

things over and makes suggestions. It is not a gathering of brass hats. It has, for instance, civilian chairmen of each section.

FISHER: While we're on this question, I should like to introduce a point that I have seen discussed in the press from time to time. It's this: there seems to be a movement on foot for the standardization of weapons between us.

ATHERTON: That has been discussed from time to time. Naturally.

WRONG: I should like to point out that there is a good deal of loose thinking about what that means. In its broadest sense, a good deal of standardization already exists.

FISHER: You mean we have already decided to produce weapons that are interchangeable? Or that have parts that are interchangeable?

WRONG: Ohno, nothing as specific as that, Mr. Fisher. I said in the broadest sense. Take aircraft equipment. We use American engines in our planes. There hasn't been any formal agreement to standardize; but common sense requires that when the security of two countries is bound up together, the forces concerned should be able to operate together without difficulty.

ATHERTON: I think that overall standardization would take quite a long time. Standardization began during the war by force of circumstance rather than by design. The United States became "the arsenal of democracy". Canada, too, on a smaller scale was sending arms and equipment to the Allies without cost. We called it Lend Lease, you called it Mutual Aid. All the allied forces in every theater had some American and some Canadian equipment. And back home we developed comprehensive machinery for determining what each would produce.

FISHER: Can you give an example or two?

WRONG: Well, here's one. Nearly everyone knows that Canada as well as the United Kingdom was a partner with you in the development of atomic energy. Here's another. We were pioneers in the manufacture of radar sets on this continent. Right after Pearl Harbor, we diverted post haste a number of radar sets to be used