Canada Shifts Focus: 1980 and Beyond

GUIDING QUESTIONS

Society & Identity
- In what ways did Canadian society change after 1980?
- How did Canada’s multiculturalism policy affect minority groups?
- How did changes to social policies affect women and minority groups in Canada?
- How did Aboriginal Canadians respond to challenges in the late 20th century?
- What was the impact of Québec nationalism on Canadian unity?
- What measures has Canada taken to promote a distinct Canadian identity?

Politics & Government
- How did changes to the Constitution impact Canadian society?

Economy & Human Geography
- How did the Canadian government respond to economic challenges after 1980?
- How does globalization affect living standards?

Autonomy & World Presence
- What factors contributed to Canada’s emerging autonomy?
- What was Canada’s involvement in the Cold War?
- What was Canada’s response to modern conflicts?
- Describe Canada’s involvement in the UN.

TIMELINE

1980
First Québec referendum on sovereignty-association

1982
Constitution patriation

1985
Peak of the debt crisis

1987
Meech Lake Accord signed

1990
Meech Lake Accord dies
Oka Crisis in Québec

1990s
Asian countries become major sources of immigration

1992
Charlottetown Accord rejected
CHAPTER FOCUS QUESTION
How did Canada and Canadian identity change as a result of social, economic, and cultural trends at the end of the millennium and beyond?

In the summer of 1990, events in the Québec town of Oka made headlines across the nation. The town council decided to expand a golf course into long-disputed land that Mohawks at the nearby Kanesatake reserve considered sacred.

The Mohawks decided to stop construction of the golf course by blockading the land. In response, the mayor of Oka called in Québec’s provincial police. On July 11, the police advanced on the Mohawk lines, gunfire broke out, and an officer was killed. It was not clear which side had fired the fatal shot.

From that point, events snowballed. The police blockaded Kanesatake. Mohawks from the nearby Kahnawake reserve barricaded the road to a bridge that ran through their reserve, blocking motorist access to part of Montréal.

There were nightly violent confrontations involving the population of nearby Québec communities, the police, and the Mohawks. Across Canada, other Aboriginal groups demonstrated their support by blockading highways and railway tracks that ran through their reserves.

As the tense standoff continued, Québec Premier Robert Bourassa called in the Canadian Forces. Troops with heavy weapons moved into the area. Negotiations to end the crisis were tense. Toward the end of September, members of other bands persuaded the Mohawks of Kanesatake to end the standoff. Eventually, the disputed land was purchased by the federal government and given to Kanesatake.

KEY TERMS
Multiculturalism Act
self-government
sovereignty-association
distinct society
amending formula
notwithstanding clause
Meech Lake Accord
Bloc Québécois
Free Trade Agreement (FTA)
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
Rwandan genocide

1993
B.C. Treaty Commission established
Collapse of the Conservative Party

1994
Widespread access to Internet

1995
Second Québec referendum

1997
Delgamuukw decision regarding Aboriginal land claims

1999
Nunavut created

2000
Nisga’a Treaty given royal assent

2001
Terrorist attack on New York’s World Trade Center (9/11)
Canadian Forces at war in Afghanistan
Popular Culture and the Spirit of the Age

As the millennium approached, popular culture—which for the most part mirrored what was happening with young people—reflected some of the cynicism and confusion that seemed to characterize the era. The revolutionary optimism of the 1960s seemed almost naïve from the perspective of the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s. Environmental disasters, economic shocks such as the stock market crash of 1987 and the economic crisis of 2008, and perennial high unemployment among young workers made for an uncertain future.

Youth culture tended to fragment into subgroups—each identifying with a style of music, a way of dressing, and an attitude toward life. The list of musical styles that came and went included new wave, punk, glam rock, heavy metal, grunge, alternative, pop, house, rap, hip hop, and gangsta. Fashionable looks ranged from mullets to big hair to neon-dyed buzz cuts, from dancewear to ripped jeans to belly shirts. Body piercing and tattoos became popular with everyone from punks to preppies.

These decades saw a huge rise in consumerism and materialism. Brand names and designer labels became extremely powerful marketing tools. Yet at the same time, people became more aware of the social and environmental costs of their consumption. Some refused to buy products such as running shoes because they were produced in sweatshops, often by children, in developing countries. Naomi Klein’s book No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies, which criticized branding and globalization, became a best-seller.

The Boomers and After

Most baby boomers were between the ages of 20 and 40 in the 1980s. They were still the largest demographic group in history, and eventually became the holders of power and wealth. As their parents retired, boomers moved into influential positions in government and business. The huge growth in the economy since the 1990s is due, in large part, to the fact that these were the peak earning and spending years of the boomers. Their comparative wealth changed the way people expected to live their lives. Travel had become less expensive and the price of consumer goods relative to wages dropped.

Financially secure boomers became known as “yuppies,” which stood for young urban (or upwardly mobile) professionals. Yuppies were not afraid to spend their money. They took expensive holidays, bought the latest electronics, fancy cars, and expensive houses. The opening decade of the 21st century saw a huge explosion in goods and services aimed at aging boomers, including retirement communities, health and anti-aging products, and cosmetic surgery.
Generations X and Y

The generation immediately following the baby boomers was much smaller than its predecessor. Called Generation X, or the Gen Xers, they were the first of the so-called “latchkey kids,” children of single working parents or those who lived in households in which both parents worked. Canadian author Douglas Coupland, who wrote a novel called Generation X, described them as “underemployed, overeducated, intensely private and unpredictable.” Gen Xers were not, generally, as interested in politics and social change as the boomers. They came of age during times of economic difficulty when all the good jobs seemed to be taken. As a result, they tended to be more cynical and less optimistic about the future. The widespread introduction of computers and the Internet had a huge effect on the lifestyles of the Gen Xers. Popular television shows, such as Seinfeld and Friends, made fun of the supposed self-centredness of Gen Xers.

Generation Y, made up of people born between the mid-1970s and the end of the 1990s, was even more heavily influenced than the Gen Xers by new technologies such as computers, video games, and cellphones. The buying power of Generation Y forced manufacturers to keep up with its demands for better and faster computing and networking products, and these have fundamentally changed the way society operates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation X, also known as Gen Xers</th>
<th>Generation Y, also known as Baby Boom Echo, Millennials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>born between 1965 and 1976</td>
<td>born from the mid-1970s to the late 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>latchkey kids of working parents</td>
<td>born into nurturing, child-centric times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable with technology</td>
<td>most technologically literate generation in history, plugged in 24/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable with diversity</td>
<td>celebrate diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-educated, underemployed</td>
<td>success-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent, individualistic</td>
<td>confident, ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cynical, pessimistic outlook</td>
<td>fun-loving outlook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 8–4 Characteristics of Generations X and Y

Aging Boomers

The disproportionately large size of the baby boomer generation, the increased longevity of the population, and declining birth rates all add up to problems for Canada in the future. As the boomers retire in large numbers, there will not be enough workers entering the workforce to replace them. Some experts predict that by 2020, Canada will face a labour shortage of 1 million workers. The skills and talents of the boomers will be sorely missed. In addition, pension costs, health services, and old-age benefits required by aging boomers will put huge pressure on the Canadian economy. The rising costs of these social programs will force young Canadians to pay higher taxes than previous generations.

1. What are some of the negative aspects of an aging population?

2. How might the large number of aging baby boomers impact your life?
In the early 1980s, personal computers had limited power and relatively few functions. By the end of the 20th century, most Canadian homes had relatively powerful computers and Internet access to a range of information and consumer services. In the 1990s, some Canadians began to “telecommute”: to work from their home or car, keeping in touch with the office via computer. In many industries, computers displaced humans. A new knowledge-based economy emerged, one in which knowledge, skills, and the ability to adapt to new situations became more important than ever before.

What came before One of the first home computers, the Commodore 64 (1982), had no hard drive, a very slow 1-MHz processor, and limited software. Nevertheless, it showed that desktop computers in homes were practical.

At home, at work Laptop computers were introduced in 1981. As they improved over the years, they gave people more freedom by allowing them to take their work with them wherever they went.

Not pocket size Cellphones were first made commercially available in 1983. The first cellphone cost nearly US$4000. Early models were large and needed to be recharged frequently.

Getting smaller Today, cellphones are smaller and have more capabilities. Many people use them as personal organizers to store contact information, photographs, music, and videos. Many cellphones also have Internet capabilities.
Canada reaches out The first Canadarm was designed and built by Spar Aerospace in 1981. The remote arm that is attached to NASA’s space shuttles allows crews to launch and recapture satellites. Without this technology, much of the world’s satellite communication would be impossible.

Hello Dolly Scientists announced the first cloning of a mammal, a sheep named Dolly, in 1996. This technological breakthrough raised ethical questions about human cloning.

What’s next? Over the past few decades, computers and other communications technologies have revolutionized the way Canadians work, play, and communicate. The widespread use of the Internet has important social implications. People network with new friends, new social groups emerge, tastes in music and art shift rapidly, and notions of personal privacy change.

Easy listening CDs were introduced in 1984 and largely displaced vinyl records.

Home viewing Video cassette recorders (VCRs), microwave ovens, and cable television came into widespread use in the 1980s.
Multiculturalism Becomes an Issue

During the 1980s, Canada became more multicultural than ever before. Government policies encouraged immigrants with money and business skills to create jobs by investing in existing companies or starting new ones. Figures 8–5 and 8–6 show how the countries of origin of immigrants changed over the years.

Unlike immigrants who had arrived earlier in the century in search of good farmland, later immigrants were drawn to Canada’s cities. For instance, in 2006, 94.9 percent of Canada’s foreign-born population and 97.2 percent of recent immigrants who had landed in the previous five years, lived in urban communities. This compared with 77.5 percent of the Canadian-born urban population.

As new cultures took root in British Columbia, some issues were raised. For example, traditional Canadian holidays, such as Easter and Christmas, are rooted in the Christian faith and culture. These holidays presented a challenge for schools with large multicultural populations. One solution was to highlight the festivals of groups represented in sufficient numbers in the school. For example, Chinese New Year, the Muslim holy month of Ramadan, and Sikh holy days such as Baisakhi were celebrated in some schools. These festivals offered students a better understanding of the beliefs and customs of Canada’s multicultural society.

Multiculturalism Act

The Canadian Multiculturalism Act (Bill C-93) was enacted by Parliament in 1988, to provide a legal framework for existing multiculturalism policies across Canada. In the spirit of the Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (see Chapter 10), the Multiculturalism Act aimed to reinforce racial and cultural equality with legal authority. The Act ensured that all federal institutions took into account the multicultural reality of Canada.

The federal government further recognized the growth of Canada’s multicultural communities by establishing the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship. Supporters say the government’s multiculturalism policy helped strengthen national unity by drawing all Canadians closer together in mutual respect.
Does Canada need a multiculturalism policy?

The federal government established the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship in 1989 with the aim of promoting multiculturalism in all areas of government policy. Despite this initiative, Canadian attitudes toward multiculturalism are complex. Canada’s official multiculturalism policy has fierce defenders and critics. Many Canadians believe the policy benefits Canada. They feel multiculturalism plays a positive role in the nation’s development, and that it helps create national unity, as Pierre Trudeau had claimed it would in 1971. Supporters also feel that multiculturalism allows people of all ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds to feel welcome here, and to play a positive role in the development of the nation. It gives Canadians an awareness of other cultures, an asset when dealing with problems that may arise in various communities. Furthermore, they say the policy helps promote values such as tolerance, equality, and support of diversity.

Opponents of multiculturalism claim that it is not good for the country to promote differences in cultures. They say this approach weakens the country’s unity. Others feel that ethnic groups should maintain their own cultures in Canada if they wish but that the government should not provide financial support to these groups. As examples, they point to countries such as Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, where ethnic diversity has ripped communities and families apart. It would be better, they say, to follow the “melting-pot” model of the United States, where cultural groups were encouraged to assimilate—that is, to give up their identities and take on the mainstream culture to a greater extent.

For:

Hedy Fry, the Member of Parliament for Vancouver Centre, has expressed the following view:

Multiculturalism is the key to Canadian unity. We must understand that people of different races can have a strong sense of belonging to one nation while maintaining their original cultural identities... Multiculturalism and respect for our differences are important reasons why this country has been ranked as the best nation in the world by the United Nations.

Against:

During a House of Commons debate in 1994, Saskatchewan Member of Parliament, Lee Morrison, said:

Every few years a politician will stop in your community... and patronizingly solicit your votes... to preserve cultural diversity. Now lest any hon. member dismiss my deeply held convictions... as the insensitive views of one white guy in a suit... Dr. Rais Khan... a very wise new Canadian... “I did not come here to be labelled as an ethnic or as a member of the multicultural community or to be coddled with preferential treatment, nurtured with special grants and then sit on the sidelines and watch the world go by... If I want to preserve my cultural heritage, that is my business. If I want to invite you into my home to eat some spicy traditional food, that is our business. If I expect you to pay for my cultural activities, that is your business.”

Analyzing the Issue

1. In a group, survey a variety of Canadian newspapers, magazines, and television programs to determine the extent to which they reflect Canada’s multicultural nature. Use a three-column chart to record your findings, according to the media types surveyed. Summarize your findings, and present them to the class.

2. Why do you think views differ on multiculturalism?

3. Imagine you are the federal minister responsible for multiculturalism. Prepare a speech announcing that you are going to do one of the following:

   a) continue the policy of multiculturalism or

   b) make changes to it

   Justify your decision, taking possible consequences into account.
Toward a More Just World

The rights movements of earlier decades (see Chapter 7) continued to gain strength during the 1980s and 1990s. Equality rights for women were enshrined in the Constitution in 1982. In 1985, Aboriginal women won the right to Aboriginal status even if they married non-Aboriginals. Tests for job suitability, such as height and strength requirements that favour men, were challenged in the mid-1990s. Gay rights activism also accelerated during this period. Although some bills that prohibited discrimination based on sexual orientation failed to pass the House of Commons in the 1980s, such discrimination was outlawed by the mid-1990s. In 2005, Canada had become the fourth country in the world to legalize same-sex marriage through the passage of the Civil Marriage Act. You will read more about each of these rights in Chapter 10.

A Spirit of Generosity

A renewed sense of responsibility to help out those in need became part of the world view of many Canadians in the 1980s. In 1984, CBC reporter Brian Stewart brought the world’s attention to the famine in Ethiopia. Canadian recording stars such as Neil Young, Bryan Adams, Joni Mitchell, and Robert Charlebois got together to form the supergroup Northern Lights and recorded the song “Tears Are Not Enough” to raise money for famine relief. Proceeds from the recording eventually raised more than $3 million. American musicians also created a similar supergroup. USA for Africa recorded “We Are the World” in 1985. Bob Geldof founded Band-Aid in 1984—comprised of Irish and British musicians—and recorded “Do They Know It’s Christmas?” This recording, along with the Live-Aid concerts that followed, each raised money for international aid efforts. Similar concerts continued into the next century.

FIGURE 8–7 The Northern Lights

How did changes to social policies affect women and minority groups in Canada?
In 1978, 21-year-old Terry Fox, who had lost a leg to cancer, decided to run across Canada. The goal of his run, which he called the Marathon of Hope, was to raise money for cancer research. Terry started his run by dipping his leg into the Atlantic Ocean in St. John’s, Newfoundland, on April 12, 1980. He intended to run all the way to the Pacific Ocean on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

Terry set himself a gruelling pace—42 kilometres per day. By the time Terry reached Southern Ontario, crowds of people were lining his route cheering him on. When Terry was approaching Thunder Bay, he was forced to stop his run due to pains in his chest. He went to the hospital where doctors discovered that the cancer had spread to his lungs. He died in 1981, and was mourned across the country.

Canadians honour Terry Fox with annual Terry Fox runs and have donated hundreds of millions of dollars to the cause he championed. He is considered one of Canada’s heroes.

1. Terry Fox hoped to raise $21 million for cancer research. So far, his organization has raised more than $400 million worldwide. Why do you think his goal has been surpassed on such a grand scale?

FIGURE 8–8 Terry Fox had a special brace fitted for his run but endured pain and discomfort nevertheless.
The Fight for Aboriginal Rights

The crisis in Oka, Québec, which you read about at the beginning of the chapter, ended after about two and a half months of tense and sometimes violent confrontation. Oka served as a wake-up call to the government and people of Canada. Canada’s Aboriginal peoples had demonstrated again that they were prepared to fight for their rights.

The Legacy of Residential Schools

Even though the residential school system had been dismantled by the final decade of the 20th century, its effects continued to haunt Aboriginal people who had lived through it. In 1990, a new aspect of the residential school legacy was brought to light. The Grand Chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Phil Fontaine, spoke out about the physical and sexual abuse he suffered at a residential school. Others soon came forward with horrifying stories of abuse. Eighteen years later, Prime Minister Stephen Harper read an official apology to Aboriginal people in the House of Commons. It said, in part:

_The treatment of children in Indian residential schools is a sad chapter in our history…. The government now recognizes that the consequences of the Indian residential schools policy were profoundly negative and that this policy has had a lasting and damaging impact on Aboriginal culture, heritage and language. While some former students have spoken positively about their experiences at residential schools, these stories are far overshadowed by tragic accounts of the emotional, physical and sexual abuse and neglect of helpless children, and their separation from powerless families and communities…. The Government of Canada sincerely apologizes and asks the forgiveness of the Aboriginal peoples of this country for failing them so profoundly._

The Path to Self-Government

In 1982, the Assembly of First Nations was formed to represent Aboriginal peoples in their dealings with the federal government. During the constitutional negotiations (see Chapter 10), the Assembly pressured political leaders for legal recognition of Aboriginal rights. As a result, Aboriginal rights were entrenched in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In 1985, Parliament also passed Bill C-31, which gave Aboriginal band councils the power to decide who had the right to live on Aboriginal reserves. Previous decisions of this sort had been made by the federal government’s Department of Indian Affairs.

The increase in band council powers raised the question, “What other powers should be transferred from the federal government to the band councils?” The stage was set for discussions about self-government. Aboriginal peoples argued that self-government would give them the right to manage resources and gain control of their education, culture, and justice systems. This would then give them the tools needed to tackle social and health concerns in their communities.

But how would self-government work in practice? Should reserves be run as municipal or town governments by the band members? Or would Aboriginal lands and reserves across Canada eventually join together to form something like a province? Furthermore, by what means could Aboriginal nations lay claim to lands that they considered to be theirs?

Aboriginal land claims have been of two types. Specific claims have arisen in areas where treaties between Aboriginal peoples and the federal government have been signed, but their terms have not been kept. For example, the agreed-upon size of a reserve may have decreased as land was taken away to build highways or other projects. Comprehensive claims have questioned the ownership of land in large parts of Canada that were never surrendered by treaty.
Land Claims in British Columbia

Most land claims in British Columbia have been comprehensive, as Aboriginal nations never officially gave up their claims to most of what is now British Columbia. In addition, when the British took over Canada, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 declared that “any lands whatever, which, not having been ceded to or purchased by us, ...are reserved to the ...Indians.” Treaties were not signed except in a few areas, such as the province’s northeast corner and parts of Vancouver Island.

Opponents of comprehensive claims argue that the 1763 proclamation cannot be valid in parts of Canada, such as the North and British Columbia, that were not known to the British at that time. They assert that Canada exercised the traditional rights of “discoverers and conquerors.” In any case, without written records, it is difficult for some First Nations to prove continuous occupation of the land.

FIGURE 8–12 Aboriginal land claims in B.C. amount to 110 percent of the province. The B.C. government stated that it favours a total land settlement of approximately 5 percent, reflecting the Aboriginal percentage of the population of the province.
Nunavut

Self-government and land claims continue to be important issues in many other parts of Canada. The creation of the territory of Nunavut in 1999 resulted from the largest treaty ever negotiated in Canada. It gave the Inuit of this northern area political control over 2 million square kilometres of the eastern Arctic. Aboriginal land claims and self-government will continue to be a powerful force for change in shaping the nation into the 21st century.

What If...

Opponents of the Nisga’a settlement demanded that a provincial referendum be held on the issue. But the government refused, arguing that the rights of a minority can never be fairly decided by a vote of the majority. What do you think the outcome would have been if the government had not made this decision?
Aboriginal art is an important part of Canadian culture, and Aboriginal writers and artists are recognized and have won acclaim around the world.

**Tomson Highway** (born 1951) is a Cree from Manitoba. After studying music and literature in Ontario and in England, he joined a performing arts company. He is a playwright whose works include *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing* and *The Rez Sisters*. He became Artistic Director of Native Earth Performing Arts in Toronto, one of only a few Aboriginal theatre groups in North America.

**Daphne Odjig** was born in 1919 on Manitoulin Island, Ontario. Her grandfather was a stone carver who told her about the history and legends of her people. Odjig later moved to British Columbia, where her paintings were inspired by the landscape of the B.C. interior and the West Coast islands. She published her memoirs, *A Paintbrush in My Hand*, in 1992, and in 1998 received the Achievement Award in Arts and Culture from the National Aboriginal Achievement Foundation.

**Joseph Boyden** (born 1966) is a highly acclaimed Canadian novelist and short story writer of Irish, Scottish, and Ojibwa descent. His first novel, *Three Day Road*, is about two young Cree, Xavier and Elijah, who sign up for the military during the First World War. It is inspired by Ojibwa Francis Pegahmagabow, the legendary First World War sniper. Boyden’s second novel, *Through Black Spruce*, follows the story of Will, son of one of the characters in *Three Day Road*, and his niece, Annie, who has returned to the bush from the city where she has been searching for her missing sister. Joseph Boyden won the prestigious Scotiabank Giller Prize for *Through Black Spruce* in 2008.

---

I ask Elijah where I can find rounds for the Fritz rifle. Elijah’d promised me more a while ago, and only a handful is left now. I think he is holding out. Elijah covets this gun, but I am responsible for taking down the Hun sniper who loved the dead. The night of the day I killed my first human was the first time I felt like an ancestor, an awawatuk raider and warrior. I prayed to Gitchi Manitou for many hours on that day and the following day, thanking him that it was I who still breathed and not my enemy. Since that time I am able to shoot at other men and understand what I do is for survival, as long as I pray to Gitchi Manitou. He understands. My enemy might not understand this when I send him on the three-day road, but maybe he will on the day that I finally meet him again.

---

*Excerpt from Three Day Road*

**FIGURE 8–14** *The Indian in Transition* by Daphne Odjig. Painted in the late 1970s, the mural outlines the history of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.
Douglas Cardinal (born 1934) is a distinguished architect from Calgary, Alberta. He is best known for designing the Canadian Museum of Civilization. In his words, “the Museum will speak of the emergence of man from the melting glaciers; of man and woman living in harmony with the forces of nature and evolving with them.”

Bill Reid (1920–1998) discovered in his teens that his mother was Haida. He became interested in traditional Haida carving techniques and began to create wooden masks and totem poles using traditional techniques. Reid’s work inspired other Aboriginal artists to return to traditional art forms.

John Kim Bell (born 1952) was born on the Kahnawake Mohawk reserve in Québec. He studied violin and piano as a youth. In 1980, he was appointed apprentice conductor of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. He went on to devote his time to promoting opportunities for Aboriginal artists and, in 1993, he established the National Aboriginal Achievement Award.

Susan Aglukark (born 1967) was raised in Arviat, Northwest Territories, now part of Nunavut. She has developed a distinctive musical style, fusing traditional Inuit chants with modern pop melodies.

1. What themes and concerns are evident in the works of the Aboriginal artists featured here?

2. Explain the importance of these artists to young Aboriginals in Canada.
The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

In 1991, one year after the Oka Crisis, the federal government launched an extensive study of the issues that affected Aboriginal peoples. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples travelled across the country for five years, gathering information and talking to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Canadians. It released a five-volume report of its findings in 1996. The report concluded that sweeping changes were needed to help mend the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the government. The report also presented strategies to close the economic gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples and improve social conditions.

Ten years later, the Assembly of First Nations put out a “report card” describing the progress that had been made on the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The report card stated the following statistics:

- One in 4 First Nations children live in poverty compared to 1 in 6 Canadian children.
- Life expectancy for First Nations men is 7.4 years less, and 5.2 years less for First Nations women, compared to Canadian men and women respectively.
- Unemployment is over 50 percent, and rises to over 60 percent for those without high school completion.

The report card also noted that Canada was one of two countries that voted against the UN Declaration on the Rights of Aboriginal People in June 2006. The report card concluded that “Canada has failed in terms of its action to date.”

PRACTICE QUESTIONS

1. What was the government’s response to demands that it acknowledge its part in the ill treatment of Aboriginal children in residential schools? Do you think this response was adequate? Give reasons.

2. Explain the importance of
   a) the Assembly of First Nations
   b) specific land claims
   c) comprehensive land claims
   d) the Nisga’a Treaty
   e) the Delgamuukw decision

3. [Evidence] What percentage of British Columbia land do Aboriginal groups claim? What Aboriginal land settlement percentage does the B.C. government favour? What issues do these percentages raise?

4. a) Why do you think the creation of Nunavut is significant?
   b) What challenges do you think are posed for Nunavut by having 29 000 people politically control 2 million square kilometres of land? How do you think e-mail and other modern technologies can help?

5. Summarize the contributions of Aboriginal artists to Canadian society.

6. What were the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples? Does this surprise you? Explain.

7. Make a list of at least five events that contributed to Aboriginal Canadians affirming their identity and position in society. Explain why you chose each item.
Constitution and Discord

In the 1970s, the October Crisis and the election of the Parti Québécois (PQ) made it clear that the threat of Quebec separatism was very real. Concerns about separatism contributed to Prime Minister Trudeau’s determination to patriate Canada’s Constitution. He hoped that a “made in Canada” Constitution would make Québécois feel more comfortable about their position. Québec discontent and the Constitution continued to define Canadian affairs well into the 1990s. Twice during this time, PQ governments tried and failed to win referenda that would have separated Québec from the rest of Canada.

The 1980 Referendum

In 1980, the PQ government of René Lévesque called a referendum on Québec sovereignty. Lévesque asked Québécois to give his government a mandate to negotiate a new agreement with Canada based on what he called sovereignty-association. Québec would become politically independent, or “maîtres chez nous,” yet maintain a close economic association with Canada. This partnership would include
• free trade between Canada and Québec
• a common currency for the two nations
• common tariffs against imported goods

Prime Minister Trudeau asked Québec to remain part of a strong, united, and forward-looking Canada. He promised to negotiate a new Constitution, which proved popular among Québécois who wanted a Constitution that recognized Québec as an equal partner in Confederation and as a distinct society within Canada.

In the referendum, only 40 percent of Québécois voted “yes” to sovereignty-association. Lévesque accepted defeat but promised that, one day, they would realize their dream of a sovereign Québec.

KEY TERMS

patriate to take control of power over a document from a former colonial government
sovereignty-association a proposal by Québec nationalists that Québec have political independence yet retain close economic ties or association with Canada
distinct society a phrase that refers to the recognition of the unique nature of Québec within Canada; it often has the sense that Québec should have special powers and privileges to protect its language and culture

What was the impact of Québec nationalism on Canadian unity?
Patriating the Constitution

The British North America (BNA) Act had been Canada’s Constitution since 1867. The Act set out the powers of the federal and provincial governments and guaranteed the language and education rights of Québec’s Francophone majority. Since the BNA Act fell under British jurisdiction, no changes could be made without the British Parliament’s approval.

Amending the Constitution

Prime Minister Trudeau wanted to patriate the Constitution so that the Canadian government would have sole authority to make changes to it. Trudeau hoped, above all, to include in the Constitution a clear statement of the basic rights to which all Canadians were entitled. You will read more about the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in Chapter 10.

As a first step, Trudeau needed to come up with a formula for amending, or making changes to, the Constitution. Questions such as the following needed to be considered: How many provinces need to be in agreement to make a change to the Constitution? Should Québec, as the Francophone partner in Confederation, be given veto power? Getting both the federal and provincial governments to agree to an amending formula was difficult.

While Québec pushed for more power, the Western provinces saw patriating the Constitution as a way to have more say in affairs that affected them. Most of the provincial premiers outside of Québec felt that the Charter would make the courts more powerful than provincial legislatures. In Québec, Lévesque feared that the Charter could be used to override his language laws or any other legislation that might be passed to protect Québec’s distinct society.

A series of meetings failed to resolve the concerns that divided the provinces and the federal government. In a final attempt to reach an agreement, the prime minister and the premiers met in Ottawa on November 4, 1981. Over late-night cups of coffee in the kitchen of the National Conference Centre, federal Justice Minister Jean Chrétien and the justice ministers from Saskatchewan and Ontario hammered out what came to be called the “Kitchen Accord.” The provincial premiers were awakened in their rooms at the Château Laurier Hotel and asked to approve the deal.

Including a Notwithstanding Clause

The premiers agreed to accept the Charter if an escape clause were added. This was the notwithstanding clause, which allowed the federal government or any of the provinces to opt out of some of the clauses in the Charter. An agreement on the amending formula was also reached. Changes to the Constitution could be made only with the agreement of “seven out of ten provinces representing 50 percent of Canada’s population.” This meant, in effect, that Québec could be excluded as long as Ontario was included.

René Lévesque argued against the deal but Trudeau accepted the compromise. He maintained that the federal government had so many members from Québec that it could speak for that province. Lévesque and the people of Québec felt that the federal government and the other provincial premiers had ganged up to deny Québec recognition of its distinct status. The Québec provincial government refused to sign the proposed Constitution.
Trudeau went ahead without Québec’s agreement. On April 17, 1982, Queen Elizabeth II and Prime Minister Trudeau signed the new Constitution Act into law. As the rest of Canada celebrated, flags in Québec flew at half-mast and Premier Lévesque led an angry demonstration through the streets of Québec City. The last step toward making Canada a completely independent nation had been taken, but the process had revealed cracks in national unity that would continue to trouble Canadians in the years that followed.

**Trudeau Steps Down**

Trudeau’s dream of a Canadian Constitution had become a reality. He felt he had played his part and was growing tired of politics. On February 28, 1984, he left his official residence at 24 Sussex Drive in Ottawa for a walk through the snowy streets of the capital. It was then that he decided to retire from politics. The Trudeau era had come to an end.

John Turner, who had served in the Cabinet under both Pearson and Trudeau, won the leadership of the Liberals. He called an election soon after, and the Liberals suffered a disastrous defeat to Brian Mulroney’s Progressive Conservatives, winning only 40 seats in the House of Commons. When the Liberals under Turner lost the next election as well, Turner resigned his position and was replaced by Jean Chrétien.

**FIGURE 8–19** Queen Elizabeth II arrives to sign Canada’s Constitution Act, April 17, 1982.

*Thinking Critically* Why would the Canadian government want to have the Queen sign the Act in Canada?
When you defend a position on an issue, you present arguments that you hope will persuade others. Argument and persuasion are important components of many forms of communication, including opinion pieces, essays, editorials, speeches, and debates. When you prepare an argument to defend your position on an issue, you need to use facts and anecdotes that support your position. Remember that a well-structured argument is very different from simply expressing opinions or ideas on a subject.

Defending a position on an issue means that you must do the following:

**Know what you are talking about.** Understanding the basis for your argument is the key to defending it. Do research to gather facts and evidence to support your position.

**Clarify your position.** You should begin by clearly stating your point of view. This statement is the thesis of your argument and needs to be as specific as possible.

**Understand the terms.** Learn the meaning of the terms that you are using. The proper use of terminology is fundamental to defending your position.

**Anticipate objections.** Knowing your position well means that you also know what objections might be raised by those who disagree with you. Be ready to counter objections with well-reasoned and well-supported points.

### Practising the Skill

Québec separation has been a major issue in Canada for many decades. Below are three positions on separatism: the first by a Grade 11 student from Kitchener, Ontario; the second from a Québec sovereigntist group’s Web posting; and the third from a grand chief and chairman of Québec’s Grand Council of the Crees. Summarize the position each writer has taken on the issue of separatism and describe how you would defend it.

1. The separation of Québec would have a large impact on our lives as Canadians, perhaps not directly, but indirectly. If Québec were to separate, we would have to take many things into account, such as how we would connect with the eastern provinces, how to organize trade with Québec, and how the rest of the world will view us if Québec does secede.

   It is my belief that as citizens in this country, we must be conscious of this movement and take action to convince Québec to stay. We have so far spent billions of dollars on protecting the French language and the Québec way of life.

   We have even let the rights of Anglophone citizens (English-speaking people in Québec) be violated for the sake of the French culture in acts such as Bill 101.

   There is evidence to show that if Québec ever did separate, its language and culture would be even more at risk than it is now. Canada is one of the main reasons that the French language is as strong as it is today. We have passed many laws to protect it and provided funding for the spread of the French language throughout the rest of the country.

   —Claire Lehan, “Separatism is an issue for all of Canada, not just Québec,” 2006
2. French is Québec’s official language. Nevertheless, Québec’s English-speaking community has always had the right to maintain and develop its own institutions, especially in the fields of health and education, and it is quite possible for an English-speaking person to live and even work in Montréal in English. Despite these guarantees, some people regard the measures taken to protect French as excessive and systematically fight against it with the aid of the Canadian government. It is our view that all citizens, regardless of their origins or the communities they belong to, are entitled to freedom of expression; and indeed Québec’s Bill of Rights is among the most progressive on that score. This individual freedom of expression can, in our view, coexist harmoniously with the legitimate promotion of the French language which, in the North-American context, requires appropriate legislation.

–Québec Sovereignty: A Legitimate Goal posted on the Internet by Intellectuals for the Sovereignty of Québec (IPSO)

3. In the past few years, Québec secessionist leaders have stated that their right to separate from Canada is based on a right of self-determination under international law. When faced with the issue of the Crees’ competing right of self-determination as a First Nation and a people, Lucien Bouchard, now the Premier of Québec, resorted to a blatant double standard. He simply declared that the right of self-determination belonged to the “Québec people,” but not to the Indians. The fundamental and constitutional rights of Aboriginal peoples in Québec are clearly a major obstacle for the secessionists. They claim that they have a historic right to determine their future on the basis of a distinct language, history, and culture. On what ground can they possibly deny, as they do, that we too have this right? The separatists claim that they have the right to choose to end their ties with Canada. On what basis can they possibly claim, as they do, that the Crees and the Inuit do not have the right to choose instead to maintain and renew our relationship with Canada?

–Grand Chief Matthew Coon Come, speech at the Canada Seminar, Harvard Center for International Affairs and Kennedy School of Government, October 28, 1996

Applying the Skill

1. **Evidence** Which opinions in each argument could be strengthened by citing specific, credible evidence?

2. Explain why knowing your subject and knowing the meaning of terms is important to defending a position on an issue.

3. With a partner, scan blogs, newspaper or magazine articles, or TV news shows for issue statements that you think state a position that needs to be defended or is being defended. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of each statement.

4. Pick a Canadian issue that you think is important and develop a position on that issue that is clearly stated and defensible. Use the guidelines for defending a position to help you. Share your work with others in a small group and get feedback. Use your fellow students’ comments to strengthen and further clarify your position.
Mulroney and the Constitution

By 1984, most Canadians outside Quebec felt that the issues of the Constitution and Canadian unity had been settled. Yet, when John Turner called an election later that year, Brian Mulroney, the leader of the Progressive Conservatives, returned to the issue of the Constitution. To build support from separatists in Quebec during the election campaign, Mulroney promised to repair the damage of 1982 by obtaining Quebec's consent to the Constitution “with honour and enthusiasm.”

Once elected, Mulroney looked for an opportunity to make good on his promise. The time seemed right when Rene Lévesque retired and the pro-federalist Liberal Party, led by Robert Bourassa, took office in Quebec. Mulroney’s first priority was to negotiate an agreement to have Quebec sign the Constitution. But by then, other provinces had their own demands. For example, Newfoundland and Alberta wanted more control of their resources—Newfoundland of its fisheries, and Alberta of its oil industries. As well, both Alberta and Newfoundland demanded reforms to the Senate that would give them a stronger voice in Ottawa.

Western alienation, which had grown through the oil crisis of the 1970s, had come to a head once again over a government contract to repair air force jets. Ottawa awarded the multibillion-dollar contract to the Bombardier company of Montreal, even though Bristol Aerospace of Winnipeg had made a better proposal. Westerners were convinced that the contract went to Bombardier just to “buy” Conservative votes in Quebec.

The Meech Lake Accord

Prime Minister Mulroney called the premiers to a conference to discuss the Constitution at Meech Lake, Quebec, in 1987. He proposed a package of amendments that included an offer to recognize Quebec as a distinct society. The package also included giving more power to the other provinces. All provinces, for example, would have the power to veto constitutional change. In a radio discussion, Premier Bourassa announced Quebec’s support for the accord:

"History will say... that [the] Meech Lake Accord was a unique chance for Canada. If it is accepted Canada will be and could be a great country. If it is rejected, it is hard to predict what will be the future."

—Robert Bourassa

WEB LINK To learn more about these constitutional debates, visit the Pearson Web site.

FIGURE 8–20 Some critics thought Mulroney had made a mistake in reopening the Constitution debate.

Interpreting a Cartoon What point of view about Mulroney and the Meech Lake Accord is this cartoonist expressing? Do you find the cartoon effective? Explain.
However, the accord had many critics. Former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau argued that the designation of Québec as a distinct society would create “two solitudes” in Canada. It would, he said, simply isolate the Francophones of Québec and make them less, rather than more, a part of Confederation. Many Québécois, on the other hand, saw this clause as a way of protecting French culture and language. Other critics also focused on the “distinct society” clause. They worried that it might be used in Québec to override the Charter and deprive specific groups of their rights. Aboriginal peoples pointed out that they too had a distinct society that needed to be recognized and protected. Others argued that Canadians had not been given enough opportunity to have their say on the issue.

Two provinces, Manitoba and Newfoundland, withheld their support from the Meech Lake Accord, and it died in June 1990. The failure of the accord was seen as a rejection of Québec itself, even a “humiliation.” Support in Québec for separation had soared to 64 percent. Lucien Bouchard, a powerful Québec member of Mulroney’s Cabinet, resigned in protest and formed a new national party, the Bloc Québécois. The Bloc would run in federal elections but it remained committed to Québec separation.

The Charlottetown Accord

Prime Minister Mulroney was not willing to let the Constitution debate end. He appointed a “Citizens’ Forum,” a committee that travelled across the nation to hear the views of Canadians on the Constitution. Eventually, Mulroney and provincial premiers proposed a package of constitutional amendments called the Charlottetown Accord. It answered Québec’s concerns in ways similar to the Meech Lake Accord, but it also advocated the principle of Aboriginal self-government. In addition, the Charlottetown Accord proposed reforming the Senate. In response to pressure from the Western provinces, the Senate would become an elected body with equal representation from all parts of the country.

The Charlottetown Accord was put to a national referendum in October 1992. Although Mulroney warned that rejection of the accord would endanger the very future of the nation, 54.3 percent of Canadian voters rejected it. The greatest opposition came from British Columbia, where 68.3 percent voted “no.” B.C. voters felt that the accord gave Québec too much power and they objected to the guarantee that Québec would always have 25 percent of the seats in the House of Commons, regardless of the size of its population. Many voters in Québec, on the other hand, believed that the Charlottetown Accord did not give them enough power because most of the Senate seats would go to the West. They also objected to Aboriginal self-government because it would affect a large portion of northern Québec.
Referendum of 1995 and After

Perhaps angered by events in the Constitution debates, Québécois again elected the separatist Parti Québécois in 1994. In 1995, Premier Jacques Parizeau called a provincial referendum on full sovereignty. The “yes” forces reminded Québécois of their “humiliation” in the rejection of the Meech Lake Accord. On October 30, 1995, the nation held its breath as the referendum votes were counted. The results: 49.4 percent of the people of Québec had voted “yes” to sovereignty. The close vote shocked Canadians.

The threat of separatism lessened somewhat in the following years. Lucien Bouchard, who became Québec’s premier in 1996, talked periodically of a new referendum, and the federal government under Prime Minister Jean Chrétien prepared guidelines for any future vote, stressing that the costs of sovereignty would be high for Québécois. Chrétien also sent the question of how Québec might separate to the Supreme Court of Canada and followed up on the Court’s ruling with his controversial Clarity Act. This set down in law, for the first time, Ottawa’s insistence on a clear question in any future referendum. Also, Ottawa would only negotiate Québec separation if a substantial majority of Québécois voted for it.

As the century closed, support for separatism appeared to decline. Liberal gains in Québec in the 2000 federal election and the resignation of Premier Bouchard seemed to support Chrétien’s tough stand on separation.

Chrétien to Martin to Harper

In 2002, Jean Chrétien announced that he would not seek a fourth term as prime minister. In 2003, the new leader of Canada’s Liberal Party, former finance minister Paul Martin, became prime minister. Martin called an election and the Liberal Party won, although it lost its majority.

In 2005, a scandal involving the misappropriation of government funds by the Chrétien government threatened the stability of the Martin government. Martin himself was not involved in the scandal, but Canadians had lost confidence in the Liberal Party. In the 2006 election, the Conservatives won 36 percent of the vote and Stephen Harper became prime minister.
New Economic Ideas

By 1981, the oil crisis, inflation, and high interest rates had all taken a toll on Canada’s economy. As the world slipped into an economic recession, many Canadians faced serious financial difficulty. The recession meant more unemployment and poor job prospects for young people. Canadians looked back wistfully on the confident 1950s and 1960s.

During the boom years, Canada had been a nation of savers. Now it was becoming a nation of spenders. But there was an important difference. In the past, Canadians had bought most of their goods with cash. Now they were experiencing the credit-card revolution, and consumerism was to become a way of life for the next decades. At the same time, governments cut public services and transfer payments to the provinces to deal with the national debt. Such measures dramatically changed Canadians’ expectations.

An Uncertain Future

When Trudeau decided to retire in 1984, the government faced huge economic problems. Years of high unemployment and interest rates had resulted in a faltering economy. The National Energy Program (NEP), which was intended to shelter Canadians from soaring world oil prices, had failed.

High unemployment meant that government revenues fell as fewer people paid income tax and more required government assistance. The government had to borrow money to pay for social services, and the national debt grew tremendously. Both provincial and federal governments often ran a deficit as government expenditures (the amount of money spent) were greater than revenues (the amount of money taken in, mostly through taxes). Although reluctant to do so, the Trudeau government had begun to cut social programs and offer tax breaks to corporations to help stimulate the economy.

Mulroney and the Debt Crisis

Brian Mulroney’s Progressive Conservatives came to power in 1984 with a promise to address Canada’s economic problems. Mulroney’s approach was inspired by conservative governments in the United States and Britain, which were cutting back on the role of government in the economy. President Ronald Reagan thought the solution to economic problems lay in the hands of corporations and wealthy citizens. He believed that if they were given large tax breaks, they would reinvest in the economy and create new jobs for everyone else. This became known as the “trickle-down effect.” In Britain, Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher took a similar line. She lowered taxes and drastically cut spending on social benefits.

Mulroney planned to use this approach to cut the debt. He would save money by trimming social programs, and the savings would help to pay off the debt. He would also stimulate the economy by cutting taxes. At the same time, the Mulroney government tightened economic links with the United States. Over the years, some Canadians continued to express concern that U.S. companies controlled too much of the Canadian economy. Some measures had been put in place to limit U.S. investment, such as the Foreign Clarity Act (Bill C-20).

KEY TERMS

Clarity Act (Bill C-20) legislation passed by the Chrétien government requiring separatist referendums to pass with a “clear majority” rather than 50 percent plus 1, before Québec could negotiate separation.

national debt the amount of money owed by a federal government; most of Canada’s national debt money is owed to Canadians who hold Government of Canada savings bonds, treasury bills, and so on.

What If…

Imagine the federal government had not cut transfer payments to the provinces. Would supporting Canada’s social safety net be worth running a deficit?
KEY TERMS

Free Trade Agreement (FTA) the agreement that came into effect in 1989 between Canada and the United States to allow goods produced in each country to cross the border tariff-free.

North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) the agreement signed in 1992 and implemented in 1994 between the United States, Mexico, and Canada to create a free trade zone among the countries.

Investment Review Agency (FIRA), which was formed by the Trudeau government in 1973 to block any foreign investment that seemed not to be in Canada’s interest. Now Mulroney announced that Canada was “open for business.” He dismantled FIRA and replaced it with Investment Canada, a body that would encourage suitable foreign investment. Mulroney also came to believe that free trade with the United States would help businesses to thrive, raise the employment rate, and increase government revenues.

Mulroney’s plan to cut the debt did not work as planned. Canada was hit by a recession in 1990. Businesses failed and workers lost their jobs. Once again, the debt increased and the government was forced to increase, rather than cut, taxes. Failure to tackle the debt contributed to the defeat of the Conservative Party in 1993, when only two Tories won seats in Parliament.

Down the Road to Free Trade

In 1987, Mulroney started negotiations that led Canada into the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with the United States. The agreement removed tariffs on goods crossing the border, and opened Canada to U.S. investment as well as opening the United States to Canadian investment.

Free trade proved to be a very controversial issue for Canadians. Supporters of free trade made arguments that included the following:

- By eliminating tariffs, Canada would attract more U.S. investment. This would help Canadian industry grow and benefit the whole economy.
- Free trade would give Canada access to the larger U.S. market, which would increase our productivity and growth. With more demand, Canadian products could be sold at lower prices to compete with imports.
- A free trade agreement would attract U.S. firms to Canada to take advantage of our natural resources, skilled workers, and well-planned transportation system.

People who were against the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement put forward arguments that included the following:

- Once protective tariffs were removed, U.S. branch plants that had moved to Canada to avoid paying tariffs would simply return to the U.S. As a result, hundreds of thousands of jobs would be lost.
- Canadian businesses could not compete against giant U.S. companies that would flood the Canadian market with cheap goods and services.
- Free trade threatened Canada’s independence. Economic union would also lead to pressure for political union.
After much heated debate, the FTA was established in 1989. It included the following points:

- Tariffs between Canada and the U.S. would be eliminated. Complete free trade would be achieved by 1999.
- Cultural industries were exempt from the agreement, allowing Canada to retain protection for publishing, television and films, and the arts.
- The agreement included mechanisms to ensure fair competition between the two countries and fewer conditions on investment.

In 1992, the Mulroney government expanded the free trade zone by signing the **North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)**, which included free trade with Mexico. This agreement also proved to be controversial. The major fear of NAFTA's opponents was that companies operating in Canada would move to Mexico to take advantage of the low wages and less strict anti-pollution laws. Those who supported NAFTA argued that while a few companies might move to Mexico, most would remain in Canada because Canadian workers are better educated and skilled. Canada had other attractions, such as transportation and communication systems, social services, and social stability. Although the Conservatives were defeated in 1993, their policies linked Canada's political and economic fortunes much more closely to those of the United States.

**FIGURE 8–25** Protests against NAFTA continued into the new century. This protester holds a sign outside the B.C. Supreme Court in Vancouver in 2001.

---

**PRACTICE QUESTIONS**

1. How did Mulroney’s ideas about government differ from those of the Liberals? What other politicians inspired Conservative policies?

2. What caused the debt crisis of the 1990s? How did Conservative and Liberal governments deal with debt?

3. How did Paul Martin deal with the deficit?

4. **Evidence** Describe the FTA and NAFTA. Why are these agreements controversial? Find evidence to show that NAFTA has benefited or damaged the Canadian economy.

---

**Prime Minister Martin Brian Mulroney**
- born 1939, Baie-Comeau, Québec
- lawyer, author
- first elected to Commons in 1983
- prime minister 1984–1993

**Domestic Record**
- passed the Multiculturalism Act in 1985 to recognize and promote multiculturalism as an essential part of Canadian heritage and identity
- launched the Meech Lake Accord (1987), which proposed giving the provinces more say in federal matters and declaring Québec a distinct society within Canada
- apologized in 1988 to Japanese Canadians for their internment during the Second World War
- introduced the Goods and Services Tax (GST) in 1991
- tried to pass the Charlottetown Accord (1992), which proposed that provinces have more power, that the Senate be reformed, and advocated Aboriginal self-government

**International Record**
- negotiated the Free Trade Agreement with the U.S. in 1987
- expanded free trade to include Mexico in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1992
The Liberals Tackle the Debt

When Jean Chrétien and the Liberals came to power in 1993, they inherited a staggering national debt of close to $459 billion. Their solution was to inject $6 billion into the economy through public works such as road repairs and new bridges. These projects would create jobs, and workers would then spend their earnings and boost the economy.

Chrétien’s Liberals had little opportunity to judge the effectiveness of their policy. At the end of 1994, interest rates shot up. Provincial and federal governments used 43 percent of revenues to pay interest on the debt. Martin announced that Canada could no longer afford “big government” nor could it fund social services as it had in the past. He eliminated more than 40 000 jobs in the federal civil service and drastically reduced money transfers to provinces for post-secondary education, health care, and welfare. The provinces were thus forced to cut programs as well. To try to enhance the effects of the cuts, Martin put extra money into the Canada Pension Plan and Employment Insurance—programs essential to Canada’s “social safety net.”

The government was reducing the deficit, but Canadians paid a high price. For example, universities and colleges had to raise their tuition fees. Through the 1980s and 1990s, health care costs rose rapidly. New drugs and technologies were expensive and an aging population meant more demand on the system. At the same time as the federal government was cutting transfer payments to the provinces, less money was available for health care. Hospital wards were closed, the length of hospital stays was reduced, staff was cut and registered nurses were replaced by aides with less training. Some patients went to the United States for treatment because the services they needed were not available in Canada.

There were other problems. Growing numbers of Canadian children were living in poverty. More Canadians were homeless, and many had to rely on food banks. Food banks reported that 40 percent of their users were children, although only 26 percent of Canada’s population was children (see Chapter 10). In the new millennium, social services were more hard pressed than ever to meet the needs of Canadians.

A New Era of Globalization

When the Liberals came to power in 1993, one of Chrétien’s priorities was to expand Canada’s trading opportunities. He sent “Team Canada” trade missions to Asia and Latin America to secure deals for Canadian investment and exports. The Canadian government also signed free trade agreements with Chile and Israel, and joined APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) to promote cooperation, freer trade, and economic growth among Pacific Rim countries.
These trade initiatives were part of a **globalization** trend sweeping the world by the end of the 20th century. Globalization was partly the result of rapid changes in communications technology and the fall of communism. Goods could be shipped easily around the world, and the Internet made it possible to do business online from almost anywhere on the planet.

**Globalization as an Issue**

People have strong views on globalization and there have been fierce protests against it. Supporters believe that globalization is a powerful trend that will raise living standards for everyone, rich and poor. They argue that when large corporations invest in less-industrialized countries, jobs and economic opportunities are created for people. This, in turn, raises standards of living, which benefits everyone.

Opponents say that globalization makes businesses rich at the cost of workers everywhere. For example, in the 1990s, many multinational corporations moved production away from North America, Europe, and Japan to countries that had lower labour costs and fewer environmental regulations. As the 21st century began, China became the world’s leading producer of manufactured goods of all kinds—and this trend continues. Meanwhile, thousands of Canadian factories have closed.

Globalization also raises ethical questions. For example, although no country has a perfect human rights record, should Canada build trade relationships with countries that consistently disregard human rights? Canada has introduced human rights as a topic in some of its trade talks, a move critics believe does little to change conditions in countries with poor human rights records.

![The APEC trading area, including major ocean trading routes](image)

**KEY TERM**

**globalization** a process by which the regions and countries of the world are becoming economically and culturally interconnected
Environmental Action on a Global Scale

Globalization has created strong economic links around the world. At the same time, the global community has come together to work on environmental issues (see Chapter 13). The Kyoto Protocol is an international agreement that sets targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It was an important step in the fight against climate change. The agreement went into effect in 2005 and, by the end of 2009, 187 countries had signed. However, Canada, under Prime Minister Harper’s government, did not meet its emission reduction goals. According to the David Suzuki Foundation: “As of 2006, Canada’s emissions were 22 percent above the 1990 level. Our Kyoto target is 6 percent below the 1990 level for 2008–2012.”

FIGURE 8–28 Canada’s record on responding to the crisis of climate change has been highly criticized.

Interpreting a Cartoon What viewpoint does this cartoon express about Prime Minister Harper’s action on environmental issues?

PRACTICE QUESTIONS

1. Why did Jean Chrétien organize “Team Canada” trade missions?
2. Why do you think trade with Asian countries is especially important to British Columbia?
3. What is globalization? What are its benefits? What are its disadvantages?
4. What economic reasons might the Canadian government give for not reducing greenhouse gas emissions?
A New Era of International Action

Canada’s international role shifted over the decades as world events and government priorities changed. It became increasingly difficult for Canada to maintain its role as a middle-power that gave it the prestige to mediate international disputes. Canadian governments have always been aware of the consequences of close adherence to American foreign policy and of how important it is that Canada pursue its own goals on the world stage.

Canada’s relationship with its closest neighbour continued to complicate its foreign policy. The extent of Canada’s support for American decisions remained an issue for Canadian leaders. For example, Prime Minister Mulroney generally supported U.S. foreign policy while Prime Ministers Trudeau and Chrétien were much less inclined to do so.

The federal government was often forced to make hard choices. For example, after the events of 9/11, President George W. Bush told the countries of the world that they could either be “with us or against us.”

The Cold War Continues: Canada’s Concerns

The Cold War continued to define international relationships throughout the 1980s. In 1981, the United States government announced a massive increase in its defence budget, with most of the money to be spent on modernizing its nuclear arsenal. The U.S. also continued its policy of fighting communism in the Americas and elsewhere. As a result, the U.S. supported numerous right-wing movements and governments that disregarded human rights. The U.S.S.R., on its side, supported pro-communist struggles.

In September 1983, Soviet jets shot down a Korean passenger jet that had strayed into Soviet air space. The next month, U.S. forces invaded the Caribbean nation of Grenada and deposed the pro-Soviet, left-wing government. The two superpowers accused one another of provoking hostilities.

Prime Minister Trudeau appealed to the United States and the Soviet Union to show more restraint. He visited a number of countries to enlist other political leaders in his campaign to mediate between the superpowers. Unfortunately, Trudeau’s initiative had little effect.

Let it be said of Canada and of Canadians, that we saw the crisis; that we did act; that we took risks; that we were loyal to our friends and open with our adversaries; that we have lived up to our ideals; and that we have done what we could to lift the shadow of war.

—Prime Minister Trudeau’s summary of his peace initiative delivered to Parliament in February 1984

FIGURE 8–29 In 1978–1979, there was a revolution in Nicaragua against a repressive military government. After a left-wing government was established, the U.S. gave support to right-wing, anti-government rebels called Contras. This support undermined American prestige around the world. An 87-year-old man of the first Sandino rebellion, armed with a double-barrelled shotgun, stands with an 18-year-old guerrilla holding an assault rifle in Leon, Nicaragua, June 19, 1979. “I fought against the Yankee invasion in the thirties and I’d like to fight today, but I’m too old,” said the old man.
The Mulroney Era: Closer Ties with the United States

Conservative leader Brian Mulroney became Canada's prime minister in September 1984. His approach to international relations was the opposite of Trudeau's. In many ways, Prime Minister Mulroney worked to forge closer links with the United States and developed a close personal relationship with President Ronald Reagan, with whom he shared a conservative philosophy.

In 1983, the U.S. government unveiled an ambitious plan to create a defence shield, part of which would orbit the Earth. This Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), nicknamed “Star Wars,” had an enormous budget. Did Canada's membership in the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD) commit it to Star Wars? Across Canada, anti-nuclear groups protested Canada's possible involvement. These groups believed that Star Wars would provoke other nations to develop similar weapons. Canada eventually declined to participate. However, the door was left open for private Canadian companies to bid on Star Wars contracts.

The End of the Cold War

By the mid-1980s, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev realized that the Soviet Union could no longer afford its costly arms race with the United States. He proposed massive cuts in the arsenal of both superpowers. Gorbachev then began a series of sweeping economic, social, and political reforms that would help the communist countries run more efficiently and create better conditions for their citizens. He also loosened censorship and allowed greater freedom of speech. These policies, called *perestroika* (reconstruction) and *glasnost* (openness), encouraged the people of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania to demand similar reforms in their countries. By 1991, the Soviet Union had collapsed, and the Cold War was

**FIGURE 8-30** The Berlin Wall, a powerful symbol of Cold War tensions, fell in November 1989. A few days before this picture was taken, guards would have machine-gunned anyone who tried to cross the Wall.

**Expressing Ideas** Why do you think some historians called the end of the Cold War “the end of history”?
over. The various member republics of the Soviet Union regained their independence and a new Russia emerged under the leadership of Boris Yeltsin, an ex-communist who now supported democracy.

Communist China, too, experimented with a kind of perestroika, allowing capitalism to flourish in some areas of the economy. However, Chinese citizens' hopes for political freedom were brutally dashed in Tiananmen Square in June 1989. Red Army soldiers and tanks attacked students involved in the democracy movement, killing hundreds, perhaps thousands, of protesters.

**FAST FORWARD**

**The Air India Tragedy**

Canada's place in the world and international tensions were emphasized by the Air India tragedy. In 1985, a bomb exploded in the cargo hold of Air India Flight 182, causing it to crash into the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Ireland. The flight was on its way from Montréal to London, England, en route to Delhi and Bombay. All 329 people on board died, including 280 Canadians. At the time, this was the largest number of people killed in an act of air terrorism. The plot to destroy the aircraft was hatched and planned on Canadian soil. The investigation and prosecution of the bomber suspects went on for 20 years, but only one person, Inderjit Singh Reyat, was convicted and imprisoned for five years on the lesser charge of manslaughter. It was not until 2005 that Ripudaman Singh Malik and Ajaib Singh Bagri, the final suspects who were arrested in connection with the bombing, were found not guilty of all charges. There were allegations that the case was mishandled by the RCMP and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS).

1. Why was Flight 182 the target of a terrorist attack?
2. Why did the investigation take so long?
3. In what ways did the RCMP and CSIS mishandle the case?
4. Do you think justice was served in this case?

**WEB LINK**

Visit the Pearson Web site to find out more about the Air India disaster.

**PRACTICE QUESTIONS**

1. Contrast Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's approach to foreign affairs with that of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau. Present your information in the form of a diagram, chart, paragraph, poem, or other representation.
2. What brought about the end of the Cold War?
3. What actions did the Canadian government take during the last years of the Cold War?
4. Use the Cold War timeline. Make a list of the events in which Canada participated. Was Canada's involvement small, medium, or large?
Peacekeeping: A Tradition in Peril?

Many thought the end of the Cold War might bring a new era of world peace. Instead, regional conflicts and ethnic rivalries erupted, most notably in the Persian Gulf, the former Yugoslavia, and Africa. The United Nations looked for ways to solve these problems using its standard methods: negotiation, peacekeeping, and sanctions.

With the end of the Soviet Union, the United States was left as the only world superpower. Now unrivalled, it could enforce its will anywhere on the planet. It was not long before this new reality played out in the Persian Gulf, in the first international crisis of the post–Cold War era.

The Persian Gulf War

In August 1990, Iraqi forces under the leadership of Saddam Hussein invaded the oil-rich country of Kuwait. Almost immediately, the United Nations demanded that Iraq withdraw and threatened economic sanctions if it refused. The United States insisted that military force be used to oust Iraqi forces.

For the first time since the Korean War, the United Nations authorized a multinational force against an aggressor nation. As in Korea, the United States would take the lead. The U.S. was joined by a coalition of forces from 35 other countries. Canada contributed two destroyers, a supply ship, a squadron of CF-18 fighter jets, a field hospital, and hundreds of military personnel.
Although the Canadian contribution was modest, there was considerable debate in Parliament before forces were sent into combat. Prime Minister Mulroney emphasized that Canada made its commitment to enforce United Nations resolutions against Iraq, not merely to support the United States. Critics argued that sanctions had not been given enough time to work.

In January 1991, U.S. and coalition forces began bombing targets in an effort to drive Iraqi troops from Kuwait. The use of “smart” weapons, such as laser-guided bombs and cruise missiles launched many kilometres from their targets, significantly changed the nature of the war. By February 27, the Iraqis were overcome by the forces massed against them. The coalition had won a stunning victory, with only a few casualties. Not a single Canadian soldier was killed or injured in the fighting. In the end, the Gulf War destroyed the Iraqi fighting force and much of the country’s infrastructure.

After victory in the Gulf War, U.S. President George H. W. Bush proclaimed a “new world order,” one in which the United Nations would take a much more active role as a global police force. In the past, the UN had been dedicated to peacekeeping—negotiating settlements and keeping warring factions apart. Now it would have more of a peacemaking role: it would, where necessary, use military force to preserve long-term peace and security. As the only superpower remaining after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States would take the lead in this peacemaking role.

**Genocide in Rwanda**

The population of the central African country of Rwanda is divided into two major groups—Tutsis and Hutus. Colonial administrations had put Tutsis in a position of dominance in the society. In 1994, after an incident in which a prominent Hutu was killed, the Hutus overthrew the Tutsi-led government and began murdering Tutsis and their supporters. France and Belgium, the former colonial powers in the area, sent troops to try to control the slaughter and the UN sent a small detachment of peacekeepers under the command of Canadian Lieutenant General Roméo Dallaire.

Dallaire sent a series of urgent appeals to United Nations headquarters and outlined an ambitious military plan to halt the killing. As he saw it, the UN needed to send a large multinational force to disarm the warring factions. His plan required two things: speed and the support of the United States, the only country that could provide enough troops on short notice. Unfortunately, the response from the UN and Washington was unenthusiastic. The U.S. feared a defeat similar to that in Somalia. Dallaire watched helplessly as close to a million people were murdered in the *genocide* that swept Rwanda.
Disgrace in Somalia

Until 1991, Canadians tended to see their soldiers as peacekeepers. Although Canada was a member of NATO, which had military bases in Europe, Canadian soldiers were most often involved in peacekeeping. Peacekeeping is similar to policing in many ways. It rarely involves fierce fighting, since its purpose is to prevent conflict. Peacekeeping cannot work unless warring parties agree to the presence of the peacekeeping forces.

Canada’s role in military conflicts changed with the Persian Gulf War, when Canadian troops were part of a large coalition against Saddam Hussein. Since then, Canadian soldiers have been involved in other conflicts and are sometimes called upon to fight and die in military operations. Changing the mission of the military has changed the way Canadians view themselves and the way the world sees Canada.

Canada’s more aggressive stance has had other results, some of which have hurt our international reputation. In 1992, the UN launched “Operation Restore Hope” in Somalia. Somalia, an East African nation, was ravaged by a civil war that broke out in 1991. By 1992, many Somalis were starving. Canadian forces joined those from other countries in distributing food and other essential supplies to the desperate local population. The mission was directed by the U.S. which has important strategic interests in the “Horn of Africa.”

One night, members of the Canadian Airborne Regiment arrested a Somali teenager found wandering in the Canadian base camp. During the night, the teen was tortured and beaten to death. At first, a military inquiry found that only a few low-ranking soldiers had committed this terrible, racist crime. As more evidence came to light, however, it became clear that there had been a high-level attempt to cover up the incident.

Canadians were shocked by the brutality of these events and, in 1995, the federal government disbanded the Airborne Regiment. A serious shadow was cast on the international reputation of Canada’s armed forces.

Looking Further

1. How is peacekeeping different from combat? How would you describe the operation in Somalia?
2. How does the way Canada uses its military reflect on Canadians? On Canadian identity?
3. What kind of international operations do you think Canada’s military should be involved in?
Civil War in Yugoslavia

After the Second World War, a communist nation called the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia was created in Eastern Europe. It was made up of six small republics: Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Slovenia, and Montenegro, as well as two autonomous regions, Kosovo and Vojvodina. Until 1980, Yugoslavia was run by political strongman Prime Minister Josip Tito, but after his death, internal divisions began to appear.

When Slobodan Milosevic became president of Serbia in 1989, tensions among the republics broke out into ethnic conflict. United Nations peacekeeping missions, which included Canadian forces, were sent into the area, but they were unable to control the situation. Eventually, the member countries of NATO threatened to take steps to end the fighting.

In May 1995, NATO forces launched a series of air strikes against the mainly Serbian forces of the Yugoslav army, which was perceived as the aggressor. The warring factions eventually agreed to a ceasefire, and American troops were sent to bolster the UN peacekeeping forces.

In 1998, Serbian forces moved into the province of Kosovo to ensure it would remain under Serbian control. The Albanian Muslims who made up the majority of the population in Kosovo were persecuted, murdered, and displaced. In spring 1999, after diplomatic efforts failed to stop the Serbian operations, the U.S.-dominated NATO alliance launched its first-ever military operation against an independent country. Canada, as a NATO member, engaged in the controversial air strikes on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Canada’s participation in the bombings was the subject of heated debate at home. Some Canadians supported NATO’s bombings, insisting that NATO was obligated to prevent the Serbian-Albanian conflict from spreading to neighbouring countries. Critics of the bombing argued that NATO should never have interfered in the domestic affairs of a sovereign nation, and that its involvement escalated the conflict. Some Canadians began to question NATO’s role in the “new world order” and Canada’s role in NATO.

Throughout the developments in the Persian Gulf, Africa, and the former Yugoslavia, the world watched with concern. The failure of UN efforts to keep the peace brought grave doubts as to the effectiveness of the organization.
The Attacks of 9/11

On September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks of unprecedented magnitude and severity shocked the world. Members of a fundamentalist Islamic group called al-Qaeda hijacked four passenger jets. Two planes flew into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York City. Another plane was flown into the Pentagon, the headquarters of the United States Department of Defense in Virginia. The fourth plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania after passengers attacked the hijackers. In all, 2976 people were killed and many more were injured. Billions of dollars worth of property was destroyed or damaged.

In response to the attacks, President George W. Bush declared a “war on terrorism” and promised to strike back. Leaders of NATO countries and others rushed to show their support for the United States. Many Canadians agreed that significant anti-terror measures were necessary. The federal government enacted anti-terrorist legislation and began using security certificates, which allowed people suspected of terrorist activity to be tried in secret hearings and deported.

War in Afghanistan

A month after the 9/11 attacks, the United States, with the support of the United Kingdom, attacked Afghanistan. The aim of the attack was to destroy al-Qaeda and its leader, Osama bin Laden, as well as the Islamic fundamentalist Taliban government that supported and protected the terrorists. The Taliban were soon defeated, and al-Qaeda members were either killed or forced to flee the country. However, the war was far from over. In the years that followed, the Taliban and al-Qaeda launched attacks to try to regain power.

The United Nations had not approved the original attack on Afghanistan. However, by December 2001, the UN Security Council authorized the creation of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to conduct operations in Afghanistan. NATO assumed the leadership of the ISAF in 2003.
Canada's involvement in Afghanistan began in 2001 when it sent a naval task force to the Persian Gulf. A year later, a battle group from the Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry was sent to Kandahar to assist in an offensive against Taliban and al-Qaeda forces. From August 2003 to December 2005, Canada’s forces were mainly based in the capital, Kabul, as part of the ISAF. They provided security for elections, which were held in the fall of 2005.

As of the end of 2009, Western forces remained in Afghanistan to help local military and police forces secure the country from internal and external threats. Foreign countries also helped the Afghan government to reconstruct basic infrastructure, promote health and education services, and support other development initiatives. There were approximately 2500 Canadian personnel in Afghanistan, and 138 had died in the fighting.

When Canadian soldiers were first sent overseas in 2001, polls showed that about 20 percent of Canadians were opposed to military involvement in Afghanistan. However, as the operation wore on, Canadians became even less supportive. By 2009, 54 percent of Canadians opposed Canadian military participation in Afghanistan, while only 34 percent supported it.

**The Iraq War**

In 2003, the United States government decided to invade Iraq to “disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).” The U.S. was joined by forces from Britain, Australia, and Poland. The war was not supported by a broad coalition of nations, and the Canadian government was not convinced that the Iraqis had, and were prepared to use, weapons of mass destruction. As it turned out, no WMD were found in Iraq. The United States and Britain, with some contingents from other countries, defeated Iraq and occupied the country.

The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade summed up Canada’s role in Afghanistan this way:

> Canada’s participation is guided by our core values of freedom, democracy, the rule of law, and respect for human rights, especially the rights of women and girls.

**PRACTICE QUESTIONS**

1. How and why have Canadians participated in conflicts after the end of the Cold War?

2. What did President George H. W. Bush mean when he proclaimed a “new world order”?

3. Is there a difference between using our armed forces for peacekeeping as opposed to peace-making? Which do you think is more “Canadian”?

4. Why did Canada become involved in the NATO action in Yugoslavia? Why was NATO’s involvement controversial? Provide specific examples.

5. Why did the U.S. not respond to Lt. Gen. Dallaire’s request for immediate assistance? What was the result due to the lack of U.S. troop support?

6. What was the stated purpose for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq?
CHAPTER FOCUS QUESTION

How did Canada and Canadian identity change as a result of social, economic, and cultural trends at the end of the millennium and beyond?

Canada experienced severe political and economic shocks in the final decades of the 20th century. Our Constitution finally came home, but attempts to bring Québec onside failed—Canadian unity barely survived two referenda on Québec sovereignty. The national debt rose and Canada experienced a severe recession. Gradually, our economy became more integrated with that of the United States, particularly after the signing of NAFTA. Globalization also became a fact of life and manufacturing moved increasingly offshore. At home, women continued to enter the workforce in increasing numbers and Aboriginal peoples began to make significant progress in securing rights that had previously been denied or resisted by governments.

1. Create an organizer such as the one below. Provide as many examples as possible from the text for each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Trends</th>
<th>Effects on Canadian Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Trends</th>
<th>Effects on Canadian Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Trends</th>
<th>Effects on Canadian Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocabulary Focus

2. To practise your use of the chapter’s Key Terms, refer to the Pearson Web site for a crossword puzzle activity.

Knowledge and Understanding

3. This chapter covers the final steps to Canadian autonomy. Complete the timeline by writing the name and date of each event and explaining how the event contributed to Canadian independence.

4. Why do you think the Canadian government has not made more progress in dealing with Aboriginal issues?

5. Provide a list of ideas/solutions on how the issues of child poverty, life expectancy, and high unemployment could be solved in Aboriginal communities.

6. Do you think Canada should have signed NAFTA? Provide support for your opinion.

7. Compare how governments in the 1980s and 1990s dealt with economic crises versus governments during the Great Depression. Which do you think were most effective? Why?

8. How did the UN involvement in the Gulf War, Somalia, Yugoslavia, and Rwanda affect its reputation in the eyes of the world? Why do you think the traditional role of peacekeepers no longer seems to apply?
9. Compare and contrast the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Include information on the cause, countries involved in the war, and level of support for the war.

Critical Thinking

10. Use the organizer from Question 1 to help you complete the following task.

Select five different trends and rank them from most impact on Canadian identity to least impact. Provide an explanation for each ranking.

For your top two selections (most impact), explain the long-lasting effects each will have on Canada.

11. “Canadian politicians should make every effort to have Quebec sign the Constitution.” Create arguments for and against this statement. Prepare to discuss your position with the class.

12. If you lived in a developing country, how might globalization affect you? What would your attitude be toward developed countries?

13. Significance “Canada’s role as a peacekeeping nation has changed.” Provide specific evidence that would support this statement. Write a paragraph explaining if you think this change is permanent or temporary. Support your viewpoint.

Document Analysis

14. Consider the following copy of a primary source document.

Canada MUST redefine its independence on the world stage, and in particular set a course in foreign policy independent of the United States. There are already welcome signs of this, including... Canada’s advocacy role in trying to establish a world ban on the use of land mines.... There is much to recommend the long-standing relationship between Americans and Canadians across the longest undefended border in the world, but lock-step adherence to U.S. foreign (military) policy is not one of them. (A recent example of this kind of concern was provided on the CBC National News.... when the Minister of

Defence, Mr. Art Eggleton, ...opined that Canada should consider contributing to the resurgent, ultimately destabilizing and doomed-to-failure U.S. "Star Wars" missile defence program.)

In this way [by redefining its independence on the world stage], Canada will recover the world respect it deserves from an earlier time, and rediscover its mandate to provide a much needed forum of sober second thought, a necessary counter-measure to those “great powers” too often inebriated by their own self-righteous views....

–Professor Donald Fleming

• When and why was this document produced?
• What is the nature of the document? For example, is it an official government document, a statement of personal opinion, or something else? Does the nature of the document influence how it can be used?
• What is Professor Fleming’s thesis and how effectively does he support it?
• Comment on the effectiveness of the language used. Does the professor state his case well? Explain.
• In your opinion, could a historian use this document to assess Canadian public opinion for the years leading up to 2000? Explain.