both languages for all our officers.

Some recent developments in departmental practice will perhaps give you a more graphic idea of the effort we are pursuing. You are aware, for example, of our language-training programme. It is still not entirely adequate, but it has begun to make its contribution to the general level of proficiency in the two official languages. To improve this proficiency, the government school of languages is now in the process of testing all officers to determine their rating in order to facilitate future training of the individual officer. An increasing proportion of our stenographers are bilingual. Any of you who has ever tried to draft a memorandum or a telegram in French will know what an important advance this represents.

Last year, following the recommendations of an ad hoc departmental committee on bilingualism, regulations covering the use of the official languages were included in our departmental Manual of Procedures. The two languages have been set on an equal footing where transmission of general policy information to our posts abroad is concerned. Concrete results have been obtained in devising and publicizing equivalent terminology in the two languages for a wide range of common expressions, which are in everyday use in the Department. It is worthy of note that the Manual of Procedures not only stresses the importance of performing a substantial part of your duties in your own language; it gives detailed directives concerning the procedures which we wish to put into practice. Supervising officers are advised that they should encourage both French- and English-speaking officers working under their direction to use their own language as a working language. This is of the highest importance, to my mind, for it is not sufficient to accept bilingualism "in principle" if it is not encouraged on a day-to-day basis at all levels of the service.

With regard to written communications in particular, the regulations make plain that, in preparing documents designed for use within the Government, both in Ottawa and at posts, drafting officers shall be free to choose the language to be used in their drafts. Documents destined for use outside the federal administration will be prepared in the addressee's language.

I should also draw attention to the recent appointment of a departmental bilingual adviser.... In order to ensure continuity in his and our efforts, a permanent advisory committee on bilingualism has also been set up.

I might mention other developments. For example, the wives of our diplomatic officers are now entitled to learn their second official language either in Canada or abroad at public expense within the limits of the availability of funds and of teaching facilities. We are also in the process of improving the supply to our divisions in Ottawa and our posts abroad of basic reference books in the two official languages.

These measures, and others you will hear about in the next two days, show that the efforts of the Department are not based on a purely theoretical approach but involve well-planned, practical solutions. All this is impressive, I think, as tangible evidence of our willingness to move ahead. We cannot afford to be complacent, however. Much more remains to be done if we are to live