

parliamentary committee, the House of Commons Standing committee, if the procedural difficulties could be overcome. I think that would be a way of at least moving part-way towards the demand that it become an advisory or executive decision-making body, to have this cross fertilization input from parliament to these experts (and many are experts) and an input back again the other way.

On other, somewhat lesser points, I would find it fascinating to see a study made of a "limited freeze" approach, - a popular move if you wish - but a freeze that would be confined only to strategic arms and one that would be coupled with verification: in actual fact it would be tantamount to a negotiated agreement, but it is worth noting nonetheless that that aspect of the freeze movement is not on the same basis as an overall freeze which would include INF weapons and conventional forces.

On the cutoff of fissionable material, the strategy of suffocation - it is said that it just never got off the ground. It is true that we are having problems with some of our allies on such things as CTB, and with the Russians on such issues as reduction of military budgets; - they are stonewalling, they have no intention of agreeing. So the strategy of suffocation is a marvellous concept, but we're having a hard time transforming it into practical reality. Maybe we should give some thought to the idea of another type of resolution on the cutoff of fissionable material.

One point I should have made, especially to John Holmes, is that Canada has already taken a lead in attempting literally to "reform" the First Committee, where all the debates go on in the UN on disarmament. We have talked to a lot of people; the Norwegian Ambassador is the Chairman of the First Committee, and something is moving. How far we'll get with it I don't know, but we can't continue the process of every group having its own little resolution, with the virtual guarantee that nothing will happen.