

objections apply to renewed efforts by both countries to lower the barriers to trade between them.

Let me now turn to another aspect of our defence problem. You may ask whether defence cooperation with the United States is in any way inconsistent with our relations with the United Kingdom. The answer is, I think, no. There is, of course, no general agreement of any kind between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United Kingdom which involves military commitments. We have nothing of this nature more formidable than the conclusions of Commonwealth conferences respecting consultation and the primary responsibility of each country for local defence. On the other hand each country regards the other as a potential ally in the event of a general war and our day-to-day conduct of affairs reflects this fact.

The historical relationship between Canada and the United Kingdom in war and peace provides the general basis for close military cooperation between the two countries in many spheres of practical importance. These include the organization of the armed forces on common lines, a large range of common arms and equipment and the exchange of service personnel and military information on an extensive scale.

In fact, it is much the same arrangement as exists between the United States and Canada, though there is no special Board set up to perform the functions attributed to the Canada-United States joint Permanent Board on Defence.

I have given you this short account of our defence relations with the United States and the United Kingdom and have tried to point out some of the dangers and advantages. In these perilous days I do not think we could do less. Should we do more? In the joint statement of February 12, 1947, the Prime Minister made it clear that defence collaboration with the United States in no way impaired but was intended to strengthen the cooperation of each country within the broader framework of the United Nations. The ultimate objective was, he said, not joint or regional defence but collective international defence. We recognized that until the United Nations became effective each nation had to consider what steps it should take to defend itself against aggression. The point I wish to make is that our defence relations with the United States and the United Kingdom are based upon the assumption that an effective United Nations can ultimately be established.

We all know how the international scene has greatly deteriorated since the joint statement was made over a year ago. We also know that the main reason for this deterioration has been the inability of the Western democracies and the Eastern totalitarian states under the U.S.S.R. to establish any basis for cooperation or even mutual toleration. We feel that the responsibility for this failure rests on the U.S.S.R. in its aggressive imperialistic policies and in its sponsorship and support for subversive communist fifth columns in all countries but more particularly in those countries of Eastern Europe which are most closely under the influence of its power and its propaganda.

But wherever the responsibility may lie, there is no doubt that we have not got the one world contemplated by the San Francisco Charter with all its 57 members co-operating whole-heartedly and confidently with each other.

Power politics are still a regrettable factor in general international relations. That does not necessarily mean a break-up of the United Nations or the secession from it of the Soviet group.

It is possible within the framework of the Charter for the free nations of the world to form their own unions for collective security and Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter expressly provide that that may be done. In addition to our own arrangement, loose as they may be, with