
January 2006

Discussion following the Remarks of Governor James J. Blanchard

Discussion

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj>

 Part of the [Transnational Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Discussion, *Discussion following the Remarks of Governor James J. Blanchard*, 32 Can.-U.S. L.J. 159 (2006)

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj/vol32/iss1/28>

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canada-United States Law Journal by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

this managing the border as it will be with the Kyoto Accord. How do we work together on that? We have integrated economies.

There is no way whether you sign Kyoto as Canada and United States – "We are going to have to work together on managing our environmental laws."

The bottom line is, there is a lot of work ahead. It is a subject I could talk on all night. I won't. I am very optimistic about the future of United States-Canada relations, despite those issues as I mentioned. I am very optimistic with new leadership, new ambassadors, and, in fact, for the first time in recent years, I have seen a renewed interest in the U.S. Congress for working on Canadian issues. When I was there years ago, George, we didn't have a northern border caucus. There was an interparliamentary union, but those guys always wanted to go to Paris or London. Very few went to Ottawa.

Of course, we didn't have a direct flight either. It is true. We didn't have a flight between Ottawa and Washington until it was – I was ambassador at the time. But we have got a northern border caucus now in Congress.⁷¹ We didn't have that before. There is a new caucus in Congress called the Friends of Canada.⁷² To me that's exciting. All I can tell you is, it is a partnership that works. You are part of it, and I thank you.

DISCUSSION FOLLOWING THE REMARKS OF GOVERNOR JAMES J. BLANCHARD

DR. KING: That was a very wise and a great talk. I had a question that maybe you have some comment on. The Canadian approach, Jim, is multilateral on agreements. There are parties to the land mine. There are parties to the land mine convention, Kyoto, the International Criminal Court; the United States is unilateral in its approach. Do you think that poses a threat to United States-Canadian relations over the long pull?

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: No, I don't. I mean, you are right, if you had to generalize the United States as more unilateral, the United States is more unilateral, and Canada is more multilateral.

Canada, of course, being a smaller country, one-tenth our size, loves all these multilateral organizations, likes to participate, and they all love to tie up the United States like Gulliver in Gulliver's travel. But the fact is that if

⁷¹ News From Congressman Bart Stupak: Stupak Heads Up Congressional Northern Border Caucus, http://www.house.gov/list/press/mi01_stupak/030105.html (last visited Oct. 11, 2006).

⁷² See Brian Adebaba, *Friendly Face-Off*, EMBASSY, March 22, 2006, available at http://www.embassymag.ca/html/index.php?display=story&full_path=/2006/march/22/faceoff/ (discussing the formation of The Congressional Friends of Canada Caucus).

you look through the sweep of history, the United States has been in the forefront of creating multilateral organizations.

The fact is when John Kennedy went to Ottawa in 1961; he went there to urge Deacon Baker to join the American organization of states. I think because Kennedy pushed it Deacon Baker resisted. And Canada did not join the organization of American states until Mulroney was Prime Minister.

So if you look at the UN and NATO and all these different groups, we have been in the forefront, and I think you will see a lot more multilateral strategies by the United States, and I think I follow politics pretty carefully as you do – we are both Democrats.

DR. KING: That's right. I am a big Democrat.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: I guess you can say I am a young Democrat or a small one, one or the other. But I think – the thing about President Bush I noticed, George W. Bush, is that while he talked very unilaterally in his first few years, the truth is, there has been a real change in foreign policy.

We are trying to work with the world a lot more, and I don't care whether it is in Europe or with Canada, the fact is I think President Bush is very sensitive to the heritage of his father, who is a multilateralist and is working very hard today to work with our allies and work with organizations. And that's a different tone and strategy than I would say [Bush held] three years ago. So that's another reason why I am optimistic.

DR. KING: Other questions.

Yes, David Crane.

MR. CRANE: We have a war on terrorism in Canada, which the United States is not supporting, and you wonder if that's punishment for our position on Iraq. You know, the whole table is worried about this and the war on terrorism.

We haven't heard a word from the Bush Administration in support of the Canadian seal hunting instruments. That's my first point.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Isn't it Paul McCartney?

MR. CRANE: Second thing, you had the advantage of living in Canada and learning about it, but why aren't the Americans trying to persuade your country to convert to the metric system and have \$1 and \$2 coins?

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: We have \$1 coins now. You never get them, though. They have them, and they work in vending machines. The vending machines love them. By the way, I always buy the new ones and give them as gifts because to kids they are so special when I come back to the United States.

MR. CRANE: My more serious question is: You raised the issue and made a point, which I think most people would agree with, that it is easier if Canada and the United States deal with the climate change issues, but how do you resolve issues of Kyoto with Canada and the United States.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: When you get down to reality and practicality, in most businesses on both sides of the border are preparing to reduce emissions and try to deal with practices and methods and technologies that reduce emissions, whether the Government says they are for it or not, and that's true whether it is in Calgary or Texas or Detroit. They are there.

When you sit in the boardroom, you will see the businesses are assuming it is the wave of the future. And that's why some claim strongly that the United States has done more to comply with reducing emissions than Canada, even though Canada is a signatory of Kyoto and the United States withdrew its signature.

So I see it as a practical element as coming together to deal with it, worry about it. Will they meet the Kyoto timetables? No. Nobody is going to meet it and will they argue as they should about China, India, Brazil? Yes, and they will until they sign.

MR. CRANE: So just to follow up on that, do you think the United States will execute in this next round of climate change treaty change?

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Again, I don't know. Maybe Margaret Broadbent can answer that better than your colleagues at the EPA or I. I don't know. I know there is this coalition that was founded – I forget what it was called, the Clean Development Coalition – and that's like Japan, Korea, Australia, Singapore, Taiwan, the United States, and Canada could probably help Bush over the bridge on this issue by joining that and working. Yeah, well, maybe.

MR. CRANE: It is not doing very much though. I looked at that material.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Well, maybe they should start, and maybe Canada can play a constructive role. Maybe that's the common ground on this. That's just the thought.

DR. KING: Question over here.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Yes.

MR. ROBINSON: If I heard Harper correctly in the interviews, at the end of the Cancun meetings, he finally stopped biffing and said "We have got to get with it," and I think he was meaning Canada as well on this identity issue, and I think he was saying it is time we face the music and try to work on an audit card that's going to be seeable in the United States and for Canadians to use, hopefully, that will be able to identify, to be used as an alternative to passports, which very few U.S. citizens have anyway.

And as you observed, it is a new situation to get one, so I think it is a sign that there should stop being complaining and admit that Canada has to get with it instead of just complaining about it. What's your comment?

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: I think so. I think he was misled a little bit by those that were claiming Congress said they had done this with everybody and the President had to comply and enforce it. I don't think Congress knew that was even in the bill.

But I do agree with your point about the fact that it is going to make it easier to work that issue out because Harper said "let's get with the program." Let's go for it in good faith and deal with this. That's the law. Let's deal with the change.

So I think it will make it easier to work things out. And if there is a need to modify the law or change the implementing regulations or even to delay it, what are all the practical considerations; it will be easier because of that spirit of cooperation. So you are right on the money.

DR. KING: Any other questions? I wanted to ask you another question. On this softwood lumber problem, furnishing an arbitrator in terms of solution, what would? What do you think?

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Actually, my law firm represents CANFOR. I don't do the negotiating, so I really should not comment on it, but I do think an agreement is this close – we are that close to having an agreement. I don't know whether it will be done in 30 days or 60 days.

I just happen to think it is going to happen soon. But it is not going to be a capitulation.

MR. HERMAN: Larry Herman. I think that all your remarks are exceptionally well taken, and I commend you as a wonderful representative of your country. When you were in Ottawa, we saw a lot of you in Ottawa, and you were exemplary in your efforts to bring the two countries closer.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: I am waiting for –

MR. HERMAN: I am not going to talk about softwood lumber, but one of the things that strikes a lot of Canadians is that on certain social issues the countries are actually growing farther apart, and I am referring to the emergence of the religious right in the United States.

And I would like your comments on that because as a Canadian who visits the United States quite regularly, I am sensitive to the prominent role that religion is playing in your media and public life, and you have and I have to tell you that it is not something that is in any way common to our experience in Canada.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Right.

MR. HERMAN: And that's one point. This is still –

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Well, you have given me a plate full of stuff, but let me start. Again, I am a student – I wouldn't call myself political science, but [a] history buff. I followed politics my whole life. I started out by handing out leaflets for Adlai Stevenson. I have read "Fire and Ice" by Michael Adams.

I think it is exaggerated. There is enough truth to make the book fun and interesting. This is talking about how our economic – our economies may be converging but our social values are diverging, something like that. Anyway there is no question in my mind how the political climate in the United States is dramatically different from when I grew up, no doubt.

And I had never seen religion play as dominant a role in my life. Apparently, there were times in history when that was the case but certainly not since the depression. I mean, if you look at the Bush foreign policy by the way, it is Woodrow Wilson on steroids. It is really interesting, the moral basis, make the world safe for democracy.

What's interesting is President Bush's policy is almost similar to Jimmy Carter and Woodrow Wilson, whereas Clinton and actually Bush's father and Nixon, they were all less moralistic, real politic foreign policies, but getting to religion, I have just never seen anything like it.

And if you look at the role of religion in societies, they develop this index of "religiosity." Seymour Martin Lipsett in his book "Continental Divide," which is a brilliant book about differences between the United States and Canada, points out that if you look at the degree of "religiosity" of countries, the United States comes up very, very high, "religiosity" being measured by regular church attendance, daily prayer tied into a church; that Canada comes up pretty low. Canada is a secular country; in the European style basically.

The United States is a religious country like none other Western nation in terms of those measurements that I said, and it is apropos politics, which is remarkable. I can't remember anybody ever asking about religion in Congress. Just once in a while you put it on a little sheet, a fax sheet, but I think that will change.

What's interesting is that a lot of people are really turned off by that. By the way, I don't suggest that Canadians aren't spiritual. I am just saying in terms of those measurements I lived in Canada as you know, and I love it, but I think the country club politics have really reacted harshly to the role of religion.

That's why I think it is interesting in the county I live in Michigan, Oakland County, the third most affluent county in America and the most affluent county in the United States, voted for John Kerry, and it was not just the War in Iraq or the deficit that followed; it was this role of religion and perceived intolerance and social values. I think there is going to be a backlash.

I also think President Bush was reelected because he was president during wartime. He had no primary opposition, no third-party opposition. Americans tend to be very patriotic and stick with their leaders when they perceive a threat of war. I think that's why he won.

I am not going to blame John Kerry, and I am not going to claim that somehow religious fanatics did something, but I think it was what I just said.

DR. KING: Wonderful question, wonder answer. I think we ought to quit while we are ahead.

GOVERNOR BLANCHARD: Thank you. Thank you Henry King, Jr.

(Session concluded.)

(Day 1 of the Conference concluded.)

**CANADA-UNITED STATES LAW INSTITUTE
ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

on

**COMPARATIVE ASPECTS OF INNOVATION IN
CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES**

APRIL 8, 2006

