

claim separate representation in any combined U.K.-U.S. Committees or Boards, either in London *or* Washington.

After all, none of the Boards mentioned above can commit Canada to anything without our consent. If we leave the initiative to the United Kingdom and the United States in these matters, they will have to consult Canada whenever Canadian co-operation is required. In the case of the Assignments Board, at least, this consultation will be almost continuous.

No new or special machinery for it will be necessary in London. We already have Navy, Army, and Air Force staff representation there.

So far as the Washington end is concerned, the ideal course would be a Canadian Military Mission there with a formal existence separate from the British Chiefs of Staff though working, of course, in close co-operation with them. But the Americans do not want this.

Alternatively representatives of the Canadian Chiefs of Staff might be attached to the Legation or become a Washington Office of the Canadian Section of the Joint U.S.-Canadian Defence Board.

It is true that this arrangement would put Canada, in theory, in exactly the same position as any of the other United Nations, so far as the Combined Boards and Committees are concerned. In theory, no account would be taken of our special position. In respect of the Assignments Board, however, the facts themselves would soon dictate such a special position for Canada.

Liaison machinery with, rather than specific membership of the U.K. Joint Staff would be best in theory. Whether it would be best in practice is doubtful.

(d) There is a fourth alternative which is a compromise between (b) and (c).

Canadian officers would become part of the British Joint Staff but above them and outside that Staff would be a Senior Canadian officer or officers — possibly attached to the Canadian Legation.

I should think there is much to be said for having *one* officer represent the Minister of National Defence in this connection; and acting for all three Services. If this is impossible, then presumably there would have to be three, acting as Washington representatives of their respective Chiefs of Staff. Consideration might be given to using the existing attachés for this purpose in Washington, where the duties are not so important as to warrant a separate appointment. In London, we already have Navy, Army and Air Force Headquarters available to which liaison officers could be attached, if new appointments were necessary.

My own view is that this fourth alternative would be the most satisfactory. If we appoint a Canadian officer (or officers if all Services have to be represented) who by their position and abilities will command the respect of the top-level men on the Combined U.K.-U.S. Staff, we will help to ensure that Canadian interests are not disregarded. If at the same time we attach Canadian officers directly to the U.K. Joint Staff, we will ensure that this senior officer is kept accurately and continually informed of detailed developments in the work of the Combined Boards which could be of interest to Canada.

#### THE RAW MATERIALS BOARD.

This deserves special consideration, for three reasons: