

to enforce its decisions.

Three courses are open.

One, to carry on as we have been, in the hope that the international situation may in time improve to the point where the defects and weaknesses of the Charter which now seem so glaring, will become academic, and where the unanimity of the Great Powers will be expressed positively, by action for peace, and not merely negatively, by inaction against war. Until that day comes, the greatest service the United Nations can perform is by keeping alive, by providing a meeting place and a platform where all nations are given at least the chance of talking out their differences, instead of fighting them out. Meanwhile, changes can be made in the structure of the organization as its foundation becomes more solidly based on better international relations.

That is one course. A second, at the other extreme, is to insist on a suitable amendment of the Charter, and if that is blocked by a veto (amendment is subject to the veto) then to scrap the present organization and form a new one, with a Charter which will permit it to work. If any state wishes to stay out, that would be its privilege and its responsibility.

This is a drastic course which should, of course, be adopted only as a last desperate resort.

There is a third way which is much to be preferred to this extremity though it is not nearly so satisfactory as an agreed limitation of the veto by convention or by amendment of the Charter would be. This course would retain the present Charter, but would frankly recognize that within the present United Nations certain members were determined to form a collective system which would really guarantee their own collective security, even if this could only be done on a limited basis of membership.

SUBMITTED TO ASSEMBLY

At the recent General Assembly of the United Nations, the head of the Canadian Delegation, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, put this idea forward forcefully in the following paragraph:

Nations, in their search for peace and cooperation, will not and cannot accept indefinitely and unaltered a Security Council which was set up to ensure their security, and which, so many feel, has become frozen in futility, and divided by dissension. If forced, they may seek greater safety in an association of democratic and peace-loving states willing to accept more specific international obligations in return for greater national security. Such associations, if consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter, can be formed within the United Nations. It is to be hoped that such a development will not be necessary. If it is unnecessary, it will

be undesirable. If, however, it is made necessary, it will take place. Let us not forget that the provisions of the Charter are a floor under, rather than a ceiling over, the responsibilities of member states. If some prefer to go even below that floor, others need not be prevented from moving upwards.

Such a limited association for collective security - within the United Nations and acting within the letter and spirit of its Charter - would not be an offensive and defensive alliance of the old type. There could be nothing "offensive" about it because it would be bound by all the obligations and restraints of the Charter.

It would, on the other hand, be much broader and go much deeper than the alliances of old. It would be a genuine pooling of resources, spiritual and material, for purposes of collective defence. Nor would such an association exclude any state from membership which did not exclude itself. It would threaten no state and no state would have anything to fear from it which based its own actions on the principles and provisions of the Charter. It would merely be the recognition by certain states of the necessity of a collective system for defence which would be really effective; for accumulating under international control and outside the veto such a terrific preponderance of power that no one would dare to commit an aggression.

There is no reason whatever why any state which is unwilling to accept these additional commitments should withdraw from the United Nations itself which would continue in its present form.

Such a security system could, and indeed must, establish beyond doubt that it was solely an instrument of peace, and that it would not be used to further selfish national or imperial interests, or to support aggressive power politics by any of its members.

A collective security agency within the United Nations which could prove both its good-will and its power - two things which don't always go together - might hope eventually to attract to its membership all states in the United Nations. We would, then, in fact, have secured a new United Nations with both universality and effectiveness. If that does not happen, however, through no fault of the collective security group, we would at least be no worse off than we are now. We would know where we stand and that would, I suggest, be on firmer ground than where we are now. For we have ensured that superior power - political, military and moral power - would be on the side of those who are determined to use it solely for the maintenance of collective security, never for any aggressive nationalist purpose.

If we can secure that result, we would then at last have some reason to hope that peace might be preserved and that life on this planet might continue to exist.

REPORTED IN PARLIAMENT BRIEFLY

AIR TRAINING PLAN MEMORIAL: When, on January 26, the House of Commons resumed sittings after the Christmas recess, Prime Minister Mackenzie King read the following letter, dated December 30, 1947, he had received from the High Commissioners for the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand:

"In 1945 informal consultations were initiated between United Kingdom, Australian and New Zealand representatives with a view to arranging for the three Governments to make a joint presentation to Canada of some suitable gift which should serve as a permanent memorial to the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan.

It was at first thought that the most fitting gift for the purpose would be an avenue of English oak trees terminated at either end by pavilions of native timbers from Australia and New Zealand. The oak trees were accordingly planted in due course at the Royal Canadian Air Force station at Trenton, by arrangement with the then Minister of National Defence for Air and the R.C.A.F. authorities, but it was felt on reconsideration that wooden pavilions would not be an entirely suitable addition owing to their inevitable impermanence. It was suggested, in the light of further discussions with the R.C.A.F. authorities, that a preferable alternative would be a gift of wrought iron gates for the entrance to the air station at Trenton, where they would be in line with the oak trees which are already growing there alongside the main highway. This suggestion was approved by our respective Governments, for their part, and a set of gates has since been designed in consultation with the Air Force authorities in Canada and the Royal Fine Arts Commission in the United Kingdom. Final details are not yet available but we understand that the design conforms generally with the preliminary sketch shown in the enclosure to this letter which is already in the possession of the Chief of the Air Staff.

MONUMENT TO AIR TRAINING PLAN

We have now been asked to inform you that the Governments of the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand would be honoured if the Canadian Government would accept from them jointly the gift of these gates as a monument to that great undertaking, the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan, so finely conceived and so splendidly executed, and as a token of the gratitude of our three countries to the Government and people of Canada for the generous part which they played in the training and care of thousands of our airmen during the late war.

If, as our Governments hope, the Canadian Government will accept this gift, arrangements will be put in hand for the manufacture of the gates in the United Kingdom. Our Governments trust also that when the gates are erected, an

opportunity may be afforded for them to be presented to the Canadian Government at a formal ceremony suitable to the occasion.

The Prime Minister replied accepting the "generous gift" with the "greatest degree of appreciation." The handsome gates, the Prime Minister added "will serve not only as a perpetual and inspiring memorial of our efforts in the common cause but as a symbol of the unity of the countries of the Commonwealth in support of the great eternal principles of justice and right upon which must be built any enduring peace for mankind.

EMERGENCY EXCHANGE BILL

SECOND READING DEBATE: In the House of Commons, debate continued over January 26 and January 27 on the motion for second reading of the Emergency Exchange Conservation Act (Bill No. 3). The Bill authorizes quotas and other restrictions of imports in connection with Government plans to meet shortage in U.S. dollars (C.W.B. Dec. 19, 1947, P. 6-12).

Progressive Conservative, and Social Credit speakers criticized the Government's revaluation of the Canadian dollar in 1946 and prohibition of certain imports from Great Britain as well as from the United States. The C.C.F. asked for imposition of rigid price controls on prohibited articles.

Howard Green (P.C. Vancouver S.) said that although the problem to be met was shortage of U.S. dollars, the import prohibitions provided under the Bill applied to all countries. This non-discriminatory policy, Mr. Green argued, had been either dictated from Washington or was designed to curry favour at Washington.

Mr. Green described the measure as one to protect the interests of the United States, not the interests of Canada.

This policy, Mr. Green added, shows an amazing subservience to the United States. One would think Canada was a subject country. No Canadian Government since Confederation has ever gone so far toward taking orders from the government of another country.

Mr. Abbott (Minister of Finance): That is rubbish. We take no orders from anyone.

Mr. Green: The policy is worse than rubbish. It is a terribly tragic policy.

Mr. Abbott: When my hon. friend says that we are taking orders from another country, he is talking rubbish.

J.T. Hackett (P.C. Stanstead) attacked the Bill as utterly and completely unconstitutional. Under the Bill, Mr. Hackett held, the Minister of Reconstruction (Mr. Howe) could rewrite the tariff legislation of the country as many times a day as he wished and he was to be able to determine who was entitled to favour and who was not.

How, Mr. Hackett asked, could any gentleman