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Times of Turmoil: Canada in the 1960s and 1970s

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Society & Identity
- How did Canada respond to changing social values after 1960?
- What measures has Canada taken to promote a distinct Canadian identity?
- How did changes to social policies affect women and minority groups in Canada?
- How did Aboriginal Canadians respond to challenges in the 1960s and 1970s?
- What was the impact of Québec nationalism on Canadian identity?
- What effect did the War Measures Act have on the legal rights of Canadians?
- How did Canadian social programs evolve?

Politics & Government
- How was regionalism expressed in the 1970s?
- How did Canadian voters signal a change in political and social values in the 1960s?

Economy & Human Geography
- How did the Canadian government respond to the economic challenges of the 1970s?

Autonomy & World Presence
- What was Canada’s involvement in the Cold War?
- What was Canada’s response to modern conflicts?

TIMELINE

1960
Québec’s Quiet Revolution begins

1961
Vietnam War begins
Berlin Wall built

1962
Medicare established in Saskatchewan
Cuban Missile Crisis

1963
Federal election over the issue of nuclear warheads on Canadian soil
Lester Pearson elected prime minister

1964
Beatles perform in Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver

1965
Maple Leaf flag adopted

1966
Canada Pension Plan introduced
Medical Care Act passed
On the night of March 7, 1963, three Canadian army buildings in Montréal were bombed with Molotov cocktails (homemade firebombs). The mysterious letters “FLQ” were painted on the walls. The next day, a document from an organization claiming responsibility for the bombings was delivered to the news media:

The Front de libération du Québec is a revolutionary movement of volunteers ready to die for the political and economic independence of Québec. The suicide-commandos of the FLQ have as their principal mission the complete destruction, by systematic sabotage of:

  - all colonial [federal] symbols and institutions, in particular the RCMP and the armed forces;
  - all commercial establishments and enterprises which practise discrimination against Quebeckers, which do not use French as the first language, which advertise in the colonial language [English];
  - all plants and factories which discriminate against French-speaking workers.

...INDEPENDENCE OR DEATH

—Revolution by the People for the People

How did this crisis emerge? What had happened between English and French Canadians to make the relationship so strained? How could the crisis be resolved?

The 1960s and 1970s were tumultuous times in Canada and around the world. A culture of activism and protest developed that challenged both social norms and government policies. The continuation of the Cold War brought with it the Vietnam War and the Cuban Missile Crisis. The Canadian government tried to carve out a path of international relations independent of the United States while also dealing with an economic recession at home.
Toward Social Change

By the early 1960s, Canadians were beginning to accept the teen culture that had evolved after the Second World War. They had very little choice—by 1965, as a result of the baby boom, more than half the population of North America was under the age of 25. The sheer number of young people in North America and Western Europe created a powerful culture of protest—a “youthquake.” The young people were joined by other groups calling for change to society, among them members of the women’s movement, the environmental movement, and Aboriginal nations.

The “Youthquake”

The transition began with the so-called “British invasion” of pop culture led by four young men from Liverpool—the Beatles. Boys’ hair became longer, girls’ skirts shorter. This was the start of the hippie phenomenon. Large numbers of young people embraced rock music, new clothing styles, sexual promiscuity, and experimentation with drugs as a protest against mainstream society. With slogans such as “Make love, not war” and “Turn on, tune in, drop out,” they strove to be different from earlier generations. Canadian youth participated in these international cultural trends, becoming part of the counterculture.

Some young people had aims that went beyond culture. They held strong political beliefs and rejected the consumerism of post-war society in the hope that the world would change for the better. Some became involved in women’s, environmental, and Aboriginal rights movements. Others demonstrated to support greater student participation in university affairs. Many joined in protests against the war in Vietnam, demonstrating outside the American embassy in Ottawa and in front of Parliament hoping to persuade Canadian leaders to take a stronger stand against the war. Some joined communes of like-minded people who tried to establish new forms of community living in remote areas.
Popular music of the day reflected these concerns. Protest songs condemned racism, war, and the devastation of the environment. Protest singers such as Bob Dylan and Joan Baez attracted a wide following. Rock groups such as the Beatles, the Rolling Stones, and The Who captured the mood with songs such as “Revolution,” “[I Can’t Get No] Satisfaction,” and “[Talkin’ ‘bout] My Generation.” Aboriginal singer Buffy Sainte-Marie and African-American artists like Marvin Gaye also used their music to highlight the social conditions of their peoples.

The youthquake showed Canadian governments that young people were becoming more politically aware. Soon, politicians began making an effort to appeal to them by increasing spending on employment and activities for youth. In 1972, the voting age for federal elections was lowered from 21 to 18. Most provinces lowered the voting age around the same time.

As the 1980s approached, baby boomers began moving away from their radical political opinions and lifestyles. They were entering the workforce and starting families. Financial concerns replaced youthful idealism. The social protest movement had all but disappeared.

**Protest and Mockery**

Political protests marked the 1960s. Even Woodstock, a huge music festival held in 1969, turned into a kind of protest against the establishment. A new political party, the Rhino Party, which grew out of the protest movement of the 1960s, fielded candidates who made far-fetched promises such as moving the nation’s capital from Ottawa to Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, or making Swedish Canada’s official language. The Rhinos made a joke out of politics, but their criticisms were very serious. They used publicity to question and mock the system itself, rather than any one political party or politician.

**FAST FORWARD**

**Political Protest**

Political protests still take place in the tradition of the 1960s and 1970s. The 1990s and 2000s saw an increase in the number of organized protests against economic globalization and human rights abuses. During an Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in Vancouver in 1997, police tore down protest signs and used pepper spray to control students and other protesters. Later, RCMP documents revealed that they had used informants to infiltrate and report on the activities of groups that were acknowledged to be non-violent protest organizations. Many Canadians felt that the authorities’ actions were obstructing the expression of free speech.
KEY TERMS

feminist a person who supports the idea that women are equal to men and deserve equal rights and opportunities

pressure group a group of people who get together around a particular issue to try to influence government policy

civil liberties basic individual rights protected by law, such as freedom of speech

Canadian Bill of Rights a federal document that set out the rights and freedoms of Canadians; it was enacted in 1960 under the leadership of Prime Minister John Diefenbaker

The Women’s Movement

Women had been expected to fill men’s shoes in industry and manufacturing during the Second World War. However, when veterans returned and women were no longer needed in these jobs, post-war society expected them to return to their traditional role as housekeepers. Many felt isolated in the suburbs and trapped by roles that did not allow them to develop their potential. Many working women continued to hold low-paying jobs such as waitressing, hairdressing, secretarial work, and retail sales. Employers could legally discriminate against them in both wages and benefits. University-educated women were expected to work as either teachers or nurses—other professions were difficult for women to enter.

In 1963, Betty Friedan’s book The Feminine Mystique became a best-seller. It argued that women were trapped in gender roles that were reinforced by images in the media. Friedan urged women to liberate themselves from these traditional roles and fulfill themselves as human beings by acquiring an education and pursuing careers. Friedan’s ideas transformed the lives of many women during this period. Just as they had done during the suffrage movement of the early years of the century, feminists joined together to fight for women’s rights.

In 1967, responding to pressure from women’s groups, Prime Minister Lester Pearson’s government set up the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. The Commission thoroughly examined how Canadian women were treated and the problems they faced. It made recommendations that included the following:

• Women should have the right to work outside the home.
• Society in general, as well as parents, should take some responsibility for children; therefore, daycare services should be provided.
• Women should be entitled to paid maternity leave from their jobs.
• The federal government should do all it can to help overcome discrimination against women in society.

Several women’s groups joined forces to form the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) in 1971. This pressure group lobbied both federal and provincial governments to act quickly on the Commission’s recommendations. One of NAC’s key victories was the inclusion of a clause guaranteeing the equality of women in Canada’s Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which came into force in 1982 (see Chapter 10).

Canadian feminists demanded that women be promoted to positions of responsibility in government, business, education, and the civil service. They argued against stereotyping women and the kinds of work they do. They also pressed for changes to the education system, under which girls were not encouraged to excel in math and sciences—subjects more likely to lead to well-paying jobs. Soon, more Canadian women were becoming engineers, doctors, politicians, and company presidents—pursuing careers in which they had previously been under-represented. “Sexism,” “male chauvinism,” and “sexual harassment” became common terms to describe behaviour and attitudes that were no longer acceptable.

FIGURE 7–4 Women burn bras in a protest at Toronto City Hall on International Women’s Day, March 8, 1979.
Challenging Social Values

Although there had been groups fighting for civil liberties in Canada during the 1930s and 1940s, it was not until the 1960s that there was a dramatic increase in activism for social change. Organizations formed during this time include Human Rights Watch, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Amnesty International, and the National Indian Brotherhood.

Diefenbaker and the Canadian Bill of Rights

John Diefenbaker’s government set the stage for reform when it introduced the Canadian Bill of Rights in 1960 to protect a person’s fundamental human rights. These rights included

- freedom of life, liberty, security of person, and the enjoyment of property
- the right to equality before the law and its protection
- freedom of religion
- freedom of speech
- freedom of assembly and association

Although Diefenbaker did not feel he had enough provincial support to make the Bill of Rights part of the Constitution, the fact that it had been passed by Parliament gave it considerable influence. Most of the rights protected by the Bill were included in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982. (You will read more about the Charter in Chapter 10.)

The Omnibus Bill and Beyond

In 1969, the Liberal government, under Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, passed Bill C-150, also known as the Omnibus Bill, which made major changes in social legislation. These included

- recognizing the right of women to have access to contraception;
- recognizing the right to abortion (with certain limitations); and
- legalizing homosexuality between consenting adults.

Trudeau was criticized for his progressive social policies, but refused to back down, saying that “There’s no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation.” Trudeau also changed Canada’s divorce law in 1968, making divorce more freely available to reflect what was happening in society.

In 1970, feeling that the abortion law did not go far enough, women protesters chained themselves inside Parliament, forcing it to close. Dr. Henry Morgentaler also challenged abortion laws. Time after time, juries refused to convict Morgentaler, despite his open admission that he had performed thousands of abortions. The law had become unenforceable.

In 1976, Bill C-84 passed in the House of Commons by a narrow margin (131–124), ending the death penalty. Although Bill C-84 did not have widespread public support, Trudeau and his Cabinet were determined that Canada should join other progressive nations and abolish capital punishment.

FIGURE 7–5 In 2008, Dr. Henry Morgentaler was named a member of the Order of Canada. Morgentaler was a crusader for women’s right to abortion. He opened an abortion clinic in 1969 and was arrested many times.
Women’s Rights

Women’s rights activists protested against Canadian laws that supported traditional roles for women. The reforms in divorce and abortion legislation were welcomed by many people. These were important steps toward women’s equality. Many unions joined the fight for women’s rights. For example, the Canadian Union of Postal Workers was the first to win the right to paid maternity leave for its members.

Gay Rights

Before Trudeau’s Omnibus Bill was passed, gay people could be arrested and sent to prison, denied employment, and otherwise persecuted. In the 1960s, gay rights activists began to organize to draw attention to these injustices. This took tremendous courage, as the attitudes of many Canadians, churches, and members of governments at all levels were strongly anti-gay. Gay people began to publicly show pride in their sexual orientation and resist persecution.
Immigration and Multiculturalism

By the 1960s, many Canadians had a somewhat more open attitude toward people of other cultures and countries. This was reflected in new immigration regulations as illustrated by the timeline below. In 1971, an official policy of multiculturalism was introduced by Prime Minister Trudeau. The policy would

...support and encourage the various cultures and ethnic groups that give structure and vitality to our society. They will be encouraged to share their cultural expressions and values with other Canadians and so contribute to a richer life for us all.

–House of Commons

The policy encouraged the country’s various ethnic groups to express their cultures. Multicultural activities were organized across the country. For example, heritage language classes were provided to help children learn the language of their parents. Festivals were held for cultural communities to share their music, dances, foods, games, arts, crafts, and stories. Programs were designed to make all residents feel at home in Canada, regardless of their origins. These programs were also intended to prevent racism by promoting respect for all cultures.

**TIMELINE**

**Canadian Immigration Milestones**

- **1900** Chinese Immigration Act increases $50 head tax to $100; in 1903 it is raised to $500.
- **1908** Continuous Passage Act requires immigrants to travel directly to Canada, thus restricting immigration from India.
- **1919** New Immigration Act excludes people from Canada for reasons of race, culture, and political beliefs.
- **1923** Law is passed prohibiting almost all immigration from China; this law was revoked in 1947.
- **1931** Admission to Canada is restricted to American citizens, British subjects, and agriculturalists with economic means.
- **1939** The *St. Louis*, a ship carrying 930 Jewish refugees from Germany, is turned away from Canadian ports. It returns to Europe where three quarters of the passengers are killed by the Nazis.
- **1947** Between 1947 and 1952, more than 186,000 displaced persons come to Canada from wartorn Europe.
- **1962** New regulations eliminate most of the racial discrimination in Canada’s immigration policy.
- **1967** Immigration to Canada becomes “colour blind.” The points system is introduced, which assigns potential immigrants points in categories such as education, age, fluency in French or English, and job opportunities in Canada.
- **1976** Immigration regulations change to allow immigration of family members with relatives already in Canada.
- **1978** Refugees make up 25 percent of all immigrants to Canada until 1981.
- **1986** UN awards Canada the Nansen Medal recognizing its contributions to the cause of refugees.

**FIGURE 7–8** Language classes and outings were organized to facilitate the integration of newly arrived refugees.

**FIGURE 7–9** In 1972, many South Vietnamese people fleeing war sought refugee status in Canada.
The Other Canada

While many Canadians benefited from the booming economic times of the 1950s and 1960s, others were marginalized. Governments expropriated properties for the building of freeways and other projects. Citizens sometimes organized themselves to preserve their communities, though this was not always the case—especially when the people affected were poor and not used to speaking out on public issues. In the 1960s, two thirds of Toronto’s Chinatown was bulldozed for the construction of a new city hall. In Nova Scotia, officials ordered the destruction of the African-Canadian community of Africville and the forced removal of its residents. The people of these communities were angered at the way they had been disenfranchised by government.

FIGURE 7–10 By the 1960s, racism and neglect had made Africville one of the worst slums in Canada, but its destruction brought an end to a vibrant community. In 2010, the mayor of Halifax apologized to the descendants of the Africville community.

Expressing Ideas What connections can you make between the relocation of people in Africville and the relocations in Newfoundland and the High Arctic that you read about in Chapter 6? What conclusions can you draw from these events?

Aboriginal Nations: Decades of Action

Governments tend to downplay Aboriginal poverty and other issues. Canada’s First Nations had fared badly economically in the boom years following the Second World War. In addition, many had also suffered from environmental damage caused by resource industries. For example, mercury poisoning from a pulp and paper mill contaminated the fish caught and eaten at the Whitedog and Grassy Narrows reserves in Ontario. The development of mines, highways, pipelines, and boom towns disrupted the hunting grounds and way of life of other First Nations.

Organizing for Change

When Aboriginal people living on reserves won the right to vote in 1960, it did little to improve their living conditions. They continued to suffer from serious problems, including poverty, poor health, and inadequate housing and education. Those who left to try their luck in the large cities often faced hostility and discrimination. By the late 1960s, Aboriginal peoples were organizing to pressure Ottawa and the provincial governments to bring about change.
The Liberal government of Pierre Trudeau issued the **White Paper of 1969** to address the issues facing Aboriginal people. The White Paper, prepared by Indian Affairs Minister Jean Chrétien, proposed dramatic changes to the lives of Aboriginal people. Among its recommendations, the White Paper proposed that

- the Indian Act be repealed
- Aboriginal people be given control and ownership of their lands
- the provincial governments take over the same responsibility for Aboriginal people that they have for other citizens
- substantial funds be made available for economic development for Aboriginal people
- the Department of Indian Affairs be closed down

The White Paper would end special status for Aboriginal peoples and place them on an equal footing with other Canadians. Its intent was to encourage Aboriginal people to leave the reserves, seek jobs in the cities, and become part of mainstream Canadian society. Assimilation would supposedly bring an end to their problems.

Aboriginal people were furious. They saw the White Paper as an attack on their right to maintain their unique identity. Harold Cardinal, an Alberta Cree leader, explained their response:

> Ironically, the White Paper concludes by... calling upon Indian organizations... to assist [in the process it recommends].... It is difficult to envision any responsible Indian organization willing to participate in a proposal that promises to take the rights of all Indians away and attempts to... legislate Indians out of existence. It is a strange government and a strange mentality that would have the gall to ask the Indian to help implement its plan to perpetrate cultural genocide on the Indians of Canada. It is like asking the doomed man on the gallows if he would mind pulling the lever that trips the trap.

> –The Unjust Society, 1969

The National Indian Brotherhood led the attack. Instead of assimilation into “White” (non-Aboriginal) society, they demanded self-government for Aboriginal peoples and control over their own affairs. When they presented their paper, *Citizens Plus*, which became known as the “**Red Paper**,” Trudeau and Chrétien abandoned the White Paper.

The Government believes that its policies must lead to the full, free and nondiscriminatory participation of the Indian people in Canadian society. Such a goal requires a break with the past. It requires that the Indian people’s role of dependence be replaced by a role of equal status, opportunity and responsibility, a role they can share with all other Canadians.

> –Foreword of the White Paper

*FIGURE 7–11* Harold Cardinal speaks to Prime Minister Trudeau and other Cabinet members at an Ottawa meeting in 1970. A delegation of about 200 First Nations peoples representing most provinces attended the meeting.
As the residential school system began to wind down by the 1970s, many First Nations took over the education of their children. “Band schools” emerged across the country where Aboriginal children could study their own languages and learn about their own values, cultures, and traditions.

The lack of secondary schools near the reserves, however, meant that most Aboriginal children were forced to leave home if they wanted to continue in school. As part of a government-run “boarding home program,” some high-school students were sent to live with families and attend school in cities such as Vancouver and New Westminster, British Columbia. But loneliness drove many to return to their reserves before graduating.

Aboriginal peoples began taking action in another area: the environment. Industries were expanding, some of them in and around reserves. Many Aboriginal groups were concerned that hydroelectric and natural gas projects would jeopardize their hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

Probably the most significant Aboriginal victory during the 1970s was won by the Inuit, Métis, and Indian Brotherhood (later Dene) of the Yukon and Northwest Territories as they lobbied to halt the construction of oil and natural gas pipelines that were to run through their lands in the Mackenzie Valley. They demanded a study to determine its impact on their lands and on the environment.

The federal government agreed to investigate the issue. The Berger Commission conducted hearings all over the North, listening carefully to Aboriginal concerns. In 1977, the commission recommended that construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline be suspended for 10 years pending an in-depth environmental study and negotiations with the Aboriginal peoples about financial compensation, self-government, and other issues.

In fact, construction was suspended for much longer. As of October 2009, the federal government had decided not to invest in the proposed pipeline, jeopardizing the project. By this time, the price tag of the pipeline had risen to $16.2 billion and the Aboriginal Pipeline Group (APG) had become a one-third partner in the Mackenzie Gas Project.

### Practice Questions

1. Explain the importance of the following in the development of Aboriginal identity:
   - a) the 1969 White Paper and the Red Paper
   - b) the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and the Berger Commission
2. Give examples of the federal government’s attempts to assimilate Aboriginal people into Canadian society.
3. What were some of the aims of multiculturalism? How did the government hope to achieve its aims?
4. List three changes that occurred for minority groups in Canada during the 1960s and 1970s.
5. **Perspectives** Write a short paragraph supporting or opposing the following statement: The policy of multiculturalism promoted a shift away from assimilation and toward acceptance of diversity in Canada.

---

**FASTFORWARD**

**Save Our Salmon**

In the late summer of 2009, it was official: West coast salmon stocks had collapsed. After a poor salmon run the previous year, 2009 was even worse. Some species of salmon simply did not show up. The disaster affected the local economy of B.C. First Nations as well as other commercial and sport fishers. The survival of a number of other species, notably grizzlies, was put at risk by the low fish stocks. Environmentalists believed that power development in fish-bearing streams and commercial fish farming may be responsible for the problem.

**Educational Reform**

As the residential school system began to wind down by the 1970s, many First Nations took over the education of their children. “Band schools” emerged across the country where Aboriginal children could study their own languages and learn about their own values, cultures, and traditions. The lack of secondary schools near the reserves, however, meant that most Aboriginal children were forced to leave home if they wanted to continue in school. As part of a government-run “boarding home program,” some high-school students were sent to live with families and attend school in cities such as Vancouver and New Westminster, British Columbia. But loneliness drove many to return to their reserves before graduating.

**Environmental Action**

Aboriginal peoples began taking action in another area: the environment. Industries were expanding, some of them in and around reserves. Many Aboriginal groups were concerned that hydroelectric and natural gas projects would jeopardize their hunting, fishing, and trapping activities.

Probably the most significant Aboriginal victory during the 1970s was won by the Inuit, Métis, and Indian Brotherhood (later Dene) of the Yukon and Northwest Territories as they lobbied to halt the construction of oil and natural gas pipelines that were to run through their lands in the Mackenzie Valley. They demanded a study to determine its impact on their lands and on the environment.

The federal government agreed to investigate the issue. The Berger Commission conducted hearings all over the North, listening carefully to Aboriginal concerns. In 1977, the commission recommended that construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline be suspended for 10 years pending an in-depth environmental study and negotiations with the Aboriginal peoples about financial compensation, self-government, and other issues.

In fact, construction was suspended for much longer. As of October 2009, the federal government had decided not to invest in the proposed pipeline, jeopardizing the project. By this time, the price tag of the pipeline had risen to $16.2 billion and the Aboriginal Pipeline Group (APG) had become a one-third partner in the Mackenzie Gas Project.
Politics and Government

As the first of the baby boomer generation reached maturity, politicians faced new priorities and demands from Canadians. John Diefenbaker and Lester “Mike” Pearson dominated Canadian politics in the early 1960s. But by 1967, Canada’s centennial year, both Diefenbaker and Pearson seemed out of touch with the times. Diefenbaker was defeated in a leadership convention in September 1967, and Pearson announced his intention to retire in December of the same year. Many Canadians wanted a leader who could appeal to a new generation of voters. The answer was the charismatic Pierre Trudeau who came to power on the strength of “Trudeaumania” and the youth vote.

Diefenbaker Versus Pearson

Diefenbaker and Pearson had different styles and visions of Canada. They were bitter rivals, fighting four national elections in 10 years. Diefenbaker was passionately committed to what he called “unhyphenated Canadianism”—a belief in the equality of all Canadians, whatever their heritage. A staunch nationalist, he also believed in preserving Canada’s British connections and standing up to the Americans. Diefenbaker championed human rights, introducing the Canadian Bill of Rights. In addition, he was the first prime minister to include a woman in his Cabinet and to appoint an Aboriginal senator. In 1960, his government gave Canada’s status Indians living on reserves the right to vote in federal elections. While Diefenbaker’s beliefs made him popular among many Canadians, they were also the source of his problems. In particular, French Canadians, who saw their culture as distinct, did not appreciate Diefenbaker’s version of “unhyphenated Canadianism.”

By contrast, Pearson and his Liberals appealed to younger, urban voters, especially in Central Canada. Pearson’s vision of Canada was based on two founding peoples: French and English. He believed that Canadians should sever their British connections and that Canada needed an identity that would be meaningful to all Canadians. Pearson won the election of 1963; Diefenbaker never again led the country. Pearson was responsible for modernizing Canada. His government introduced a trial abolition of capital punishment and easier divorce laws. Above all, he is remembered for introducing Canada’s flag in 1965.

The Flag Debate

For some Canadians, the Red Ensign was too British to be the symbol of modern Canada. Still, many opposed a new flag both for reasons of tradition and because they felt that Pearson was giving in to pressure from Québec. An emotional debate split the country. In general, English Canadians wanted to keep the Red Ensign; French Canada wanted a new flag. Finally, after hundreds of suggestions from across Canada, the red-and-white maple leaf design was chosen. On February 15, 1965, Canada’s new flag was raised on Parliament Hill for the first time. Ironically, English Canadians have come to regard the flag with pride and affection, while people from Québec, disillusioned by the bitter debate, continue to fly primarily the fleur-de-lys.
Social Welfare

Pearson’s government continued to build on the social welfare programs started by Mackenzie King. During the war, King was looking for a way to keep the support of voters who remembered the hardships of the Depression and were attracted by the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), the political party that stood for social benefits. As a result, he introduced unemployment insurance in 1940 and family allowance, or the “baby bonus,” in 1944. In 1966, Pearson’s government began the Canada Pension Plan, which improved on existing pension schemes. It also introduced the Canada Assistance Plan to help the provinces finance social assistance programs for people in need. In the same year, Pearson introduced Canada’s system of universal health care, the Medical Care Act.

Before 1966, most Canadians who fell seriously ill could spend their life savings on medical care. Many had to depend on charity, or face debt or bankruptcy to pay medical bills. Despite bitter opposition from doctors, Saskatchewan Premier T.C. “Tommy” Douglas introduced a complete medicare program that allowed all people in the province to seek medical treatment without paying out of their own pockets. When the bill was finally passed in Saskatchewan in 1962, it illustrated to the rest of Canada that a medicare system was possible.

In the same year, Tommy Douglas left provincial politics to become leader of the New Democratic Party (NDP), which grew out of the CCF. Fearing that the NDP might capture votes with a campaign for national medicare, the Liberals added health care to their party platform. As a result, the national Medical Care Act was passed in 1966. This Act meant that federal and provincial governments would now share the cost of medical care by doctors and hospitals for all Canadians, with funding coming from taxes. Today, Canadians identify medicare as the social program they value most.

Before 1966, most Canadians who fell seriously ill could spend their life savings on medical care. Many had to depend on charity, or face debt or bankruptcy to pay medical bills. Despite bitter opposition from doctors, Saskatchewan Premier T.C. “Tommy” Douglas introduced a complete medicare program that allowed all people in the province to seek medical treatment without paying out of their own pockets. When the bill was finally passed in Saskatchewan in 1962, it illustrated to the rest of Canada that a medicare system was possible.

In the same year, Tommy Douglas left provincial politics to become leader of the New Democratic Party (NDP), which grew out of the CCF. Fearing that the NDP might capture votes with a campaign for national medicare, the Liberals added health care to their party platform. As a result, the national Medical Care Act was passed in 1966. This Act meant that federal and provincial governments would now share the cost of medical care by doctors and hospitals for all Canadians, with funding coming from taxes. Today, Canadians identify medicare as the social program they value most.

Thinking Critically

In 2004, Tommy Douglas was voted the Greatest Canadian of all Time in a nationwide CBC contest. Why might Canadians have such high regard for him?
Trudeau: A New-Style Politician

Pierre Elliott Trudeau was a French Canadian who was also a strong federalist. He appealed to many young Canadians. Previous leaders had seemed formal and serious; Trudeau was relaxed and witty. He drove a flashy sports car and was a “hip” dresser. A bachelor until 1971, he dated celebrities, went to New York nightclubs, hung out with the rich and famous, and eventually became an international celebrity himself. He delighted in joking with reporters. Crowds of admirers swarmed him at his public appearances. Young people responded to him as though he were a rock star, and “Trudeaumania” gripped the nation. He succeeded Lester Pearson as prime minister in 1968, just as radical separatists were becoming increasingly violent.

Trudeau also had a clear vision of what he thought Canada should be: a “just society” for all Canadians. He believed that government had a duty to protect the rights and freedoms of people and to foster their economic and social well-being. He also supported individual freedom and thought that governments should not interfere with personal liberties.

Québec Nationalism

In 1960, after Duplessis’ death in 1959, Jean Lesage and the Liberals came to power with an election slogan that announced it was “Time for a Change.” Once in power, Lesage’s first step was to stamp out corruption. Government jobs and contracts were now to be awarded according to merit. Wages and pensions were raised, and restrictions on trade unionism were removed.

The government also began to modernize the province’s economy, politics, education, and culture. This wave of change became known as the Quiet Revolution, and it transformed the face of Québec. It took control of social services and the education system. Students were now required to take more science and technology courses to prepare for the new Québec. Above all, Québécois were encouraged to think of themselves as citizens of the 20th century. As new attitudes began to take hold, the influence of the Roman Catholic Church declined.

KEY TERMS

Medical Care Act an Act passed by Parliament in 1966 that provided free access to physician services for Canadians

Quiet Revolution a period of rapid change and reform that modernized Québec society during the years 1960 to 1966 under the Liberal provincial government of Jean Lesage

FIGURE 7–14 Pierre Trudeau stands before a crowd during a visit to Newfoundland in 1971. Trudeau had charisma and used the media very well. Media coverage is a “two-edged sword.” The media can bring down a politician as easily as it can raise him or her up.

Expressing Ideas What qualities do you think help politicians to “sell” themselves to a mass audience? Do any contemporary politicians have the mass appeal that Trudeau had?

What was the impact of Québec nationalism on Canadian identity?
In the 1962 election, the Liberals went one step further. They campaigned, and won, with the motto *Maîtres chez nous*—“Masters in our own house”—with the aim of strengthening Québec’s control of its own economy. Among other things, the government bought several hydro companies and turned them into a provincially owned power monopoly, Hydro-Québec.

**The Birth of Separatism**

Québec nationalism and the separatist movement grew in the 1960s and 1970s. Québécois resented what they perceived as injustices at the hands of English-speaking Canadians. Why was Ottawa, the national capital, overwhelmingly English speaking? Why did federal politicians from Québec seldom hold key Cabinet posts? Why did Francophones not have the right to their own schools and hospitals in the rest of Canada, even though Anglophones enjoyed those rights in Québec? Why was Québec’s Francophone majority expected to speak English in stores and at work?

For some, the only solution lay in a Québec controlled entirely by Québécois—a new country independent of Canada. Some extremists joined terrorist groups such as the FLQ (*Front de libération du Québec*) in the name of *le Québec libre*—“a free Québec.” The FLQ blew up mailboxes and attacked symbols of English-Canadian power in Québec. Many Québécois supported the aims of the terrorists, if not their methods.

In 1967, Québec Cabinet minister René Lévesque left the Liberal Party and, a year later, formed the *Parti Québécois (PQ)*. Lévesque believed that Québec and Canada would do better to “divorce” peacefully than to continue a “marriage” of two cultures that seemed imposed and unworkable.
A Bilingual Nation

Lester Pearson, who had become prime minister during Québec’s Quiet Revolution, was convinced that Canada would face a grave crisis unless French Canadians felt more at home in Canada. In 1963, he appointed the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (the “Bi and Bi Commission”) to investigate solutions. The Commission’s report called for Canada to become bilingual, with English and French as its two official languages. Perhaps more importantly, it recommended that Canada adopt a bilingual strategy that would promote both languages across the nation, including the protection of French and English linguistic minorities. For example, parents would be able to have their children attend schools in the language of their choice in regions where there was sufficient demand.

When Pierre Trudeau succeeded Pearson in 1968, he was determined to do more to persuade people from Québec that their future lay with Canada. In 1969, his government passed the Official Languages Act, making Canada officially bilingual. All federal government agencies were now required to provide services in both languages, and more Francophones were appointed to senior government positions. Trudeau also called on French and English Canadians, especially young people, to increase their understanding of each other’s cultures—and provided money to help make this happen.

These tactics were met with mixed reviews. Some loved them, some hated them. Some Canadians embraced the idea of bilingualism with enthusiasm. For example, many parents enrolled their children in French immersion classes. Others, especially Western Canadians, felt that the federal government was forcing French on them. They believed that Ottawa was focusing too much attention on Québec, while the West and its concerns were largely ignored. Francophones in Québec were also unimpressed. They wanted “special status” for Québec in Confederation. Trudeau, however, insisted that Québec was a province just like any other.
The October Crisis

Trudeau disliked the very idea of separatism and took a forceful stand against Québec nationalists. In October 1970, members of the FLQ kidnapped British diplomat James Cross. In exchange for Cross’s safe release, they demanded the release of FLQ members serving prison sentences and a public reading of the FLQ manifesto. Québec Premier Robert Bourassa agreed to most of the demands but refused to release any FLQ prisoners. In response, the FLQ kidnapped Québec Labour Minister Pierre Laporte.

Alarmed by the deteriorating situation in Québec, Trudeau took drastic action. At the urging of Bourassa and Montréal Mayor Jean Drapeau, he imposed the War Measures Act. Until then, the Act had only been used in wartime. The Act suspended Canadians’ civil rights—anyone could be arrested and detained without being charged with an offence. Membership in the FLQ became a crime. When asked how far he would go to defeat the FLQ, Trudeau replied, “Just watch me.”

On October 16, 1970, federal troops patrolled the streets of Ottawa and Montréal, and armouries across the country were locked down. Hundreds of pro-separatist Québécois were arrested and held without charge. Imposition of the War Measures Act was fiercely criticized, but Trudeau was undeterred. After all the rights legislation that had been passed by the Liberals under Trudeau, many people were shocked by this hardline approach.

One day later, police found the body of Pierre Laporte in the trunk of a car. His murder increased pressure on the government to crack down on the FLQ and find the remaining hostage, James Cross. Montréal police located Cross after he was held in captivity for 60 days. His kidnappers negotiated safe passage to Cuba in exchange for Cross’s release. The October Crisis was over. Of the 450 people detained under the Act, most were released and only a small number were ever charged.

Robert Bourassa and Bill 22

Premier Robert Bourassa had taken office just months before the October Crisis in 1970. Although most people in Québec did not support radical separatist movements, it was clear Trudeau’s Official Languages Act had not gone far enough to satisfy the Francophone majority in the province. In 1974, Bourassa responded with Bill 22, the first provincial legislation passed
in Québec aimed at protecting the status of the French language. Bill 22 made French the sole official language of Québec. It was to be the language of civic administration and services, and of the workplace.

Bill 22 forced hundreds of thousands of business and professional people in Québec who were not proficient in French to move out of the province. Toronto eventually surpassed Montréal as the business capital of Canada. Many Anglophones were angered by what they saw as the loss of their language rights. Many Francophones, however, did not think that Bourassa had gone far enough. In the next election, Bourassa and the Liberals lost to the Parti Québécois.

The PQ in Power

In 1976, the Parti Québécois won the provincial election. It was a stunning victory for René Lévesque and his party, which had won only seven seats in the 1970 election. Lévesque had reassured voters that a PQ win would not automatically mean separation. He promised that he would hold a province-wide referendum on the issue, and Quebeckers voted in a party dedicated to the goal of separation from Canada.

The separatists had no interest in official bilingualism—their priority was to strengthen the French language. Shortly after taking office, the PQ government passed Bill 101, sometimes referred to as the "Charter of the French Language." Its terms specified that

- French was the only official language of the province and government employees had to work in French
- commercial outdoor signs would be in French only
- children of immigrants would be required to attend French schools

The Québécois welcomed the new language law. Many felt that their culture and language were endangered. The birth rate in Québec had fallen, and most new immigrants were educating their children in English. To non-Francophones, however, Bill 101 was a symbol of oppression. Many people in the rest of Canada felt that the PQ’s policies were extreme. They looked to the federal government to stand up to the separatists.

PRACTICE QUESTIONS

1. What did Pearson and Trudeau do to address rising Québec nationalism?
2. Do you think the Official Languages Act was an effective way to address dissatisfaction in Québec?
3. a) What motivated the FLQ? What tactics did they use?
   b) Had you lived in Québec in the 1960s, how do you think you would have reacted to the FLQ? Write a letter to the editor explaining your view.
4. Make a timeline of events during the October Crisis. Identify events that you think were most significant. Give reasons for your choices.
5. In Québec elections, the Parti Québécois won 23.5 percent of votes in 1970, more than 30 percent in 1973, and 41 percent in 1976. What do you think accounted for these results in each case?

KEY TERMS

- War Measures Act an Act passed during the First World War giving the government emergency powers in the event of a national crisis
- Bill 22 provincial legislation that made French the sole official language of Québec
- Bill 101 also called the "Charter of the French Language," Bill 101 strengthened the position of the French language in Quebec
Building Your Skills

Assessing Viewpoints

The use of the War Measures Act by Prime Minister Trudeau remains controversial. Was he justified in invoking such powerful legislation?

The following documents give different points of view. Read each document and identify the circumstances under which the statement was made, and what position was taken.

Source 1

The kidnapping in broad daylight of a Québec Cabinet minister [Laporte] in front of his own... residence had a dramatic effect on [the government’s] view of the crisis we were facing. We began to believe that perhaps the FLQ was not just a bunch of pamphlet-waving, bomb-planting zealots after all; perhaps they were in fact members of a powerful network capable of endangering public safety, and of bringing other fringe groups—of which there were a large number at the time—into the picture, which would lead to untold violence. If all these groups coalesced [came together], the crisis could go on for a very long time, with tragic consequences for the entire country.

—Pierre Trudeau, Memoirs, 1993

Source 2

...[T]here were no fine distinctions drawn between separatism and terrorism in the general round-up in October 1970.... After the crisis had passed, rather than issuing an apology for such overzealous police work, the prime minister boasted that separatism was “dead.” Other... Liberals agreed: the FLQ crisis had been an opportunity to “smash separatism” and the government had taken it.

—The Structure of Canadian History, 1984

Source 3

As for the objection that Trudeau was acting to squash separatism and... the Parti Québécois, we have the statements of both the prime minister and one of his supporters... during the crisis. On October 17, [Bryce] Mackasey stressed to the House of Commons that the Parti Québécois was “a legitimate political party. It wants to bring an end to this country through democratic means, but that is the privilege of that party.” Trudeau... made the same point in November to an interviewer.


Applying the Skill

1. Are these documents primary sources or secondary sources? Explain in each case.
2. Summarize each document’s main argument.
3. Which documents support Lévesque’s claims?
4. Which documents do you consider to be the most credible sources? Justify your choices.
5. Write one or two paragraphs giving your view on whether the use of the War Measures Act was justified. Support your view with details from the text and the documents above.
Economic Challenges

When the Trudeau era began, Canadians could look back on nearly two decades of economic growth. People old enough to remember the dark days of the Depression were amazed by the prosperity they were enjoying. Many Canadians believed that the post-war boom would continue indefinitely. High unemployment and poverty were surely problems of the past, never to be seen again. But within just a few years, this optimism was badly shaken.

The Problem of Inflation

A variety of factors caused the economic crisis, but one of the most important was an oil embargo imposed in 1973 by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). In that year, war broke out in the Middle East between Israel and its Arab neighbours. Many Western countries, including Canada, supported Israel. In retaliation, OPEC, which included Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and other Arab oil-producing countries, refused to sell oil to these countries. Almost overnight, oil and gas prices jumped about 400 percent.

The huge increase in oil prices started a round of inflation that would last most of the 1970s. The prices of all manufactured products went up sharply, and Canadians found that the purchasing power of their dollar fell steadily. Suddenly, they were heading for tough economic times.

As prices rose, Canadian workers began to demand higher wages; but as their wages increased, so did prices, and inflation spiralled. At the same time, businesses were failing. Their energy and labour costs had soared while the demand for their products was down. Unemployment rates rose from the average of 3 to 5 percent during the 1950s and 1960s to a high of 12 percent by 1983.

For the average Canadian family, the 1970s were unsettling times. Inflation stretched household budgets and increased the need for women to enter the workforce. Dual-income families became common. By 1978, the average family’s buying power had fallen for the first time since the end of the Second World War.
Regionalism

To make matters worse, two economic problems that had plagued Canada in the past resurfaced. Both were the result of regionalism. The first of these problems was regional disparity, or the economic gap between the poorer and more prosperous regions of Canada. As in the Depression of the 1930s, industries based on natural resources were hit the hardest in the recession of the 1970s. The fishing industry in Atlantic Canada and the forestry, mining, and fishing industries in British Columbia suffered massive layoffs. Ontario and Québec were less affected, and the other provinces resented them. The Trudeau government increased transfer payments to the provinces to be used for social services. It also spent millions of dollars on regional projects to help economic development in certain areas, especially the Atlantic provinces.

The second problem of Western alienation had long existed. Many Westerners believed that Ottawa’s policies favoured Central Canada at the expense of the West. In the 1970s, Westerners were shocked when, in response to the oil crisis, the federal government froze the price of domestic oil and gas and imposed a tax on petroleum exported from Western Canada. The money raised by the tax would subsidize the cost of imported oil in the East. These actions infuriated Albertans. Along with their premier, Peter Lougheed, they felt that Alberta had the right to charge world prices for its oil:

The Fathers of Confederation decided that the natural resources within provincial boundaries would be owned by the citizens through their provincial governments.... We view the federal export tax on Alberta oil as contrary to both the spirit and the intent of Confederation.


FIGURE 7–21 Regional unemployment rates, 1966–1982

Reading a Graph Which regions had the highest unemployment rate? Which had the lowest? How did the rate in British Columbia vary in relation to other provinces? What might account for the difference?
To deal with a renewed oil crisis and rising gas prices, the Liberals also brought in the National Energy Program (NEP). The NEP aimed to
- reduce the consumption of oil
- protect Canadians from rising oil prices
- make Canada self-sufficient in oil

The program provided funding to Canadian petroleum companies to drill for oil in promising sites in the Arctic and off the coast of Newfoundland. It also encouraged consumers to switch from oil to gas and electric sources of power. Alberta, once again, reacted angrily. By 1984, oil prices had fallen and the NEP had been dismantled, but the bitterness it caused in the West would linger for years to come.

### FAST FORWARD

#### The Future of Energy

The energy crisis of the 1970s resulted from the Arab world’s response to Western support for Israel in the 1973 Arab–Israeli War. Today’s energy crisis is caused by a vastly increased world demand for hydrocarbons. To meet demand, and to diminish the climate-changing effects of burning petroleum and coal, new technologies are now in widespread use. Many governments actively promote energy conservation; some even use tax incentives. In January 2010, the government of Ontario signed a $7 billion deal with Korean technology company Samsung to develop green energy technology and to construct solar and wind power facilities in that province. Selling the green technology developed under this scheme is expected to create jobs and bring financial benefits.

### Expanding Horizons

During the 1970s, Canadians were again asking themselves whether the United States had too much influence over the Canadian economy. Prime Minister Trudeau was particularly interested in finding new trading partners so that Canada would no longer depend so heavily on the U.S. as the major customer for its exports. Trudeau tried to interest the European Economic Community in expanding trade with Canada. Those countries, however, were more eager to strengthen trade links among themselves. And the newly industrialized countries of Southeast Asia, the so-called “Asian tigers,” showed little interest in a special agreement with Canada.

Reluctantly, the Trudeau administration accepted the reality of Canada’s continuing economic dependence on the United States. The government tried to strengthen its control over the economy and culture through programs and agencies such as the NEP, the CRTC (see Chapter 6), and the Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA), which reviews all major proposed foreign investments to determine whether they serve Canada’s national interest.
Innovations

The Information Age

The Second World War spurred a wave of new technology that continued into the 1960s and 1970s. Computers and other communications technologies were revolutionizing the way Canadians worked, played, and communicated. Canada had entered the information age. With satellite broadcasting, Canadians had access to hundreds of television stations. Satellite links also allowed for cheap long-distance telephone calls, making it easier for Canadians to communicate with family or friends and businesses abroad.

Giant step for mankind
Space travel became a fact in the 1960s. U.S. astronauts from the Apollo 11 spacecraft landed on the moon in the lunar module “Eagle.” The first person to set foot on the moon’s surface was Neil Armstrong on July 21, 1969.

Happy baby, happy mom
Disposable diapers hit the marketplace in 1961. The first Pampers were marketed for use during special away-from-home outings. Sales of disposable diapers increased dramatically over the next few decades and greatly reduced women’s work around the home.

Information to go
The first computer microchip, invented in 1971, revolutionized computer technology. Computers had been in use since the end of the Second World War, but they were very big and slow at processing information. The microchip made computers smaller, more portable, and cheaper. The first flexible disk drive was invented in 1976.

Information at your fingertips
The Internet was formed in 1969 when the U.S. Defence Department and four U.S. universities linked their computers to create the Advanced Research Projects Agency Network (ARPAnet). Its aim was to decentralize the Defence Department’s computer system and make it less vulnerable to attack by the Soviet Union.

Transplanting futures
The 1960s and 1970s saw dramatic advances in medicine. The first successful heart transplant took place in 1967.
The Environmental Movement

Canada’s prosperity was won at a great cost. Many environmental challenges facing the world today had their roots in this period. It was not until 1962 that North Americans began to be aware of the extent of environmental damage. In that year, an American scientist, Rachel Carson, published a widely read book titled *Silent Spring*. In it, she warned that pollution of air, water, and soil was threatening life on Earth. She criticized the chemical industry for producing toxic pesticides such as DDT and claiming that they were safe.

At first, business and governments resisted any attempts to limit pollution, but public concern over the environment rose steadily. Environmental groups were established to lobby governments to control pollution and as awareness grew, legislation changed. Greenpeace was created in 1970 by a small group of activists in British Columbia to draw attention to environmental concerns.

**up close and personal**

Greenpeace: Warriors for the Environment

In the fall of 1971, 11 people with a shared vision of a green and peaceful world set sail from Vancouver on an old fishing boat. They were headed toward Amchitka Island, Alaska, to “bear witness” to underground nuclear testing by the United States. Not only were they concerned about the immediate effects on the region’s ecology, including the possibility of earthquakes and tsunamis along Pacific coastlines, but they also had a strong anti-nuclear message to spread.

Although their mission was unsuccessful, and the U.S. detonated its bomb, it was that country’s final nuclear test in the area. Some believe that this voyage and the global environmental awareness that resulted was the beginning of the end of the Cold War. Today, Greenpeace is an international organization with more than 40 offices, and 2.8 million members around the world. Through direct action, Greenpeace seeks to

- protect biodiversity in all its forms
- prevent pollution and abuse of Earth’s oceans, land, air, and fresh water
- end all nuclear threats
- promote peace, global disarmament, and non-violence

**FIGURE 7–24** Crew of the boat Phyllis Cormack, also known as Greenpeace; inaugural protest mission

**PRACTICE QUESTIONS**

1. What economic problems arose in the 1970s? How did Trudeau propose to deal with them? What was the outcome?

2. What would be the effect of high inflation on
   a) people on fixed incomes and pensions?
   b) workers who were not in unions?

3. How did the problems of this period influence the growth of regionalism and Western alienation?

4. **Perspectives** How do you think space travel changed people’s perspective about planet Earth?
A More Independent International Policy

As the Cold War intensified during the early 1960s, tensions developed between Canada and the United States. Even at the personal level, the leaders of the two countries did not get along: Prime Minister John Diefenbaker and U.S. President John Kennedy strongly disliked each other; President Johnson treated Lester Pearson with contempt; Trudeau had nothing but scorn for President Richard Nixon. These differences were particularly obvious during the most serious crisis of the Cold War: the Cuban Missile Crisis, which took the world to the brink of nuclear war. Later, the Vietnam War further strained Canada’s relations with the United States.

The Nuclear Issue in Canada

The Cuban Missile Crisis caused a debate about Canada’s defence policy and the government’s stand on nuclear weapons. Should Canada accept nuclear weapons on its territory, as the United States wished? When the Avro Arrow was scrapped (see Chapter 6), Canada accepted U.S. Bomarc missiles that were capable of carrying nuclear warheads. The years that passed before the missiles were actually installed, however, allowed time for second thoughts.

In 1963, the ruling Conservative Party was divided on the issue. The Minister of External Affairs felt Canada should be a non-nuclear nation. He argued that it was hypocritical to urge the United Nations to work for disarmament while accepting nuclear weapons. The Defence Minister, in contrast, insisted that nuclear weapons were vital in protecting Canada against communist aggression. Meanwhile, the anti-nuclear movement was growing among Canadian citizens. Many were starting to realize that nuclear war would amount to global suicide.

During the election campaign of 1963, the Liberals, under the leadership of Lester Pearson, proposed that Canadian forces accept nuclear weapons under certain conditions. Prime Minister Diefenbaker and the Conservatives, however, appealed to Canadian nationalism, including Canada’s right to decide for itself on international matters. Many business leaders and influential newspapers supported the Liberals, fearing that Diefenbaker’s anti-Americanism would injure trade with and investment from the United States. The nuclear issue split the country. Diefenbaker was narrowly defeated in the election of 1963, and the Liberals formed a minority government. This federal election was the first to be fought over Canada–U.S. relations since 1911.
The Cuban Missile Crisis: Canada–U.S. Relations Deteriorate

In 1959, Cuban rebels led by Fidel Castro overthrew Cuba’s pro-U.S. dictator, Fulgencio Batista. The United States reacted angrily, imposing trade and economic sanctions on Cuba. In 1961, a group of Cuban exiles, supported by the U.S., landed in Cuba with the aim of overthrowing the Castro government. The “Bay of Pigs” invasion was a failure, which encouraged Cuba to turn to the Soviet Union for support.

In October 1962, U.S. surveillance showed that the U.S.S.R. was installing offensive nuclear missile bases in Cuba. Missiles launched from these sites were a direct threat to U.S. security. President Kennedy announced a naval and air blockade of Cuba. U.S. forces and NORAD were readied for war. Armed B-52 bombers were constantly in the air. The world seemed to be poised on the brink of war.

At first, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev refused to remove the missiles. He put the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. on full alert and Soviet ships steamed toward U.S. ships blockading Cuba. At the last minute, Khrushchev agreed to dismantle the missile bases in exchange for a promise that the U.S. would not invade Cuba.

After the Missile Crisis ended, relations between the U.S. and Cuba continued to be difficult. The U.S. tightened its economic embargo and restricted its citizens from doing business with or visiting Cuba. As of 2009, the embargo was still in place.

During the crisis, the United States expected Canada, its partner in NORAD, to provide unconditional support of its policies. Prime Minister Diefenbaker, however, preferred that the United Nations send a fact-finding mission to Cuba to verify the U.S. surveillance.

Diefenbaker was reluctant to have Canada drawn into a major conflict that seemed largely rooted in U.S. policy and interests. At first, the Canadian government refused to place Canada’s NORAD forces on alert. Nor did it allow U.S. planes with atomic weapons to land at Canadian bases. The Americans were furious.

Diefenbaker believed he was defending Canada’s independence, but a poll later showed that 80 percent of Canadians thought he was wrong. Canadian troops were eventually put on alert but the damage to Canada–U.S. relations had already been done.

Looking Further

1. The Monroe Doctrine is a policy enacted by the U.S. government in 1823, which gives it the right to intervene if foreign governments interfere in countries in the Americas. Was President Kennedy justified in using the Monroe Doctrine to support his actions during the Cuban Missile Crisis? Explain.

2. In your opinion, should Canada have supported the United States during the Cuban Missile Crisis? Give reasons for your answer.

3. “At the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the U.S. had missiles of its own in Europe that were capable of striking Soviet targets.” To what extent does this statement affect your thinking about the crisis?
The Vietnam War

The war in Vietnam profoundly affected politics and society in the United States and Canada. Vietnam was divided, almost in half. North Vietnam had a communist government. The government in South Vietnam, more a dictatorship than a democracy, was supported by the United States. The Americans felt that if the south fell to communism, then it would not be long before other Asian states fell, a sort of domino effect. At first, the United States sent military advisors and economic help to the South Vietnamese, but by the 1960s it was sending troops as well. By 1966, there were 317,000 U.S. soldiers in Vietnam, and the number kept growing. At the same time, the U.S.S.R. and communist China supplied weapons and aid to North Vietnam.

Vietnam was the first war recorded by television cameras. Nightly newscasts brought the events of the war into the living rooms of millions of Americans. In 1968, the public was horrified to learn of a massacre of Vietnamese civilians by U.S. troops in the village of My Lai. That same year, North Vietnamese forces simultaneously attacked cities throughout South Vietnam during the Tet Offensive. They even briefly seized the U.S. embassy in the capital city of Saigon (today’s Ho Chi Minh City). Americans, who had been assured that they were winning the war, were stunned.

As Americans watched Vietnamese villages being bombed, and their own young men returning home disabled or in body bags, many began questioning the war. As more and more Americans disagreed with their government’s actions, massive anti-war protests swept across the country.

Canada’s Reaction to the War

Canadians were divided in their response to the war in Vietnam. Many people still saw communism as a real threat to Western security. However, as the war raged on, more and more Canadians turned against American policy. Until 1968, most opponents of the war were students, but opposition soon came from a much wider group of Canadians.
During the Vietnam War, the U.S. drafted young men to serve in the armed forces. Beginning in 1965, thousands of American draft resisters and deserters who were opposed to the war came to Canada. Anti-draft groups were established in many cities to help them get settled and support their protests against the war. The U.S. government was unhappy about Canada accepting resisters.

The Canadian government tried its best to stay neutral during the Vietnam War, but its close relationship with the U.S. made this complicated. Canada did not send troops to fight in the war, although thousands of Canadians did join the U.S. forces voluntarily. Some Canadian companies benefited from the war by selling goods such as berets, boots, airplane engines, and weapons to the U.S. Defense Department. In 1965, when Prime Minister Pearson spoke out against a U.S. bombing campaign in North Vietnam, he was severely reprimanded by President Lyndon Johnson.

**The Vietnam War Ends**

In 1969, President Richard Nixon took office in the United States, with a pledge to pull American troops out of Southeast Asia. By 1972, the Americans began to withdraw. The last American combat forces left South Vietnam in 1973. Less than two years later, a massive North Vietnamese military offensive crushed the South Vietnamese army. Vietnam, ravaged by decades of war and destruction, was unified under communist rule. Those who did not support the new regime were stripped of their property and forced into “re-education” camps, where they were pressured to support their new leaders.

Many anti-communist Vietnamese fled. They took to the seas in boats hoping to find freedom. These “boat people” made their way to refugee camps in Malaysia and Hong Kong where they applied for refugee status. Thousands of Vietnamese were accepted into Canada and became citizens.

**FIGURE 7–31** This demonstration was one of hundreds of anti-war protests in Canada.

**Expressing Ideas** Do you think Canada was right to offer American draft resisters and deserters a safe haven?

1. Identify the following and explain the role each played in the Cuban Missile Crisis: a) Nikita Khrushchev, b) Fidel Castro, c) John F. Kennedy, d) John Diefenbaker.

2. What questions about nuclear weapons did the Cuban Missile Crisis raise in Canadians’ minds? Why did these questions divide Canadians?

3. What effect did the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War have on Canada–U.S. relations?

4. How did U.S. policy deal with Cuba after the Cuban Revolution? How did Canada’s policy differ?

5. How would you explain the war in Vietnam to someone who knew nothing about it? Answer the following questions: What? Where? When? Why?

6. List the ways in which Canada asserted its independence from the U.S. in the 1960s.
Should Canada’s foreign policy be independent of the United States?

As you learned in Chapter 6, Canada has a long history of international involvement and the Canadian military has been in many places in the world. Mostly, our troops have been part of United Nations peacekeeping missions, in Cyprus and Suez, for example. Peacekeeping allowed us to actively participate in international conflict while still maintaining a non-combative role—and a largely independent foreign policy. We were not directly involved in either the Cuban Missile Crisis or the war in Vietnam, even though both were very important to our superpower ally, the United States. However, in 1990, we joined the U.S.-led coalition against Iraq and sent ships and planes into that conflict. Although our commitment was relatively small, it represented a shift in Canada’s foreign policy. Lately, as part of NATO, Canada has taken on a more active combat role, particularly since the 9/11 attacks and the beginning of America’s “War on Terror.”

At the time of writing, Canadian troops are fighting in Afghanistan as part of the NATO force there. This is a significant departure from peacekeeping. Defeating the Taliban in Afghanistan is an important NATO goal, but it is also fundamental to the geopolitical goals of the United States. Is Afghanistan important to Canada? Should we be involved? Are we helping the U.S. achieve its goals rather than our own? In today’s world, with the...
threat of international terrorism, is it really possible for a middle power closely allied to a superpower, as Canada is, to have an independent foreign policy?

Consider these opinions for and against Canadian participation in Afghanistan. The first is from an article in the Tyee newspaper, published in October, 2006. Byers argues that following the American lead has meant that Canada’s peacekeeping reputation has been sacrificed. The second is from an interview in Maclean’s magazine with commentator Andrew Coyne. Coyne thinks Canada’s mission in Afghanistan is necessary. He also makes the point, in this excerpt, that helping the U.S. has other benefits.

Against:

Wrapped up in the distinction between the peacekeeping opportunities in Lebanon and Darfur and the counter-insurgency mission in Afghanistan is the additional issue of reputation costs, most notably the cost to Canada’s international reputation for independence and objectivity, and thus our ability to lead and persuade on a wide range of issues. Where would we gain the most in terms of our international reputation: continuing with a failing counter-insurgency mission in Afghanistan, or leading a humanitarian intervention to stop the genocide in Darfur?

For:

There’s a crasser, more self-interested reason for why we should stay. Just now we’re having a devil of a time convincing the Americans we’re as serious about fighting terrorism as they are. The issue has all sorts of obvious implications for our trade relations. Sticking it out in Afghanistan would be a fine way to prove our credentials. Whereas clearing it out before the job’s done risks giving aid and comfort, not just to the enemy, but the French and Italians.

Analyzing the Issue

1. In your opinion, does Canada have an international role that is different from, and independent of, that of the U.S.? How would you define that role?

2. Summarize Coyne’s argument in a sentence and support it with two examples of Canadian military action from the 20th century. Do the same for Byers’ argument.

3. Research Canada’s participation in the Gulf War. Compare this with Canada’s participation in the Afghan operation in terms of length of commitment, military resources provided, cost of the war, and casualties.

4. A Nanos poll in November 2009 showed that at least 60 percent of Canadians wanted troops withdrawn from Afghanistan. In your opinion, does this mean that the mission needs to be better explained to Canadians? Write a brief description of Canadian foreign policy goals as you see them and include an explanation of why or why not the Afghan mission fits the goals.
Trudeau's Foreign Policy

The Vietnam War and the Cuban Missile Crisis highlighted the differences between American and Canadian foreign policy. As prime minister, Pierre Trudeau reflected the changing attitudes of the time. One of his goals was to chart a course in foreign policy that was less dependent on U.S. approval.

This intention was clearly signalled in 1970, when Canada officially recognized the communist government of the People's Republic of China. Even though Trudeau defied U.S. policy, his decision made sense to most Canadians. mainland China was a great power, a major purchaser of Canadian wheat and other goods, and potentially a significant trading partner.

At the same time, Trudeau did not wish to anger the U.S. Neither did he think Canada could act on foreign or economic affairs without considering the U.S. to some extent. He explained his views in a now famous speech:

Let me say that it should not be surprising if these policies in many instances either reflect or take into account the proximity of the United States. Living next to you is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly or even-tempered is the beast... one is affected by every twitch and grunt.

–Speech to the National Press Club, Washington, 1969

Defence Revisited

Trudeau’s approach to national defence was a sharp departure from that of previous governments. Lester Pearson had referred to Canada and the United States as “defence partners.” Trudeau believed that Canada needed to re-evaluate this policy. He took steps to scale back Canada’s participation in the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union in the hope that this would ease Cold War tensions. These steps included the following:

• From 1970 to 1972, Canada’s NATO forces gave up their nuclear missiles in Europe.
• The Bomarc missile sites that Pearson had accepted in 1963 were dismantled. A new jet fighter, the CF-18 Hornet, was armed with conventional rather than nuclear warheads.
• The national defence budget was cut by 20 percent and Canada’s NATO contingent in Europe was reduced to half its former strength.

Military officers, diplomats, and officials from the U.S. embassy in Ottawa were outraged, but the government pursued its new course.
At the same time, Canada continued to participate in NATO and NORAD, alongside the United States. American vessels and submarines armed with nuclear missiles were permitted to dock in Canadian ports. American branch plants in Canada accepted contracts from the U.S. Defence Department to develop nuclear technology or other war materials, sometimes over strong protests from Canadian pacifists.

**Canada’s International Profile**

Throughout Trudeau’s period in office, the Cold War continued to dominate international affairs. The world remained divided between the West (the U.S. and its allies) and the East (communist China, the Soviet Union, and countries friendly to it). Trudeau wanted Canada to be a middle power, strong enough and respected enough to chart an independent foreign policy.

Outside the two rival power blocs, most of the world’s people lived in countries not officially allied with either superpower. African and Asian nations emerging from colonial rule after the Second World War tried to remain detached from Cold War rivalries—at least for a time. But other divisions were emerging. Most new nations were located in the southern hemisphere. They were also, for the most part, far less industrialized than countries in the northern hemisphere. So, while the Cold War split the world politically between East and West, a huge economic gap separated the rich North from the poor South.

The Trudeau government aimed to bridge both gaps in order to promote world peace and understanding among nations. As a middle power, Canada could build links between East and West and North and South. Trudeau’s efforts to reduce nuclear weapons and to establish trade and sporting links with communist states were part of this plan. Trudeau called for more aid for the poor countries of the world. He believed that the prosperous nations of the North should be helping the poverty-stricken countries of the South to develop their economies and improve the living conditions for their people. This policy of “trade and aid” became the cornerstone of Trudeau’s foreign policy in bridging the North–South gap.

In 1968, a new government body known as the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) was formed. CIDA’s responsibility was to boost foreign aid to less industrialized countries. Countries receiving aid would have to agree to use it to buy products manufactured in Canada. In this way, Canada would benefit as well. This was known as tied aid, and it made up more than half the total development aid Canada extended to less industrialized nations. During Trudeau’s administration, the total amount of aid Canada extended to developing countries increased from $278 million in 1969 to more than $2 billion in 1984.

**FIGURE 7–36** Canadian-sponsored immunization program in the Philippines

**Developing Understanding** How would Canadian programs, such as immunization, improve living conditions for less industrialized countries? How would improved living conditions promote peace?

**FIGURE 7–35** Paul Henderson celebrates after scoring the winning goal for Canada in the Canada–U.S.S.R. hockey series in 1972. This popular event was one of many steps taken by Canada to lower Cold War tensions. Why do you think winning the series meant so much to Canadians?

**What If…**

Imagine Canada had taken a stronger military stance during the 1960s and 1970s. How might Canada’s image as a middle power have been affected? Would the Canada–U.S. relationship have been different?
The Cold War Renewed

While Trudeau was trying to bridge the economic gap among countries during the early 1970s, tension between the United States and the Soviet Union eased, and the two countries agreed to reduce the number of their nuclear weapons. In 1972, at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I), the U.S. and the Soviet Union signed the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABMT) and an interim agreement on strategic offensive arms. This marked a breakthrough in relations between the two superpowers.

In 1979, however, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. It also sent medium-range missiles to Eastern Europe. In response, NATO announced that it, too, was deploying more advanced missiles in Europe. In protest against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, many Western nations, including Canada, boycotted the 1980 Olympic Games held in Moscow.

Sovereignty in the Arctic

Canada and the United States were soon drawn into a confrontation over territory. Canada claimed sovereignty, or possession, of the islands of the Arctic and the waterways between them, including the Northwest Passage. In 1968, oil was discovered at Prudhoe Bay in Alaska, and American oil companies were interested in establishing a regular tanker route through the Northwest Passage to the east coast of the United States—in other words, through an area Canada believed was its own. The following year, an American oil tanker, the Manhattan, travelled along this route without Canadian approval. The Canadian government became alarmed that the U.S. was treating the Northwest Passage as an international waterway, rather than as part of Canada's Arctic possessions.

Canada was also concerned about the fragile Arctic ecosystem. Greater tanker traffic through the Northwest Passage increased the likelihood of an oil spill that could spell environmental disaster. The government announced it was extending Canada’s territorial limit from 3 to 12 miles (about 5 to 19 kilometres) offshore. In addition, it passed the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, creating a 100-mile (160-kilometre) pollution-free zone around the islands of the Canadian Arctic. Within this zone, strict environmental regulations would be enforced, and oil tanker traffic would be controlled. Despite protests from Washington, the oil companies involved in the Alaska development agreed to respect Canada’s rules.

Canada won support for its moves in the Arctic region from a number of nations with Arctic territories. At the United Nations, a conference on a “Law of the Sea” was suggested, endorsing the idea that the nations of the world should act together to protect the oceans as “the common heritage of mankind.” Canada renewed talks about a 12-mile territorial sea and a further 200-mile economic zone for every country whose land mass faced an ocean. Canada also suggested that oil or mining companies active in environmentally sensitive areas should pay a special tax and channel some of their revenues into local economic development. To date, these suggestions have been adopted by more than 160 nations as part of the Law of the Sea Convention.
The Politics of Global Warming

In recent years, global warming has severely weakened Arctic ice and made the region easier to navigate. Canada now faces a serious threat against what some see as its sovereign territory. Many countries lay claim to the region—and the seabed—of the Arctic Circle. At stake is the Arctic’s many important resources: oil, natural gas, diamonds, gold, and silver.

The Northwest Passage is enormously beneficial to Canada as well. Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced that Canada will build a deep-water port in the High Arctic. Will this be enough to protect Canada’s sovereignty in the Arctic? Though Inuit governments and organizations are generally positive, the Inuit have mixed feelings about these developments, which will significantly change their lives.

Paul Kaludjak of the Arctic Athabaskan Council (AAC) expressed the council’s view:

_The Canadian government does not have a strategy to assert our sovereignty. Instead, individual departments have reacted to events. We need a long-term plan that knits together federal and territorial agencies and Inuit organizations. We all have roles to play. Asserting Arctic sovereignty is a national, not a federal, project._

—Arctic Athabaskan Council Newsletter, November 2006

Canada has until 2013 to submit evidence to the UN to support its claim to the Arctic.

FIGURE 7–37 How might the extension of territorial limits affect Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic? Do you think Canada should defend its claims to the region?

1. What do you think Trudeau meant when he said that living next to the United States is like sleeping next to an elephant?

2. List the ways in which Trudeau distanced Canada’s foreign policy from that of the U.S. in the 1970s.

3. How did Trudeau try to bridge the gap between rich and poor countries?

4. In what areas of the world did Cold War tensions increase from 1979 to 1984? What was Canada’s response?

5. What steps did Canada take in the 1960s and 1970s to uphold its rights in the Arctic? Have these efforts been effective?
CHAPTER FOCUS QUESTION

How did Canada’s political, social, and economic policies reflect a new independence in the 1960s and 1970s?

By 1967, Canada had a population of 20 million people, half of whom were under 25 years of age. The needs, views, and priorities of youth affected everything from politics to social priorities. In politics, Pierre Trudeau and his policies seemed to reflect the times. The country experienced a separatist crisis to which Trudeau responded forcefully. Canadians also thought a lot about their ties to the United States, particularly after Americans became involved in the unpopular Vietnam War. And, perhaps for the first time, the environment became an important national and international issue.

1. Make a three-column chart like the one shown below for the key people, events, and ideas of the 1960s and 1970s. Use the information in the chapter to fill in the chart, including a brief explanation of each item and a sketch to help you visualize the concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key People</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
<th>Key Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocabulary Focus

2. Create a series of study cards, one for each of the following terms. Write a definition for each term and then pass the cards to two other students, each of whom will add another layer of meaning to the definition by linking the term to two other terms on the list.

Québec nationalism
October Crisis
Flag Debate
hippy
Cuban Missile Crisis
draft dodger
NATO
Red Ensign
NORAD
War Measures Act
Vietnam War
Canadian nationalism

Knowledge and Understanding

3. Continue the ongoing timeline assignment for the history section of this course. Review the events that are covered in the chapter. Write the name and date of each event on the timeline and explain how the event contributed to Canadian independence.

4. What was the October Crisis? Why was this event a challenge to Canadian unity? How did Trudeau respond?

5. What efforts were made to celebrate Canada’s identity in 1967?

6. How successful was the Canadian government in dealing with the economic challenges of the 1960s and 1970s? Provide evidence from the textbook.

7. What is inflation? What caused the inflation of the 1970s? Why would inflation affect Canadian unity? (Hint: Think about regionalism.) How did the National Energy Program add to the problem?

9. “The Vietnam War helped define Canada as a nation since it encouraged Canadian leaders to distance their country from U.S. foreign policy.” Explain this statement in your own words.

10. How successful was Canada at keeping its independence from the U.S. during the 1960s and 1970s? Create a two-column chart like the one below. Provide examples of independence and rate their success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Canadian Independence from the U.S.</th>
<th>Success Rate (high/moderate/low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Thinking

11. Using the chart from Question 1, select at least five events that you think were the most significant to Canada’s independence during the 1960s and 1970s. Provide evidence to support your opinion.

12. Assess the impact of Québec nationalism both on Québec and on the rest of Canada.

13. List and then rank Trudeau’s largest national and international challenges. Provide evidence from the textbook to support your choices.

14. Trudeau was right to impose the War Measures Act in 1970. Present a reasoned argument for or against this statement.

Document Analysis

15. The 1960s and 1970s were decades of varied and widespread social activism. Look at the photos in the collage below and respond to the following:

- How might these images influence other groups or individuals?
- Analyze the photos and explain why each group was protesting.
- Is there a common theme or goal for the groups?
- Describe some of the methods used by the groups to achieve their goals.
- Evaluate which methods were the most successful in drawing attention to the groups’ causes and explain why this was the case.
- Which of these methods are still used today?
- From your knowledge, how successful were the groups in achieving their goals?