

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