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### Introduction

#### The BorderLines Process

**by Alan Broadbent**

The Canadian Unity Council and CRIC have been valuable partners in *BorderLines: Canada in North America*, a citizen exploration of the Canada-United States relationship. In the light of heightened US concern about security and identifying friends and enemies following the events of September 11, 2001, Canada needs to be vigilant about this most important of its international relationships. The BorderLines process is a comprehensive and inclusive national debate about Canada’s place in the North American continent.

In the current environment, we could too easily slip into a newly defined relationship with the US – without our eyes wide open. Canadians need to understand the essential elements of our country that we wish to preserve, and these need to be articulated by a wide range of citizens. From our original Aboriginal communities to the most recent refugee and immigrant arrivals, for all of us who were born here or choose to be here, we need to have a national conversation about our country. As the US increasingly defines the behaviour it wants to see from other countries, we need to know what we want as Canadians, be prepared to make our case, and if need be to take our stand.

BorderLines was a series of five conferences, which were held in Calgary, Montreal, Halifax, Vancouver and Washington. This non-partisan process began by looking at the current state of Canada-US relations, and by gaining an understanding of what is inevitable, given the power inequality between the two countries. Second, it looked at what is possible and defined some scenarios for the development of the relationship. Third, it created a discussion with people in the United States of their view of the relationship. Finally, it attempted to define what is desirable, what Canada wants. The conference debates were very broad and have produced a diversity of opinion.

In addition to these conferences, four television shows were produced by TV Ontario to communicate with a wider audience, and a web conversation was facilitated at www.borderlines.ca.

The relationship between Canada and the United States is historic and complex. It reaches into many areas of Canadian economic, political, cultural, and social life. While trade and security are currently at the top of the Canadian agenda, many other issues emerge as the conversation deepens: resource management and co-ordination; the importance of cross-border regions such as “Atlantica” on the east coast, and “Cascadia” on the Pacific Coast; bi-lateral versus multi-lateral approaches; and the effects of globalization on political and cultural institutions.

The BorderLines process was initiated by Richard Gwyn, the highly respected author and columnist, and Honourary Chair of BorderLines, and directed by a distinguished steering committee (see http://www.borderlines.ca/steering.phtml). Avana Capital Corporation, through its *Ideas That Matter* division, provided management resources. The convening partner was The Munk Centre for International Studies at the University of Toronto, headed by Janice Stein. Hosting partners across the country included The Canada West Foundation, The Institute for Research on Public Policy, The Atlantic Institute for Market Studies, The Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada and the Woodrow Wilson International Center. All the partners and contributors should be commended for enabling a creative exchange of views on this crucial issue.

*Alan Broadbent is a CUC Governor and Co-chair of the BorderLines conferences.*
Canada and the US: An Initial Comparison

Will Canadian Quality of Life Last?
by David J. McGuinty

Today’s polling results show that Canadians are confident they have a better quality of life than their American neighbours. But will it last?

We don’t know, because no one is monitoring the ecological resources that underpin Canadian prosperity and well-being. We don’t know if we are running down our stocks of the environmental goods and services that comprise “natural capital”.

Environmental goods go well beyond minerals, lumber and fossil fuels. They also include the bounty of biodiversity: genetic recipes, patterns, design and engineering solutions, medicines and other marketable ideas. Environmental services encompass clean air and water, pollination, climate regulation and other life-sustaining benefits.

Traditional measures such as gross domestic product (GDP) do not account for the full costs and benefits of economic decisions because they ignore impacts on natural capital stocks. To fill this gap in Canada’s understanding of its long-term economic prospects, the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy is proposing six new indicators.

- **Forest cover** would track changes in the extent of Canada’s forests. The Round Table found that in 1998, the only year for which sufficient data is available, Canada was 41% forested.

- **Freshwater quality** would show whether water quality is meeting objectives for particular uses such as swimming and aquatic life. In 2002, 22% of monitored waterways were impaired.

- **Air quality** is estimated using ground-level ozone (“smog”) levels, weighted by population. Canadians exposure to ground-level ozone is creeping up (+3% over 20 years).

![Figure 1: Canada: Doing Better or Worse than the US?](image)

July 2002: Would you say that Canada does each of the following things a lot better, somewhat better, about the same, somewhat worse or a lot worse than the United States?
a) providing a good quality of life for its people; b) providing a high economic standard of living for its people; c) providing good job opportunities for its best-educated workers; d) providing citizens from all backgrounds with an equal opportunity to succeed.

Canadians are confident that their country offers a better quality of life, and more equality of opportunity, than does the US. In addition, only one in four thinks the US does a better job providing a high economic standard of living. There are concerns, however, as to whether Canada can compete with the US in providing job opportunities for its brightest and best. A majority of Canadian university graduates think that Canada under-performs the US in providing good job opportunities for its best-educated workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Canada’s Performance, Job Opportunities: Responses by Highest Level of Education Attained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you say that Canada does each of the following things a lot better, somewhat better, about the same, somewhat worse or a lot worse than the United States....Providing good job opportunities for its best educated workers? (July 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college or vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Canada and the US: An Initial Comparison**

---

**Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.** This indicator tracks emissions of the gases that are destabilizing the planet’s climate patterns. Canadian GHG emissions have increased 16% over the last 20 years.

**Extent of wetlands** would track changes in the total area of wetlands. The area covered by wetlands is a proxy for biodiversity. Surprisingly, there is no information at this time to calculate this indicator.

**Educational attainment** would track the percentage of the workforce-age population with post-secondary education. The report found that this indicator went from nearly 43% in 1990 to 55% in 2000. This is the only human capital indicator in the group, and measures Canada’s ability to compete in a knowledge-based economy.

**WHY TRACK NATURAL CAPITAL**

Why do we think we need to use indicators to track natural capital? Wetlands provide a great example. These areas filter and purify water and store large quantities of carbon. They help control floods, reduce erosion and protect shorelines. As well, they indirectly support a range of economic activities such as fishing, farming and recreational activities. Despite all this, we are in the process of draining many wetlands out of existence.

The Round Table developed its indicators because losing the services provided by natural capital – even though they may be difficult to express in dollar values – will have a definite impact on our current and future budget expenditures. Using these new indicators will help Canadians have more informed and useful debates on divisive issues where environment and economy are inextricably linked. These issues are not going away – I suggest that we learn how to deal with them.

*David J. McGuinty is President & CEO of the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy.*
Canadians support free trade. In a March 2001 CRIC survey, 71% said that free trade agreements, such as the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement and NAFTA, benefit Canada. Yet many see room for improvement. In the wake of lingering trade disputes between the two countries, two of every three Canadians think the US benefits more than Canada from trade between the two countries, a figure that is much higher than that registered before the free trade deal was signed. The proportion saying that the US benefits more from trade between the two countries is highest in western Canada (74%), and reaches 79% in BC and 80% in Saskatchewan. Only 17% of Westerners say the two nations benefit about equally, while 7% say Canada benefits more. Frustrations with the fairness of free trade may help to explain why a majority of Canadians, and 60% of Westerners, do not think that Canadian businesses have the ability to compete successfully with US businesses. It is possible that this reflects a conviction that the playing field of Canada-US competition is not level, rather than a lack of confidence in domestic entrepreneurial skills.
The softwood lumber dispute between Canada and the United States is not new. American concerns about a new competitor with ample supplies of wood entering their market date back to the nineteenth century. Canada now supplies about a third of the US market. We have been the target of American producers since the recession of the early 1980s. The assault from this exceptionally well-financed and well-protected lobby has been as unrelenting as it is unjustified. The dispute is not really about policy, or how each country manages its forests. The core of the issue for the Americans is market-share and price. That is the heart of the matter for every protectionist interest.

After the expiry of the quota agreement, the US industry immediately responded by insisting that their government impose two new sets of duties, a countervail, and anti-dumping charges, allegedly targeting specific companies, but in reality hitting the whole industry. The Canadian industry is now paying a duty of nearly 30%. The American strategy is not hard to understand: hit the Canadians hard in the pocket book; and wait for them to come to the table and sue for “peace”.

**SOME PROBLEMS**

There are a few problems with this scenario.

The first is that the North American supply of wood is not a closed shop. We live in a rapidly shrinking world economy, and there are many producers of wood: in Scandinavia, in the Baltic countries, in Russia, in Chile, the list goes on. These producers have increased their market share as Canada’s has shrunk. This increased supply has had a predictable result – prices have been at rock bottom levels, despite the unusually strong demand for wood in the US. This has meant that it is not just Canadian producers who have been hurt; American producers are also hurting, and hurting badly.

The second is that we have both the North American Free Trade Agreement and the World Trade Organization in place – and they are supposed to ensure that trade is not simply governed by the whims of the most powerful. Rules are meant to be there to protect countries like Canada, whose prosperity depends on access to foreign markets. Without this access our standard of living would be cut in half. We are a trading country and have no choice but to insist that the rules of trade be applied fairly and firmly.

Canada and the Canadian industry have, quite rightly, taken their case to both NAFTA and the WTO, and our case is a good one. The Canadian industry is not subsidized. We are not dumping into the American market. We are supplying our American customers with quality products at competitive prices. Our prices are competitive because we have more wood than the Americans, because our costs are lower, and because our productivity is higher. Our forest management practices have been consistently improving over the last several years. Provincial governments understand that a sustainable forest industry depends on sound forest management and insist on strong environmental practices by the industry.

**DIVIDE AND CONQUER**

There are in fact two parallel processes under way in Washington: the first, the so-called “Aldonas process”, is focussed on the question of the policy changes that Canadian provinces could make to allow the US government to publicly indicate how these changes could eventually affect the countervailing duties that have been imposed; the second is direct discussions, involving senior CEOs on both sides of the border, about an “interim agreement” that would replace the countervailing duties in the short term.

The Americans have always taken a “divide and conquer” approach to this dispute – divide the provinces among themselves, divide the industry, keep pummelling with force majeure until someone sues for peace. We have met this approach this time.
by going to litigation in the courts that are supposed to be there for us. The importance of these cases is that they will produce rules that will govern our long-term trading relationship with the US.

The Aldonas process, in a sense, is not a negotiation, it is more of a consultation that is designed to allow the US administration to take note of the kinds of policy initiatives that are underway in Canada, and that the provinces decide make good policy sense. Both the provinces and the industry have to make a thorough analysis of the costs and implications of these changes.

NOT AN IDEOLOGICAL ISSUE

On the interim agreement, this is a practical, and not an ideological issue. If a negotiated solution can produce a practical result that offsets the risks and dangers associated with the current dispute, then it should be explored and discussed. But there should not be a rush to a deal whose costs and consequences are too high, and where we could be hit in a short time with yet another set of punishing taxes and duties from the US. Our cases at NAFTA and the WTO are well reasoned and well based. We certainly have nothing to fear from their proceeding to a conclusion in the next few months.

The lumber dispute is not new. Is there an end in sight? No one can promise that, because the issues of price and market share lie at its heart. The North American industry has much to gain from taking a more productive approach. The industry is not closed – we have competition from other countries and other products – and that reality should help to discipline everyone to come up with solutions that are firmly based in market realities: companies that can produce a good product at a competitive price should do better than companies that have a lesser quality product at a higher price. That is the logic that should prevail, not which companies have more lobbying power in Washington.

The Hon. Bob Rae, P.C., O.C., Q.C., LL.D.
is Chairman of the Board of The Canadian Unity Council. He is counsel to the Free Trade Lumber Council and a partner at Goodmans LLP.
Mr Rae is a former Premier of Ontario.
Free Trade in Principle and in Practice

**FIGURE 7** SHOULD CANADA EXPORT ITS FRESH WATER?

![Bar chart showing approval and disapproval of water exports]

**SAMPLE A: CANADA ALLOWING EXPORT OF LARGE QUANTITIES OF ITS FRESH WATER**

**SAMPLE B: GOVERNMENT LICENSING / REGULATING COMPANIES TO EXPORT FRESH WATER**

July 2002: Canada has large reserves of fresh water. **(Sample A)** There has been some discussion of allowing this water to be sold in bulk to foreign countries. *Would you approve or disapprove of allowing the export of large quantities of Canadian fresh water? Would that be strongly or somewhat? (Sample B)* Some say that the government should issue licenses to companies to allow them to sell some of this water in bulk to foreign countries, provided they follow the appropriate environmental regulations. *Would you approve or disapprove of the government licensing companies to export some Canadian fresh water? Would that be strongly or somewhat?*

Canadians have a remarkably open mind about expanding the scope of Canada-US free trade. A slight majority support a common currency for the two countries, and 63% favour free trade for labour, as well as for goods and services. However, there are limits to how far Canadians are prepared to go. Surveys show that a majority rejects the option of Canada adopting the US dollar as its currency. While the notion of a common currency implies some sort of two-way partnership, the adoption of the US dollar strikes too many as a one-way shift on Canada’s part to conform to the US model. And Canadians are categorically opposed to bulk water exports. Even when reassured that exports would be subject to government license and environmental regulation, about two-thirds remain opposed.
Managing The Border

April 2002: Some people say that Canada and the United States [the United States and Canada] should adopt a common border security policy and follow the same set of rules when deciding who can or cannot enter either country. Which of the following statements is closest to your view? (a) A common border-security policy is a good idea because it will increase the security of both countries; or (b) A common border-security policy is a bad idea because Canada will have to give the United States [the United States will have to give Canada] some say in our border-security policy.

April 2002: And still thinking about the Canada-US border, which of the following two goals should be the most important for the Canadian and American governments? (a) Making sure that the products we trade can move easily across the Canadian-American border; or (b) Making sure that border security is improved to help keep undesirable people out of Canada and the United States?

Thinking about the Canada-US border changed radically after the terrorists attacks on September 11, 2001. Up until that day, many commentators were advancing the idea that the movement of people and goods across the border should be made much easier. Many Canadians seemed to agree. In October 2000, while a majority opposed the idea of allowing Canadians and Americans to move freely across the border without having to report to a Customs and Immigration post, a significant number (44%) were in favour. A year later, however, the number in favour fell to 33%, and attention turned to the issue of security. In early 2002, a majority of both Canadians and Americans said that improving border security was more important than facilitating the movement of goods between both countries. This shared focus on security underlay public support for a common Canada-US border security policy, with only three in ten Canadians saying that such a policy would be a bad idea because it would mean giving the US a say in Canadian policy-making.
Managing The Border

Notes for an Address by the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney
to the Investment Dealers Association of Canada, La Malbaie, Quebec, June 18, 2001.

There are actions that leaders in business, government and the non-profit sector can take that will give Canadians the critical edge they need to be globally competitive.

These include recommendations made by a number of public policy analysts and expert commentators who truly understand the importance of clear sighted action:....

Move the FTA to a second stage that would strengthen the perimeter around North America and ensure unrestricted movement within the North American market for people as well as goods and services. This will require commitments to common approaches on issues ranging from tariffs to customs, immigration and defence...

Let’s look at our border with the United States, where the volume of trade has tripled over the last decade, and where the border infrastructure is hopelessly overloaded. 70% of goods cross the border by truck; but fully 90% of Canada-US road traffic crosses at only 11 ports of entry.

As Canada’s Ambassador to the US, Michael Kergin noted in a recent address to the Economic Club of Detroit: “Tariffs are way down, but the costs associated with crossing the border are rising.”

One US study indicates that the cost of time delays, paper work and other aspects of compliance add 5-7% of the cost of cross border shipments, a silent tax....

Clearly, we need to improve our cross-border infrastructure. We also need to have a hard and unemotional look at the question of the border itself:....

If the 15 nations of the European Union can operate a seamless customs union, and they do, why shouldn’t Canada and the United States, the two largest trading partners in the world?

This is the major issue of trade policy facing our two countries today, and addressing it successfully will require imagination and innovation on both sides of the border.

A German can fly to the UK without immigration delays or inspections, with neither country losing “sovereignty”. Why should a Canadian flying to New York or Los Angeles or Miami not be placed in the same position?

Brian Mulroney was Prime Minister of Canada from 1984 to 1993.
A complete text of this speech is available online at http://www.ida.ca/Files/Media/AnnualConf/2001/Speeches/2001MulroneySpeech_en.pdf.
Canada’s military relationship with the US has been controversial throughout the post-war period. In the early 1960s, the question of whether or not Canada should allow the US to position nuclear weapons on Canadian soil sparked intense debate, and became a heated election issue. In the 1980s, the testing of US cruise missiles over Canadian territory sparked public protest. On several occasions, Canada has had to decide whether to participate in US-led military actions overseas. Public opinion research points up the lack of consensus on these matters. About half of Canadians are satisfied with the state of military relations between the two countries, but the other half is divided over whether they should be closer or more distant. Similarly, Canadians are more or less evenly divided on whether or not Canada should take a more independent approach to its partnership with the US in matters of security or diplomacy. This difference of opinion, however, does not necessarily amount to fractious polarization; the gulf separating the majority of those on different sides of the issue is not necessarily that wide. Nor does it prevent a majority from supporting specific proposals on Canada-US military cooperation that would enhance Canada’s security. This can be seen in responses to a question regarding NORTHCOM. The only certain conclusion is that Canada’s military relationship with its superpower neighbour is likely to remain a periodic flash-point for political debate for the foreseeable future.

Considering military relations between Canada and the US, which do you think would be best for Canada: closer military relations with the US than we have now, less close military relations, or about the same as now?

*Source: Environics Focus Canada / Canadian Opinion Research Archive, Queen’s University.

July 2002: The United States recently announced the creation of a new military command structure – called NORTHCOM – to look after the security of all of North America. It is expected that Canada will be asked to join NORTHCOM, which would mean that the Canadian armed forces would work more closely with those of the US. Which of the following statements about NORTHCOM is closer to your own view: (Note: split sample.)
### TABLE 3  THE US AND ITS ALLIES: CLOSE PARTNERSHIP OR GREATER INDEPENDENCE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>As Close As Now (%)</th>
<th>More Independent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>October 2002</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Source: CRIC.
The Canadian Government appears poised to participate in the American national missile defence system. This decision has been the subject of acrimonious debate both within the government and Canadian society. Much of the debate has centred on the international impact of the development of the missile system.

One of the most common arguments presented in favour of Canadian involvement is that if Canada does not take part, the United States will penalize Canada. The most common concern is over the future of NORAD. If Canada does not join the missile defence system, some fear that the United States will dissolve NORAD. Many Canadian critics see such a threat as an attack on Canadian sovereignty.

It is clear to most observers, however, that the United States does not intend to pressure Canada to join in the missile defence program. Since the American government announced its intention to develop the system, the Canadian government has not been able to decide on its response. In that time, the American administration has made no statements critical of the Canadian government on this issue. Moreover, there are no indications that undue pressure has been brought to bear on Canada.

US COULD REDESIGN NORAD

However, the Americans have made it clear that they are able and willing to redesign NORAD to ensure that Canadian indecision does not hinder their efforts. This was made clear when Space Command was moved from NORAD to Strategic Command. This means that Canadian officials are no longer privy to the actions and thinking of this important branch of the American forces. Nor will Canada have as clear an understanding of American space policy as they once did. The United States will not disband NORAD. The tragic events of September 11 underscore the joint benefit of maintaining the surveillance of continental airspace as a shared responsibility. But the United States has also made it clear that it will not automatically include Canada in the planning process of its space defence.

The threat to Canada is not possible American bullying of Ottawa; it is American indifference. If the United States finds that it does not need Canada in the development of its missile defence, and sees that Canada is reluctant to take part, it may simply go it alone. The moment that the United States no longer feels obligated to include Canada in this new frontier is the time that Canadian defence policy will truly face major challenges.

Without the willingness of the United States to include Canada in its policy regarding outer space over North America, Canada will face two choices:

- develop its own means of national surveillance, and the capability to respond to threats from this emerging strategic area;
- hope that the United States will provide for its protection but without Canadian input.

The first option means that Canadians can expect hugely increased defence expenditures. Operations in space are very expensive. If the second option is followed, Canada will be surrendering much of its national sovereignty to the United States, without any way to influence American decisions. Neither choice is appealing.

What should concern Canadians is not American pressure tactics, but that the United States will simply stop caring about what they think when it comes to defending outer space over North America.

Rob Huebert Ph.D. is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science and is the Associate Director of the Centre of Military and Strategic Studies at the University of Calgary.
Where has Canada gone? The question was emblazoned on a recent cover of the Canadian edition of Time Magazine. The magazine wondered whether Canada’s decision not to join the war against Iraq was a symptom of the country’s growing irrelevance on the world stage. Successive polls made it abundantly clear that most Canadians had deep reservations about the war. Even as war loomed, they remained much less likely than Americans to say that it was necessary to resort to military force to disarm Iraq. Opposition to Canada’s involvement in the war never wavered. In fact, the Focus Canada surveys conducted by Environics showed that opposition to Canada’s participation in a US-led intervention in Iraq, in the absence of UN approval, grew consistently from 52% in the spring of 2002 to 65% in March 2003, after the war was launched.

What explains this attitude? While some commentators talked of the country’s declining influence, others detected a strong tone of anti-Americanism beneath the surface of Canadian anti-war sentiment. What both these schools of thought missed is the simple truth that for most, the case for war simply was not made in a manner that resonated with Canadian values. Canadians are very committed to addressing challenges by working with the international community through the offices of such organizations as the United Nations. During the build-up to the Iraq conflict and the actual war, the Canadian public remained faithful to its commitment to international activism in terms of peacekeeping, foreign aid, aid to refugees, and support for international institutions. As research data show, Canadians are notably more supportive of the UN and of foreign aid than their American neighbours.
The diplomatic crisis that preceded the US-led war on Iraq reawakened an issue that has haunted Canadian foreign policy makers since the First World War: that of a population divided along linguistic lines on matters of foreign military intervention. Since the early 1990s, it looked as though the gap between anglophone and francophone public opinion was narrowing, almost to the point of closing altogether in the case of the war in Kosovo. Beginning in the fall of 2002, however, the majority of polls, along with the war protests in Montreal last February and March, seemed to suggest that the split was still there. What is really going on? A look at the available data shows a picture that is far less cut and dried.

Unquestionably, there is a marked difference in the way Quebecers and other Canadians view security issues. However, it is equally important to note that the overall trends are the same in both groups. While Quebecers’ opinions may be more pronounced and enduring than those of their fellow Canadians, there is not necessarily a conflict between the viewpoints of the two groups. In fact, on most of the questions asked by pollsters, the majority opinion in both groups clearly flows in the same direction. This is as true of our relations with the United States (questions on Northcom or shared values), as it is of the relevance of the UN, or its role in the crisis in Iraq. In short, the data suggest that current differences of opinion between Quebecers and other Canadians have absolutely no bearing on the ones that divided the two communities during both world wars!

This is an important point in that it challenges the attempts of political spin-doctors to offer their own take on the protests and poll results. There were plenty of ridiculous statements made: critics of the federal Liberals accusing the Chrétien Government of siding with Quebecers (who were going to the polls in early April); Bernard Landry calling them yet another expression of the “distinct society”; certain members of the English-speaking community denouncing, in veiled terms, what they saw as a new “act of treason” by francophones; and US pundits blaming it on the long arm of France in Quebec.

That said, the fact remains that Quebecers express their views much more strongly than do their fellow Canadians, and that distinction demands explanation. The first reason that comes to mind is of a historical or cultural nature: Quebecers have a different attitude towards war, because they have seen little evidence of force as a viable solution to their problems. On the contrary, from the Metis uprising to the 1970 October crisis, Quebecers have seen the army as an instrument of domination and a bastion of English-speaking culture. While this argument still has some pertinence, it is clearly not sufficient in that it does not explain the increasing convergence of opinion.

Where military matters are concerned, Quebec public opinion has evolved considerably in recent years. Peacekeeping missions, the Oka crisis of 1990, and the 1998 ice storm clearly have played a part in that. The war in Kosovo also showed us that Quebecers are willing to massively support a military operation abroad when they feel it is warranted.

All of this suggests that the differences observed in 2002-2003 likely have more to do with situational than structural factors. For example, the divergence of opinion could be the result of a different perception of what is at stake. Canadians outside Quebec are more exposed to American ideas and admonishments, and perhaps are even more sensitive to the concerns of the American public. They are more likely to accept (albeit sometimes rather reluctantly) prevalent opinion in the United States.
The most interesting aspect of these polls is not the continued presence of a century-old cleavage but the fact that this situation is changing, the gap closing. New, more sophisticated explanations that go beyond old clichés, are needed to explain this phenomenon.

Stéphane Roussel is a professor of political science at the Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada Research Chair in Canadian Foreign and Defense Policy); Michel Fortmann is a professor of political science at the Université de Montréal (Research Group in International Security).

**Figure 13** United Nations and World Peace

March 2003: Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly?

**Figure 14** Support for UN Peacekeeping

March 2003: Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly?

c) When the United Nations needs peacekeeping troops, Canada/U.S. should provide some of its soldiers.
Canada and the United Nations: Why We Must Lead the Movement for Reform
by Flora MacDonald

I am reassured by the fact that Canadians are very supportive of the United Nations. Canadians feel strongly about the United Nations because we were there at its founding, and played a key role later, particularly in the development of the Charter. It is something that succeeding generations of Canadians have pointed to with pride.

The United Nations arose out of a need for some institution that would focus on the maintenance of peace and security. Over the years, the emphasis on peace and security was enlarged in the search for cooperation at the global level. Unfortunately, this element is now missing; there is an urgent need to recapture it. These days, you hear less about global cooperation and more about the pursuit of a global view as espoused by a single country.

A great many Canadians understood this single-country pursuit, right from the outset of the situation in Iraq. They, and many others around the world, felt that an invasion of Iraq would lead, not to wider cooperation, but could, in fact, throw the whole Middle East into even greater turmoil. And that’s exactly what has happened.

How does the West, whose peoples do not always comprehend the interests and needs of other parts of the world, narrow the gulf that has opened? Surely that is why we have a United Nations. But it needs to be reformed. There are not enough countries speaking out about the need to strengthen the UN. Those who believe in it have to be much more active in demanding reforms, especially reforms that would make it more representative.

Changing the structure of the Security Council, and the way it works, would be a good first step towards a reformed UN. The five permanent members of the Security Council – the US, France, the UK, China, and the Russian Federation – have veto powers. There is no similar representation from countries such as Brazil, or India or from any African country. The current arrangement reflects the realities of 1945, not those of 2003. Often the United States dominates the Security Council by threatening to pick up its marbles and go home, if it doesn’t get its way. This imbalance is the reason that the United Nations must be reformed to make it a more relevant institution.

Canada could gain status in the world if it were to play a leading role in this process. Today, our relations with certain countries are not as good as they once were, because of cutbacks in our foreign aid and defence expenditures. Fortunately, we still have fairly good relations with many countries. We can take advantage of this by actively pursuing reform of the United Nations. I think it is a moral imperative to do so.

Some will argue that this course of action will further strain our relations with the United States. They will argue that our refusal to take part in the invasion of Iraq already sits badly with the Americans. Perhaps, but there are many Americans who themselves disagree with Washington’s foreign policy direction. They would welcome a credible friendly power that seeks a different and more cooperative approach. As friends and allies of the US, we can either become an uncritical supporter, or we can pursue our own foreign policy in a way that is best for Canada and that helps us play a helpful role in the world.

I believe that Canada has to play its own role in the world. It can do this by becoming an advocate for reform of the one institution through which international cooperation and understanding can be achieved – the United Nations.
The Hon. Flora MacDonald is President of Partnership Africa-Canada, the World Federalist Movement of Canada, the Shastri-Indo-Canada Advisory Council, and is a program advisor for Care Canada. She served as Secretary of State for External Affairs in the government of former Prime Minister Joe Clark. She served as Minister of Employment and Immigration, then as Minister of Communications and Culture in the government of former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. She was appointed an Officer of the Order of Canada in 1992 in recognition of her humanitarian work, and then promoted to the rank of Companion in 1998.
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The graph shows the support for UN peacekeeping from 1980 to 2003. In 1980, 70% agreed, 19% disagreed, 10% neither, and 1% didn’t know. In 2003, 89% agreed, 10% disagreed, 1% neither, and 0% didn’t know.

*Source: Environics Focus Canada / Canadian Opinion Research Archive, Queen’s University.

March 2003: Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly?

The graph shows the focus on home vs. giving foreign aid. In Canada, 63% agree, 35% disagree, 1% neither, and 0% didn’t know. In the U.S., 84% agree, 14% disagree, 2% neither, and 0% didn’t know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>CANADIAN AND AMERICAN ATTITUDES ON FOREIGN AID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Do you think Canada spends too much money assisting poor countries around the world, the right amount, or not enough money?”</strong></td>
<td>Canada 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Environics Focus Canada, March, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Turning to the issue of foreign aid, do you think the United States is now spending too little on foreign aid, about the right amount, or too much on foreign aid?”</strong></td>
<td>US 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6</th>
<th>CANADIAN AND AMERICAN ATTITUDES ON IMMIGRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you think Canada should accept more immigrants, fewer immigrants, or about the same number as we accept now?</strong></td>
<td>Canada 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: CRIC, July 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In your view, should immigration be kept as its present level, increased or decreased?</strong></td>
<td>US 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Gallup, June 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 2002: Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements: a) Canadians and Americans basically have the same values.

March 2003: For each of the following statements please tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat or disagree strongly? e) Canada/the United States ought to be accepting more immigrants from those parts of the world which are experiencing major conflicts.
Do Canadians and Americans hold the same fundamental values? Most Canadians say no, suggesting that they believe there are important differences between the two countries. The evidence regarding attitudes to issues ranging from foreign aid, to immigration, to homosexuality suggests that these differences are very real. This is not to say that differences of opinion exist on every question, or that in each case the differences are remarkably large. What it suggests is that Canadians rightfully can claim a measure of distinctiveness. They want to maintain this distinctiveness. Only one in ten thinks Canada should become more like the United States. At the same time, however, most do not want the two countries to grow more distant from one another. Almost half of Canadians are satisfied with the current relationship. The other half are divided evenly between those who want closer ties between the two countries, and those who want more distance.

Fire, Ice and Foreign Policy
by Michael Adams

Nothing in history is inevitable. But I believe both the decision of the US government to invade Iraq, and the decision of the Canadian government not to join in, make sense in the context of the increasingly divergent values of the people of the two nations.

Since the early 1980s in Canada, and the early 1990s in the United States, my colleagues and I have been measuring and tracking the social values of North Americans – the ideas that motivate people to behave the way they do in their roles as parents, employees, consumers and citizens.

Our research was conducted before the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and before the United States, in defiance of the United Nations Security Council, led a war of regime change in Iraq.

Even before these events, our research was showing us the cultural seeds of divergent American and Canadian decisions. In 41 of the 56 comparable trends in our data, we found strong evidence of diverging values in Canada and the US. On 24 trends, the gap actually widened between 1992 and 2000. At a time when the political, economic and technological forces of globalization suggested Canada and the United States should be converging, Canadians’ social values were becoming more distinct from those of Americans.

The portrait of these two distinct societies starts with a comparison of their religious convictions.

Christian fundamentalism has far deeper roots in the United States, particularly in the Bible Belt, than in Canada. Yet not so long ago, we were more conventionally religious. In the mid-1950s, 60 per cent of Canadians told pollsters they went to church each Sunday; the proportion in the US then was only 50 per cent. Today, only a fifth of Canadians claim weekly church attendance, whereas the proportion in the US is four in 10.
Since the 1950s, many Canadians have begun to replace traditional religious authority with either secular humanism or more personal spirituality. Americans, unlike Canadians and Europeans, seem to cling to institutions, particularly religious institutions as anchors in a chaotic, Darwinian society.

Asked whether decisions in an organization should be made by one person or as many people as possible, 28 per cent of Canadians in 1996 preferred one person. We found a similar proportion in 2000. In the US, the story was marginally different in 1996 (31 per cent wanted the leader to make the decisions), but significantly different in 2000 when 38 per cent wanted the boss to decide.

All this deference to authority, south of the border, was registered before 9/11. After 9/11, the proportion of Americans wanting their commander-in-chief to take change went through the roof. Canada has seen no similar surge in support for dirigiste leadership.

American deference to patriarchal and hierarchical authority in the hyperpatriotic post-9/11 environment has led to much rallying about the flag. Even half of Democrats polled feel it is unpatriotic to question their President, and the American Civil Liberties Union warns of a climate of severely muffled dissent and debate in that country.

Canada has a leader of the opposition whose job it is to question the prime minister and his government. Not questioning the prime minister is seen as a failure if not of democratic verve, then of intelligence. Who is the leader of the opposition in the United States?

In American politics, to quote political sociologist Ben Wattenberg, "Values matter most." The strongest values of Bush supporters in the 2000 campaign in our research had to do with family, ethics, religiosity, duty and propriety. With 9/11, Bush suddenly was in a presidential role not seen since Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbour.

North of the border, Canadians responded to 9/11 with heartfelt sympathy and outrage. They supported participation in the war on terrorism. However, like many around the world, they did not think the US government had made a convincing case for the invasion of Iraq. Moreover, they were determined to support the UN. The individual autonomy Canadians wanted for themselves they also wanted for their government.

The widening gap between the values of ordinary Canadians and Americans – and between the governments of both societies – have never been more apparent.

Michael Adams is the president of the Environics group of companies and author of Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values, published by Penguin in the spring of 2003.
Values

**FIGURE 21 | CANADA’S TIES WITH THE US**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPRING 2001</th>
<th>AUTUMN 2001</th>
<th>SUMMER 2002</th>
<th>SPRING 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Distant</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think Canada should have much closer ties to the U.S., somewhat closer, about the same as now, somewhat more distant or much more distant ties to the U.S. than it has now?

**FIGURE 22 | IS UNION WITH THE U.S. INEVITABLE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964*</th>
<th>2001 (MARCH)</th>
<th>2002 (JULY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Inevitable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Not Inevitable</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that it is just a matter of time before Canada and the United States join together; in other words, do you think that a political union [1964 & 2001: “the union”] between the two countries is inevitable?

*Source: Social Research Group/Dr. Maurice Pinard*
Notes on CRIC Surveys

April 2002 – Canada-US Survey: Commissioned by CRIC, The School of Urban and Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Arlington, and Publius: The Journal of Federalism. Telephone survey of 1,001 adult Canadians conducted between April 11 and April 19, 2002, and of 1,036 adult Americans conducted between April 12 and 14, 2002, by RoperASW. Surveys of this size have a 95% probability of being accurate to within 3% (plus or minus).

July 2002 – CRIC BorderLines I: Results from a CRIC survey conducted by Environics Research Group. 2,002 adult Canadians were surveyed by telephone between June 25 and July 16, 2002. Results of a survey of this size have a 95% probability of being accurate to within 2.2% (plus or minus).

October 2002 – CRIC BorderLines II: Results from a CRIC survey conducted by Environics Research Group and CROP. 2,939 adult Canadians were surveyed by telephone between September 27 and October 16, 2002. Results of a survey of this size have a 95% probability of being accurate to within 1.8% (plus or minus).

March 2003 – CRIC Survey on International Affairs: Two surveys were conducted on behalf of CRIC. In Canada, 2,012 adults were surveyed by Environics Research Group between March 7 and March 27, 2003. A survey of this size has a 95% probability of being accurate to within 2.2% (plus or minus). In the United States, Tele-Nation surveyed 1,004 adults between March 14 and 16. A survey of this size has a 95% probability of being accurate to within 3.1% (plus or minus).

For information on other CRIC surveys cited in this paper, see www.cric.ca.
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