

These, however, are matters that could be settled later.

When I began this survey it seemed to be taken for granted by most that any new foreign policy record would be issued in booklet or pamphlet form, and on a weekly, bi-monthly or quarterly basis. The advantages and disadvantages of the various suggested timings ("periodicity" for those who like jargonese) were debated.

Then Arthur Andrew came up with an attractive idea. Why not adopt - or rather adapt - the pattern of Keesing's, the British weekly diary of world events, or its U.S. counterpart, "Facts on File"? These, as you know, are loose leaf systems. Recipients are provided with binders into which the material, already perforated, is inserted as it is received. All material indicates the date it originated, though the indexing is done according to page. Cumulative indexes are issued fortnightly, and quarterly, and progressively discarded, so that only the year-end complete index is finally retained. Then it would seem advisable that each year's volume should be bound.

For us, this system would seem to have some important advantages, including flexibility, speed of distribution, selective mailing lists for those receiving only a part of the record, and possibly, in some respects, lower production costs. For example, all material destined for the record could be printed on a uniform type of paper. This would obviate re-typing or re-printing such things as Statement and Speeches - the mailing list for which would probably be much larger than for the complete record.

The loose-leaf system would also eliminate delays in distributing material immediately available in both languages. Other material requiring translation could follow when ready.