

...Over the past 25 years, the perimeters of defence have changed beyond all recognition. The advantages of dimension and distance have in large measure been eclipsed. The time-scale of any potential attack has been compressed to a fraction of what it once was. The destructive power we are able to unleash has compelled us to abandon the very notion of war except in legitimate defence against aggression. And the cost of effective defence today is such that few countries in the world are able to shoulder it on their own.

#### OGDENSBURG PRINCIPLES STILL VALID

The changes that have taken place have served, if anything, to confirm the principles to which we subscribed at Ogdensburg. These principles are as valid today as when they were first formulated. If our defence was recognized to be indivisible then, it is surely no less indivisible in the circumstances of the present day. The development of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them accurately over intercontinental distances has placed North America, for the first time, in the front line. Indeed, there is every likelihood that, in the unthinkable event of war, we should bear the brunt of the first devastating attack.

Against this new and terrible threat it was already in our common interest to plan our defences jointly. And so, throughout the 1950s, we planned and built the northern radar lines and fighter defences against the threat from the air. It could not have been otherwise. Canada could not have built these costly defences alone. And the United States could not have been defended without them.

#### ORIGIN OF NORAD

It was part of this same recognition that our defences could only be conducted in common which led us in 1957 and 1958 to integrate our air-defence forces in a single command under NORAD. The danger of attack by strategic bombers is now giving way to the even more terrible threat from intercontinental missiles. But, whatever the changes in the strategic situation, as long as the threat to the security of North America exists it will clearly remain in our mutual interest to co-operate intimately in the defence of the continent we share. It should be recognized, of course, that in defending North America we are protecting the strategic deterrent of the NATO alliance. We are thus helping to guarantee that measure of stability between the leading powers which is our best hope for preserving peace until an effective programme of international disarmament can be realized.

Just as the military defence of North America has been recognized as a single problem, to be approached jointly, so has the military industrial base of our two countries come to be regarded as a single entity. That is as it should be. The cost of developing modern weapons is enormous. Only a handful of highly industrialized countries can today afford to maintain an independent productive capacity for the full range of weapons required in modern warfare.

#### DEFENCE PRODUCTION SHARING

We in Canada have long purchased very substantial quantities of military items in the United States.

In particular, we have purchased from you costly and sophisticated equipment which it would not be economical for Canada to try to produce itself. Unless these purchases are balanced by comparable United States purchases from Canada, they would sooner or later impair our ability to contribute fully to our common effort. I am glad to say that this principle was accepted in the Canada-United States Defence Production Sharing Programme, which was inaugurated in 1959 and which has helped greatly to open the United States military market to the Canadian defence industry.

In the final analysis, however, we cannot look at the Ogdensburg Declaration from the perspective of North American defence alone. We must look at it from the perspective of the total relation between our two countries.

Canadians tend to be preoccupied with that relation. I know that is something which Americans find it difficult to understand. But there is really no parallel in the American experience to compare with the impact of the Canadian-American relation on virtually every sector of our national life.

#### POWER DISPARITY

I think there are two aspects of the relation between Canada and the United States which, more than any others, are a cause for Canadian preoccupation. The first is the sheer disparity in power between our two countries. We sometimes like to identify that disparity in terms of population and physical wealth; but that, of course, is only part of the story. The significant fact is not only that the United States is today a great power by any standard but that the impact of power in the modern world tends to be vastly more pervasive than in any previous period of history.

Canadians, of course, welcome the fact that the United States enjoys this position of leadership and are not preoccupied by the disparity of power as such. What preoccupies us are the very great effects which that disparity can have on Canadian interests, where they diverge from yours.

The second point of preoccupation for Canadians is the effect of your preponderant influence on the development of Canada as a distinct and separate entity on the North American continent. This preoccupation has, of course, been with us from the days of our founding fathers. It is part of the process of Canadian nation-building. No doubt it has been magnified by vast range of contacts and exchanges between us which modern communications have made possible.

#### NATIONAL PURPOSE AND IDENTITY

But, when all is said and done, the problem of Canadian development is a matter for Canadians to solve. For my own part, I suspect that we are moving steadily closer to solving it. I am confident, in particular, that the great debate over cultural and constitutional matters which is engaging Canadians at this very moment will serve to strengthen our national purpose and deepen our sense of identity.

The whole range of relations between us has recently been surveyed by two of our distinguished former ambassadors. They undertook their survey at