

The counsel of President Washington, said General Marshall, still held good: "If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the special agreement which this country will be called upon to negotiate with the security council, on its call, must be foreseen in the light of regional agreements, existing in fact or tacitly, or to become effective within the provisions of article 52 of the charter. Canada is particularly lucky in being located next to a good neighbour, a great power, the United States, and at the same time in belonging to a great family of nations, the British Commonwealth. Canada may rely on both imperial and continental solidarity. Groups of nations are being formed.

In the October, 1945, issue of *World Digest*, Lord Vansittart, Britain's permanent under-secretary of state for foreign affairs before Munich, writes:

It is now generally recognized that Russia is establishing a protectorate, or sphere of influence, in central and eastern Europe. It is inevitable that the west should also organize itself, though in a voluntary and far looser form. Generalissimo Stalin has, indeed, explicitly commended the project. No difficulty, therefore, arises on this score. In the United States all tenable opposition has melted. There was always the Monroe doctrine and now there is the act of Chapultepec, too. Briefly this act converts the Monroe doctrine from a unilateral declaration to a multilateral agreement. It is, in American eyes, "a watertight non-aggression mutual-aid pact binding all the American states represented at the conference, whether the aggression comes from inside America or from outside."

The economic consequences of this pan-American unity are not specified, but "a new intercontinental solidarity" will surely develop.

Equity and security both demand that we should now do as our two great allies have done, and do it quickly. This necessity was foreseen by Marshal Smuts:

"More and more states are consulting with each other and forming groups to protect their common interests", he said.

"Regional groups will have to be formed within the scope of the world organization."

In the light of the structure of our regional agreements, how can we meet the specifications of the special agreement which we might be called upon to ratify between Canada and the security council; mainly as to the armed forces, the importance and degree of readiness of our contingents? Actually, if we look at the continental area, the United States is expected to enforce universal peace-time military training.

It is understood that high-ranking war department officials in the United States are now planning the peace-time army, under a system of universal military training. In Great Britain, the compulsory recruitment of men for the forces as an essential part of

the reallocation of man-power during what is called the interim period, and the conscription regime has been declared by Mr. Churchill on May 10 last as perhaps absolutely necessary for some years to come.

Other nations friendly to Canada, such as France, have peace-time military training from which there is no indication that they will depart.

And here I wish to point out that there is a great contrast between Russia's demobilization policy and other allies' policy; while the western allies are taking a race to demobilize their men as quickly as possible, there is no sign that Russia is active in the same field.

I submit that a uniform system of organizing various national contingents, placed at the disposal of the security council, is commendable, and for two reasons: (a) efficiency of forces, (b) international understanding.

(a) Efficiency of forces. Article 43, paragraph 2, mentions the "general location where these forces will be stationed". Article 45 ends by saying that the security council, assisted by the military staff, will establish plans providing for the combined action of the forces put at their disposal. The general idea would be to form organically grouped units capable of concerted and united action.

At San Francisco France suggested the establishment of suitable zones of security in which such troops would be stationed.

(b) A uniform system is commendable in order to favour international understanding.

Canada is a self-governing dominion which has emerged from the war with a record unsurpassed by the other nations of the world and it is very proud and jealous of the nationhood status that it has acquired. At the San Francisco conference the attitude of Canada has been one of the most important middle power.

I share the views previously expressed in this house that this government cannot announce a definite national defence policy until the picture is clearer and therefore must undergo an interim period. But, after this interim period is over, how could it be possible for Canada to have a different system of preparing combat forces, while its closest associates, the United Kingdom and the United States, enforce universal peace-time military training?

Often during the recent war Canada has been criticized in the United States because, while they had universal compulsory military service, we in Canada favoured the voluntary system for overseas service together with conscription, but only to the extent that it was necessary.