

use a phrase the Soviets like - frank and comradely. The important thing is that, after considering your position carefully, we followed the course that we believe serves our national interest and that your Government, despite its preponderant power and its reservations as to the course we are following, has respected our right to pursue that course.

The Communist world, and indeed other countries that know better, like to refer to Canada as a satellite of the United States. This suits their purpose. When Prague dared to differ ideologically with Moscow, it encountered the mailed fist of Soviet armed might and Czechoslovakia's satellite status was affirmed before the whole world. When Ottawa and Washington differ, there is straight talk - and so there should be - but the principle of sovereignty is honored in the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Canada's right to differ from the United States is important - perhaps more to us than to you. But I don't want to dwell on it any further. More important is that Canada and the United States share the same great national objectives and the same hopes for mankind. Where we shall often differ is in the means by which each of our countries works toward the fulfilment of these objectives and these hopes.

The title of my address suggests that Canada accepts its role as a "middle" power. I use the term because it is in general currency. I am not sure, however, that it has much real meaning in today's world.

There is a faintly old-fashioned ring about classifying countries as great, middle or small powers. In the nineteenth century, nations were ranked by the size of their fleets and there were only five or six "great powers". They were the ones with battleships. Now the battleships have gone and so has the whole order that they symbolized. One of the really striking developments on the world scene in the past 25 years is the advent of vastly greater numbers of independent states. It is very much more difficult, if not impossible, to classify them as great, middle or small powers.

The conception of degrees of "power" remains. It is still true that nations have varying capacities to influence the course of events outside their own borders. None of us is completely independent. The actions of every nation impinge increasingly on the others, and not even the greatest powers can entirely disregard the interplay of national decisions.

The capacity of a state to influence other states rests fundamentally on three factors: economic capacity; military strength and political influence.

No nation can be considered a power of consequence unless it has a measure of capacity in all three. Nevertheless, a nation can place great emphasis on one sphere of activity and much less on the others. It is also possible for a country to be compelled by circumstances to rely heavily on one source of national strength.

There are cases of nations which have considerable economic capacity but have chosen not to acquire or to employ military strength. Postwar Japan is an economic power of major proportions which has decided to maintain only modest military forces and to rely on the United States for its security require-