

**AIMS 10TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET
NOVEMBER 9TH, 2004
CASINO NOVA SCOTIA HOTEL, HALIFAX (NS)**

**TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS BY
SECRETARY WILLIAM S. COHEN**

Mr. Prime Minister, I could have listened to you all night. At least the last part of the evening, to be sure.



Secretary William Cohen begins his speech to AIMS 10th anniversary banquet.

You know, it really is unfair to look at the program and say that the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney is the Chairman of the event and I am the honoured guest speaker and then to take the podium at 9:15 after listening to one of the most, I think, light-hearted but profound statements coming from the former leader of this great country. It's almost cruel and unusual punishment to have to follow you, which is in violation, of course, of the Eighth Amendment to the US Constitution.

I want to say hello to Tim Woodcock — Mayor Woodcock. We have another mayor who is here tonight as well — Frank Farrington, who has joined us this evening. And I believe the third mayor is here from the City of Bangor.

And we have other individuals. We have Rebecca Hutt, who is the director of our airport, Bangor International Airport. Bob Humphrey, I think, is here. We have, most importantly, Mark Woodward, who is the editor in chief for the *Bangor Daily News* and who had to write all those editorials about me as a young city councilor.

But most of all I wanted to say that it's difficult for me to come up here, because I asked Prime Minister Mulroney, "How long do you think I should speak?" He said, "Oh, Bill, I'd give them five or ten minutes of something light and not too intellectual". He said, "Don't worry, I've heard you speak before and I know you can do it".

But I actually feel a little bit like Henry Ford coming here this evening. Ford, after having made all of his millions in the United States, wanted to go back to his fatherland in County Cork, Ireland. And his reputation for wealth had long

preceded his arrival. So when he finally stepped off the plane, there was a group of local town officials who were seeking money for the construction of a local hospital. Well, Ford was quite accustomed to being touched in that fashion. He pulled out his chequebook. He made a cheque out for \$5,000. The next day, in bold print, it said in headlines, "Ford contributes \$50,000 for the construction of a local hospital".

Well, they were terribly embarrassed. They came rushing to Ford. They said, "Mr. Ford, we are terribly sorry. This is not our fault. It must have been a typographical error. We'll be happy to see to it that a retraction is printed in tomorrow's press". And Ford said, "Wait a minute, I think I've got a better idea". That's where that phrase really came from. He said, "If you give me one wish, I'll give you the balance of \$45,000" — one of those offers they couldn't refuse. They said, "Anything". He said, "I want, when that hospital is finally completed, to have a plaque over the entranceway with a quote taken from a source of my choice". They said, "Anything, it's done". He gave them the cheque for \$45,000. The hospital was built. It is there today. And it has a plaque over the entranceway with a quote taken from the Book of Matthew. And it says, "I came unto you as a stranger and you took me in".



Secretary Cohen makes a point during his speech to the AIMS audience.

I hope you'll take me in tonight, but not quite in that fashion. And actually I was thinking tonight, I had called my oldest son who now lives in Georgia, and we were talking about the Bowdoin connection, and Tim Woodcock, of course, also was a Bowdoin man. And, in my son's senior year, the most popular professor on campus was a professor of religion. That's not why he was popular. He was popular because he always asked the same question every year on the final exam: "Discuss the wanderings of St. Paul". And of course, the students loved him. They would really goof off all year long, they'd wait until the night before the exam, they'd get together, they'd cram, they'd go in, and they'd ace the exam.

That is, except in my son's senior year. All of the students walked in, they looked down at the exam question. Immediately, hands started to shake, butterflies in the stomach, several became sick, and all but my son walked out. They looked down, and it said: "Discuss the meaning of Christ's sermon

on the Mount". And my son sat there and he wrote and he wrote and he wrote for the full three hours to the astonishment of his professor. And he finally turned around and he passed his blue books in. He walked down the centre aisle with what Mark Twain would call the "calm confidence of a Christian holding four aces". And the professor looked down at the exam book and it said, "To the experts I leave the meaning of Christ's sermon on the Mount. As for me, I should like to discuss the wanderings of St. Paul".

And I keep that in mind tonight because I'd like to wander a little bit with you, because you are the experts when it comes to talking about trade and commerce and the relationship between Atlantica and the United States. And I wanted to be here tonight to pay tribute to your tenth anniversary. I also wanted to be here to pay my respects to Prime Minister Mulroney for his friendship and what he was able to achieve in coming to speak at the University of Maine on my behalf a couple of years ago.

You know, long before most of us had any concept of the economic impact of globalization, it was your prime minister who saw the need to have cross-border economic trade. He was the leader when it came to talking about Canada-US free trade. He was the leader on NAFTA. He is someone who was dominating the world stage as a prime minister then. He continues to dominate it now. And it was no accident, frankly, when it came time to deliver the farewell to Ronald Reagan that it was Brian Mulroney to whom the Reagan family turned to deliver that final eulogy. And true to his form, he called upon the words of Thomas d'Arcy McGee and William Butler Yeats to capture the spirit and the optimism of President Reagan.

I must tell you, as I watched it I thought of Yeats' words that were descriptive of Prime Minister Mulroney. I thought of Yeats' words that described him at that very moment as the man who carries the sun in a golden cup and the moon in a silver bag. If ever there were words to describe this great leader, it was captured in Yeats' words. And let me tell you what an honour it is for me to be here, but also to be able to call him my friend. And what an honour it is for you to have had such a man to represent the great country of Canada. So I'm here for a variety of reasons.

As you know, the presidential campaign in the United States, mercifully, has ended. It seems only a short time ago — it was actually a week ago — and as I was walking into the hall tonight, I learned that Don Evans and John Ashcroft had tendered their resignations. There may be others that will follow in the next couple of days. But the analysts all looked at our country, and they divided it up into red and blue. That is, of course, Republican and Democrat, Liberal, Conservative. Maine came out in the blue column, although I think

intuitively it is somewhat green in terms of its aspirations pertaining to the environment, but nonetheless it's much more complicated than that.

We are a country of 295 million people and we are united and pulled together by an economic engine that stretches certainly from coast to coast, but all the way through to Canada, crossing these lines. This is a country that's not divided against itself. So while we look at the geopolitical map and say it's red and blue, the fact is that we are still a country very much united by virtue of the economic engine that has delivered so much prosperity to the United States and to Canada and the world beyond.

We are — we share something so common to me, coming from Maine and looking at what we have in common as far as our brothers to the north are concerned. We are farmers. We are fishermen. We have the same values. We may have different cultures, we may have a different heritage, but we have the same values, the same ideals. And so there is a commonality that I guess that we have to take advantage of. And that's where AIMS, I think, is so important to what has taken place. To go from a regional think tank to a national think tank, to come up with a phrase "Atlantica". I couldn't help but look at this wonderful magazine where it says "two countries, one region". You may recall this, Tim, but I ran consistently against a man in Maine. His name was Plato Truman. And his campaign slogan was "two great names, one great man". Of course, he lost consistently as well.

But when I think of the goals of AIMS — the things that you have focused upon, the notion that you're going to really zero in on school performance, the education of our children, preparing them to compete in a world that is smaller and smaller, reduced by technology, miniaturized by technology — that that is something that is of such fundamental importance to you that you bring it to the attention not only of Canada but of the United States. To think about offshore oil and gas policy, energy regulation, health care reform — you have many accomplishments to be very proud of. And when I saw Brian give this tremendous energetic presentation, I understood exactly why you have been so successful.

On the regional side, I'd like to say a few words with respect to Canada and the United States. Because of the political situation in Iraq, there has been some dissension, some question, about whether there's a viable relationship that continues to exist between the United States and Canada. There can be no question about that. We are joined at the hip. There is no walking away from a relationship with Canada. We depend upon you for trade. It was Brian Mulroney, well over a decade ago, who said the biggest trading partner of the United States is not Germany, it's not Japan, it's right here. Those words were true then; they're even truer today.

Today that relationship produces something like \$2 billion of trade every single day. And we've seen from the time that NAFTA, and before that the Free Trade Agreement, was instituted, \$166 billion in goods and services. By 2003, it was up to \$441 billion. This is impressive. It makes the US-Canada trading relationship the largest in the world. So the notion that, because you have a disagreement between the leaders of our respective countries, somehow this is going to tear us apart is simply fallacious. There is no walking away from this relationship.

I can tell you from my own personal experience that it's important that you conduct diplomacy on a personal basis, that you establish a personal relationship. That's just Human Relations 101. But we must never allow our foreign policies to become personal, no matter what the size or the significance of the disagreement. We have too much at stake. We have our prosperity at stake. We have our shared ideals at stake. We have our security at stake.

And here, of course, Canada plays an even more significant role. When we think about protecting our skies, it's NORAD. You are a joint partner in that effort. If we think about protecting NATO here and abroad, you are now in Afghanistan. Two thousand five hundred of your men and women are in Afghanistan. So when we think about the war against terror — and frankly it's a misnomer, it's not really a war in the sense that you have an identifiable enemy that you can go to battle against and contest and crush. It's not going to happen that way.

Prime Minister Mulroney talked about John F. Kennedy. You may remember Kennedy's phrase: "We are engaged in the long twilight struggle against communism". Now we are engaged in a long twilight struggle against terrorism, because you will never know when it's over. So, talk coming from public officials, talk about how we're going to win this thing — we're not going to win it in any classical traditional sense, but continue to wage the long twilight struggle against those forces that are determined to destroy us.

And you'll never know when it's over, because as long as a single individual, be it Osama bin Laden or Timothy McVey, as long as a single individual has access to technology and to techniques that can bring about horrific results, we will always have terror living with us. And that really is the challenge for the United States, for Canada, for our relationship in terms of how we cooperate. What is it that we share? How do we share this, whether we have a disagreement about Iraq or not?

You know, I really put that aside. I say, whether you think it's wise or unwise, legal or illegal, we're there. We're on the ground and we're fighting and we're dying at this moment. And it's important that it be resolved successfully.

Nothing could be more destructive to the world order than for the coalition forces to have to retreat and simply pull out and allow chaos to consume their region. Because it's not just Iraq any longer. Every other country in the region would then fall victim to the forces of extremism. And so you would have instability throughout the entire region. If that happens, what happens to the world economy? Oil prices spike. They're high enough now, but they would go much higher. And you know, as men and women in the business community, that whenever you have instability, what happens? Capital flows the other way. And so it's important that we all be successful because there's more than the US involved right now. And the consequences are to more than the US and to Britain and to the other Allies involved.

If we were to "lose" or to "leave", and to leave it in a dangerous situation with chaos prevailing, it would have implications all the way over to Asia, because our Asian friends would also look at that region and say it's unstable. But who is going to fill the vacuum? Will it be China? Will it be Japan? Will it be India? All of these implications unfold from where we are today, whether we like it or we don't like it. So we're there. And so it has to be resolved successfully and requires cooperation to be sure.

But that's not what I wanted to finish talking to you about tonight, because this war against terror or the struggle against terror involves something other than military force.

Last evening I had the opportunity to host a dinner to deal with the 9/11 Commission's report. The 9/11 Commission was chartered to try and understand how we got hit the way we did on 9/11. Why did we get hit? Will we get hit again? If so, what do we do to prepare ourselves? How do we stop it? All of these issues were tied up with the 9/11 Commission. And they have made a series of recommendations that the House and the Senate are trying to resolve. They may not be reconciled. But it came down to a discussion. We had representatives from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, Treasury, FBI, members of Congress, members from the Executive Branch trying to express their support or opposition to what was being proposed.

My judgment is that the war against terror or the struggle against terrorism is not going to be won on the battlefield. Iraq aside for the moment, the struggle is going to be waged by sharing information, sharing techniques, sharing

technology, sharing good police work, having covert operatives, covert action, special forces — ultimately, perhaps the use of military force.

But the battle has to be waged by sharing information. That basically is what the Commission has tried to come up with. We've got the State Department's information and referral, and each of the various other agencies, like Immigration, has its own source of information. But that information isn't shared vertically from the bottom to the top, and when it gets to the top it's not shared horizontally. And so we have all of that information out there, much as we have tables in this room, and each of you has some special piece of information that may be able to put these dots together to say here's a pattern and here's something that we see that is anomalous and that poses a threat to our existence. We must share this information, but failure to share something that is known on that side of the room with that corner of the room could prove our destruction.

So how do you share information in a culture which has been protecting that information, sheltering it, protecting sources and methods? This is a great challenge for us.

You're seeing measures taken now to try to break those stereotypes down, to try and share more information. But basically also to call upon technology. And this is something that is of fundamental interest to you in Canada and to us in the United States. What technologies do we now call upon to help protect us?

And so we see identification, fingerprinting, iris scanning, and other types of measures taken to somehow identify the people who are coming into our country. It may pose significant problems to trade with our partners, particularly with Canada.

I know this is a very sensitive issue. But the fact is that we have found that we have very little choice. We must find ways in which we can continue to protect ourselves, while at the same time not jeopardizing the trade relationships we have. This is going to take a lot of thought, a lot of compromise, frankly, in how we bring this about. Technology is going to be ever more intrusive in our lives. And the one thing that we have tried to come to grips with most recently is the different obligations between government at the federal, state, and local levels.

Think about it. Government has two basic obligations. Number one, to protect you at the federal level, certainly with our military, at the state level with our state police or your mounted police, and at the local level with your sheriff and local police officers. Protect our security. At the same time, government has an obligation to protect your privacy and your liberty. And the two are coming

into some conflict. How do we reconcile the need to protect you and, at the same time, to protect your individual liberties? These two basic goals are coming into conflict.

So we're now having open sessions to try to reconcile them. If you were to travel to any place in Asia, step off the plane, walk down the plank, and go to the baggage department, you could look up at the ceiling and see a little glass bubble and a camera behind it. Do you think they're taking your picture to monitor your face and who is moving? The answer is they're measuring your body temperature. Why are they measuring your body temperature? Because you might be carrying the SARS virus. You might have a high temperature that day and you are about to become the guest of that country for a period of 14 to 21 days.

Is that offensive? Is it something that offends your sensibilities? Well, it all depends. It depends on whether or not you have the virus loose in your country, whether it can destroy your economy, as it nearly did Taiwan and Singapore after originating in Shanghai. It ended up in Toronto, didn't it?

And this is the thing that we have to really be concerned about. How do you live in a society where small groups of individuals can have access to technology and can create a virus, be it ebola or smallpox or some combination of the two, and suddenly they are only a plane ride away?

So technology is going to continue to play an ever-increasing role in our lives, and it's up to us policymakers today, and former policymakers, to look at the pressures upon us and say, yes, this may impede traffic, so we've got to find a way to solve that. It's fundamental to make sure that we have this kind of economic trade going on between us — we can't afford to impede that. But we can't afford to ignore the terror threat, either.

I feel myself, at least, coming on with a major senatorial-length speech, and I'm looking at your faces. And I can see the old expression "the mind will absorb what the seat will endure", and I want to close on a different note.

It's really important that we continue to speak to each other, that we conduct our foreign policies in ways that are open. Henry Kissinger has written many books. I don't know how many of you have read his books. They are worth reading, all of them. They're very long — they're fourteen or fifteen hundred pages. And if you hear Kissinger, he will say, I may not be a great writer, but if you read me you'll be a great reader. But he wrote a thin book that came out back in 2000. It was just a question mark — I assumed it was a primer for President Bush. No, I'm serious. I'm serious.

He wrote a book called *Does America Need a Foreign Policy: A Rhetorical Question?* And in that book he synthesized all of his experience. And that's why I assume he was handing it to the next president of the United States: "Here, read this book because it summarizes all of the things I've been writing about for so many years". In the book he actually quotes from an Australian philosopher, and he said that the American people must come to accept the fact that we are a superpower, whatever that word means. But we have a preeminent presence throughout the world. And it's true that, culturally, economically, politically, militarily, we have a very dominant presence throughout the world. But he said the United States must try to conduct its foreign policy as if there were multiple centres of power.

Human Relations 101. Make other people, make other countries feel that they're important. Listen to their history, learn about their culture, look at events through their eyes. Try and understand why they are formulating policies that may be different than your own. You may end up disagreeing with them, but at least you've given them the sense that you're listening to why they may have a different viewpoint. And so it comes down to what even Secretary Powell was quoted in today's *Financial Times* as saying, that we intend to conduct a very vigorous foreign policy, meaning that we are going to try to engage other countries to act on a multilateral basis whenever we can, unilaterally whenever we must.

It's not the Bush doctrine. That's actually the Clinton doctrine. It shouldn't be any doctrine. It's common sense. Try to act multilaterally whenever you can, unilaterally whenever you must. Shakespeare said it long before Kissinger, as a matter of fact, in "Measure for Measure". He said, "How excellent it would be to have the power of a giant. How tyrannous it would be to exercise it like a giant".

And so what we have to take into account is that United States, by virtue of its power, certainly has the capacity to influence world events, but we must work with our partners and our allies to make sure that we try to shape that policy in ways that also reflect some consensus of thought.

I want to conclude as I began with a word about Brian Mulroney. He, above all the people that I have worked with over the years — and he mentioned that we have known each other for more than 20 years — but I think of Brian in Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes' words. Holmes is one of our greatest Supreme Court justices. And he wrote with an elegance of language that I think is unequalled in today's literature. In a letter to one of his colleagues, he said, "I've always believed that it's not place or power or position that gives one the success that one desires, but the trembling notion that one has come near to an ideal".

And the only thing that prevents us from believing that we're living in a fool's paradise is the voices of a few masters, and I feel it so much I don't want to talk about it any more. Brian Mulroney is one of those voices of the masters. He, more than any other individual that I've come to know on a very personal level, symbolizes that coming near to the ideal. And he has represented this country in a way that I think is more profound than any of us can appreciate.

So it is with great honour that I come here tonight to thank you for inviting me, to praise you for the work that you've done to build a stronger alliance, to help build stronger ties between the New England states, the Atlantic states and Canada, to forge a friendship and a partnership that will endure well beyond our contribution to these efforts. Thank you very much for your honour.