

Both agree that the pressure to house urbanites in apartment buildings is developing to such an intensity that the biggest buildings will soon contain all the amenities of a small town. This, they say, will obviate the need of residents to leave their building for anything but work.

Children will spend the entire week inside their apartment building—even attending school there, according to Dr. Rose. He says that the child of the future may only see the outside on a Sunday if his parents take him for a drive in the country.


Dr. Cappon claims that the economic facts of life in Canadian cities will soon make houses beyond the reach of all but a few wealthy persons.

A Toronto social planning consultant, Leone Kumove, said recently that apartment dwelling statistics now show that in the Canadian capital, Ottawa, an average of 35 children are resident for every 100 one-bedroom apartment suites. He estimated that 30 to 40 per cent of children in Metropolitan Toronto (with a population approaching 2 million now) will be living in apartments by 1980.

Dr. Rose feels that the family of the future will see the father providing only three fifths of the family income.

He predicts the rest will come from the wife who will be better educated and have a more important job than today's average wife.

He thinks women will work full time at high paying jobs except for brief periods of time spent delivering children. And he predicts the percentage of young people in the future will decline as parents limit the number of children to an average of two per family.

Dr. Rose feels the philosophy of young people "doing their own thing" is one of self-gratification and self-centeredness, and the future Canadian society "will not be a fundamentally humane or humanitarian society. Indications are strong... that young people's rejection of the past, its values and its people, does not bode well for the disadvantaged in our society," he adds gloomily. 

## NATO and NORAD

# Canada's view on the defence of North America

*These excerpts are from an address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, The Hon. Mitchell Sharp, in Winnipeg, on December 12, 1969.*


"There is a strong body of opinion in this country that feels our membership in the NATO alliance and our joint arrangements with the United States for the defence of North America in NORAD in some way limit our independence of action in international affairs and compromise our moral position. I am aware of this opinion, which I know to be sincerely held, although I do not share it. It is part of what I had in mind when I referred... to wishful thinking about the reality of the world in which we live. It is true... that Canada faces no threat of aggression by conventional means, although we share an unusually long border with one of the two greatest military powers on earth. ... The facts of our geographical situation which allowed us to live in peace at home through two world wars, now place us between the two great nuclear powers and a war between these powers would be fought outright over our heads. Whatever the outcome, our cities and our civilization

would certainly be destroyed. We seek peace as an ideal with the realization that we are the third party most threatened by global nuclear conflict.

I believe, as we must all believe, that such a conflict will never take place. At the same time, there is no doubt that the capacity to engage in such a conflict exists and there is no final guarantee that somewhere a fuse will not be lighted, a fuse that might set off a chain reaction ending in ultimate catastrophe. ... The threat of Soviet aggression has diminished, it seems to be receding but it has not disappeared. Together with our partners in NATO, we are trying to meet the Soviet Union and its associated nations more than half way and we do not feel that the time has come to break up an alliance that does not have and has never had any aggressive intention and one that is now involved in the process of improving relations.

Some of those who feel that our membership in NATO reduces our independence and weakens our moral position in the world, also suggest that our association with the United States in NORAD and in defence pro-

duction sharing agreements reduces us to the status of a U.S. satellite. I don't intend to spend much time on this position. So long as the continent of North America is threatened by Soviet nuclear power, we are bound to join in arrangements for its defence with the country that shares it with us, the United States, that is our closest friend and ally. Those that suggest we are a satellite of the United States are closing their eyes to reality. Czechoslovakia learned after the Prague spring of 1968 what it means to be a satellite. I don't believe that anyone in Canada believes for one second that the United States would intervene in our affairs in such a manner even with the greatest provocation. ... The United States, to preserve its own security, needs our airspace and access to our territory. It has the capacity to take what it needs by force but has neither the least wish nor the will to do so.

Our American friends are determined to get what they need by agreement with us—a fact that gives us considerable leverage." 



**CANADA TODAY/D**

APRIL 197

Published by  
Office of Info  
1771 N Street  
Washington,  
Telephone: 2

