



Chumir Ethics Forum



Sheldon Chumir Foundation for Ethics in Leadership

Phone: (403) 244-6666

www.chumirethicsfoundation.ca

Fax (403) 244-5596

President's Message

The retirement of Vaclav Havel from the presidency of the Czech Republic is a milestone that reminds us that individuals *can* make a difference in the direction of world events. For me, it also recalled an event that took place in the mid '90s, when I was in Prague to sign an exchange agreement between the University of Winnipeg and Charles University. The Rector of Charles University – a colleague of Havel's and a distinguished person noted for his strong support of human rights and democratization – told me of wondering whether, after the period of Nazi occupation and the subsequent Communist era, his country would ever again be in a position to engage in free exchanges of ideas with people from other parts of the world. Our agreement marked, for him, the fulfillment of a dream that that freedom would, indeed, come to pass, and he was visibly moved by being a part of that change. I was equally moved, especially coming from a part of the world where we have taken such freedoms for granted and where, on the whole, we have experienced little interference with those freedoms.

In the past year and a half, fears have surfaced that some of these cherished freedoms are being eroded as governments seek to enhance security in the face of threats of terrorism that seem closer to us than they once did. At the same time, we have the phenomenon of apparent declines in political participation, particularly among younger people – declines that, for many people bring worries that we may be experiencing a decline in the strength of democracy. This is an important debate so, fol-

lowing our successful forum on this topic last November in Victoria, the Foundation is sponsoring two more forums on this topic in Edmonton and Winnipeg in March. Those of you who will not be able to attend may wish to look at an earlier paper by our keynote speaker, Reg Whitaker, which appears on our website. Similar concerns about disengagement from public participation are being addressed at a February event in Calgary – "Taking Action - Attacking Voter Apathy II". We are supporting the public leadership component, along with Leadership Calgary and Winning Women.

Discussions of what counts as ethical behaviour, and how we can bring about ethical leadership surround us these days. In a way, this is a heartening sign for increased expressions of a hunger for ethical behaviour in public life may lead to positive change politics and government, business, the professions and the international sphere, especially in developing countries where dire poverty has been virtually universal and corruption has been rampant.

Over the past few months, all of these issues have been a focus of attention at the Foundation, and they find expression in several of the articles in this issue of the newsletter. The day after the recent elections in Kenya I received an enthusiastic email from Mildred Ngesa, our journalist-correspondent in Nairobi. Mildred was positively euphoric about the election – not just the political outcome, but also the fact that it was relatively free of violence, that more women were elected than ever before and that it brought hope to the public that they *can* bring about change. Her enthusiasm was infectious, so I asked her to share her

(Continued on page 2)

What's Inside

President's Message	1
Kenya's New Democracy Mildred Ngesa - <i>International Correspondent</i>	2
Ethics & Tomorrow's Corporate Leaders Alison Dempsey - <i>Program Director</i>	3
Event Announcement <i>Edmonton & Winnipeg Forums</i>	3
Towards Sustainability in Ethics and Business John Harker - <i>Public Policy Fellow</i>	4
Ethics At Work Alison Dempsey - <i>Program Director</i>	6
Escape From Politics Reg Whitaker	7
Deadline Reminder <i>Internship & Fellowship Applications</i>	8



Sheldon M. Chumir

Kenya's New Democracy



Kenya has unexpectedly emerged as a rising star among Africa's developing democracies. The third multi-party elections last year drew international accolades for upholding "people power". Afro-pessimists had predicted the worst - the stage was set for a repetition of the electoral violence witnessed in Congo, Uganda, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Senegal, and in Kenya itself in both 1992 and 1997.

Despite Kenya's independence since 1963, democratic politics had failed to materialize under the ruling Kenya Africa National Union. So in 1992, when Section 2 (a) of the Constitution was repealed, Kenyans were yet unable to form an effective multi-party democracy. The legacy of the KANU regime was an unresponsive electorate with limited opposition parties, too ill-prepared and disorganized to put up a spirited fight against KANU. They lost miserably and Kenya succumbed to the familiar despair of poverty, corruption, economic turmoil and sporadic ethnic strife.

By 1997 little had changed. In spite of a resilient bid to oust President Moi, KANU's flag-bearer and self-proclaimed *ruler d'élégance*, opposition parties suffered from a split vote. Their failure to recognize a genuine desire for grassroots leadership left opposition leaders pursuing power agendas while the people became increasingly disillusioned. The public outcry was for unity: "If you want our votes, then unite and go fight Moi as one!" The opposition did not listen, and Moi won again. The elections were marred by vote-rigging, corruption, incidents of violence, and unrest. Civil society cried "foul" and hopes dwindled for a genuine democracy where the people would hold the leadership mantle.

Kenya had become just another entry in the list of African countries suffering the totalitarian rule of ageing statesmen. Western cynicism took the form of massive aid withdrawal and donor apathy. Kenya appeared headed for inevitable decline and its population a victim of bad governance. The prognosis was disheartening. Biting poverty and corruption had infected every identifiable issue, and the country's economy was practically on its knees. Crime had escalated to unmanageable levels and the public sector was overwhelmed with job retrenchments and rampant unemployment.

Then last year, for the first time since he claimed power in 1978, President Moi agreed to relinquish it to whoever would succeed him in Kenya's third multi-party elections. Opposition parties were organized by the National Alliance of Kenya and the National Democratic Party. "Democracy" as heralded by civic society and the numerous non-governmental organizations would eventually win

the day. "Unity" was the unwavering mantra of the electorate, and the birth of the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) marked unprecedented opposition unity and remedied Kenya's ailing leadership. The unity of the opposition resurrected voter confidence, and opposition leaders were empowered by transcending tribalism. For the first time in the history of Kenya, a people-driven election in which nearly every Kenyan participated sent positive ripples across the continent and beyond. NARC won.

Its close opponent, Uhuru Kenyatta of the former ruling party KANU - and Moi's preferred choice - conceded. Moi handed over power to the new President Mwai Kibaki without hesitation, and a new era began. President Moi had remained in power for twenty four years by pitting tribe against tribe such that ethnic chauvinism became part of Kenya's culture. Strategies to heal the wounds inflicted by years of "divide and rule" policies were implemented. Democracy demanded that the wish of the people be respected and that promises of change, as made by opposition leaders for the last ten years, be honoured.

The need for change was manifested by high voter turn-out in spite of historical election-rigging, anticipated violence, and wet weather. The people knew that every vote counted, and resolved to rely on the ballot-box rather than the battle field. The Kenya of today emerges as a country that championed democracy and cheated anarchy, and embarks upon an arduous journey to rebuild with robust will and renewed hope. Western media and politicians must rethink the stereotype of African elections signifying the corruption of democracy, human rights and rule of law. The example of Kenya shines like a torch against the gloom of Africa's woes - an exception perhaps, but evidence that "people power" is possible in democracy anywhere in the world.

Mildred Ngesa
International Correspondent

(Continued from page 1)

thoughts with our readers. This edition of the newsletter also describes a couple of our ventures in relation to business ethics and corporate responsibility; and those of you who attended John Harker's presentation on December 10th will enjoy reading the condensed version of his talk.

Finally, many of you have asked when we might be presenting our next major Symposium, following upon the highly successful "Community Values in an Age of Globalization" last April. I'm happy to tell you that we are working on the next one, which will likely take place in April 2004. We'll keep you posted.

Marsha Hanen, President
Sheldon Chumir Foundation

Ethics and Tomorrow's Corporate Leaders

Queen's University undergraduate business school organizes the Queen's Inter-Collegiate Business Competition every year. The final round of the competition between the best six individual teams in each event is held at Queen's in Kingston, Ontario. Students from across Canada and beyond are brought together for an inspiring two days of competition based on their business studies. This year marked the 25th Anniversary of the Competition and it was a truly impressive occasion, in terms of the hours of work that the Queen's business students put into the organisation, the talent of the students representing their universities in the competition events, and its diversity with teams from across Canada as well as Hong Kong, Germany, Sweden and the U.S.

I had the pleasure of judging the six finalist teams in the Sheldon Chumir Foundation Ethics Event on Friday, 10th January and presenting the awards to the winning teams on behalf of the Foundation at the 25th Anniversary Closing Banquet on Saturday, 11th January. The University of Lethbridge took first place competing against teams from Queen's, University of Calgary, Memorial, University of Saskatchewan and Carleton. Each of the teams handled the ethical challenges posed in the case study - which they received just five hours beforehand – admirably and all of the participants are to be congratulated for their efforts. I would like to express my appreciation to my fellow Ethics Event judges - Stephen Bernardo of Mathew, Dinsdale & Clark, Rosemarie Boyle and Alison Lawford both of Export Development Canada for their insight and valuable contribution.

This is the third year that the Foundation has sponsored the Ethics Event and it was gratifying to hear fellow judges from the private and public sector, faculty and students acknowledge the significance of having had this event as part of the ICBC Competition well before the most recent spate of corporate transgressions. It is also a tremendous opportunity to raise awareness of the Foundation and its Mission, to promote and enable ethical conduct in all aspects of society.

In light of the events of the past eighteen months or so, and the ongoing sense of distrust and lack of public confidence in today's corporate leadership, it is so important that future business leaders have the skills and the confidence to "do the right thing" in an increasingly challenging and changing business environment. The Foundation has been exploring additional potential to work with undergraduate and/or postgraduate business schools to ensure that ethics, sound corporate governance principles and values-based leadership form the cornerstone of their curricula.

Alison Dempsey, Program Director
Sheldon Chumir Foundation



Foundation board members (l to r) Cliff O'Brien, Aritha van Herk and Ron Ghitter officially open the new Calgary office

Repeat Per-Forum-ance!

Back by popular demand
following our Victoria Forum
The Sheldon Chumir Foundation
for Ethics in Leadership
is pleased to present two more forums

Escape from Politics: a community forum

Edmonton
Tuesday March 25th
7:30-9:30 PM
Location TBA

Winnipeg
Wednesday March 26th
7:30-9:30 PM
Eckhardt – Grammaté Hall
University of Winnipeg

with a distinguished group of commentators
and the featured speaker:

Dr. Reg Whitaker
Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus,
York University; Adjunct Professor of Political
Science, University of Victoria

**watch our website - chumirethicsfoundation.ca
and see page 7 for an outline of the Forum...**



Towards Sustainability in Ethics and Business



The 1911 edition of the Oxford English Dictionary defines ethics as the science of morals, which are concerned with the distinction between right and wrong, and with the regulation of conduct.

I will talk about conduct, and I will talk about extractive companies operating in conflicted countries. If you think about mining, perhaps you think diamonds, and Sierra Leone. If you focus on

lumber, you might think of Liberia, where French and Chinese buyers lessen the impact of UN sanctions. Cocoa mostly comes from Cote D'Ivoire, slipping into civil war. And oil: Sudan, but not just there.

Sudan is of interest to students of Ethics and corporate conduct, particularly in Calgary, home of Talisman Energy Inc. Presumably, Talisman, in deciding to sell its Sudan assets, had an eye to the impact of Sudan not just on its bottom-line but on its reputation. Which brings us to the question of Talisman and ethics. When Jim Buckee first met Lloyd Axworthy, he said Talisman had always been an ethical company.

I could say "the jury is still out" on this point. A class action law suit is underway in New York, with plaintiffs accusing Talisman and the Government of Sudan of unethical conduct. On the eve of my last day in Sudan, word came that Lloyd Axworthy hoped I would visit a guerrilla commander and persuade him to not shoot at Canadian oil workers. I went, and was told I was a hostage and would remain so until Talisman withdrew from Sudan. Afterwards, a leading "protestor" contacted me. He had heard about the incident, and asked if I agreed that the commander was a principled opponent of Oil, a stalwart of the liberation movement.

I did not respond. I could have told him that a few months after the incident, I met a trusted confidante of the commander. He told me his man was willing to meet Talisman, not with a view to taking hostages but with an interest in "arrangements". And I wonder, today, what the protestor thinks, as the guerrilla commander has quit the liberation movement and joined the government forces?

Complexities surround extractive companies in conflict zones. So what can be said about Talisman and ethics? The company did upgrade its work on CSR, and called on PricewaterhouseCoopers for "verification". Is this good enough? Independence in verification is key.

Also, the company signed the Canadian Code of Conduct and seems to have promoted CSR within GNPOC. It worked in Washington to promote a sustainable peace process. But as to the oil region, I am not up-

to-date, though members of my 1999 team recently wrote in the Montreal Gazette that Talisman is "still complicit in violations of human rights" in Sudan.

Finally, some people in Canada assert that the Indian company buying out Talisman will be less interested in compliance with international law, and things will worsen for the Sudanese.

My approach is different.

I ask, will Talisman act ethically, and encourage the Indians to be ethical in Sudan? This could, and should, be seen as one test of whether or not Talisman is an ethical company.

Of course, there are other tests, and one is being applied in New York. It is not certain that the case will go to trial. And a trial does not always mean justice is done. But a trial would encourage Transparency, which I see as essential.

The Talisman case is by no means the only class action underway today. One is against Shell concerning repression of critics of oil development in Nigeria. Exxon Mobil is in court over its relationship with the Indonesian army. Unocal is in court for its operations in Myanmar, and an appeal court recently ruled that the company cannot hide behind the activities of the security forces of the government concerned, and must bear responsibility for them.

I have to wonder about the impact of cases such as these on other initiatives in ethics in business. Will the drive towards voluntary codes be blunted? Should it be? Codes frequently bring on board standards of international law, but are they effectively monitored? They frequently lack serious internal monitoring, much less regimes of external monitoring.

Then there is the impact of the availability of so many codes. One executive of an extractive company said this is a good thing. "Let a thousand flowers bloom". My cultural heritage is more Methodist than Maoist, and

(Continued on page 5)



Friends of the Foundation gather to see our new office

(Continued from page 4)

I cannot help but think of leaves hiding, not revealing. Transparency is key

Another initiative which might be impacted by Class Action is "Publish What you Pay", introduced by the NGO, Global Witness, and George Soros the financier. It calls on G8 governments to force companies to publish what they pay host governments, in regular and "special" payments. Soros says companies will not act voluntarily, but BP did disclose what special payments it paid to the Angolan authorities. BP's action was not appreciated in Luanda!

Shell is against Publish What You Pay. It took a lead role in another initiative which may be affected by Class Actions. This was the formulation of UK/US guidelines on security and extraction. The guidelines are not binding. But they have involved bodies like Amnesty International, well used to monitoring unethical conduct. Monitoring is key, but not enough.

One extractive sector has gone further. Big chocolate companies have created a joint organization with major civil society organizations: cocoa farms often exploit child labour in a form of contemporary slavery. The initiative aims at projects which will change employment and social practices, freeing the children, and freeing the companies from complicity in unethical conduct. Will it work? Will it be impeded by Class Action? I cannot predict where the drive for ethics is going, but there are many signs that it is here to stay.

One is the durability of protest. Which I welcome, but I am uneasy when I hear that we need a "new normative framework", worried when we rush to fashion new codes. I appreciate the value of the "old" normative frameworks and regulatory systems built on their foundation. We do not need new frameworks and codes if we then ignore what we have already, unless the new is more effective than the old, about which I remain sceptical.

Another sign is the willingness of protestors and companies to work together. The cocoa initiative is an example, and so might be the co-operation between companies like Shell or Exxon Mobil and Amnesty International on the UK/US guidelines.

The third sign is the behaviour of companies themselves. Ethics is about conduct. More companies are looking for ways to act ethically, requiring closer involvement by all levels of the company, including directors and investors. There is some distance to go, and the role of non-executive directors needs more thought, but less will be left to CEOs. This does not imply that CEOs are unethical. We hear too little of the "positives" of CEO behaviour. The best of them are showing ethical leadership, transforming the operating culture of their



The new office is a good environment for discussion...

companies.

Leadership is so important in moving towards sustainability in ethics and business. For me, this involves the company and its individuals treating everyone, including each other, with respect, knowing that what is done will impact on others. If this spirit can infuse corporate cultures, I am convinced we will see more ethical business.

And we will see that it leads to greater participation, in business and community decision-making, and to more "shared responsibility". Communities have responsibilities as well as rights. They often lack information or power, or both. Companies frequently have to work with two legal frameworks, the host country laws and the body of international law. It would be a mistake to assume there was harmony between them.

Too often, extraction brings profit for an elite and dire consequences for a local community. But it is unlikely that exploitative extraction will continue out of sight and out of mind.

Ethical companies must seek to promote transparency, otherwise, they could be made complicit, even by their partners, in unethical, even illegal, conduct. There are costs involved here, and to avoid them companies must internalize ethics, which some of them clearly want to do anyway because it is the right thing to do. The right thing to do is not always the easy thing to do, and I would encourage companies and communities to work hard at effective partnering, embracing ethical leadership.

John Harker,
2002 - 03 Public Policy Fellow

Mr. Harker's December 10th Calgary Presentation is available to download as a pdf file at www.chumirethicsfoundation.ca

... some people in Canada assert that the Indian company buying out Talisman will be less interested in compliance with international law, and things will worsen for the Sudanese.

My approach is different.

I ask, will Talisman act ethically, and encourage the Indians to be ethical in Sudan?

This could, and should, be seen as one test of whether or not Talisman is an ethical company.

Ethics Training in the Workplace



Accountability, governance and the need for ethical conduct in business have been increasingly “hot topics” over the last few years, particularly the last eighteen months. It is gratifying to see these issues moving up the agenda, but there is often a gap between the commentary and the challenges facing us in the everyday world of work – struggling between wanting to “do

the right thing” and what often seem to be conflicting pressures of business (and individual) performance.

While laws and regulations can define the **outside boundaries**, and codes of conduct can serve as **internal reference points**, it comes down to the individuals within organizations to ensure a business culture that embodies ethical conduct.

In December, I had the opportunity to introduce the Foundation’s mission to promote ethics and values and to raise awareness of the ethical dimension of decisions and actions to a group of employees with a natural resource sector company in Calgary. Sessions like this one, which combined vision, education and informed dialogue are core to the Foundation’s commitment to being practical and relevant. There is much talk of ethics these days, but it is not always clear from the rhetoric how this affects each of us on an everyday basis.

In my introduction, I put to the group that if an organization’s culture is one in which employees feel free to take responsibility for finding solutions, then consider the possibilities if employees are also encouraged and supported in their efforts to take account of the ethical dimensions and consequences of their decisions and actions.

When they identify possible solutions, is there sufficient mutual trust within the organization and will individuals have the necessary courage to choose the solution they feel is the “right thing to do”?

And what does it mean if people have different ideas about what they think is best ?

I put the latter question to the group to highlight one of the greatest challenges for any organization seeking to embed a uniform code of ethics and practices. That challenge being the reality that, within a group, there are likely to be quite different perceptions of the same situation and, equally, a variety of perspectives on what doing the right thing in that situation might entail. There is no easy way to resolve that dilemma without threatening the diversity and individuality within organizations.

The session’s main emphasis was to be on the

interaction within the group. So, following the introduction, I presented the group with three short scenarios that I had conceived and written specifically for this session. The context for each scenario related to a different aspect of the company’s internal and external operations to maximize participants’ identification with the myriad issues and pressures at work. Each scenario contained one particular dilemma to be resolved amidst many, often competing, considerations and interests.

I emphasized that, whilst the dialogue among the group might not lead to agreement on the ‘best’ solutions, the main object of the exercise is the dialogue itself and an increased awareness of the different considerations and perceptions influencing individual response. People can usually agree on what would be clearly wrong. It is not so straightforward, or necessarily even possible, to decide if there is one clear “right way”. We are often required to navigate a way through a sea of gray.

Core principles and values, however, do not change with circumstances, instead they determine perspective, motivation, understanding of duty and responsibility. Provided an organization’s core values are clear, realistic, and, above all, modelled consistently by everyone from the CEO down, they will be the tools needed to understand, and respond to, the complexities involved in ‘real life’ ethical decision-making.

The strongest leaders are those who uphold their values by their daily actions. Leadership, therefore, is not something that happens only at the top – every individual has the capacity and the responsibility for leadership.

Alison Dempsey, Program Director
Sheldon Chumir Foundation

SHELDON M. CHUMIR FOUNDATION FOR ETHICS IN LEADERSHIP

Suite 970, 1202 Centre Street S,
Calgary, Alberta T2G 5A5

Tel: (403) 244-6666

Fax: (403) 244-5596

email: info@chumirethicsfoundation.ca

website: www.chumirethicsfoundation.ca

Please Note: the **municipal version** of our URL
(.calgary.ab.ca) is **no longer supported**

Join Our Email List

We would be pleased to inform you of upcoming forums, symposia and events throughout the year.

To join our email list, please contact Elaine at:

ewojtkiw@chumirethicsfoundation.ca

See you online!

Escape from Politics

There is a widespread feeling that democracy is in crisis in Canada. For some years now, polls have been finding that the institutions that we hold in common for self-government have been declining in legitimacy. Politics, instead of being a symbol of our democratic citizenship, have become a term of opprobrium, an activity to be shunned.

Participation in public affairs can take many forms, but the minimum for the exercise of citizenship in a representative democracy is *voting*. By this measure, the Canadian political system is failing to engage the participation of its citizens at the minimal level.

- Turnout has been declining progressively in federal elections since 1988.
- Most provinces are following a similar pattern of declining turnout in provincial elections.

Before advancing explanations for this trend, it is best to look at the empirical evidence about turnout:

- The decline in turnout is most closely correlated with *age* – young Canadians, born in 1960s and later, account for most of the decline.
- The decline is *generational* – as post-1960 Canadians age, they continue to participate less than older generations.
- The decline is *cumulative* – each new generation turns out less than its predecessor in elections.
- The decline in turnout is correlated closely to a decline in *political knowledge* and *political interest*.
- The decline in knowledge is not a function of education: young Canadians are better educated than earlier generations, but less knowledgeable about politics. There are more opportunities for gaining political knowledge, but there is less interest in taking advantage of them.

There are a number of explanations that have been put forward to account for these trends. Not all of them stand up to close scrutiny, however.

- Are young Canadians finding alternative avenues for political expression outside the parliamentary system?
 - There is some evidence for this: young people register more confidence in social movements, public interest groups, protest movements, etc., than in political parties.
 - Yet those who participate in extra-parliamentary activities actually prove to be more, rather than less, likely to vote than those who participate in no alternative public activities.
- Is declining turnout a function of generally declining deference to authority and a general decline in the legitimacy and attractiveness of all civil associations?



Old friends gather and new friends meet at the new office

- There is evidence that younger Canadians belong to fewer traditional groups, such as churches, and this is correlated with lower political participation.
- The general decline of deference to authority cannot account for the fact that political institutions and actors are held in the *least* esteem, and that the declining legitimacy of political institutions is accelerating faster than other social, cultural and economic institutions.

It is necessary to dig a bit deeper, and look at some structural factors that may be at work:

- Culture and community have become more fragmented, partly as a result of new communication technologies
 - New technologies fragment the sense of the 'commons', while enhancing differences.
- In an era of neo-liberal restructuring, there is a pervasive anti-government climate, with the denigration of public service, and the hollowing out of the public sector as an agent of social change.
- Globalization reduces the salience of national and provincial states, takes away the policy tools, and places important decisions at a level where decision makers are unaccountable.
- Politics are 'legalized' and 'constitutionalized': both Left and Right try to move their important issues out of the reach of democratic politics, and thus out of reach of democratic accountability, the Left by embedding social rights, the Right by locking national legislative powers into restrictive global frameworks.

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

What are some of the possible remedies?

- A renewal of *civic* education, as opposed to specialized and technical education would be very helpful.
 - Teaching civic values through *practice* in and out of the classroom would be a hopeful route, starting at the local level by engaging students in the issues that affect their own communities.
- Institutional reforms are an absolutely necessary ingredient.
 - One set of reforms currently on offer falls under the rubric of right-wing populism, including frequent recourse to referenda, initiatives, recall, etc. These offer a false solution. The deliberative process at the heart of democracy must be respected, not bypassed. When the mediating institutions, representative and deliberative, between leaders and masses are removed, there is a loss rather than a gain in democratic accountability.
 - 'E-democracy' – making the political system more accessible through internet technology – offers some opportunities, especially as young people are especially familiar with and at ease with the new technologies. But on closer examination, the problems and difficulties that have shown up with e-democracy experiments suggest caution, especially with regard to the well-known 'digital divide' that excludes many from access, especially the poor. Technology may assist in solutions, but does not itself offer an overall solution for the larger problem.
 - Reforming Parliament to give MPs a greater measure of autonomy, and freedom from deadening party control is desirable, and there are even pressures coming from inside the governing Liberal caucus to open up the process to greater Parliamentary participation.
 - Reforming party finance to break the stranglehold of big corporate money on politics is an absolute must – and surprisingly, the Liberal government in Ottawa has tabled draft legislation that would go a long way toward doing just this.
 - Electing a regionally equal or otherwise more representative Senate (say, with equal gender balance, and with guaranteed First Nations representation), or abolishing it altogether.
 - Reforming our profoundly flawed and distorting 'First-Past-the-Post' voting system, and substituting some form of Proportional Representation would make our parliamentary institutions more democratically representative, and would also bring more viewpoints into government.
 - Restoring direct enumeration of voters to make first time voting easier would catch many potential voters now lost from sight.
- Giving more power to municipal governments, liberating them from provincial servitude, and providing more funding for programs that touch people in their daily lives.
- Reconnecting the global, the national, and the local is a huge, but very important task
 - Anti-corporate globalization movements have to engage with their national governments, which are the only democratically accountable units at work in the global governance system.
 - National and provincial governments have to accept more responsibility for global governance, both by enforcing constraints and regulation on the corporate sector, and by forming alliances and partnerships with NGOs, social movements and public interest groups.

All these proposed remedies have one theme in common - finding ways to make the collective democratic decision making process more relevant to the lives of young Canadians. The paradox of a better educated younger population with less knowledge and interest in public affairs must be seriously addressed, and ways found of reconnecting them with the 'commons', the public space where decisions can be made by the community as a whole, and not just by profit-maximizing corporations. A good first step is to listen to and draw on the energies of those young people who are passionately interested in politics, even if not the traditional forms of political engagement.

Dr. Reg Whitaker

Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus,
York University; Adjunct Professor of Political
Science, University of Victoria

Foundation Program Application Deadlines

Deadlines are fast approaching to submit applications to the Foundation for its Fellowship and Internship programs:

Internship Applications: March 14, 2003

Media Fellowship Applications: March 21, 2003

Public Policy Fellowship Applications: March 28, 2003

Senior students or graduates are invited to apply for an Internship sponsored by the Sheldon Chumir Foundation for Ethics in Leadership. Persons working in print or electronic media are invited to apply for a Media Fellowship, and persons working in any public policy area (government, public service, academia, policing etc.) are invited to apply for a Public Policy Fellowship.

Please refer to our website for application details:

www.chumirethicsfoundation.ca

