

themselves. Since only the USA is negotiating with the USSR, it's a bilateral negotiation and nothing more. Something has to be done, however, to "take into account" the French and British deterrent, I believe.

On a relative point, I hope someone is giving thought to the phasing in of deployment in such a way so that the process of gradualism might make it possible to maintain the dialogue with the Russians and pace it to the point where we might even reach an arms control agreement by that means. By contrast a sudden cutoff point, on negotiations - "it's on, it's done", could have the opposite effect. I think Canadian statements are inclined towards the idea of there being no cutoff point, that we can always go on negotiating. I think a study on phasing so as to co-ordinate it with the negotiations would be very useful. (Editor's note: the NATO plan is in fact to phase the weapons in over four years.)

On Canada's possible role of interpreter, I heartily endorse that idea. I'm aware of the constraints but I think that Canada has something to say to both sides and things that they evidently in present conditions aren't able to say to each other, at least in terms that are going to be acceptable or believable. There's a heightening of the hostility, etc.

I think on practical proposals, we do need something in the field of arms control similar to the Institute of Strategic Studies, - a kind of parallel to it. Indeed there is pressure for some type of arms control or Peace Institute, whatever we call it. Thought is being given to this idea I think it would fill a need.

In the light of comments made by Mr. Harker on the consultative committee which already exists, it's a very difficult committee to make work beyond its consultative mandate because it has such a spectrum of views. Its members obviously can't agree on many issues. It could help perhaps, if that committee did meet together with the