

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
NOVEMBER 14, 1977



STATEMENT DISCOURS

SECRETARY
OF STATE
FOR EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS.

SECRÉTAIRE
D'ÉTAT AUX
AFFAIRES
EXTÉRIEURES.

NOTES FOR REMARKS BY THE
SECRETARY OF STATE
FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
THE HONOURABLE DON JAMIESON,
TO THE ROTARY CLUB OF
WINDSOR, ONTARIO,
NOVEMBER 14, 1977

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
AFFAIRES EXTERIEURES
OTTAWA
NOV 22 1977
LIBRARY / BIBLIOTHÈQUE

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to discuss with Canadian and American Rotarians some aspects of my country's relations with the United States. It is especially appropriate because Rotary has done so much to promote friendly relations between our two countries and indeed among all nations of the world in which Rotary is located. Rotary, itself, is an important element in the extensive private exchange between our countries, an exchange between people, families, companies and communities such as Detroit and Windsor. The Rotary motto "Service before Self" is an operational philosophy that provides an inspiring example for all persons engaged in public service.

I am especially pleased, of course, to be in Windsor, an important industrial and service centre and perhaps the only Canadian city in which an American audience may be referred to as our "neighbours from the north". So welcome to all our American friends to Canada's most southern city.

The world we live in is a challenging place and I want to talk about some of these challenges today and their effect on Canada/USA relations.

Never in the history of our two countries have we faced more difficult and complex problems; yet relations between Canada and the United States have seldom been better than they are to-day. To be sure there are tensions and still unresolved issues of great importance, but there is no bitterness, no sense of confrontation. Rather there is a strong and mutually shared commitment to consultation and co-operation and the results are obvious.

The northern pipeline treaty, involving the biggest project of its kind in world history, was negotiated in surprisingly short order, despite dire predictions to the contrary. Several key issues involving the St. Lawrence Seaway were settled without recourse to formal legal proceedings. The contentious Garrison Diversion is to be modified to allay Canada's legitimate concerns and the International Joint Commission has again demonstrated its worth in dealing with this and other environmental problems, some in the Detroit-Windsor area.

Only a few months have passed since our two countries declared the 200 mile off-shore limit but already Canada and the United States have accepted the concept of joint management of fish stocks and our negotiators are making good progress towards a permanent boundary settlement. All of these developments and many more have occurred during 1977; a very good record for two countries whose governments and people are involved in literally thousands of transactions every day.

A Windsor-Detroit audience does not need detailed reminders of the extent of our inter-dependence but a few statistics are in order. Canada and the United States do more business together than any other two countries on earth. American exports to Canada equal those to all of the European Economic Community and are two and a half times US exports to Japan. Canadian cross-border sales dwarf our exports to the rest of the world with Canadian auto sales alone worth one and a half times everything we send to the EEC.

And raw statistics tell only part of the story. Because of the intricate economic linkages, an improvement in the Canadian economy benefits the United States far more than a comparable rise in any other country or region; the reverse is equally true - in spades. It is not by choice only that we co-operate to fight to-day's major economic problems; it is a matter of necessity. Neither country can enjoy real economic health while the other is ailing; nor can one nation remain insensitive for long to the other's legitimate concerns.

I have told of some of the major success stories in our relationship this year. A balanced view requires that I take note of some still unresolved problems. There is the matter of West Coast tanker traffic, our still somewhat differing views on a suitable regime to govern sea-bed mining, the irritating and potentially very serious issue involving the extraterritorial application to Canada and Canadians of American law and the negative impact of the US convention tax on a Canadian travel industry already suffering a deficit, in relation to the US, of close to a billion dollars annually.

This audience is very familiar with the auto pact and I suspect that few from either side of the border would seriously advocate its abandonment. Yet, there continues to be obvious short-comings in the arrangement. For instance, in 1976, Canada had a deficit in auto parts of 2½ billion dollars, only partially off-set by a surplus of 1½ billion in finished automobiles. Canadian agriculture encounters problems from time to time, often in the non-tariff barrier field.

There are, of course, grievances on the American side also; border television is an example of which you in this region are well aware. There are US complaints on occasion, about the application of our Foreign Investment Review Act and with actions by some of our provinces and the federal government in the resource sector.

On virtually all of these issues, negotiations are continuing and I can report with satisfaction that there is across-the-board progress towards resolution. This is yet another mark of the good state of Canada-US relations, for in to-day's troubled economic times, countries usually move instinctively towards isolation, protection and confrontation.

I have touched on only a few of the many bilateral matters of common concern. No one speech can cover the full range of Canada-United States relations. Even if it could, we can be certain that before the words were uttered, new elements would be added and other no longer relevant issues deleted. Such is the nature of one of the most complex and dynamic bilateral associations in the world.

Despite this ever-changing pattern there are, nevertheless, certain constants in the relationship, most of them highly desirable and positive but a few, as we have seen, that produce on-going, inevitable tensions. These call for constant attention and mutual sensitivity if they are to be kept within manageable limits.

When speaking of our common interests and characteristics, the temptation to indulge in high-blown rhetoric is almost irresistible. By any measurement, ours

is a remarkable and unique example to the world. In my extensive travels, I have found nothing in either the developed or the developing world that comes even remotely close. Quite the contrary. Good neighborliness and mutual trust between nations are rare ingredients indeed on this tragically troubled planet.

Although I have discovered that there are many around the world who think otherwise, good Canada-United States' relations are not something we inherited automatically along with our North American domiciles. We have had to work at it; we must still work at it. Otherwise minor irritants, of which there must be many thousands between Canadians and Americans in the run of a year would soon accumulate and merge into a general feeling of antipathy and even bitterness. This is the fact, and the example we can convey in our international relations.

In our dealings with the world community, there is little real difference in the ultimate goals of Canada and the United States. This is not only because we consult on and co-ordinate many of our foreign policy initiatives. It is also because, instinctively, we perceive international problems in the same way and usually arrive independently at the same conclusions. The essential difference which can create difficulties, is that the United States is a superpower while Canada's ability to influence and shape events is much more limited.

Middle East leaders told me last week that the United States holds 90% of the cards needed to resolve the torment of that troubled region. The same was said by some regarding Cyprus and the various African conflicts. That does not leave much leverage or influence for the rest of us, including Canada; especially when in other places and at other times that other super-power, the Soviet Union, plays the principal role.

It would be easy for Canada to become a mere rubber stamp for American foreign policy, especially since, as I have noted, our objectives and interests so frequently coincide. Easy, no doubt, but most unwise from the standpoints of both our countries.

Canada is a great and sovereign country in its own right. We must be free to make our own decisions and policies and to differ with the United States when we feel this to be necessary. Also, Canadian interests are not always squarely on all fours with those of the United States. There are and will continue to be times when what we are seeking, and need to achieve, will diverge from American objectives and when we pursue different courses, we must do so openly and with a full understanding of each others' points of view.

Canada is deeply conscious of the world leadership burden the United States is called upon to carry. We know that in this position the inter-relationship between important issues is incredibly intricate. Citizens of both our countries are not sufficiently aware sometimes that international issues are not a series of individual water-tight compartments. Proposed solutions for one problem may be perfectly logical in that case but their application would serve only to exacerbate another equally serious difficulty. When a smaller country or region, or even groups of people within our own countries, have a special interest in only one element of the inter-locking global puzzle, it is not always easy for them to comprehend the failure to advance on the particular and narrow front of their concern. They fail to see sometimes the mutual exclusivity of individual initiatives each of which may be eminently sensible in its own right.

In terms of Canada-US relations in the international field, this is an ever present fact of life. Because Canada does not have the same global responsibilities and range of interests, there are times when we find it difficult to stay in concert with the United States. There are many such examples but I will mention just one because it is current and of overriding importance.

The threat of nuclear proliferation is a growing danger to the very survival of mankind. Canada and the United States, as well as many other countries, are as one in recognizing this frightful danger. We are even agreed in theory on what should be done about it and I should emphasize that on many aspects of the problem there are encouraging signs of progress.

Canada is a world leader in the fields of nuclear material supplies and technology. We believe that nuclear energy properly controlled and safeguarded offers one of the best hopes for a resolution of the present global energy crisis. In this, too, our capabilities and our convictions do not depart significantly from those of the United States.

Over recent years, Canada has moved progressively to establish what is today the most stringent nuclear policy on exports of any country in the world, including the United States. But though we have shown leadership in the nuclear field, the effectiveness of our policy will remain limited and even perhaps counter-productive until there is a wider degree of international agreement on technology and safeguards than exists at present.

It is of the utmost importance that like-minded nuclear supplier countries arrive at a common policy on this issue and that Canada and the United States, in particular, do not get out of phase in their efforts. We are working very closely to avoid this possibility but for the complex global policy reasons I have mentioned with which the United States must cope, and for equally complex though sometime different reasons affecting Canada, the achievement of a common approach to the wide range of nuclear questions represents a tremendous challenge.

I am happy to tell you that in recent days, we have reached an interim agreement with the United States covering a broad spectrum of our bilateral nuclear relations and clearing the way for further joint efforts to achieve a more effective world-wide safeguards regime.

Thus if this issue reveals the sometimes difficult nature of the Canada-US relationship, it shows as well the determination to consult and co-operate which is the mark of true friendship.

An independent foreign policy for Canada is not only a necessity for a strong and vital country, it also provides that element of credibility which gives meaning and significance to Canadian support for United States initiatives in international affairs. If the world community took it as read that Canada would always agree with the United States then Canada would be cast in the role of a mere cipher and we would be no good to anyone; least of all ourselves.

And we must be ourselves. Despite our deep and abiding friendship, we remain two distinct peoples, alike where it counts and different where it counts. For America, there has been the agony of civil war; the courageous act, one of the finest in all history, of facing up to and subduing racial intolerance and bigotry. There has been also America's remarkable resurgence after the tragedy of Viet Nam and the recent constitutional crisis; the reaffirmation of that moral strength that helped to build the United States and upon which Americans have always been able to draw in difficult and trying times.

From our side of the border, we Canadians have watched the fascinating drama of a developing, evolving America, sometimes with concern, often with admiration and even envy and always with affection. Canadians appreciate the terrible burden of world leadership the United States has assumed, the remarkable generosity it has displayed and the equanimity with which it continues to endure the harsh and often unreasonable criticism that power and leadership cannot seem to escape.

Often around the world I see and hear glaring examples of man's ingratitude and of a widespread lack of comprehension of what the United States is seeking to accomplish. Those are times when it is my pleasure to seek to put the record straight; to say "they're our neighbors and they're not like that at all."

Canada has followed its own road to nationhood; different from that of the United States but in its own way no less troubled and difficult and no less rewarding. We possess today, on our half of this North American continent, a land of proud

achievements and of incredible promise. We do not underestimate the seriousness and magnitude of our present problems or of the challenge we now face to our national unity. But Americans who have watched us for so long from their side of the border will know that our sense of national purpose remains strong; that our will and our ability to accommodate legitimate though diverse objectives has not diminished and that the determination of the great majority of Canadians of all backgrounds and in every region is to build a stronger and even more united Canada.

As we pursue this important task, we appreciate the attitude of our American friends. The total absence of any improper interference is only what we would expect from a trusted neighbor. It should be an example for others.

Indeed there is much in our relationship that others could emulate. We live in a world where trust between neighbors is in woefully short supply and where suspicion and cynicism are the principal ingredients in international dealings. How satisfying in such a climate to know that in Canada-US relations a simple phone call between Ottawa and Washington is often enough to resolve a serious problem and that a handshake can serve as well as a complex treaty.

We Canadians want to keep things that way; I am sure you Americans do too. And we will!

10
2750 H