

## Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats on the "[Contact Us](#)" page.

## Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « [Contactez-nous](#) ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES  
NSSC 5 / CESN 5

**The Illusion of Choice: Options For Canadian Security**

By /par Colonel M.W. Haché

The Illusions of Choice: Options For Canadian Security?

“The United States and Canada are tied together...by a noble heritage of ideas, language and literature, by the geographical bonds of this vast North American continent, by the great waterways of the St Lawrence and the Great Lakes.... We are tied together also by a great mechanical framework flung across this continent, drawing us together in both continental and industrial unity...we are...two communities which engage in the greatest volume of total trade between any two commercial countries in the modern world.... We should recall that across...this great boundary line, there are annually many millions of crossings by people in travel and traffic, in study and conference, in freedom and goodwill. More millions are reached by radio and movies...by the press and by sports, in this one great North American community. Greater in its unifying power than those waterways and lakes, than those three thousand miles of undefended boundary, than those billions of United States dollars invested in Canadian enterprises, more basically powerful...is that heritage of civilization imperiled in the world tonight, a civilization united by a common struggle for freedom of the human mind and equality of opportunity for all people.”<sup>1</sup>

These were the President of the University of North Carolina’s words to a conference on Canadian-American affairs in 1941. They were prophetic in that Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs, reflected them in a statement 31 years later that “The Canada-U.S. relationship, as it has evolved since the end of the Second World War, is...by far our most important external relationship. It impinges on virtually every aspect of Canadian national interest, and thus of Canadian domestic concerns...”<sup>2</sup> These words remain equally true in Canadian security deliberations today.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gibson, Frederick W., and Jonathan Gregory Rossie, eds. The Road To Ogdensburg: The Queen’s /St. Lawrence Conferences on Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941. p. 27

## Introduction

There are many facets of Canada's relationship with the United States. The primary focus of this paper is on the security relationship, which is a subject unto itself in terms of complexity and evolution. "Concepts of security are changing. Military security is but one element of a broader concept of national security that must reflect political, economic, social, environmental and even cultural factors."<sup>3</sup> President Bush recently provided a very comprehensive definition of American national security in the National Security Strategy of the United States of America.<sup>4</sup> In contrast, Canada does not have an official national security strategy. "It is now widely acknowledged, both inside and outside of government in Canada, that there is no national security framework or clear and distinct national security policy as such."<sup>5</sup> Rather than attempt to condense and adapt the American definition to suit Canadian needs, this paper will use a modified version of the Canadian National Defence College's 1980 definition of national security<sup>6</sup> as follows: National security is the preservation of a way of life acceptable to the Canadian people. It includes freedom from military or terrorist attack or coercion, freedom from internal subversion, and freedom from the erosion of political, economic and social interests and values that are essential to the quality of life in Canada.

---

<sup>2</sup> Sharp, Mitchell. "Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future." International Perspectives Autumn 1972 Special Issue. p. 1

<sup>3</sup> Canada. Parliamentary Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy. Security In A Changing World. Ottawa: Canadian Communications Group – Publishing, 1994. p. 5

<sup>4</sup> Bush, George W. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. US: The White House, 2002. Sect I. 15 Jan . 2003 <[www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html)>

<sup>5</sup> Macnamara, W.D. and Fitz-Gerald, Ann. "A National Security Framework for Canada." Policy Matters-IRPP. 3-10 (2002). p. 7

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. p.8

This paper will deal with the Canadian government's policy focus on the military and economic aspects of our shared security interests with the United States from the Second World War to the present. It will be neither a detailed and complete chronology of activities nor an all-encompassing treatment of the political, economic and security issues that impacted Canadian policies and strategies throughout that period. Instead, the paper will argue that, regardless of government concerns, policies or strategies to specifically reduce Canada's dependence upon the United States, the reality is that they failed to achieve that independence. As the Minister for International Trade recently stated, "North America - and in particular the United States - is by far our most important market and increasingly critical to our prosperity and security."<sup>7</sup> The term "illusion of choice" in the paper's title reflects

ion contrary to American interests would be harmful to Canadian economic

ion to our security. Given that the governm

ent's primary responsibility is to ensure the security of the nation, then the reality of Canadian econo

six decades is that the

Canadian government has few viable options other than to protect Canadian values and interests through support of American security initiatives today. A statement from a 1953

ent ~~Defence~~ External Affairs study on continental air defence applies to our overall

security considerations today. "It may be very difficult indeed for the Canadian

Government to reject any major defence proposals which the United States government

---

<sup>7</sup> Remarks from an address by the Minister for International Trade to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Canadian American Business Council in Washington D.C. February 5, 2003.

presents with conviction as essential for the security of North America.”<sup>8</sup> September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 was a clear reminder of how American security concerns fundamentally affect our economic prosperity, and hence our national security. Equally, it revealed how few options the Canadian government truly has in responding to American security concerns.

Concerns about Canadian sovereignty were an underlying theme throughout the history of the Canadian-American economic and security relationship. Sovereignty, as described by John Foster Dulles in his address to the 1939 Conference on Canadian-American Affairs, “involves, by definition, the power, within certain areas, to do what one pleases.”<sup>9</sup> The Canadian Oxford Dictionary’s definition of sovereignty uses the words “absolute and independent authority of a...nation,”<sup>10</sup> indicating quite clearly that there is to be no unwanted external influence in dealing with issues of sovereignty. The Canadian government has been consistently concerned with retaining their absolute power and independent authority in governing Canada since Confederation. Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs in 1972, opined that

“the overriding issue to emerge from the Canadian-U.S. relationship for most Canadians today is that of economic independence.... (A) cross-section of various polls (1948-1963) indicates that 88.5 percent of Canadians think it important for Canada to have more control over its own economy; that two of every three Canadians view the current level of American investment in Canada as being too high...”<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Sokolsky, Joel J. Alliances and the Canadian Political Culture. Occasional Paper No. 26. Kingston: Queen’s Centre for International Relations. 1988. p. 25

<sup>9</sup> Gibson, Frederick W., and Jonathan Gregory Rossie, eds. The Road To Ogdensburg: The Queen’s /St. Lawrence Conferences on Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941 East Lansing MI: Michigan State University, 1993. p. 100

<sup>10</sup> Barber, Katherine ed. The Canadian Oxford Dictionary. Toronto ON: Oxford University Press Canada, 1998

<sup>11</sup> Sharp, Mitchell. “Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future.” International Perspectives. Autumn 1972 Special Issue. p. 11

This begs the question of whether or not the Canadian government's absolute power and independent authority eroded during the next three decades as Canada's dependence upon the American economy increased?

Finally, and as mentioned earlier, this paper will focus on military and economic aspects of national security. While the linkage of defence alliances to national security is clear, the linkage of economic prosperity tends to be more subjective. For the purpose of this paper, it is accepted that the Canadian government's recognition in 1994 of "economic factors" in national security,<sup>12</sup> supported by a declaration by the Minister for International Trade in 2003 that the American market is increasingly critical to our prosperity and security,<sup>13</sup> represent a Canadian government acknowledgement of the direct linkage between prosperity and Canadian national security. Governments pursue economic policies and strategies to maximize their nation's economic prosperity. This enables the government to fund defence, social and entrepreneurial programs that safeguard their nation and generate further economic growth and prosperity. A country that is not dependent upon any other nation's economy is neither sensitive nor vulnerable to changes in foreign economic policies. For nations with major trading relationships, like Canada and the United States, the issue becomes one of exposure and vulnerability for the trading partners. If they become so vulnerable that they are unable to make political decisions without causing adverse effects on their own prosperity, then their ability to provide for the security, social and economic needs of their nation is put at risk.

---

<sup>12</sup> Canada. Parliamentary Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy. Security In A Changing World. Ottawa: Canadian Communications Group – Publishing, 1994. p. 5

<sup>13</sup> Remarks from an address by the Minister for International Trade to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Canadian American Business Council in Washington D.C. February 5, 2003.

## Alliances

Alliances have been the basis for security policy ever since Canada received legal freedom from the United Kingdom to independently control their domestic and foreign affairs with the 1931 Statute of Westminster.<sup>14</sup> This first began in 1940 with the Ogdensburg Agreement as “an obvious proof of Canada’s realization that her safety must depend ultimately on the security North America.”<sup>15</sup> Prime Minister Mulroney reaffirmed this reality with his introductory comments to the 1987 White Paper that the “quest (for peace and stability) continues to be best pursued through cooperation with our allies.”<sup>16</sup>

This policy theme continued in the 1994 White Paper:

“As a nation that throughout its history has done much within the context of international alliances to defend freedom and democracy, Canada continues to have a vital interest in doing its part to ensure global security, especially since Canada’s economic future depends on its ability to trade freely with other nations.”<sup>17</sup>

The white paper concluded by noting that the Canadian Forces will cooperate:

“with the United States in the defence of North America... remain actively engaged in the United Nations, NATO, and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe...

---

<sup>14</sup> Conrad, Margaret and Alvin Finkel eds. History of the Canadian Peoples. 1867 to the Present. Toronto: Addison Wesley Longman. p. 249

<sup>15</sup> Creighton, D.G. “The Ogdensburg Agreement and F.H. Underhill.” The West and the Nation: Essays In Honour of W.L. Morton. Berger, Carl, and Ramsay Cook eds. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. p. 303

<sup>16</sup> Canada. National Defence. Challenge and Commitment : A Defence Policy for Canada. Ottawa : Minister of Supply and Services, 1987. p. II

<sup>17</sup> Canada. National Defence. 1994 DEFENCE WHITE PAPER. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group – Publishing, 1994. p. 3



(and) become more actively involved in security issues in Latin America and the Asia-Pacific region.”<sup>18</sup>

Alliances, or alliance-like agreements, form the basis for this policy of cooperation.

### So why are alliances important for Canada’s security?

“(T)he size of our country and our small population pose unique challenges for defence planners. Our territory spans nearly 10 million kilometers – fully 7% of the world’s landmass. We are bordered by three oceans which touch upon over 240,000 kilometers of coastline. We are charged with the control of our airspace as well as the aerial approaches to Canadian territory. Beyond our coasts, Canada seeks to maintain political sovereignty and economic jurisdiction over 10 million square kilometers of ocean in the Pacific, Atlantic and Arctic.”<sup>19</sup>

Canada is also located between the United States and the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, (now Russia). For decades this meant that Canada’s arctic waters were the stage, and potential battlefield, for nuclear submarine warfare, and the airspace over Canada the battlefield for North American defence against missiles and aircraft.

Unilaterally defending Canada under those circumstances would have been prohibitively expensive, and so Canada’s post-war defence policy began with, and remained based upon, its alliances with the United States, and ultimately NATO. As Joel Sokolsky summarized this trend’s beginnings in the 1940s:

“this internationalist outlook drew Canada towards the United Nations, and the search for security through collective action. But in the growing tension and bipolarity of the late 1940s, Canada came to realize that the U.N. could not meet its security concerns.... Hence Canada’s active involvement in the creation of NATO.”<sup>20</sup>

P

---

<sup>18</sup> Canada. National Defence. 1994 DEFENCE WHITE PAPER. Ottawa: CanadatCommunications Group – Publishing, 1994. p. 49

<sup>19</sup> Canada. National Defence. 1994 DEFENCE WHITE PAPER. Ott . Ot

More succinctly, “Canada had no choice but to seek its security in a ‘larger family of like-minded nations.’”<sup>21</sup>

There were other reasons for participating in alliances, principal of which were to gain a “seat at the table” in international political processes and to gain access to broader markets.

“(T)he main overriding motive for the maintenance of a Canadian military establishment since the Second World War has had little to do with our national security as such... (and) everything to do with underpinning our diplomatic and negotiating position vis-à-vis international organizations and other countries.”<sup>22</sup>

The success of this strategy is revealed in Joel Sokolsky’s argument that “Through its alliances Canada has participated as an independent nation in international politics to an extent that its relative military strength and geographical position would not otherwise have afforded.”<sup>23</sup>

Having identified the Canadian government’s pursuit of security through alliances, it would be useful at this point to review the prevalence of the United States in these alliances. In 1940,

“As Hitler’s armies erased national borders with ease, (William Lyon MacKenzie) King had recognized that Canada was increasingly dependant on the United States for its defence. American President Franklin Roosevelt was equally conscious of this fact and was afraid that Canada’s involvement in the war made the whole North American continent vulnerable to the fascist dictator.”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Sokolsky, Joel. “A Seat At The Table.” Hunt, and Ron Haycock eds. Canada’s Defence: Perspectives On Policy in the Twentieth Century. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993. p 158

<sup>22</sup> Eayrs, James. “Military Policy and Middle Power: The Canadian Experience.” Canada’s Role as a Middle Power. Ed J. King Gordon. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1986. p. 70

<sup>23</sup> Sokolsky, Joel J. Alliances and the Canadian Political Culture. Occasional Paper No. 26. Kingston: Queen’s Centre for International Relations. 1988. p. 26-7

<sup>24</sup> Conrad, Margaret and Alvin Finkel eds. “Canada’s World War 1939 – 1945.” History of the Canadian Peoples. 1867 to the Present. Toronto: Addison Wesley Longman. p. 309

Consequently, a mutual desire for close Canadian–American cooperation was declared by the leaders of the day, and it endures today. Nevertheless, a perspective existed amongst some historians, economists and politicians in the late 1930s that “Ogdensburg would be regarded as a turning point leading to Canadian subordination to the ‘American Empire.’ ”<sup>25</sup> This was reflected again in 1972 by Mitchell Sharp’s observation that “Because of the vast disparity in power and population, it is also inevitably a relationship of profoundly unequal dependence; the impact of the United States on Canada is far greater than Canada’s impact on the United States.”<sup>26</sup> Regardless of this concern, defence of North America has become a recurring theme in Canadian defence policy since the 1970s.

The Ogdensburg Agreement led to the establishment of significant Canadian-American defence - related organizations such as the Permanent Joint Board on Defence (PJBD), Military Cooperation Committee (MCC) and the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD). These, when added to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and United Nations, represent the primary focus for Canadian defence-related security policies. Having established that alliances form the policy basis for Canada’s defence we will now turn to the economic prosperity component of national security.

### Economics

---

<sup>25</sup> Gibson, Frederick W., and Jonathan Gregory Rossie, eds. The Road To Ogdensburg: The Queen’s /St. Lawrence Conferences on Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941 East Lansing MI: Michigan State University, 1993. p. 29

The Canadian government also pursued economic and trade-related “alliances” to promote international economic stability, and to gain access to international markets. To achieve this, Canada actively participated as a member of a variety of international organizations, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF) established in December 1945, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) formed in 1947 and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which evolved from the Organization of European Economic Co-operation in 1961. Canada joined the G7 in 1976 and the World Trade Organization (WTO) when it was formed in 1995.<sup>27</sup>

The year 1940 was identified earlier on in this paper as the beginning of a new era in Canada’s security and economic relationship with the United States. A general overview of the economic outcomes for this of this period may be found in the following historical and governmental perspectives.

“During the Second World War, Canada moved closer to the Americans, economically, politically, and militarily. Critics, such as...(economist) Harold Innis...would later claim that in this period (1939-1945) Canada moved from ‘colony to nation to colony’...- that is, that it had achieved independence from Britain only to lose it to the United States.”<sup>28</sup>

In 1972 Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs, advised that since the 1950s some 70% of Canadian foreign trade was with the United States and that 80% of the foreign direct investment in Canada was American. He also identified that, on average,

---

<sup>26</sup> Sharp, Mitchell. “Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future.” International Perspectives Autumn 1972 Special Issue. p. 1

<sup>27</sup> Access to data on the various organizations the Canadian government participates with may be found through searching the International Trade link on the DFAIT home page. 14 March 2003. <<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/trade/menu-en.asp>>

<sup>28</sup> Conrad, Margaret and Alvin Finkel eds. History of the Canadian Peoples. 1867 to the Present. Toronto: Addison Wesley Longman. p. 309

better than half of Canadian business was under American ownership.<sup>29</sup> Then, in 2001, a Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade identified that Canada was very reliant on foreign trade with the United States, and that the relationship was significantly greater than any other Canadian foreign trade relations.<sup>30</sup> The trend in the growth of Canadian economic dependence on the United States was clear.

Equally clear was the government's understanding of the complexities of the relationship and the political awareness of the issues of the times. Minister Donald MacDonald observed in the mid-to-late 1960s "it has been an political axiom in Canada that to seek a comprehensive economic arrangement with the United States is to court Canadian political disaster."<sup>31</sup> My overall assessment from these observations is that the Canadian government was well aware of their situation, and that they were unable to execute policies specifically designed to reduce Canada's economic dependence on the United States. That they failed to achieve this economic policy goal is the basis for my criticism that the Canadian Government has not created the conditions to support their claim of sovereign authority in national security issues.

Let us review the how this evolved since 1940. As mentioned earlier, Canadian and American concerns regarding Hitler's victories in Europe led to the bilateral Ogdensburg Agreement in 1940. Then, "In the Hyde Park declaration of 20 April 1941, the two

---

<sup>29</sup> Sharp, Mitchell. "Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future." International Perspectives Autumn 1972 Special Issue. p. 5

<sup>30</sup> Canada. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade – Sub-Committee Report on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment. CROSSING THE ATLANTIC: EXPANDING THE ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CANADA AND EUROPE. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada – Publishing. 2001. p. 1

governments agreed that their economies should be meshed in order to obtain the greatest possible efficiency and productivity.”<sup>32</sup> While the Americans had not yet entered the war, they were prepared to support Canada in her war efforts on behalf of the United Kingdom. “(William Lyon Mackenzie) King told Parliament that the Hyde Park declaration ‘involves nothing less than a common plan for the economic defence of the western hemisphere’ and ‘the enduring foundation of the new world order.’ ”<sup>33</sup> King also identified how the United States willingly provided financial support for Canada’s war industries,<sup>34</sup> even though they would not directly participate in the war against Germany. Canadian and American economic roots became more tightly intertwined as a result, and this continued with an Exchange of Notes on mobilization plans for defence production facilities on 12 April 1949, a Statement of Principles for Economic Cooperation on 20 September 1950 and a Defense Production Sharing Agreement on 1 October 1956.<sup>35</sup>

During the 1940s it was reported that the United States and United Kingdom were our most important export markets, and that the United States was practically our only source of imports.<sup>36</sup> Canada’s concern about this situation led to their insistence on having Article 2, an initiative to eliminate conflict in economic policies and to encourage

---

<sup>31</sup> Brookings Dialogues on Public Policy. Building a Canadian-American Free Trade Area. Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1987. p. 13

<sup>32</sup> Middlemiss, DW and Sokolsky, JJ. Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989. p. 15

<sup>33</sup> Conrad, Margaret and Alvin Finkel eds. “Canada’s World War 39-45.” History of the Canadian Peoples, 1867 to the Present. Toronto: Addison Wesley Longman. p. 309-10

<sup>34</sup> Granatstein, J.L ed. “Canadian Trade Policy In The Age Of American Dominance and British Decline 1943 – 1947.” Canadian Foreign Policy – Historical Readings. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd, 1993. p. 182

<sup>35</sup> “Defense Trade – Lessons to Be Learned from the Country Export Exemption.” US General Accounting Office Report to the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, March 2002. 13 March 2003. <[www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govem/gao02-63.pdf](http://www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govem/gao02-63.pdf)> Appendix I.

<sup>36</sup> Norrie, Kenneth Harold. A History of the Canadian Economy. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1990. p. 536

economic collaboration between any or all member nations,<sup>37</sup> inserted into the NATO Charter in an effort to develop European trade links through that alliance.<sup>38</sup> Regardless, foreign trade with the United States continued to grow throughout the 1940s and 1950s, as did American ownership of, and influence over, Canadian industry.<sup>39</sup> Attempts to access European markets continued to be unsuccessful, even with Article 2 in the NATO charter, throughout the 1960s.<sup>40</sup>

Enter the 1970's, with a newly elected Liberal party under a new and charismatic leader, Pierre Trudeau. In 1971, the Department of External Affairs declared that they were concerned about the adverse impact of global economic regionalism on Canada, both in terms of the dominance of the United States' economy in North America and access to other economic regions abroad. Consequently, they published a new policy focused on improving access to Europe and gaining access to the Pacific and Latin America.<sup>41</sup> In 1972, the Trudeau government developed what became known as the "Third Option," an economic policy designed to gain greater economic independence from the United States.<sup>42</sup> A clearer picture of the intent of this new policy comes from the Mitchell Sharp's (Secretary of State for External Affairs) statement that:

---

<sup>37</sup> The North Atlantic Treaty Charter. 27 march 2003. <<http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm>>

<sup>38</sup> Sokolsky, Joel. "A Seat At The Table-Canada and Its Alliances." Canada's Defence: Perspectives On Policy in the Twentieth Century. Hunt, Barry and Ron Haycock eds. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993. p. 150

<sup>39</sup> Berger, Carl, and Ramsay Cook eds. The West and the Nation: Essays In Honour of W.L. Morton. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. p. 303

<sup>40</sup> Sokolsky, Joel. "A Seat At The Table – Canada and Its Alliances." Canada's Defence: Perspectives On Policy in the Twentieth Century. Hunt, Barry and Ron Haycock eds. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993. p. 153

<sup>41</sup> Canada. Department of External Affairs. Foreign Policy For Canadians. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971. p. 28-9.

<sup>42</sup> Sokolsky, Joel. "A Seat At The Table." Canada's Defence: Perspectives On Policy in the Twentieth Century. Hunt, Barry and Ron Haycock eds. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993. p. 155

“The basic aim of the third option... would be, over time, to lessen the vulnerability of the Canadian economy to external affairs, including, in particular, the impact of the United States and, in the process, to strengthen our capacity to advance basic Canadian goals and develop a more confident sense of Canadian identity.”<sup>43</sup>

This restatement of a recurring governmental goal confirms both the failure of previous policies since 1940 and the Liberal government’s intent to succeed.

Indeed, for the balance of the 1970s there was a new focus on Asia-Pacific and Latin America, and later on in the decade, a renewed focus on Europe. Nevertheless, this quest for greater economic independence from the United States suffered the same fate as the policies of previous governments. Despite the stated commitment by the Liberal government to reverse that trend, “The Third Option did not work; the U.S. share of the Canadian trade actually grew.”<sup>44</sup>

In 1983 the Department of External Affairs published a Liberal Party discussion paper that provided both a brief summary of three decades of foreign trade strategies and an indication of government intent for the period ahead.<sup>45</sup> In 1984, the Conservative Party was elected and their economic agenda began to evolve towards a Free Trade Agreement with the United States in 1988. While still supportive of a healthy international trade environment, the government’s focus increasingly became pro-American as a result. Nevertheless, public concerns regarding Canadian sovereignty continued. “Their concern is that too close an economic relationship with our large neighbor may put in jeopardy the

---

<sup>43</sup> Westell, Anthony. “Economic Integration With The USA.” International Perspectives. November/December 1984. p. 9

<sup>44</sup> Brookings Dialogues on Public Policy. Building a Canadian-American Free Trade Area. Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1987. p. 59



fundamental political decision taken more than two centuries ago to maintain an independent political community in the northern half of North America.”<sup>46</sup> The pro-American focus on Free Trade in the mid-1980s, combined with the emergence of the European Economic Community<sup>47</sup> in the late 1980s did nothing to reduce Canada’s economic dependence on the United States. Consequently, a 2002 Conference of Defence Associations summary of Canada’s economic situation included the data that 87 % of Canadian exports went to the United States and that over 70 % of Canadian imports come from the United States.<sup>48</sup>

The Canadian economy became increasingly dependant upon the American economy throughout the 60-year period from 1940, and this occurred despite public and government concerns regarding their dependence upon the United States for Canadian economic prosperity. This increasing dependency on the American market increased Canada’s sensitivity to American economic prosperity and policies. Perhaps even more importantly, Canada’s inability to counter this dependency through government policy revealed an increased vulnerability to American policies and activities.

### Factors Impacting Canadian Government Policies and Strategies

---

<sup>45</sup> Canada. Department of External Affairs. Canadian Trade Policy For the 1980s: A Discussion Paper. Ottawa: External Affairs, 1983.

<sup>46</sup> MacDonald, Donald S. “Canadian Perceptions.” Brookings Dialogues on Public Policy. Building a Canadian-American Free Trade Area. Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1987. p. 13

<sup>47</sup> Canada. Department of External Affairs. Foreign Policy For Canadians - Europe. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971. p. 16

<sup>48</sup> Conference of Defence Associations. A Nation at Risk: The Decline of the Canadian Forces, Ottawa: CDAI, 2002 pg. xvii

Having identified the continued divergence between economic outcomes and government economic policies and strategies, it is important to point out that the Canadian government was hindered in its efforts by global forces beyond its control. Many of the forces affecting the government since the 1940s had existed in one form or another since Confederation. They included foreign tariff policies, fluctuating foreign capital markets,<sup>49</sup> the Depression of the 1930s, various energy crises and the general acceptance by the public of the growing closeness between Canada and the United States. Other more recent influences beyond Canada's control included Euro-centric trading policies<sup>50</sup> and practical problems<sup>51</sup> that arose with the evolution of the European Union (EU) as a regional economic bloc in the late 1980s. Concerns about EU growth further eroding Canadian access to European markets continue today. In 2001, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and international trade reported that "EU enlargement has led to trade diversion away from Canada."<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Conrad, Margaret and Alvin Finkel eds. History of the Canadian Peoples. 1867 to the Present. Toronto: Addison Wesley Longman. p. 86

<sup>50</sup> "The percentage of EU member-country imports originating in EU countries (ie. Intra-EU trade) has risen since 1980, displacing exports from countries such as Canada...It would appear that the major development driving the above trade trends is the increased regional integration on both sides of the Atlantic in the form of NAFTA and the EU. Both Canadians and Europeans have become more oriented to their respective regional markets as the existence of the two free trade areas has concentrated trade within those zones." Canada. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade – Sub-Committee Report on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment. CROSSING THE ATLANTIC: EXPANDING THE ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CANADA AND EUROPE. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada – Publishing. 2001. p. 9

<sup>51</sup> "EU continues to be a collection of sovereign states, each with its particular laws and regulations...the EU is a collection of 15 markets 'united under a single trade regime, but each having its own language, customs and business practices...' This reality often results in a struggle for foreign companies to penetrate easily and fully the whole of the EU." Ibid p. 3

<sup>52</sup> Canada. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade – Sub-Committee Report on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment. CROSSING THE ATLANTIC: EXPANDING THE ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CANADA AND EUROPE. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada – Publishing. 2001. p. 50

Regardless, the Canadian government was not an innocent victim throughout the entire period. There were opportunities since 1940 to strengthen economic prosperity, thus contributing to national security. For example, having witnessed the history of failed economic policies, and the continuing reality of growing economic reliance upon the United States, the Liberal government had the option in the 1970s of aligning national economic policies with those of the Americans. Instead, they pursued Trudeau's "Third Option," a deliberate economic policy that "eroded U.S. goodwill, leaving Canada dangerously exposed to US economic policy."<sup>53</sup> The failing trend of economic policies to reduce our dependence on the American market continued thereafter, and economic independence was not achieved by the end of the twentieth century.

"In 2001, over 22 percent of America's total exports went to Canada and about 19 percent of its total imports came from north of the border. Canada...moved up to be the leading foreign provider of critical petroleum products to the United States.... Canadian direct investment in US-based companies has also increased dramatically.... Canadians constitute almost 30 percent of all foreign visitors to the United States, with slightly fewer than 15 million visits made in 2000. Trade, direct investment, and tourism linkages between the US and Canada roughly account for over 3 million US jobs. Canada's linkage to the United States is even more pronounced. Exports were responsible for over 43 percent of Canada's gross domestic product in 2001, appreciably higher than for any other major western nation. About 87 percent of merchandise exports are destined for...the United States. US foreign direct investment in Canada also exceeds US\$139 billion, with US-owned companies on Canadian soil providing more than 1 million jobs and responsible for 10 percent of Canada's GDP. Americans also make about 90 percent of total foreign visits to Canada every year. Trade, direct investment and tourism ties to the United States account for about 4 million of the 15.4 million jobs in Canada and perhaps 40 percent of the nation's GDP."<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Westell, Anthony. "Economic Integration With the USA." International Perspectives. November/December 1984. p. 5

<sup>54</sup> Fry, Earl. "Canada-US Economic Relations: A Window of Opportunity." Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 33

These statistics reveal how significantly intertwined the Canadian and American economies had become. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that there is a counter-argument to any perspective of a unilateral dependence of Canada upon the American economy based upon the interdependence that has arisen between the two economies. “Whereas a generation ago Richard Nixon’s trade action threatened Canada’s economy but posed no down side for the US, the experience of virtually closing the Canada-US border in the wake of 9/11 illustrated to both nations that the arteries were vital for both economies.”<sup>55</sup> Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye argue that this interdependence makes both economies sensitive to changes in the other’s economic policy or prosperity. They also argue that vulnerability exists for one nation if the other is able to make choices to mitigate their own sensitivity. If neither nation is able to mitigate their sensitivities to the other, then this vulnerability does not exist, and both nations remain sensitive to each other, as it is unlikely that either nation would choose to adversely impact their own economy by choosing to adversely affect the other’s economy.<sup>56</sup> History has proven that the Canadian government was unable to mitigate Canadian economic sensitivity to the American economy over the past six decades. Consequently, by Keohane and Nye’s standard, the Canadian economy is not only sensitive to the American economy, but also vulnerable to it unless the United States is equally unable to mitigate their sensitivity to the Canadian economy. It is conceivable that a global economic power like the United States would succeed if they wished to reduce their economic dependency on Canada for national security reasons. Consequently, it is assessed that the Canadian economy is vulnerable in the economic relationship. American

---

<sup>55</sup> Hennessy, Michael A. and Robertson, Scot. “Defence and Security Challenges for Canada In Light Of The Bush Mid-Term Sweep.” Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 27

<sup>56</sup> Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye. Power and Interdependence. Harrisonberg: Addison Wesley Longman, 2001. p. 9 – 10.

economic prosperity and policies will affect Canada's prosperity, and therefore Canadian national security is dependant upon an "open" border and American goodwill.

### Reality - Canadian Security Post 11 September 2001

In the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 attacks the immediate response by the Americans was to shut down all access to the United States. The subsequent economic turmoil caused by shortfalls in supplies, delayed product delivery and the resultant cut in cash flow was significant for Canada, and clearly demonstrated that "the uncertainties of our common border with the United States pose real threats to Canada's economic security."<sup>57</sup> "After September 11 and the ensuing resurgence of American power and resolve, it has become even more obvious that Canada's material well-being and physical security are irremediably tied to the United States."<sup>58</sup>

One policy analysis of our reliance on the Americans was that,

"Trade with the United States drives our economy. US investment helped to build our economy. US innovation and entrepreneurship provide us with both opportunities and competition. US popular culture dominates us, not because it is forced upon us, but because Canadians choose it. The US military provides us with a blanket of security. US warm weather cossets millions of Canadians each winter. The US presence pervades every aspect of Canadian life, most of it positively."<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Noble, John J. "Getting The Eagle's Attention Without Tweaking Its Beak." Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 44

<sup>58</sup> Martin, Pierre. "Coming to Terms With Uncle Sam: Managing Canada-US Bilateral Security After September 11." Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 20

In responding to questions about what the American response to “September 11” would be, Canadian analyst Pierre Marc Johnson forecast a period of unilateralism and American led agenda-setting in the coming year or two, and that Canada will be affected as much as other countries are.<sup>60</sup> John Curtis provided a more detailed analysis on immediate, medium and long-term economic impacts. The immediate effects were forecast to be an impact on air-related industries, increased costs related to border issues, increased costs associated with risk-related industries (insurance and security) and increased government expenditures for security, intelligence, etc. The medium-term forecast was for an economic slowdown, and in the long-term there would be impacts on trade policies affecting our economy (ie- NAFTA, FTA).<sup>61</sup>

In summary, these observations identify both more active American security agendas and a downturn in economic stability and prosperity for Canada. Barbara MacDougall summarized the impact best when she said, “the greatest threat to our security would be a threat to our economic stability and to our trade with the United States.”<sup>62</sup> John Noble’s argument that “our access to American markets is a far more serious and pressing issue than the future of our Medicare system. Without continued secured access to the American market, we won’t generate the wealth necessary to pay for Medicare or anything else”<sup>63</sup> is indicative of the relevance of economic prosperity to sovereign choices

---

<sup>59</sup> Hart, Michael and Dymond, Bill. “The US Election and Canadian Interests: Ottawa Must Get With The Reality of a Bush-Dominated Washington.” Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 31

<sup>60</sup> “A Roundtable on Sept. 11.” Policy Options. 22.9. (November 2001). p. 42

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. p. 37-38

<sup>62</sup> MacDougall, Barbara. “The Fickle Finger of U.S. Favour.” Canadian Speeches. 15.5 (November / December 2001). p. 19

<sup>63</sup> Noble, John J. “Getting The Eagle’s Attention Without Tweaking Its Beak.” Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 44

over Canadian interests such as healthcare. Accordingly, Canadian national security priorities must reflect this modern reality.

### Choices in National Security

“The new attitude regarding security policy in the United States since 11 September represents an enormous constraint on the range of available choice for Canada when it comes to continental defence. In the current American mindset, the distinction between ‘homeland defence’ and ‘continental defence’ is almost entirely academic. The United States will do whatever it feels it must do to defend its territory, regardless of what Canada feels, wants, says or does.”<sup>64</sup>

September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 revealed that six decades of governmental policy has in fact limited, rather than provided, viable choices in national security for the Canadian government. Canada simply does not have the economic foundation from which to freely choose not to support American security initiatives.

“If we aren’t prepared to implement policies on our external borders to satisfy United States concerns, they will implement them on our common border. We have a choice: exercise our sovereignty in a manner that protects Canadian economic interests; or refuse to co-operate with the United States, in the name of some kind of sacrosanct and abstract sovereignty, and thereby jeopardize our economic interests.”<sup>65</sup>

The second of these choices, while sovereign in nature, fails to provide for Canadian economic prosperity, and therefore national security. Consequently, there is only one viable choice for the government to make.

One example of this working well was the Canadian government’s response to American security concerns about our shared border in the aftermath of the September 11<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Martin, Pierre. “Coming to Terms With Uncle Sam: Managing Canada-US Bilateral Security After September 11.” Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 20

attacks. Money was immediately made available for the Canadian Customs and Revenue Agency, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service, Solicitor General, Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Department of National Defence to enable them to pursue border security and counter-terrorism initiatives. The immediate benefit was that commerce across the border was able to flow again. An example of where Canada has not supported American security initiatives is in Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD). While the government is quick to point out that Canada was never formally asked to participate, and therefore have not formally refused, the reality is that the informal response to the Americans was that Canada was not very supportive. Subsequently, Canadian military involvement in American military space programs was curtailed and anecdotal information indicates that access was also restricted in certain aspects of North American Aerospace Defense and to a variety of intelligence sources. While not yet catastrophic in overall effect, this could add up to a significant impact on Canada's capability to conduct military and/or security operations both domestically and abroad. While alternate sources for some information may be available, it will not be of military quality and will lack the analysis that we formerly acquired through our partnership with American agencies. More recently we have witnessed the emotion and debates related to the Canadian government's position on supporting the Americans in Iraq. It will remain to be seen what this all comes to mean in terms of our future relationship with the United States. It is possible that their choices may adversely affect Canadian prosperity, and therefore our national security.

“Our relationship with the US is so vast, and so important to us in virtually every facet of our lives, that we run a tremendous risk if we simply stand aside. On all manner of issues,

---

<sup>65</sup> Noble, John J. “ Getting The Eagle’s Attention Without Tweaking Its Beak.” Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p. 44



from trade to national security, we are so inextricably intertwined with our US neighbour that tweaking the eagle's tail feathers may not be the wisest course of action..."<sup>66</sup>

If the Canadian government is truly serious about retaining absolute power and independent authority in governing Canada, then they must accept what 60 years of economic history has proven, hearken back to Mitchell Sharp's words and accept that "The Canada-U.S. relationship...is... by far our most important external relationship. It impinges on virtually every aspect of Canadian national interest, and thus of Canadian domestic concerns..."<sup>67</sup> and develop successful policies and strategies to support that relationship. The Canadian Government needs to concede that the correct sovereign choice for national security at present is to actively support American security initiatives and policies.

### Conclusion

While Canada does not have an official national security policy, successive governments have successfully sought membership in security alliances such as the United Nations and NATO for Canada's defence. Equally, they actively and effectively used their seats at various alliance tables to both participate in international diplomacy and to gain access to broader economic markets. Canada also became an active member of several economic "alliances" including the International Monetary Fund, the organization for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the Group of 7 (developed nations) and the World Trade Organization.

---

<sup>66</sup> Hennessy, Michael A. and Robertson, Scot. "Defence and Security Challenges for Canada In Light Of The Bush Mid-Term Sweep." Policy Options. 24.02. (February 2003). p.27

Again, Canada sought broader access to foreign markets through the promotion of “free trade” concepts and the maintenance of global economic stability. Interestingly, and despite all of their efforts during the past six decades from 1940 to the present, the Canadian government did not succeed in gaining significant enough foreign market access to balance or offset their trading relationship with the United States.

A close, and mutually beneficial, relationship with the United States evolved as Canada began to exercise her newfound independence in international affairs in the late 1930s. Initially based on mutual defence concerns related to the Second World War, they quickly came to include wartime economic agreements that were later adapted to continue during the post-war period. The Canadian and American economies became increasingly intertwined as foreign trade and investment between them grew. This growth tended to favour the United States more than Canada in that American ownership of Canadian business exceeded Canadian investment in American companies, and the balance of Canadian-American trade became a significantly larger percentage of Canada’s total foreign trade than of the American’s.

This period of growth was characterized by several recurring themes. The first was a Canadian concern about safeguarding their sovereignty with respect to their relationship with the United States. This concern pervaded most discussions and policies regarding defence and economic relations with the United States. A second theme was that, regardless of the concern about, and policies to counter, growing dependency on American

---

<sup>67</sup> Sharp, Mitchell. “Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future.” International Perspectives. Autumn 1972 Special Issue. p. 1

investment and markets, it continued. A third theme was the continued attempts, and failures, by the Canadian government to gain access to European markets initially, then Asian-Pacific and Latin American markets later on. Finally, there was the more recent growth in dependence of the American economy on Canadian energy sources and other raw materials. This created an interdependency that Keohane and Nye characterize as a relationship of sensitivity and, under certain circumstances, vulnerability. The fact that the Canadian government was unable to mitigate Canada's sensitivity to the American economy over six decades of commitment to that goal indicates that Canada may well be vulnerable to the American economy. This vulnerability will be confirmed if the United States proves itself successful at making choices to reduce their sensitivity to the Canadian economy. This vulnerability will adversely impact Canadian prosperity, and hence Canadian national security. Consequently, the Canadian government has few viable options other than to protect Canadian values and interests through support of American security initiatives today.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

Barber, Katherine ed. The Canadian Oxford Dictionary. Toronto ON: Oxford University Press Canada, 1998

Berger, Carl, and Ramsay Cook eds. The West and the Nation: Essays In Honour of W.L. Morton. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, c 1976

Conn, Stetson. The Framework of Hemispheric Defense. Washington DC: Office of the Chief of Military History, Dept of the Army, 1960.

Conrad, Margaret and Alvin Finkel eds. History of the Canadian Peoples. 1867 to the Present. Toronto: Addison Wesley Longman, c2002.

Cooper, Andrew. Canadian Foreign Policy: Old Habits and New Directions. Scarborough ON: Prentice-Hall Canada Ltd., 1997.

Eayrs, James. "Military Policy and Middle Power: The Canadian Experience." Canada's Role as a Middle Power. Ed J. King Gordon. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1986.

Fergusson, Jim et al. To Secure A Nation – Canadian Defence and Security In The 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Calgary: University of Calgary Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, 2001.

Gibson, Frederick W., and Jonathan Gregory Rossie, eds. The Road To Ogdensburg: The Queen's /St. Lawrence Conferences on Canadian-American Affairs, 1935-1941 East Lansing MI: Michigan State University, 1993

Hunt, Barry and Ron Haycock eds. Canada's Defence: Perspectives On Policy in the Twentieth Century. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993.

Jockel, Joseph T. Security to the North: Canada-U.S. Defense Relations in the 1990s. East Lansing MI: Michigan State University Press, 1991.

Jockel, Joseph T. The End of the Canada-U.S. Defence Relationship. Kingston: Queen's Centre for International relations, 1996.

Jockel, Joseph T. No Boundaries Upstairs: Canada, the United States, and the Origins of North American Air Defence, 1945-1958. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.

Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye. Power and Interdependence. Harrisonberg: Addison Wesley Longman, 2001.

Middlemiss, DW and Sokolsky, JJ. Canadian Defence: Decisions and Determinants. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989.

Norrie, Kenneth Harold. A History of the Canadian Economy. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1990.

Sokolsky, Joel J. Alliances and the Canadian Political Culture. Occasional Paper No. 26. Kingston: Queen's Centre for International Relations. 1988.

Sokolsky, Joel J. and Joseph T. Jockel eds. Fifty Years of Canada-United States Defense Cooperation: The Road From Ogdensburg. Lewiston NY: E. Mellen Press, 1992

Stewart, Larry. Canada's European Force: 1971-1980. A Defence Policy In Transition. Queen's National Security Series 5/80. Kingston ON: Queens University, 1980.

### Periodicals

"A Roundtable on Sept. 11." Policy Options. 22.9 (November 2001): 37-45

Eayrs, James. "The Road From Ogdensburg." The Canadian Forum. February 1971

Foulkes, Charles. "Canadian Defence Policy in a Nuclear Age." Behind the Headlines. XXI.1 (May 1961)

Fry, Earl. "Canada-US Economic Relations: A Window of Opportunity." Policy Options. 24.02 (February 2003): 33-38

Hart, Michael and Dymond, Bill. "The US Election and Canadian Interests: Ottawa Must Get With The Reality of a Bush-Dominated Washington." Policy Options. 24.02 (February 2003): 28-32

Hennessy, Michael A. and Robertson, Scot. "Defence and Security Challenges for Canada In Light Of The Bush Mid-Term Sweep." Policy Options. 24.02 (February 2003): 24-27

Jones, David T. "Yo, Canada! A Wake-Up Call For Y'All Up There." Policy Options. 24.02 (February 2003): 45-48

Macnamara, W.D. and Fit-Gerald, Ann. "A National Security Framework for Canada." Policy Matters-IRPP. 3.10 (2002)

Malone, David. "Foreign Policy Reviews Reconsidered." International Journal. 56.4 (Autumn 2001) 555-578

Martin, Pierre. "Coming to Terms With Uncle Sam: Managing Canada-US Bilateral Security After September 11." Policy Options. 24.02 (February 2003): 19-23

McDougall, Barbara. "The Fickle Finger of U.S. Favour." Canadian Speeches. 15.5 (November/December 2001) 18-20

Noble, John J. "Getting The Eagle's Attention Without Tweaking Its Beak." Policy Options. 2.02 (February 2003): 39-44

Sharp, Mitchell. "Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future." International Perspectives. Autumn 1972 Special Issue. 1-24

Westell, Anthony. "Economic Integration With The USA." International Perspectives. November/December 1984. 5-26

### Electronic Sources

Bush, George W. "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." US: The White House, 2002. 15 January 2003. <[www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssall.html)>

"Census 2001 - Geography – Highlights." 6 March 2003. <[http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Highlights/Page9/Page9\\_e.cfm](http://geodepot.statcan.ca/Diss/Highlights/Page9/Page9_e.cfm)>

"Defense Trade – Lessons to Be Learned from the Country Export Exemption." US General Accounting Office Report to the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, March 2002. 13 March 2003. <[www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govem/gao02-63.pdf](http://www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govem/gao02-63.pdf)>

International Trade link – DFAIT Home Page. 14 March 2003. <<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/trade/menu-en.asp>>

National Library of Canada. 27 March 2003. <<http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/2/18/h18-2987-e.html>>

Neill, R. "The Second National Policy." 13 March 2003. <[http://www.upei.ca/~rneill/canechist/topic\\_15.html](http://www.upei.ca/~rneill/canechist/topic_15.html)>

Pettigrew, Pierre. "WTO Post-Doha and Canada-EU Trade Relations." Address by The Minister for International Trade to The Rafael De Pino Foundation. Madrid, Spain. 17 Jan 2002. Trade Negotiations and Agreements/World Trade Organization (WTO). 23 Feb 2003. <<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/tna-nac/wto-speeches-en.asp>>.

Pettigrew, Pierre. "Canada-U.S. Partnership for Prosperity and Security in An Uncertain World." Address by The Minister for International Trade to The U.S. Chamber of

Commerce and Canadian American Business Council. Washington, DC. February 5 2003.  
3 March 2003. <<http://webapps.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/minipub/Publications>>

#### Other sources

Brookings Dialogues on Public Policy. Building a Canadian-American Free Trade Area.  
Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1987.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. Canadian Trade Policy For the 1980s: A  
Discussion Paper. Ottawa: External Affairs, 1983.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. Canadian Trade Policy for the 1980s: A  
Discussion Paper. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1983.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. Foreign Policy For Canadians. Ottawa:  
Information Canada, 1971.

Canada. Department of National Defence. Challenge and Commitment : A Defence Policy  
for Canada. Ottawa : Minister of Supply and Services, 1987.

Canada. National Defence. 1994 DEFENCE WHITE PAPER. Ottawa: Canada  
Communications Group – Publishing, 1994.

Canada. Parliamentary Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy. Security In  
A Changing World. Ottawa: Canadian Communications Group – Publishing, 1994.

Canada. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade –  
Sub-Committee Report on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment.  
CROSSING THE ATLANTIC: EXPANDING THE ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN CANADA AND EUROPE. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services  
Canada – Publishing. 2001.

Canada. Parliamentary Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs.  
Facing Our Responsibilities – The state of readiness of the Canadian Force. Ottawa: Public  
Works and Government Services Canada – Publishing, 2002.