



**CDSN**  
THE CANADIAN DEFENCE AND  
SECURITY NETWORK



**RCDS**  
RÉSEAU CANADIEN SUR LA DÉFENSE ET  
LA SÉCURITÉ



# **The Permanent Joint Board on Defence (PJBD): How Permanent and Joint? Celebrating 80 Years of Cooperation**

**25 February 2020**

**A report by the Centre for Defence and Security  
Studies, University of Manitoba**

[cdss@umanitoba.ca](mailto:cdss@umanitoba.ca)



**CDSN**  
THE CANADIAN DEFENCE AND  
SECURITY NETWORK



**RCDS**  
RESEAU CANADIEN SUR LA DÉFENSE ET  
LA SÉCURITÉ



## The Permanent Joint Board on Defence (PJBD): How Permanent and Joint? Celebrating 80 Years of Cooperation

On 17 January 2020, 17 panelists and 65 participants considered the past, present and future of the Permanent Joint Board on Defence at Johns Hopkins University in Washington D.C. Sponsored by the North American and Arctic Defence and Security Network (via a DND MINDS grant), Johns Hopkins School of Advanced and International Studies, the University of Manitoba's Centre for Defence and Security Studies, Defence and Security Foresight Group and the Canadian Defence and Security Network, the goal of the workshop was two-fold. The first was to provide policy relevant advice to the current co-chairs given the rise in great power competition. The second was to celebrate 80 years of this extraordinary binational advisory board; a cake was cut by the two co-chairs to mark the occasion.

Two cadets from West Point, one graduate student and two undergraduate students from the University of Manitoba served as rapporteurs and managed the question and answer sessions. Three panels explored the past, present and future of the PJBD and wider CANUS defence relationship.

This report was written by Andrea Charron with the aid of Laura Conrad, Nicholas Glesby and Channah Greenfield. While it aims to capture the discussions on the day, the findings and recommendations are not endorsed by government representatives or by the participants per se. The hope is that this event is the start of many future discussions and studies about the PJBD.

### Findings

- The PJBD allows policy makers to exchange views of a politically sensitive nature. Its key role is to help the two nations to develop common understanding and workable approaches to continental defence challenges as well as global security threats with a North American nexus; its ability to do so has historically been enhanced by appropriately metering media and public scrutiny.
- The PJBD is still a high-value mechanism for dialogue at low cost.

- The PJBD continues to evolve in composition which influences the issues it discusses. Currently, the Board's representatives are mainly drawn from the Defence departments of both nations and are mainly civilians. Other representatives from different departments (e.g. USCG and Homeland Security, for example) attend meetings as necessary and appropriate.
- Homeland defence<sup>1</sup> is increasingly important in today's geopolitical context and should remain a key focus of the PJBD. That being said, events and trends from around the world can impact North America in unexpected ways. A continual scan of other regions and incidences is encouraged.

## Recommendations

- The Board should continue to facilitate discussion on politically-sensitive defence issues facing North America and to develop common understanding and workable approaches to address these concerns. While secrecy is inherent to candid discussion of defence issues, some insight in the form of a public communiqué about the Board's dialogue would provide another primary source of discussion regarding the importance of homeland defence.
- Rather than reacting to immediate events and issues, longer-term, strategic discussions make for better advice. Synchronizing the many CANUS defence-related fora, agreements and processes is a constant challenge. The goal of the PJBD should be to provide overarching guidance to the strategic defence relationship, including by addressing strategic issues emanating from other fora or providing direction to them as appropriate.
- Just as the PJBD was born of the urgency of preparations to defend the homeland during World War II, its agenda seems to be a function of the urgency of purpose given external factors. As the scope of defence issues expands, new agencies, actors and representatives may need to be introduced to the PJBD. Consideration of the membership is recommended. In the past the Chair of the MCC, representatives from all of the three main military services and a foreign service/Global Affairs representative were standard. (Perhaps even academics with appropriate security clearances could be included for a wide-variety of input).
- The PJBD's meetings should not be limited to national capitals; there is demonstrated value from past meetings with connection to the issues under discussion (for example visiting NORAD HQ or Joint Task Force North). While being fiscally prudent is always a goal, ensuring enough time is allotted to consider the issues is important as the occasion to meet face-to-face. One formal meeting a year may not be sufficient. If the Board needs to meet more frequently, perhaps virtual options can be explored.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term homeland defence is used by the U.S. military whereas the Canadian military uses the term continental defence or North American defence. Homeland defence will be used in this report and includes continental U.S. and Canada and encompasses a range of threats and security issues in all domains related to critical public security, border security and disaster responses that would necessitate binational or bilateral military cooperation.

## **PJBD – Some Basics**

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence, born of a joint press release in 1940 (see Annex III), is composed of two national sections – the U.S. section and the Canadian section. Each country is represented by a Chair. Historically, the number of representatives has varied significantly. In the beginning, there were only 4 or 5 representatives for each section. At its height, each section also had a political secretary, military representatives from the Navy, Air Force and Army, a representative from the Military Cooperation Committee and a representative from the State Department and Foreign Affairs. Today, chiefly civilian representatives drawn from the Defence departments of both nations make up the Board although more participants from different security-related agencies attend as required (e.g. Homeland Security, or the USCG). As well, the span of topics quickly extended beyond traditional defence issues after the war.

Each nation has its own secretary who coordinates the roles and tasks of their nationals on the Board. Historically they were assigned by the U.S. Department of State and External Affairs respectively. Today, the secretaries are assigned by the Departments of Defense/Defence. The secretaries establish the agenda, assign tasks coming out of the PJBD, and ensure these are followed up in a timely fashion.

Today, the two Chairs are chosen by their respective governments. The Prime Minister selects the Canadian Co-Chair and the Secretary of Defense makes a recommendation to the President regarding the U.S. Chair. While the Department of State and Global Affairs continue to have representatives at PJBD meetings. Today the Board's representatives are mostly from the Defense/Defence departments of both nations – with the secretaries provided by the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs and from the Assistant Deputy Minister for Policy. Key military leaders attend as needed or as relevant (for example, the Commander of NORAD and USNORTHCOM and Commander Canadian Joint Operations Command). The current composition of the Board is as follows:

US/Cdn Co-Chairs

DoD and DND Policy leads – typically represented by ASD ISA and ADM(Pol)

US/Cdn Joint Staff representative(s)

Other DoD/DND representatives, dependent on the subject matter, including Tri-Command representatives (CJOC, NORAD, NORTHCOM)

State Department and Global Affairs Canada representative(s)

DHS/Public Safety representative(s)

National Security Council/Privy Council Office

US/Canadian Embassy representative(s)

The PJBD has no executive authority. Through the Chairs, the Board reports directly to the President and his/her Cabinet and to the Prime Minister and his/her Minister of Defence on matters of high policy importance. Typically, recommendations are captured in a letter for the President and Prime Minister and their key advisors in the Secretary of Defense/ Department of Defence and Secretary of State/Global Affairs.

The Board, of late, meets formally once a year rotating between the U.S. and Canada (typically in Washington D.C. and in Ottawa) although meetings have been hosted in other locations in the past (including Royal Roads British Columbia, Montreal and Colorado Springs). The U.S. will chair the 239<sup>th</sup> meeting of the PJBD in Washington D.C. later in 2020.

## **PJBD – the Past**

The Board's genesis is thanks to a telephone call from President Roosevelt to Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King (WLMK) in 1940 to invite him to Ogdensburg to discuss issues of "mutual concern". Two years earlier, in Kingston, Ontario during a commencement address at Queen's University, Roosevelt uttered a remarkable pledge given U.S. neutrality at the time. Roosevelt assured Canadians that "the people of the United States [would] not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil [was] threatened by any other empire."<sup>2</sup>

The few aides in attendance at Ogdensburg (four for the President and only 1 for the Prime Minister) is perhaps the reason why an agreement, in the form of a press release, was barely a page in length. Nevertheless, this press release was the basis for the establishment of the Board that exists still to this day.

The Board, in its first five years, spurred by a sense of extreme urgency given WWII, had 42 meetings and advised on everything from the defence of the then UK colony Newfoundland, to the construction of the Alaska Highway. The urgency with which the PJBD operated during the war ended with the 1947 U.S. National Security Act<sup>3</sup> which restructured the U.S. military and created a number of civilian security agencies. With new resources available to the U.S., the Board's rate of advisories diminished considerably but not before being instrumental in advising on the Distant Early Warning Line, North American Air Defence Modernization, NORAD renewal and underwater acoustic surveillance to name a few issues.

At several points throughout the PJBD's history, questions were asked about its continued utility. Rather than the formal recommendations made during the war, the PJBD became an advisory board reviewing issues brought before it. The scope of issues was increasingly "eclipsed"<sup>4</sup> (others prefer the term overshadowed) by a number of committees including the Military Cooperation Committee (MCC),<sup>5</sup> which was created in 1946 at the direction of the PJBD to focus on issues pertaining to combined military planning and other elements of the bilateral mil-to-mil relationship. The MCC does not develop policy either; only Ministerial-level

---

<sup>2</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt, "The Great Communicator": The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945 File No. 1168 (August 18, 1938) Kingston, Ontario, Canada - Address at Queens University: 4.

<sup>3</sup> National Security Act (1947) Found at <https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/1947-07-26.pdf>. The Act created the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board and created the National Military Establishment and constituent actors.

<sup>4</sup> Christopher Conliffe "The Permanent Joint Board on Defense, 1940 - 1988" in *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy and Technology of Defense*, David Haglund and Joel Sokolsky (eds) (Boulder CO: Westview Press, 1989): 145 – 166. See especially 160-162. Conliffe divided and titled the 6 phases of PJBD activity between 1947 and 1988 as follows: The war years (1940 - 1945); Uncertainty (1945 -1950); The last fling (1950-1953); Decline (1954 – 1959); Eclipse (1960 – 1963) and Limbo (1964 – 1988).

<sup>5</sup> The MCC serves as the principal strategic connection for the Canadian and American Joint Military Staffs and reports to the PJBD. The committee meets biannually and alternates between meetings in the Canadian and American capitals.

engagements, such as the CANUS ministerials, can produce decisions that translate into new policy guidance. While the PJBD remains primarily an advisory body (although it can take decisions where those reside within the level of authority and the mandate of its substantive policy leads), it is, nevertheless, a policy-driven body.

The other reason for a slowdown in PJBD activity is due to the fact that homeland defence has not been a priority, especially after the end of the Cold War when both militaries were still deployed overseas. Attention was focused outside of North America and on the protection of North America against the threat of violent extremism. Attention refocused on the homelands after 9/11 and with the formation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002. The PJBD continues to adapt by employing potential post 9/11 scenarios to evaluate the changing threat environment.

Nevertheless, and despite a thinning of the agenda at times, the PJBD has been uniquely important and useful because of its mandate to look at all aspects of North American defence in a broad sense. The PJBD took a strong, positive position on the construction of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, it stimulated U.S.-Canadian cooperation on the Y2K problem and it encouraged more extensive study and cooperation of the management of the North American power grid. In short, it strives to forge a continental vision unconstrained by bureaucratic stovepipes.

## **PJBD – the Present**

The PJBD hosted its 238<sup>th</sup> meeting in Ottawa in June 2019 and it is fair to say that homeland defence was fore of mind for many in attendance. Today's geopolitical upheaval has been likened to what existed in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The rise of great power competition has been compared to a regrowing jungle.<sup>6</sup> There are four trends which bring the defence of North America into sharp relief. The first is the impact of new technology on the lethality and disruptive nature of weapons. Second, there are a number of geographic and functional seams that need to be managed as a result of the U.S. unified command plan (for example the multiple commands which intersect the Arctic) as well as those between Canada and the U.S. in domains other than the aerospace domain. Third, the grey zone between war and peace is actively exploited by adversaries. And finally, the American and Canadian publics have different perceptions of the threats facing North America; Americans routinely feel under threat whereas Canadians feel more secure. Therefore, when the NORAD commander states that North America is no longer a sanctuary,<sup>7</sup> this is especially discordant with the Canadian public's notion of Canada's relative safety in North America.

The U.S. publicly notes China and Russia as key adversaries of concern for NORAD as well as USNORTHCOM. Russia is an acute threat while China is a longer-term concern. Canada, instead, references the return to major power competition and decline of the rule-based order rather than specifying specific adversaries. Regardless, Canada and the U.S. are both aware of

---

<sup>6</sup> Robert Kagan, *The Jungle Grows Back: America and Our Imperiled World* (New York: Knopf, 2018).

<sup>7</sup> Statement of General Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy United States Air Force Commander United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command before the Armed Services Committee, 26 February 2019:2. Found at [https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/OShaughnessy\\_02-26-19.pdf](https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/OShaughnessy_02-26-19.pdf)

the capabilities of especially Russia and China; their intentions, however, remain opaque vis-à-vis North America. The board, therefore, has its attention fixed on the shifting geo-strategic environment and is paying greater attention to other regions in the world for the implications for North America.

The development of new technology and all domain challenges means that the militaries of Canada and the U.S. can no longer defend against threats of the future using the capabilities of the past. Climate change and its effects present both immediate and long-term security challenges that will translate into added pressures for the Canadian and U.S. forces – especially increased activity in the Arctic.

Canada and the U.S. need to be able to react quickly to protect North America. To continue to deter, detect and defeat threats, both Canada and the U.S. want to have intuitive sensing grids/systems of systems to ensure all domain awareness. Command and control (C2) must be evaluated regularly both in combined and joint forms.<sup>8</sup> Canada and the U.S. also need innovative operating concepts to remain flexible and agile to changing threats. Homeland-defence-aligned organizations are also crucial as is the trust between allies and partners and continued coordination. In short, in order to have a capable defence of the homeland, Canada and the U.S. need to provide persistent and credible deterrence.

Modernizing key systems, like the North Warning System, therefore, are priorities but not necessarily via straight replacements. Rather, a series of interim improvements is likely expected and hopefully with dual-use capabilities (civilian and military) in mind. The ideal end goal is for a system of systems which can detect in more than the air domain, is able to transfer both classified and unclassified information quickly and securely to the right agencies and personnel which are prepared and able to act. Large military bases in the Arctic (especially Canada) are not the likely solution – rather, investing in security capabilities that also achieve the goals of the government of Canada and the Canadians living there, is preferred. That being said, any efficiency to be gained in procurement systems on both sides of the border is a force-multiplier.

Understanding and clarifying each state's understanding of the threats facing North America are of tremendous help and a key role of the PJBD as the CANUS defence relationship has been a product of two asymmetries: the asymmetry of the amount of capabilities the U.S. and Canada contribute and the interest in the CANUS defence relationship and the PJBD; Canada highlights the benefits it receives from binational and bilateral defence cooperation with the U.S. often.

The PJBD can also be a tremendous help when it considers the threats to North America that may not be directly within the purview of the militaries but for which the militaries may be called upon to assist civil authorities. The PJBD has the freedom to investigate any threat to North American security and defence. For example, a deepening fentanyl crisis, epidemic or major natural disasters, such as an earthquake on the West Coast, are all examples of transnational threats to North America.

Likely, the PJBD's immediate agenda will be focused on steps to deter key adversaries and rogue states (such as North Korea and Iran) persistently and consistently in all domains. Inevitably, the politically-pricklier questions of dispensation and who pays for what and how will

---

<sup>8</sup> Joint is one or more service operating together (e.g. Air Force and Army). Combined is one or more nation working together.

be on its agenda. Continued progress on North American defence modernization, especially in the Arctic, must be tracked and encouraged by the PJBD.

## **PJBD - The Future**

As was the case in the past and present, deterring and defending against missile attacks will be on the PJBD's future agenda. While hypersonic weapons are the focus of the media, it is the lower atmosphere missiles which are likely to be more problematic. As well, perennial missile defence discussions between Canada and the U.S. are likely to continue unresolved in the immediate future, military attention to the homeland is likely to increase as function of its importance to Western, strategic deterrence. With this increased focus will come increased activity for and attention to the PJBD.

According to one participant, the goal for Canada has been to be high but not too high on the U.S. agenda. If the U.S. adopts a strident Monroe-doctrine-like approach to homeland defence, then Canada can expect to be asked to contribute more to the defence of North America. However, given looming expectations of a recession, contributing more will be politically difficult. If the PJBD could help pin point what are the spending priorities for North America that could be helpful to focus discussions in Canada.

Just as the PJBD was born of the urgency of preparations to defend the homeland during war, its agenda seems to be a function of the urgency of purpose given external factors. As the scope of defence issues expands, new agencies, actors and representatives may need to be introduced to the PJBD.

The defence of North America is one part of the wider liberal international agenda of both Canada and the U.S. and their respective national interests. Canada and the U.S.' other foreign relations, therefore, will have an impact on the importance of and approach to North American defence. Future PJBD recommendations will need to keep this context in mind.

A recurring theme, especially among the academics, was the lack of information on any of the recommendations made by the PJBD since a PhD thesis by David Beatty was published in 1969 at the University of Michigan.<sup>9</sup> Although the PJBD has great symbolic importance, this is difficult to communicate when there is no public record or communiqué of issues discussed.<sup>10</sup> That being said there is great value to the PJBD being able to discuss issues and make recommendations, especially politically sensitive ones, outside of any spotlight.

It is clear that North American defence is rising in priority and could be a forcing function that requires the PJBD to expand its agenda and convene meetings more than annually as is the current schedule. As homeland defence rises in priority and captures more political attention, so too will the profile of the PJBD. Synchronizing the multiple CANUS defence-related fora and processes is a challenge and perhaps one which the PJBD could tackle. An informal discussion between the co-chairs of the PJBD and International Joint Commission (IJC) might provide

---

<sup>9</sup> David Beatty, *The Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defense* (Ann Arbor: MI University Microfilms, Inc., 1969).

<sup>10</sup> After one PJBD meeting in Toronto a press conference was held. It was poorly attended and no other press conferences have been held. The U.S. section has the practice of issuing? issue reporting cables to spread the results of the PJBD meetings beyond military personnel.



some lessons learned on agenda setting, receiving input, structuring discussions and communicating recommendations.<sup>11</sup> While the two institutions have very different mandates and authorities, they are both binational advisory bodies and they both seek to protect North America. The IJC however, rules on applications for approval of projects affecting boundary or transboundary waters and may regulate the operation of these projects while the PJBD provides specific advice to a more select audience. Nevertheless, a discussion among co-chairs may be helpful in exchanging best practices including ways for the PJBD to communicate with the public or perhaps the value of the IJC's secretariat in Windsor.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.ijc.org/en>

## Annex 1 – Panelists

**17 January 2020**  
**Johns Hopkins University SAIS / Kennedy-Herter**  
**Auditorium**  
**1740 Massachusetts Ave, NW**  
**Washington, DC 20036**

### **Introductions**

Lt Gen (ret) Miller and Hon. John McKay PC – current co-Chairs of the PJBD

### **PJBD and Canada-U.S. Defence in Historic Context**

Moderator: Dr. Joel Sokolsky, RMC

Mr. Jack David, Chair of the U.S. Section, Permanent Joint Board on Defense, U.S.-Canada from 2002-2004

Dr. JJ Jockel, St. Lawrence University (by Zoom)

Dr. Whitney Lackenbauer, Trent University

Rear Admiral (ret) William Truelove, (by Zoom)

### **PJBD and Canada-U.S. Defence Current Priorities**

Moderator: Dr. Andrea Charron, University of Manitoba

Brig Gen M. Luke Ahmann, Deputy Director, Strategy, Policy & Plans (J5) NORAD & USNORTHCOM

Brig Gen Heitkamp, Deputy Director for Politico-Military Affairs (Western Hemisphere) Strategy, Plans and Policy Directorate, The Joint Staff

Mr. Greg Witol, Deputy Director of Western Hemisphere Policy at the Department of National Defence.

Col (ret) Sergio de la Peña, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Western Hemisphere Affairs

### **Future PJBD and Canada-U.S. Defence Issues**

Moderator: Dr. Brian Bow, Dalhousie University

Dr. Tom Karako, CSIS

Dr. Joel Sokolsky, RMC

Dr. James Fergusson, University of Manitoba

Mr. Dwight Mason, Chair of the U.S. Section, Permanent Joint Board on Defense, U.S.-Canada from 1994-2002

### **Student Rapporteurs**

Nicholas Glesby, University of Manitoba

Laura Conrad, University of Manitoba

Channah Greenfield, University of Manitoba

West Point Cadet Cassie Daly

West Point Cadet Maxwell Myers

## Annex II – Co-Chairs of the PJBD

Table prepared by Roman Ellis with help from Hon. Mr. McKay P.C.

PERMANENT JOINT BOARD ON DEFENSE CO-CHAIRS		
<i>*N.B. Dates in brackets [] are assumed.</i>		
YEAR	U.S. CO-CHAIR	CANADIAN CO-CHAIR
1940	F.H. LaGuardia <sup>12</sup> 1940-1947	O.M. Biggar <sup>13</sup> 1940-1945
1941		
1942		
1943		
1944		
1945		
1946		
1947		
1948		
1949	Guy V. Henry <sup>16</sup> 1948-1954	
1950		
1951		

<sup>12</sup> Canadian Army, *A Brief history of the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence, 1940-1960*, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1960, p. 5.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

1952			
1953			
1954			
1955	John. A. Hannah <sup>17</sup> 1954-1963		
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			
1961			
1962			
1963	Hon H. Freeman Matthews <sup>19</sup> 1963-1969		Hon L. Dana Wilgress <sup>18</sup> 1959-1967
1964			
1965			
1966			
1967			

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11; Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, “Secret: Ottawa, September 17, 1962,” in [Chapter III - The United States, Part 2 – Defence and Security Issues](#), *The Department in History: Documents on Canadian External Relations*, Vol. 29: 1962-1963, 2013; David G. Haglund and Joel J. Sokolsky, *The U.S.-Canada Security Relationship: The Politics, Strategy and Technology of Defense* (Routledge, 2019): Phase 5.

<sup>18</sup> *A Brief history of the Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence*, p. 13.; Greg Donaghy, [Tolerant Allies : Canada and the United States, 1963-1968](#), McGill-Queen’s University Press, Montreal, 2002, p. 118.

<sup>19</sup> “[H. Freeman Matthews, Diplomat since 1920’s: Obituary](#),” *New York Times*, 21 October 1986; [H. Freeman Matthews Sr. Papers](#), Philadelphia Area Archives Research Portal.

1968		Arnold Danforth Patrick Heeney <sup>20</sup> 1967-1970
1969		
1970	Andy Leroy Borg <sup>21</sup> 1969-1975	John Black Aird <sup>22</sup> 1971-1979
1971		
1972		
1973		
1974		
1975		
1976		
1977		
1978		
1979	Thomas E. Morgan <sup>24</sup> 1978-[1981]	George Hees <sup>25</sup> 1979-1984
1980		
1981		

<sup>20</sup> "A. D. P. Heeney: Diplomat headed IJC and civil service body," *Globe and Mail* [Toronto], 21 December 1970; 1. P.C. 1971-2222.

<sup>21</sup> Richard M. Nixon, "Appendix A: October 31, 1969," *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard M. Nixon, 1969*, 1971, p. 1077; Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library, "Gubser, Charles S.," published May 13, 1975, <https://www.fordlibrarymuseum.gov/library/document/0248/whpr19750513-007.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> P.C. 1971-2222; Cabinet Conclusions, "Appointment - Chairman, Canadian section, Canada-United States Permanent Joint Board on Defence," Library and Archives Canada, RG2, Privy Council Office, Series A-5-a, Volume 6381 Access Code: 90, 21 October 1971.; *Canada Gazette, Part I, Vol. 113, No. 44, 3 November 1979, p. 6770*.

<sup>23</sup> "Nominations & Appointments, October 20, 1981," Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, National Archives and Records Administration.

<sup>24</sup> *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter, 1978, Book 1-January 1 to June 30, 1978*, 1979, p. 453.

<sup>25</sup> *Canada Gazette, Part I, Vol. 113, No. 44, 3 November 1979, p. 6770*.; *Canada Gazette, Part I, Vol. 118, No. 11, 17 March 1984, p. 2224*.

1982	Charles S. Gubser <sup>27</sup> 1981-1985	& Jack Sydney George Cullen <sup>26</sup> 1984
1983		
1984		
1985		
1986	John H. Rousselot <sup>29</sup> 1985-1988	Allan Lawrence <sup>28</sup> 1984-1987
1987		
1988		
1989	Fred Jones Hall <sup>30</sup> [1988]-[1993]	Patrick Crofton <sup>31</sup> 1989-1995
1990		
1991		
1992		
1993		
1994	Mary Ann Peters <sup>32</sup>	

<sup>27</sup> [“Nominations & Appointments, October 20, 1981,”](#) Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, National Archives and Records Administration.

<sup>26</sup> [Canada Gazette, Part I, Vol. 118, No. 11, 17 March 1984, p. 2224.](#); [Canada Gazette, Part I, Vol. 119, No. 1, 5 January 1985, p. 65.](#)

<sup>28</sup> 1. [Canada Gazette, Part I, Vol. 118, No. 11, 17 March 1984, p. 2224.](#); Ibbotson, Doug, [“MP Allan Lawrence says he'll be quitting after 30 years in politics,”](#) *Toronto Star*, 27 October 1987.

<sup>29</sup> [“Nominations & Appointments, November 22, 1985,”](#) Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, National Archives and Records Administration; L.A. Times, *John Rousselot: 75; Congressman of 14 Years, John Birch Society Official*, published May 12, 2003, <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2003-may-12-me-rousselot12-story.html>.

<sup>30</sup> Allan Cromley, “Shultz Gives Sooner Brief Lesson City Man Adapts to Role in State Department,” *Sunday Oklahoman*, 28 February 1988.

<sup>31</sup> [“Veterans health-care system upgraded,”](#) *Toronto Star*, 3 March 1989; [P.C. 1989-0356](#); P.C. 1995-0457.

<sup>32</sup> Deanna Congileo, [“Carter center appoints new chief executive officer,”](#) Emory University, 1 April 2014.

	1993-1994	
1995	Dwight Mason <sup>33</sup> 1994-2002	Jesse Philip Flis <sup>34</sup> 1995-1998
1996		
1997		Jacques Saada <sup>35</sup> 1998-2004
1998		
1999		
2000		
2001	Jack David <sup>36</sup> 2002-2005	Judi Longfield <sup>37</sup> 2004-2006
2002		
2003		George R. Nethercutt Jr. <sup>38</sup> 2005-2009
2004		
2005		
2006		
2007		

<sup>33</sup> House of Commons, Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, *Partners in North America: Advancing Canada's Relations with the United States and Mexico*, December 2002, p. 113.; Dwight Mason, email to Andrea Charron, 18 January 2020.

<sup>34</sup> P.C. 1995-0457.; Kittelberg, Lori, "PM Names Saada to Canada-US Security Post," *The Hill Times* [Ottawa], 14 September 1998; P.C. 1998-1557.

<sup>35</sup> Lori Kittelberg, "PM Names Saada to Canada-US Security Post," *The Hill Times* [Ottawa], 14 September 1998; [P.C. 2004-0463](#).

<sup>36</sup> The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Nominations & Appointments," 1 March 2002.; Dwight Mason, email to Andrea Charron, 18 January 2020.

<sup>37</sup> [P.C. 2004-0463](#).; [P.C. 2006-0472](#).

<sup>38</sup> The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "Personnel announcement," 8 April 2005; "Unreported Cases," *Delaware Journal of Corporate Law*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2013, p. 1056.

<sup>39</sup> [P.C. 2006-0472](#).; [P.C. 2011-0607](#).

2008		2006-2011
2009		
2010		
2011	VACANT <sup>40</sup> 2009-2011	
2012	John M. Spratt Jr. <sup>41</sup> 2011-[2016]	Laurie Daniel Hawn <sup>42</sup> 2011-2015
2013		
2014		
2015		
2016		
2017	VACANT <sup>44</sup> 2016-2017	Hon John McKay PC <sup>43</sup> 2016-Present
2018	Lt Gen (ret) Christopher D. Miller <sup>45</sup> 2018-Present	
2019		

<sup>40</sup> David T. Jones, "[US-Canada Security](#)," *International Journal*, Vol. 66, No. 2, 2011, p. 457.

<sup>41</sup> The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, "[President Obama Announces More Key Administration Posts](#)," 16 September 2011

<sup>42</sup> [P.C. 2011-0607](#); Canada, "[Governor in Council Appointments](#)" [archived on 29 July 2015].

<sup>43</sup> Canada, "[Organization Profile - Canada-US Permanent Joint Board on Defence](#)," 6 March 2017; [P.C. 2016-0752](#).

<sup>44</sup> "[President Donald J. Trump Announces Intent to Nominate and Appoint Personnel to Key Administration Posts](#)," *Federal Information & News Dispatch* [Washington, D.C.], 27 March 2018.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*



## Annex III – The Ogdensburg Press Release

THE WHITE HOUSE

FOR THE PRESS

August 18, 1940

The following joint statement of the President and the Prime Minister of Canada, Mackenzie King, is released for papers appearing on the streets not earlier than 9 O'clock P.M., Eastern Standard Time; today, August 18th, 1940. The same limitation applies to use by radio broadcasters or radio news commentators.

William D. Hassett

- - - - -

The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defense in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defense shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defense shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land, and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defense of the north half of the Western Hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defense will consist of four or five Members from each country, most of them from the Services. It will meet shortly.

NOTE: This release constitutes what is commonly referred to as the "OGDENSBURG AGREEMENT".