

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.

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.

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.

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