- In 1972 there was a far greater coincidence between Canadian national interests and international environmental concerns (e.g. on marine pollution and fisheries, on Arctic jurisdiction, on the use and management of global commons). In 1992 there is a much larger gap between our domestic policies and our international posture on several crucial sustainable development issues (e.g. energy, agriculture, forestry and indigenous peoples); and action on the UNCED agenda will require much greater changes in our domestic policies in those sectors.
- In 1972 Canada had a relatively unblemished record on international environmental concerns. Today Canada is undergoing international scrutiny and criticism concerning its high consumption of fossil fuels, clear cutting of old growth forest, agricultural subsidies and the political and economic rights of indigenous peoples. These questions received only incidental discussion at the Stockholm Conference but are now major worldwide concerns.
- In 1972, the Canadian economy was relatively healthy and national unity was not seen to be in crisis. In 1992, these are the two major issues on the domestic agenda.
- In preparing for the 1972 Stockholm Conference there was a great deal of interdepartmental and federal-provincial cooperation, with few major differences or conflicts between them. In 1992 there exists a range of differences between the federal and provincial governments and within and among the key economic and sectoral agencies on domestic policy issues (e.g. forestry, agriculture) and several global issues (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions, international trade).
- The Canadian energy, agriculture, forestry and other industries are also taking widely divergent positions today and deploying new, vigorous and politically influential lobbying groups to ensure that their views are known and incorporated into Canadian positions. At the same time, opposing NGOS are much more professional as well.
- In 1972 none of the central economic or key sectoral agencies felt particularly concerned or threatened by the newly emerging environment agenda. Today most of the central economic and key sectoral agencies are concerned about the new sustainable development agenda but none have yet embraced it. Sustainable development has not been incorporated into Canadian budgetary policy.
- Canada's approach to Stockholm was driven in large measure by our concerns over sovereignty in the Arctic and against tanker pollution on our shores. Much of this effort was directed towards finding multilateral solutions for bilateral problems with the USA. One of the principal achievements of Stockholm was to demonstrate that