

NOT FOR PUBLICATION BEFORE
12:00 HOURS, MARCH 20, 1975

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

STATEMENT DISCOURS

SECRETARY
OF STATE
FOR EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS.

SECRÉTAIRE
D'ÉTAT AUX
AFFAIRES
EXTÉRIEURES.



NOTES FOR A
SPEECH MADE BY THE
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
THE HONOURABLE ALLAN J. MACEachEN,
TO THE WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL
AND
NEW ENGLAND TRADE CENTRE
BOSTON, MARCH 20, 1975

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to be in Boston today to address the World Affairs Council and the New England Trade Centre. Coming as I do from Cape Breton, this area is very familiar to me. As you know, the links between the New England states and the Maritimes in Canada go back a long way in the history of our two countries. Let me cite one unusual example to show how strong the ties are. In 1917, Halifax suffered an explosion in the harbour which did terrible damage to life and property in the city. The first relief to reach the city was from Boston - in advance of the arrival of any Canadian assistance. It is something that we have not forgotten.

This northeastern region of the United States has had the longest period of contact with Canada of any region in the United States dating back even beyond the Revolution and the United Empire Loyalists. Both countries have witnessed over time significant movements of people between this region and Eastern Canada. Because of this, you are aware of one of the most fundamental aspects of life in Canada - approximately 27% of our populations speak French as their mother tongue. The importance that Canadians attach to the cultural vitality of the French fact affects the policies we develop and the way we view the rest of the world. One example is Canada's membership in both the Commonwealth and the Agence de Cooperation culturelle et technique, its francophone equivalent. There has been a tendency for Canada to be regarded from abroad as an anglophone country. That misconception is not something that would occur to you in this area. I have noticed that you have recognized your francophone neighbours by placing many signs throughout the area in both English and French. Our policies increasingly reflect Canada's bilingual and multi-cultural nature.

With such ties between us, many of you here today feel, I am sure, very familiar with Canada and the ways of Canadians. I suspect that you may also be wondering about reports of changing attitudes in Canada. Over the past year, I have noticed an increased interest in Canada among people in the United States, particularly in the media - but also in universities. Some of this interest may be because we are not acting as you might have expected us to do. Whatever the reasons, Canadians welcome this interest because we are certain that this contributes to the maintenance of a healthy relationship between Canada and the United States.

The area that I would like to talk to you about, today, concerns Canadian activities to enhance the kind of life enjoyed by Canadians. In addition to concerns about economic growth, the Canadian government has in recent years given high priority to policies that maintain and enhance the quality of life in Canada. Some of these policies do have an impact on our relations with the United States.

Let us look first at the environmental area. An important element to the quality of life is the state of our natural environment. I am referring here not simply to the desirability of having in this place or that a piece of real estate that is still in its natural state and therefore to be visited with

awe from time to time by thousands of city dwellers. Rather, I am referring to the capacity of our natural environment to renew itself while sustaining man's activities. For many years, in both our countries, we thought that that capacity was effectively unlimited. It is only in recent times, historically speaking, that we have come to understand that we can all too readily overload the assimilative capacity of the natural environment. We have also come to understand how little we know about the complex series of factors which must be kept in balance in order to ensure that the global ecosystem, of which each of us is a part, continues to function as it should.

Any observer of a world map is aware that Canada has a great deal of environment to manage and to protect. Nonetheless, despite our enormous territory, the concentration of our population and industry has given us many difficulties akin to those experiences in your own country. I can say unequivocally that we are facing these head on, and that we have made a number of decisions designed to ensure that the protection and management of our natural environment is conducted as effectively as possible. I do not have the time here to list these in detail, but I would cite one decision which is representative of others - the decision in 1971 to create a comprehensive Department of the Environment. This Department is very broad in scope. It places within one organizational structure the responsibility that the Federal Government has in such varied tasks as managing renewable resources in both the terrestrial and maritime environments, the development of regulations to abate or control pollution, the monitoring of air and water quality throughout our country, the development of what is perhaps the world's most advanced land use data bank, the assessment of the effects on the environment of major projects of many kinds, weather forecasting, and substantial research activities in support of all of these functions.

Canada is and will continue to remain an environmentally responsible neighbour. We see the United States in the same light and take pride in the serious efforts that we both have been making to manage in a responsible and creative manner those environmental issues which have transboundary implications. Let me stress that we in Canada have welcomed the opportunity to work with the United States in creating a very dynamic and beneficial bilateral environmental relationship. The United States is an acknowledged leader in this area, and together, I think we have taken actions that can serve as models for other nations.

Nonetheless, there will be problems from time to time. The proposed oil refinery at Eastport, Maine is one example that I might mention. This project of the Pittston Company could involve the passage of very large crude carriers through the Canadian waters of Head Harbour Passage to Eastport. We have examined the effect of an oil spill in these constricted waters and it is our view that the fisheries and wildlife resources of the area would have been severely affected, in addition to the appreciable aesthetic degradation which would have resulted along all the contiguous shoreline. The total annual landed value of fisheries products in the area is five million dollars, involving a labour force of roughly 1600 people. As well, the Charlotte County Islands and Passamaquoddy Bay would be at risk, even in the event of a minor oil spill. This particular area is used by a large variety of birds either for breeding or as a staging area on their migratory route to and from their prime nesting or wintering

sites. The Canadian Government concluded that there would be an unacceptable risk in the transport of a large volume of pollutants through these difficult waters and that we would oppose the passage of large crude or product carriers through Canadian waters in the area. We made these views known to the United States Government on June 7, 1973, and through the United States Government to the State of Maine. On a number of occasions since that date, we have continued to express our opposition to this project.

The Maine Environmental Protection Board has now come to a decision in the matter of the Pittston Company's application. There has not, as yet, been an opportunity for us to devote careful study to the conclusions of the Board. It would thus be premature to comment substantively on them although the general tenor of the decision seems to be encouraging to us. However, the Canadian Government's opposition to the carriage of large quantities of pollutants through Head Harbour Passage is well known. The Government will be examining the details of the Board's decision in this light.

There are a number of transboundary issues that are currently being discussed between Canada and the U.S. Several of these are in the vicinity of the border of New England and Canada. Discussion and consultation will help permit solutions to be developed in individual cases that will satisfy both Canadian and U.S. concerns. We have a long tradition of operating in this manner and we intend to bend our best efforts to maintain this tradition.

With the longest coastline in the world, Canada is very aware of the need to protect the marine environment. The sea plays an important part in the lives of many regions of Canada as it does for this region of the U.S.A. and therefore Canada has taken a great interest in questions concerning the law of the sea. I am sure you here in Boston share this concern and are also paying close attention to developments at the Third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference which resumed this week in Geneva.

Canada strongly supports the idea of a 200 mile economic zone. We think it important that we have the exclusive right to manage all living resources within the zone and that we obtain appropriate protection for the coastal state's interest in the fish stocks of the continental margin beyond 200 miles. The future of our own fishing industry depends on the effective management of these resources and on the right to reserve to our own fishermen that portion of the total resource within the zone which we have the capacity to catch.

Canada is also seeking rights in the economic zone which would provide coastal states with more extensive powers over marine pollution. In addition we have a special concern to ensure that very vulnerable areas such as ice-infested waters are protected from pollution. Canada believes that coastal states must have the authority, with appropriate safeguards, to deal with particular geographic, navigational or ecological situations not adequately covered by international rules and standards.

As you can see Canada is approaching the preservation of the marine environment issue at the Law of the Sea Conference from the perspective of a coastal state although we recognize that we have an important stake in the freedom of commerce and navigation by sea. The United States position as a great maritime power gives you a somewhat different perspective. However, both Canada and the United States are working for a successful conclusion to the Conference which will meet the very important concerns of both countries on this issue and the many other vital issues facing the Conference.

One of the most important areas that determine the quality of life in Canada is its cultural vitality. Without a vigorous and distinctive cultural life, national independence is nothing but an empty shell. Canadian concerns about our cultural survival may seem puzzling to you Americans who are about to celebrate your Bicentennial.

But although the first French settlers came to the Saint Lawrence Valley some time before the first New Englanders, Canada is in fact a much younger society. We celebrated our first centennial as a nation only seven years ago; and as a result, the maturation of our national culture is still very much under way.

This process, by virtue of Canada's history and sociology, is somewhat complex and more deliberate than your own. For example, we are committed to the cultivation of two official languages, to the preservation of regional identities, to the enhancement of our citizens' varied ethnic backgrounds, among which our native peoples, Indian and Inuit, have a very special status. In other words, we are deliberately seeking to avoid the emergence of a uniform "Canadian way of Life". The Canadian dream is one of diversity, of "multiculturalism", as we call it; and the pattern we want for our society is that of the mosaic. All this may appear somewhat bewildering for Americans, who have forged their own highly distinctive tradition in such matters. This bewilderment may be compounded by the fact that Canadians can not speak so confidently of their "manifest destiny" in cultural affairs; for the people of the United States seldom realize the tremendous cultural impact they have on Canada through television, radio, magazines, books, films and other media.

Canadian concern about this situation is not new. A Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Sciences and Letters, made recommendations in 1951 on the situation of the arts, sciences and letters in Canada at that time. The final report made the following comment in its opening section:

"American influences on Canadian life to say the least are impressive. There should be no thought of interfering with the liberty of all Canadians to enjoy them.....It cannot be denied, however, that a vast and disproportionate amount of material coming from a single alien source may stifle rather than stimulate our creative efforts....We must not be blind, however, to the very present danger of permanent dependence."

We fully recognize that this influence is friendly. Canadians welcome the opportunity of seeing and reading the best that the U.S. creates. However, Canadians also want to be able to read, hear and see themselves through our own artists, writers and entertainers. In the past, these artists have encountered great difficulties in obtaining sufficient opportunities to reach their audience. Recently, various Canadian authorities have taken steps to try to ensure that some of these problems encountered in the past were removed.

One recent area involved Canadian periodicals. The Government has for some time been determined to ensure that there was a viable Canadian magazine industry where Canadian periodicals will be autonomous and possess their own style and individuality and be free of direct foreign control. Our magazine market has been dominated by U.S. publications. A section of our Income Tax Act has conferred for some time now an advantage of incentive to Canadian magazines by allowing Canadian firms to deduct the cost of advertising in Canadian magazines at 100%. There was no intention to interfere with content since emphasis was placed on "dissimilarity" from a foreign periodical in order to qualify for income tax relief. In 1965, when this section of the income tax became law, Time and Reader's Digest, unlike all other foreign publications, were exempted from the effect of this section of the Income Tax Act and Canadian advertisers in these foreign-controlled periodicals were permitted to deduct the full cost.

The Government recently announced that it was proposing to end the exemption for these two magazines. The intent of the section of the Income Tax Act was to support the Canadian magazine industry, then as now weakened by the virtual domination of the market by United States publications. Instead of legislating against the entry of United States material - that would have been unacceptable interference with the free flow of ideas and information - the framers of the section legislated an advantage or incentive for Canadian magazines. However, the exemption of Time and Reader's Digest from the beginning, vitiated the very purpose of the section because these were the two main competing foreign publications. By ending the exemption, we are restoring the original intention and force of the section.

I would like to emphasize that there are no restrictions on the availability of Time and Reader's Digest within Canada as a result of this action - just as there is no restriction of the availability of Harpers or Atlantic or The Economist or L'Express or Le Point, all of which are currently being sold in Canada as foreign publications.

Canadians are generally concerned that when they look in the mirror of their cultural tradition and identity, they will not recognize themselves. Canada is still a relatively young country and we want to ensure that our cultural identity is shaped as much as possible by ourselves, with contacts and influences from abroad that enrich us but do not stifle us. I think many Canadians would agree with the following remarks that I would like to quote to you:

"The true sovereigns of a country are those who determine its mind, its mode of thinking, its tastes, its principles,

and we cannot consent to lodge this sovereignty in the hands of strangers."

I regret to say that I do not know the name of the person who made those remarks, but I hope you will be interested to know that they appeared in an address at the University of Philadelphia in 1823.

Both Canada and the United States have and are continuing to develop policies to enhance the quality of life of citizens in each country. The pursuit of United States policies will have a greater impact on Canada than we will have on you, and therefore we will certainly see some issues somewhat differently than you. We may have divergent interests: this is often the case in relationships which are assymetrical. What is more important is that differences be settled amicably and in good faith, based on understanding of what each is trying to accomplish as a nation in North America and in the world. I am delighted to have had an opportunity to contribute to this process here in Boston today.