



CONFRONTING GLOBALIZATION & RECLAIMING DEMOCRACY



CONFRONTING GLOBALIZATION & RECLAIMING DEMOCRACY

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Origin of the MAI Inquiry	3
1. CONFRONTING GLOBALIZATION: TESTIMONY	
Anti-Poverty Groups	4
Labour Movement	6
Environment Groups	7
Cultural Associations	9
Health Care Associations	10
Education Groups	11
Women's Organizations	12
Farmers' Groups	14
Faith Communities	15
Human Rights	16
Additional Observations	18
2. RECLAIMING DEMOCRACY: RECOMMENDATIONS	
Track One: Objectives	20
Track Two: Policies	25
Conclusion	29
List of Witnesses	31
Commissioners	35
Principal Organizers	38

Introduction

The revelation in the spring of 1997 that the Canadian government, along with the other member countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), was privately working with the International Chamber of Commerce to create a new global investment treaty of unprecedented power set off a firestorm of protest all across the country. So secret had the talks been until then that even most politicians and some Cabinet ministers knew nothing about them.

As information leaked and then poured out, it became clear that this new treaty would alter life for every person on the planet. Soon, a consensus was building among “civil society” groups – those representing human rights, the environment, workers, women, the poor, public health and education, farmers, seniors, the cultural community, and many others. The Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) would give private corporations in every signatory country not only the legal status of nation-states, it would also give them—and them alone—such powerful tools to enforce their newly acquired “rights” that governments would be compelled by law to safeguard corporate interests over those of their own citizens.

A massive grassroots campaign began in Canada and in countries around the world. Citizens’ groups launched public education sessions in church basements and town halls from coast to coast. Stunned by the depth and breadth of this citizen opposition, the OECD countries started squabbling with one another and, in the fall of 1998, threw in the towel and admitted defeat.

Citizens in Canada, however, weren’t satisfied. How had such a concept come about? What would have happened if we hadn’t had a draft document leaked to us? Why had our government, once again, chosen not to consult with civil society when negotiating such a far-reaching treaty? Why did we never seem to see our values and principles in these international trade and investment deals? Why did they always seem to reflect only the interests of big business?

So in the fall of 1998, The Council of Canadians, representing the coalition of 40 national groups that had come together to defeat the MAI, set out to hear from Canadians in all walks of life living in communities from St. John’s, Newfoundland to Vancouver, British Columbia. We invited some of our key civil society leaders to serve as voluntary Commissioners and seek the wise counsel of ordinary Canadians—advice the federal government seemed unprepared to hear. These Commissioners found time in their busy lives to serve in this process and we are deeply grateful to them for their patience, compassion and dedication to democracy.

The outpouring across the country was remarkable. Hundreds attended most sessions. At each stop, we were moved by the quality of the presenters and impressed with the depth of the research and creative thought that had gone into their presentations. Along with thought-provoking analysis, there was also much laughter and some tears; the full range of human emotion seemed to be triggered when people expressed their true feelings about the MAI.

As well, presentations by sector and organization made it very clear that every major environmental, cultural, social, human rights and labour group in the country was opposed to the MAI in its current form. Canadian civil society came together in an unprecedented way to contest this flawed model for international rule-making and to present a wealth of ideas for alternatives based on human and earth-centred values.

We are proud to present these ideas and recommendations in this report. We are unanimous that it should not be seen simply as a reflection on a proposed treaty now dead. For one thing, that would be an inaccurate reading of the political will to see some form of an MAI resurrected, most likely at the upcoming talks of the World Trade Organization (WTO). As well, parts of the MAI are alive and well in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which is already being used to knock down existing nation-state health and environmental rules.

Most important, however, is that the model put forward in this document expresses the demands of civil society to our government as it participates in international negotiations on our behalf. We believe the economy exists to serve people and communities, not private global capital, and we want our government to uphold this essential principle in the international arena.

We are also putting our government on notice: we will never be left out of this process again.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Maude Barlow". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Maude" being larger and more prominent than the last name "Barlow".

Maude Barlow
Chair, MAI Inquiry

The Report of the MAI Inquiry: A Citizens' Search for Alternatives

ORIGIN OF THE MAI INQUIRY

Speaking at the World Economic Forum in February 1998, Canada's international trade minister, Sergio Marchi, described the MAI as "a shopping cart" in which Canadians were throwing "their anxieties" about economic globalization. The World Economic Forum is an annual event where the CEOs of the top transnational corporations meet with prime ministers, presidents and senior government officials to discuss major issues concerning the global economy. On this occasion, Marchi was trying to explain why so much widespread opposition to the MAI had erupted in Canada. Far from taking these "anxieties" seriously, however, the minister tended to dismiss Canadians' concerns as unfounded, trivial worries that could be mollified with a little public relations.

It was precisely this kind of incident that provoked the Council of Canadians to conduct a set of cross-country hearings into the impacts of the MAI and to search for alternatives during the fall of 1998. The Council knew from its work with partner organizations involved in the MAI campaign that Canadians had strong, deeply felt reasons for resisting this deal. Indeed, many Canadians felt that they were losing control over their economic, social and ecological future in an increasingly globalized economy. If Ottawa would not take these concerns seriously, then the Council would. And so it began to organize a public inquiry of its own across the country. The objective was to document both problems and potential solutions. It would be called The MAI Inquiry: A Citizens' Search for Alternatives.

A national commission was convened to conduct the Inquiry, composed of individuals who were both well known and knowledgeable about issues of globalization. A Citizens' Handbook on the MAI was published and distributed to assist people in preparing for the hearings. Hearings were held in eight major cities across Canada—Vancouver, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, and St. John's—and there were an additional eight hearings in cities and towns throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Furthermore, hundreds of individual Canadians also participated by filling out the "Citizens' Report Card" contained in the Handbook.

The following is a summary report on the findings of the Inquiry, divided into two parts. Part One, "Confronting Globalization," identifies the impacts of the MAI and related forms of economic globalization by recounting the experiences of civil society groups in Canada. Part Two, "Reclaiming Democracy," identifies an emerging consensus among citizen groups in Canada for an alternative trade and investment agenda.

1. Confronting Globalization

CIVIL SOCIETY SPEAKS OUT AGAINST THE MAI AND CORPORATE-DRIVEN GLOBALIZATION.

“If ownership, consumer protection, environmental protection and human rights protection are no longer in the hands of our government, what is left of our country? The picture of what we will inherit is bleak. We will no longer be citizens with national pride and distinction but nameless, faceless consumers.”

**GRADE 12 CLASS,
ST. ANGELA’S ACADEMY
(SASKATOON)**

During the course of its cross-country hearings, the Commission heard several presentations that examined the MAI within the context of citizen struggles against corporate-driven globalization. Two submissions in particular stand out. The first is a document entitled “Ethical Reflections on the MAI,” which was submitted by the Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice (ECEJ) in Toronto. The second is a brief prepared for the Inquiry by L’opération SALAMI in Montreal. In different ways, both documents provide an in-depth citizens’ critique of the main components of the MAI. In addition, there were other submissions that situated the MAI and its impacts in the context of the current structures of capitalism, notably briefs by the Canadian Auto Workers in Quebec (Le Conseil conjoint TCA—Canada/Québec) and Veterans Against Nuclear Arms. (Copies of these and other submissions are available from the Ottawa office of The Council of Canadians.)

It should be noted that the Commission received presentations from a number of municipal, provincial and federal politicians, including the leader of the New Democratic Party, Alexa McDonough. However, since this report is meant to reflect the views of “civil society”, the views of politicians have been largely omitted.

For the most part, the testimonies given by witnesses and the briefs submitted to the Inquiry were rooted in the experiences and struggles of groups within particular sectors of the economy and society. Based on the testimonies and submissions received, the Commission has identified 10 key sectors of civil society groups. The purpose here is to reflect the main themes and issues that emerged from the presentations made by groups in these 10 sectors.

ANTI-POVERTY GROUPS

The current crisis in homelessness, the Commissioners were told, is a concrete example of the dramatic impact of corporate-driven globalization on Canadians’ lives. According to anti-poverty groups in Canada, there are now over 200,000 people living on the streets of the nation. “Tracking the streets of Toronto, we are finding between three and four deaths a week,” said John Clarke of the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty. “The situation is appalling.” The authorities themselves, Clarke said, don’t know what to do about it. Given the deep cutbacks that have taken place in government social services, health care and education, along with the dismantling of the public sector in general, Clarke declared that “the marketplace gets to decide who lives and who dies.”

While acknowledging that economic globalization in general, and MAI-style investment rules in particular, serve to increase gross domestic product and therefore the appearance of a healthy economy, Clarke emphasized that this is largely a “con-job” that needs to be challenged head



on. If more money is available, he asked, why do governments cut social programs that are essential to the survival of poor people? The fact is, he said, “the MAI is working to increase even further the pieces of the pie for those who already have the largest share.” Handing back the surplus within unemployment insurance in the form a tax cut is “offensive,” maintains Clarke. “A tax break will not benefit the working poor,” he said, “if they have to pay for hospital services and garbage pickup.”

Jean Swanson of End Legislated Poverty in Vancouver echoed these comments. She spoke of recent efforts by OECD countries to deregulate labour markets and “moderate” wages. “Wage moderation,” she said, “means more working poverty.” The assumption, says Swanson, is that governments should get out of the business of creating jobs altogether. Hence the move by governments to slash unemployment insurance, rewrite welfare standards, crack down on so-called welfare and UI fraud, reduce minimum wages, and gut job training programs. These measures, says Swanson, constitute “the new poor laws.” They are designed to compel working people “to compete more fiercely for low-wage jobs.”

The MAI creates an economic climate that encourages governments to adopt such laws in order to attract more foreign investment. In Canada, a prime example is the massive restructuring of unemployment insurance to the point where the percentage of unemployed eligible for benefits has plummeted from 87 percent to 27 percent. Another example was the abolition of the Canada Assistance Plan in 1996, which ended national standards for welfare payments across the country. For Swanson, it is not enough to stop the MAI. We must also demand governments stop implementing “poor laws” that serve the vested interests of global corporations.

LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Commissioners heard from representatives of organized labour in virtually every major centre of the country. Don Anderson of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour told the Inquiry that the MAI is only the most recent and devastating piece of the current globalization agenda, which has led to industries fleeing to low-wage regions and countries deregulating long-established employment standards. “Capital respects no boundaries,” he said, “it is a global predator.” Anderson also showed that the so-called three anchors proposed by MAI negotiators as protection for working people—reference to labour standards in the preamble, the inclusion of OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises in the appendix, and the clause committing governments not to lower labour standards to attract investment—were a “sham” having little or no “practical value whatsoever for working people.”

Audrey Cormack of the Alberta Federation of Labour warned that “globalization undermines our bargaining power” and that Canadian workers are now forced to compete “with underpaid, maltreated workers in Indonesia, China, Taiwan and other nations.” Citing the recent firings of garment workers by a Disney contractor in Haiti and a Wal-Mart contractor in Nicaragua, Helen Kennedy of the Metro Toronto District Labour Council emphasized how the proliferation of free trade zones around the world eliminates labour standards along with the rights of workers to organize unions. The MAI would not only accelerate these trends, said Kennedy, but it would also give corporations the power to sue governments who bring in legislation to protect workers’ rights in the future. To counter these trends, Susan Barton, Bertrand Begin and Pat Riley of the New Brunswick Federation of Labour proposed the inclusion of a social clause that would contain the right to organize, the right to collective bargaining, to pay equity and to employment equity, as well as bans on child and forced labour. To be effective, they said, such a social clause would need enforcement mechanisms.

Serge Roy of the Syndicat de la fonction publique du Québec declared: “Under the MAI, public intervention would no longer be sovereign and sectors over which government has control would be destroyed.” Philip Legg of the B.C. Federation of Labour told the Inquiry that if the MAI were in effect today, corporations could overturn the performance requirements issued by the B.C. government under their recent Jobs and Timber Accord. In St. John’s, Earl McCurdy of the Fish and Allied Workers Union pointed out that while the fisheries were protected under NAFTA, they would not be protected under the proposed MAI. In fact, said McCurdy, concerns about the impact of the MAI on the fisheries were raised not by the Canadian but by the Norwegian government. Wendy Vandersteen of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers argued in Halifax that the MAI would accelerate the privatization of Crown corporations such as Canada Post by compelling them to operate like commercial enterprises. Under the “national treatment” clause of the MAI, public enterprises that provide uniform, affordable postal or even daycare services for Canadians could be challenged as “discriminatory” against foreign-based corporations.

The Commissioners also received briefs from other unions. The Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) emphasized the impacts of the MAI on health and education services (see sections below) and the Manitoba Federation of Labour highlighted the negative aspects in general of the MAI's main components. In Montreal, le Conseil conjoint TCA-Canada/Québec presented a critical look at some of the strategic issues to be faced regarding the impacts of the MAI on the fight for democratic rights.

ENVIRONMENT GROUPS

The Commissioners also heard powerful warnings about the environmental dangers of corporate-driven globalization and the MAI. Geoff Richardson of Greenpeace Canada highlighted the United Nation's recent Human Development Report, which cites the annual numbers of pollution-caused deaths and the rapid depletion of the planet's forests and fish stocks. "Much of this biological degradation," he said, "is fueled by unregulated and uncontrolled foreign investment." What's more, "investment tends to promote Western lifestyles and levels of material affluence" which, in turn, means "more burning of fossil fuels, more Big Macs, more *Gilligan's Island* reruns."

Many witnesses referred to the Ethyl Corporation case against the Canadian government as an example of how MAI investment rules could be used to overturn or ratchet down unwanted environmental legislation. In 1998, U.S.-based chemical giant Ethyl Corporation invoked the investor-state mechanism in NAFTA (Chapter 11) to sue Ottawa for \$350 million after the government placed a ban on the sale of MMT, a gasoline additive that Prime Minister Chrétien, while in opposition, called "an insidious neurotoxin." Ethyl, which produces and sells MMT, not only forced the federal government to withdraw the ban, but also got Ottawa to make a

"[The MAI] constitutes the most effective anti-environmental strategy yet devised by corporations and their allies."

**KEN TRAYNOR,
CANADIAN
ENVIRONMENTAL
LAW ASSOCIATION
(TORONTO)**

"We need to promote approaches to sustainable development founded on the principles of international justice, intergenerational equity and constant natural capital."

**GEOFF RICHARDSON,
GREENPEACE CANADA
(TORONTO)**



public disclaimer about the harmful effects of MMT and to pay the company \$20 million in legal fees. Since the investor-state mechanism is a major feature of the MAI, witnesses emphasized that “paying the polluter” would become a trend in the future.

Steven Shrybman of the West Coast Environmental Law Association stressed that the Ethyl case demonstrates the constraints that the MAI would put on governments to regulate corporations and their investments. What is new here, said Shrybman, is the MAI’s enforcement regime. Through the investor-state mechanism, corporations can effectively use the MAI’s dispute settlement procedure to get rid of unwanted environmental laws, policies and programs on the basis that they are investment-restrictive. The MAI, he said, “enshrines a new ‘theology of the market’—a new version of the Ten Commandments.” “Perhaps,” quipped Shrybman, “we should insist that they be written on stone tablets.”

At the Toronto hearings, Ken Traynor of the Canadian Environmental Law Association showed that the proposed MAI rules contain “an extremely broad definition of investment and investor rights, with extraordinary ‘expropriation’ claims” that go well beyond what is currently allowed under Canadian law. “This constitutes the most effective anti-environmental strategy yet devised by corporations and their allies,” said Traynor. What’s important is the “chilling effect” of the Ethyl case and potential claims under the MAI, since “no government will take lightly the prospect of a huge financial claim against it for legislation, however high the public support for the measure.” Traynor further documented how eight provisions proposed by Environment Canada would do little to improve environmental protection in the MAI, as long as the main components of the investment regime remained in place.

In a similar vein, Garth Nelson of Nature Saskatchewan argued that the MAI’s investment protection rules would prevent governments from using tax incentives to encourage eco-forestry practices among timber companies or develop energy policies that curb fossil fuel demand. In Halifax, Ron Colman of the Genuine Progress Index challenged what he called “MAI Mathematics,” which allows Chile to be praised for its booming economy and repaying its IMF loans, but fails to account for the fact that “the country’s forests are being cut down, its fish stocks depleted, [and] its rural population sprayed with toxins.”

CULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS

The Commissioners heard moving testimony from representatives of the cultural sector. In Montreal, Lucette Lupien reminded the Inquiry that it was the mobilization of artists and entertainers in France that was largely responsible for the French government's withdrawal from the MAI negotiations. In Toronto, Garry Neil of the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA) testified that the MAI was the latest in a series of globalization measures restricting Canada's ability to maintain cultural sovereignty. "The MAI as drafted," he said, "would affect every cultural support program and measure which Canada has implemented." Canada's ability to regulate the foreign ownership of Canadian broadcasters, cable companies, film and television distributors would be restricted, he said, along with direct funding for Telefilm Canada, the Canadian Television and Cable Production Fund, and provincial film agencies, which form the cornerstone of the current production boom in the country.

As well, Neil said, the MAI's "national treatment" provisions would restrict the operations of Canada's regulatory agency, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC), including Canadian content and cable substitution requirements. Canada's 36 co-production treaties, which are designed to stimulate partnerships in film and television with producers in countries other than the United States, would likely be challenged by U.S. film producers as a violation of the MAI's "national treatment" and "most favored nation" clauses. Indeed, other witnesses cited the carefully worded judgment rendered by the Canadian Conference of the Arts on the MAI: "This agreement, if passed, has the potential to seriously compromise the political and cultural sovereignty of signatory states, and if no cultural exemption is obtained, will jettison most of Canada's cultural policies."

In Halifax, Stephen Cross of the Irondale Ensemble Project spoke passionately about the plight of the cultural industry in this country. Comparing the arts industry with the fish industry, Cross declared that the only difference between the two is that the "the arts industry hasn't collapsed yet." He then went on to say: "Do you think that these downturns [in the fisheries] were fated? An accident? Do you think we have run out of fish because God or nature did not put enough fish in the ocean? Or trees in the forest? Or minerals in the ground? Do you think these industries are suffering or dead for any other reason than government-industry policy?" The industrialization of the fisheries, he said, "has, in one way or another, alienated most small fishermen out of their traditional livelihoods. The larger companies now own the fish." "These policies are with us," concluded Cross, "because government is led by corporate ethics."

"We cannot allow our culture and our communal memory to be replaced by corporate memory," pleaded Patrick Close, a representative of Saskatchewan Visual Artists. Yet this, the Commissioners were told, is precisely what is happening. "The sad fact is," said Cross, "cultural organizations and artists need money to survive just like everybody else, and most of the money is in the hands of the corporations....Do a survey. Contact the several arts organizations in the metro area and ask if the chair of their board is a corporate representative.....Now take a walk through the New Neptune. See if you can keep count of the number of corporate plaques

"The MAI as drafted would affect every cultural support program and measure which Canada has implemented....We need a clear citizens' alternative. Canada should take the initiative on an international charter of cultural rights."

**GARRY NEIL,
ALLIANCE OF CANADIAN
CINEMA, TELEVISION
AND RADIO ARTISTS
(TORONTO)**



throughout the lobby area, the elevator, the box office, etc. Now search throughout the building, through the Fountain Hall, the DuMaurier Theatre, the Ford Canada theatre school, the Pratt and Whitney rehearsal room, to see if you can find a plaque thanking the taxpayers of Nova Scotia and Canada for their contribution to this edifice.”

HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATIONS

Canada’s fragile public health care system, the Commissioners learned, would also be further threatened by the MAI. Fred Muzin of the B.C. Hospital Employees Union said the MAI would “expand opportunities for transnational corporations to seek profits in the health care system” in Canada, which is viewed as “a \$72-billion opportunity....a captive market.” Private interests, he said, are increasingly gaining control of Medicare in this country, and the MAI will accelerate this process. Heather Smith, president of the United Nurses of Alberta, testified that a number of U.S.-based, for-profit health care corporations such as Columbia/HCA, Liberty Health, and WE-CARE have already begun to take control of some key sectors of health care delivery in her province.

In Saskatoon, Rosalee Longmore from the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses and Tom Graham from the Canadian Union of Public Employees gave evidence that Canada’s public health care system would not be protected under the MAI. “Health care is only protected to the extent that it is a social service maintained and provided for a public purpose,” said Longmore. “But terms such as ‘social service,’ ‘public purpose’ and ‘health’ are not defined in the agreement,” she said, and are therefore “open to interpretation.” According to Graham, documents show (based

on application of the exact same terms in NAFTA) that the U.S. government insists such terms be interpreted very narrowly to mean any private delivery of health care, whether for-profit or not-for-profit. Since the vast majority of health care services are not delivered directly by governments, but “privately,” through community-based institutions, for-profit health care corporations could claim access to public dollars for Medicare under the MAI rules.

According to the Canadian Health Coalition, the reservation that is supposed to protect Medicare in the MAI “at best, is flawed and full of holes, and, at worst, is a deliberate attempt to expose our public health care system to commercial attack.” Paul Moist, president of CUPE Manitoba, pointed out ways in which foreign-based corporations could carve out markets in provincial health services such as the Workers’ Compensation Boards (WCBs). “While existing WCBs generally use public health facilities,” said Moist, “they are not required to do so by the Canada Health Act.” Currently, the WCBs represent a lucrative \$7.5-billion market which, he suggests, could become a target for increased privatization under the MAI. Furthermore, the MAI “national treatment” rules could prevent a government from regulating the extent to which a privately operated WCB purchased commercial services.

Moist argued that these measures would rapidly create a two-tiered health care system in this country. Provincial drug plans, which prescribe lower-cost products, could also be vulnerable. A foreign-owned pharmaceutical corporation could claim under the proposed MAI rules that a low-cost drug plan amounts to a form of “expropriation” because it prevents the sale of the company’s products to a significant share of the market. If an MAI panel upholds the claim, Moist said, then provincial governments would be compelled to terminate the program or pay compensation. The same restrictions would prevent the federal government from pursuing its promise to introduce a pharmacare program based on low-cost drug products.

EDUCATION GROUPS

Teachers’ and students’ associations also spoke to the Commissioners about the impacts of the MAI and globalization and the threats they pose to Canada’s publicly funded education system. Leo Broderick of the P.E.I. Teachers Federation pointed out that, historically, corporations have always tried to influence if not control the public education system and that, under the MAI, they would be able to accelerate their agenda through “business-school partnerships.” In Winnipeg, the Seven Oaks Teachers’ Association argued that the term business-school partnerships is “one of the most deceitful ironies” because it leaves the impression that both are working towards the same goal. “Nothing could be further from the truth,” they said, since corporations view the school system as “a vast untapped marketplace” and democratic principles of citizenship have no place in this market.

Witnesses noted that publicly funded education in North America amounts to a \$700-billion-a-year industry (over \$60 billion in Canada). The Manitoba Teachers’ Society warned that Canadian content in public education is in danger of disappearing as provinces begin contracting with Disney, IBM and other corporations to produce their curricula. Mark Ciavaglia

of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation argued that the Ontario government deliberately provoked a crisis in the education system (through Bill 160) so that it “could fight the deficit on the backs of children and, in the long term, open the door to divestment in public education.”

Citing several supporting documents, Ciavaglia showed that a for-profit education industry has emerged in the United States as Education Management Organizations (EMOs) have contracted with local school boards to manage public schools, promising leaner, meaner administration, more innovative curricula and computer resources. Just as Health Management Organizations (HMOs) depersonalized health care in the United States, said Ciavaglia, “EMOs offer ‘cookie cutter schools’ with centralized lesson plans.” Meanwhile, corporate involvement in post-secondary education is also on the rise. Representatives of the Canadian Federation of Students, such as Maura Parte in Vancouver, Jaime Reban of Regina and Margaret Byrans in Winnipeg, cited as examples Rothman’s \$15-million contribution to the University of Toronto School of Business, which includes a list of 26 terms and conditions, and Coca-Cola’s contribution to the University of Regina in exchange for monopoly control over soft drink sales on campus.

The corporate takeover of public education, witnesses argued, would be greatly facilitated by MAI investment rules, in particular the government subsidies code, the ban on performance requirements, and government procurement provisions. In the case of post-secondary education, for example, Dr. Dan Beveridge and Valerie Patrick from the University of Regina Faculty Association testified that foreign investors could access operating grants for continuing education, diploma, and vocational training programs, as well as student assistance grants currently offered through Canadian universities and colleges. Moreover, Canadian governments could not require foreign-owned post-secondary institutions to purchase Canadian textbooks or any other Canadian-produced instructional goods or services. And, noted Beveridge and Patrick, if research grants were deemed an investment incentive, then foreign-based researchers would have access to them.

WOMEN’S ORGANIZATIONS

The Commissioners heard a strong plea to look more critically at the devastating impacts of the global economy on women, both in Canada and internationally. In Toronto, Fely Villasin of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) noted that women hold less than 10 percent of the global economy. When it comes to the impacts of neo-liberal trade and investment agreements, the hardest hit are women and children. What’s more, she emphasized, “the darker your skin and the thicker your accent, the worse the impact.” When defending Canadian culture and the democratic rights of Canadians, therefore, “we need to be aware of differing experiences of people of colour and women.”

These concerns were reinforced by NAC’s written submission to the Inquiry. The economic restructuring that has taken place under free trade has had a devastating impact in Canada, where 18.2 percent of all women live in poverty. “Women’s unpaid work is the ‘free’ in free

trade. With the cuts to many social support services, women increasingly are the ones who look after our children, many times single-handedly, and/or aging and ailing parents and spouses.” The MAI, said NAC, will fortify the current privatization and deregulation of Canada’s economy which continues to “deprive women and our families of a national daycare program; undermine accessible post-secondary public education for all; fight against pay equity and employment equity; destabilize the public health care system; [and] make gender, race, and class discrimination an ever present factor in the workplace to contend with.”

At the same time, NAC emphasized the costly impacts of the MAI and economic globalization on the human rights of peoples in the South. The MAI’s investment protection measures, for example, would serve to strengthen the military rule of dictatorships like the former Suharto regime in Indonesia through the operations of transnational corporations (including many Canadian ones). It would also reinforce the implementation of “structural adjustment programs” promoted by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB) that have had a devastating impact on women, particularly in Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America. “History clearly shows that women cannot trust the IMF, WB or the WTO to make decisions in our best interest and that of our communities.” For these reasons, NAC maintains that the MAI or MAI-like measures in the WTO must be firmly resisted.

The costly impacts of MAI-like rules on women in the South were also emphasized by Ann McGrath of OXFAM in Edmonton. For its part, the Council of Women of Winnipeg told the Inquiry that emphasis should be put on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights when negotiating international trade and investment treaties. And Paula Mallea, speaking on behalf of the



Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives in Manitoba said: “To leave women and their issues out of any ‘global’ process is to perpetuate the subjugation and oppression of women and children around the world.”

FARMERS’ GROUPS

In Saskatchewan, Wendy Manson of the National Farmers’ Union told the Inquiry that Canada and its farmers have done everything asked of them by the proponents of economic globalization. “Canada signed the FTA, NAFTA, and the WTO; we’ve doubled our agri-food exports in just seven years; we’ve terminated the Crow Rate—at a cost to farmers of approximately 61cents per bushel—in order to attract value-added industries; we’ve dismantled our hog marketing boards [and] diversified into all manner of crops and exotic beasts; farmers have expanded, invested in value-adding facilities and new technology; and we’ve all become ‘more efficient’ in order to ‘compete’ in the world market. The result? Record low farm incomes, farmers forced to cease farming, and calls to Ottawa for immediate assistance so farmers can make it until spring.”

The record shows, said Manson, “the more international the market becomes, the harder time farmers have exacting a fair return.” Expanding agricultural exports is not necessarily the solution. “While the export pie may be getting bigger, the farmers’ share—both in relative and absolute terms—is shrinking.” Indeed, the return on equity rates for farmers has been one-tenth to one-fifth of the return for the major corporations involved in farm inputs, food processing, transportation, and retail sectors—e.g., Philip Morris Inc., Agrium, John Deere & Co., Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Canadian National Railways, Loblaw Co., Westfair Foods, Maple Leaf Foods, Safeway Co., and McDonald’s. Furthermore, “a substantial portion of the value-added industries are foreign-owned,” such as Canadian wheat flour mills (79% foreign owned), malt plants (93%), durum flour mills (66%), pasta plants (67%), and beef packing plants (66%).

The MAI would serve to accelerate the continuing corporate takeover of Canada’s food production system by U.S. agribusiness giants such as ConAgra, Archer Daniels Midland, and Cargill. Canada’s system of agricultural marketing boards, which are designed to ensure farmers get a fair return for their products, could also be jeopardized. The MAI’s broad definitions of investment and expropriation, coupled with the “rollback” and “standstill” clauses, give agribusiness corporations the tools they need to eliminate, or at least prevent, the expansion of marketing boards. The NFU also expressed concerns about the ways in which the MAI’s proposed rules on financial institutions would restrict the Farm Credit Corporation and similar agencies from providing better loan terms to domestic farmers. Similar concerns were raised about farm safety nets such as Crop Insurance and the Net Income Stabilization Account. And, even if Canada succeeded in exempting laws restricting foreign ownership of agricultural lands, the NFU warns that “the rollback mechanism would soon erode, then eliminate, that exemption.”

The NFU’s position was reinforced by Bob Stirling and John Warnock’s critique of the corporate food system. “Even though food production on the prairies was tied to world markets from

“Canada signed the FTA, NAFTA and the WTO – we’ve doubled our agri-food exports, dismantled our marketing boards, invested in new technology, and become ‘more efficient’ in order to ‘compete’ in the world market. The result? Record low farm incomes, and calls for immediate assistance so farmers can make it until spring....The more international the market becomes, the harder time farmers have exacting a fair return.”

**WENDY MANSON,
NATIONAL FARMERS’
UNION**



the European settlement period onwards,” explained Stirling and Warnock, “the degree of corporate penetration of farming today, thanks to the free trade regime, far exceeds anything we have seen to date.” As a result, there has been “a major upheaval in the way food is produced,” including the enormous use of fossil fuels, declining farm population, erosion of local farm communities, and poorer nutritional food value. Stirling and Warnock also provided the Inquiry with supporting data and charts demonstrating these historical trends and their impacts.

FAITH COMMUNITIES

A critical look at the basic values and principles that underlie the MAI and economic globalization was the key message that the Commissioners received from the country’s mainline faith communities. In Saskatoon, Bishop James Weisgerber recalled one of the recent themes of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops’ social teachings, which emphasizes that, in an economy based on justice, “the needs of the poor have priority over the wants of the rich; the rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits; the participation of marginalized groups has precedence over the system that excludes them.” The MAI, he suggested, fails to live up to these and other moral principles. Who, then, will benefit from the MAI? The answer, he said, “seems to be [the] huge multinational corporations headquartered in the North....These titans who are often in league with docile governments, already control the rapidity and might of financial flows and seek, through the MAI, a further enhancement of their corporate power.”

Speaking on behalf of the Multi-Faith Social Justice Circle of Saskatoon, Rev. Merv Harrison highlighted the values and principles their group identified through an ecumenical project

called “Building a Moral Economy.” In response to the question, “What does God require of us?” Rev. Harrison underlined four themes, originally articulated by the Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice: “caring for the most vulnerable,” “promoting the common good,” “preserving the environment,” and “citizen participation in decision making.” The MAI, Rev. Harrison said, violates all of these principles because it places the interests of capital over the rights and needs of people and the environment. These principles and judgments were reinforced by the submission made by Kateri Hellman Pino of the Oblate Justice and Peace Commission.

Ethics professor Chris Lind presented a set of charts to the Inquiry outlining the contrasting value systems of a “market-based economy” and a “moral-based economy,” juxtaposing values such as “competitiveness” and “cooperation,” “indifference” and “compassion.” Barbara Rumscheidt from the Atlantic School of Theology spoke about globalization as a “fundamentalist belief system” that “proclaims free trade as the whole truth.” “Globalization,” she said, “tells us how to serve the global economy and how to be ‘saved’ by it. As members of the human race, we are pitted against each other as if in a tragic human drama....[designating] other human beings as unproductive, or unmarketable, devaluing them as surplus commodities, and declaring their communities non-viable.”

In a similar vein, Carl Ridd referred to Franz Kafka’s shocking parable “In the Penal Colony” to describe the forces of globalization and the MAI. “In the penal colony,” commented Ridd, “there are the administrators, the administrated, and the prisoners who have rebelled. The prisoners are fed into a giant Machine or Apparatus that tracks them by a series of beltways under raised or lowered systems of spikes which, by progressively deeper penetrations into their naked bodies, inscribe into them their sentence—their offence—which, whatever else it was, always involved a rebellion against the single truth of the penal colony.”

HUMAN RIGHTS

The issue of human rights was raised repeatedly during the hearings. A common thread running through most of the presentations was the criticism that the MAI grants “rights” to corporations while it denies human beings their basic economic, social, cultural and environmental rights. As Quebec labour leader Serge Roy asserted, “The MAI means a full-fledged change in peoples’ rights...fundamental rights belong to people, not to capital.” Many presenters referred to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, signed in 1948, which has been recognized as “the Magna Carta of the 20th century”—and to its accompanying international covenants. Whether groups were highlighting the impacts of the MAI on jobs, on poverty, on food security, on education, on health care, on the environment or on a variety of other public services, references were often made to the fundamental human rights encoded in these documents.

Several witnesses emphasized that not only do international trade and investment agreements fail to protect basic human rights but that they are often designed to violate them. Kathleen Ruff, former director of the B.C. Human Rights Commission, told the Inquiry that the essence of human rights is “an equal sharing of power ” which, in turn, poses a threat to the proponents of economic globalization. The problem, she said, is not that international human rights agreements don’t exist but that “they do not have binding power” among nation states. The MAI signifies “a war,” Ruff said, because it allows transnational corporations to trample on the basic human rights of people and citizens. These concerns were echoed by MLA Raj Pannu in Edmonton, who emphasized that building resistance to the MAI and economic globalization must be rooted in a reaffirmation of the Universal Declaration and related covenants.

The relationship between militarization and human rights in the MAI was an issue raised by Marion Frank from Veterans Against Nuclear Arms in the Toronto hearings. “What must be the world’s biggest public secret,” he said, “is the connection between corporate-driven investment regimes like the MAI and those forces making for war.” Noting that transnational corporations require political stability and security for their investments (which the MAI rules would establish on a global basis), Frank revealed that this demand is directly linked to the build-up of military alliances and arms production. As a result, transnational corporations often become “merchants of death” and foreign investment a tool to reinforce military regimes and the repression of human rights. Examples of corporate involvement in war-torn Nigeria (Mobil, Chevron) and the Congo (Bechtel) were cited as evidence. John Dillon of ECEJ and other witnesses pointed out that security and military interests were singled out for special protection and exemption under the MAI. This means, as Philip Penna of the Canadian Uranium Alliance confirmed, that Canada’s continued production of uranium to fuel the U.S. nuclear military machine would be fully protected under the proposed MAI rules.

Perhaps the most powerful reminder of what new economic regimes such as the MAI can do to human rights came from the testimony of First Nations people. Chief Saul Terry of the Union of B.C. Chiefs told the Inquiry that the colonial experience of indigenous peoples could be a “template” for seeing and understanding what will happen to all peoples under corporate-driven globalization. “There is,” he said, “a neo-colonial steamroller coming at us again.” The very terms used to describe the MAI—no “special treatment,” “most favoured nation,” “dispute settlement,” “standstill,” “rollback” (or roll over)—are well known to First Nations whose social order and political communities have been torn apart by colonial forces. “We’ve been legislated and regulated from our lands and resources,” he said. In Saskatoon, Priscilla Settee of the Indigenous Peoples’ Program emphasized that this is only the latest of many assaults on indigenous peoples. Many young First Nations people, she said, are not only losing their rights, but “their lives in standing up to the corporate tidal wave.”

“Human rights is not a fancy term. At its heart it means an equal sharing of power. That is why it is so threatening.”

**KATHLEEN RUFF,
FORMER DIRECTOR,
B.C. HUMAN RIGHTS
COMMISSION
(VANCOUVER)**

“Citizens should be empowered by MAI clauses to launch cases against governments and corporations, not the other way around.”

**EARL McCURDY,
PRESIDENT, FISH FOOD
AND ALLIED WORKERS
(ST. JOHN’S)**

IN ADDITION to groups from these 10 sectors, the Commissioners heard witnesses who raised other key domestic and international issues. In Vancouver, the Council of Canadians drew attention to the Asian financial meltdown and pointed out that, by removing all barriers to capital flows, the MAI would create the conditions for further financial crises. Under the MAI, policies like those employed by Chile to curb fly-by-night capital flows would be ruled illegal. Yet the Asian financial crisis has shown, said the Council, what happens when governments lack the means to control international speculation on their country's currency and commodity markets. If the Tobin Tax on investment transfers between countries were implemented, it could put the brakes on speculation and pose "a major barrier to the MAI." Besides the Council, many other groups and individuals raised the issue of rampant speculation on financial markets.

One issue not covered by other sectoral submissions is the relationship between the MAI and other international trade agreements such as the FTA and NAFTA. John Dillon of the Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice explained how restrictions on the use of "performance requirements" for foreign-based corporations began with the FTA, were extended in NAFTA, and were further expanded in the MAI, thereby substantially weakening the powers of governments. Similar comparisons were made with the broader definitions of "investment" and "expropriation" found in the MAI. Dillon's submission also drew attention to the fact that the MAI actually reintroduced measures rejected in the NAFTA negotiations, including the "lock-in" provision, which prevents countries from withdrawing from the deal for the first five years and ensures that the rules remain in place for a further 15 years after that.

Representatives of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC), which is composed of over 100 organizations involved in international development, reminded the Commissioners not to lose sight of the international implications of the MAI and economic globalization, especially for developing countries of the South. Noting that the MAI's rules appear to contradict the OECD's own principles and guidelines for "development cooperation," the CCIC emphasized the "centrality of locally-owned and appropriate development strategies." From the standpoint of developing countries, CCIC maintains that foreign investment can play "a very important role," but "development experience demonstrates that market-based initiatives are most effective in reducing poverty when they are part of national and/or regional development policy frameworks that are locally owned." While emphasizing that there is a serious capital shortage in most Third World countries today, CCIC also pointed out that the MAI proposals fail to place social obligations on foreign investment through legally binding labour, social and environmental standards.

Undoubtedly, the dominant theme that surfaced throughout the Inquiry was the way in which corporate-driven globalization, symbolized by the MAI, is hijacking and violating peoples' democratic rights. Whether it was towards the secret manner in which the MAI was originally negotiated at the OECD, or the supremacy of corporations' "rights" over the rights of citizens, or the granting of sovereign powers to transnationals at the expense of nation states and democratically elected governments—there was a discernible "democratic outrage" in the

testimonies. At the heart of this outrage is a feeling of betrayal by the federal and most provincial governments. Instead of defending the basic rights of citizens and communities, Ottawa appears to have become the champion of corporations and investor rights in negotiating global trade and investment agreements.



THIS THEN IS THE CORE message conveyed by Canadians engaged in confronting globalization and the MAI. Drawing on the inspiration of First Nations peoples, Marjorie Griffin Cohen of Simon Fraser University proposed that the aboriginal concepts of “non-extinguishment” and “reparations” be employed in the ongoing fight for democratic rights. In the first instance, we should demand no extinguishment of our fundamental democratic rights as citizens. In the second, we should demand reparations to compensate for rights already harmed. This two-fold demand, she suggested, could alert the larger society to what is happening—and what to do about it.

2. Reclaiming Democracy

CIVIL SOCIETY OUTLINES AN ALTERNATIVE AGENDA FOR CANADA IN TRADE AND INVESTMENT

“Democracy” is derived from two Greek words, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour told the Inquiry: *demos* meaning “people” and *kratos* meaning “power.” In other words, “people power” is the essence of democracy. On the basis of this authority civil society groups were asked to propose an alternative trade and investment agenda for Canada.

All great human rights movements, remarked Manitoba MLA Tim Sale, “have been fired by a fierce imagination.” The Inquiry gave citizens and civil society groups the opportunity to fire up their imaginations. In Vancouver, for example, Mae Burrows reported on a “sustainable development workshop” that imagined replacing the MAI with an MAP (Multilateral Agreement on People), in which citizens’ rights would take precedence over investor privileges and corporations would be held to account for violating agreements such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In Saskatchewan, Tim Quigley reported on the proposal for “community parliaments” arising from eight rural community hearings in the province. The National Farmers’ Union put forward a six-point plan to achieve food security and food safety in Canada. The National Action Committee on the Status of Women outlined proposals for “remaking the economy through women’s eyes.” The Saskatchewan and New Brunswick federations of labour envisioned a binding code of labour rights at the core of every international trade and investment agreement. And the Alliance for Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists proposed a Charter of Cultural Rights to be developed at both the national and international levels.

The Commissioners learned of two projects that outline an alternative model for international trade and investment agreements. The Alternatives for the Americas project is the work of civil society groups in several countries throughout North and South America. It proposes, among other things, a number of government measures to re-regulate foreign investment to meet the basic development needs of people. The other project, entitled “Towards a Citizens’ MAI,” was designed to stimulate worldwide discussion and debate about alternatives among civil society groups opposed to the MAI. Prepared by the Polaris Institute in Ottawa, its proposals are similar to many in the Alternatives for the Americas project.

Sifting through the variety of proposals submitted to the Inquiry brings to light an emerging consensus on alternatives among civil society groups. This consensus follows two parallel tracks. The first clarifies the basic principles and priorities needed to develop trade and investment alternatives. The second identifies the policies and mechanisms needed to implement them.

TRACK ONE

There was broad agreement that a radically new policy framework for trade and investment needs to be developed and that it should include the following objectives.

A) RE-ESTABLISH DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

Numerous witnesses saw the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as setting forth the right principles for an alternative framework for trade and investment. The Declaration entrenches many of the basic democratic rights and freedoms of citizens, including the right to food, clothing and shelter; the right to employment, education and health care; the right to a clean environment, cultural integrity and quality public services; the right to fair wages, collective bargaining and the formation of unions; and the right to participate in decisions affecting these rights. These individual rights, in turn, are reinforced by collective rights that have been encoded by other UN documents such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Several witnesses also referred to supporting principles expressed in the charters or declarations that came out of major international events such as the Rio Summit on the Environment, the Beijing Summit on Women and the Copenhagen Summit on Social Development.

Most participants made a connection, implicitly or explicitly, between investment and these basic rights. In a democratic society, they argued, investment should relate directly to the development needs and priorities of citizens. Investment, both domestic and foreign, should be designed in a way that enhances the economic, social, cultural, environmental and political rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration and its accompanying covenants and charters. Moreover, elected officials at all levels of government should consult directly with civil society groups to determine the development needs and priorities as well as the investment criteria required to serve those priorities. These views were expressed, in varying ways, by witnesses before the Inquiry, and reinforced by responses from the hundreds of Canadians who submitted the Citizens' Report Card accompanying the Inquiry Handbook.

B) PROTECT THE COMMON GOOD

Many witnesses emphasized the need to protect certain areas of the economy and society for the sake of the common good. In other words, they recognized that certain areas constitute the "commons" because they affect the lives and rights of all people. Priority was given to the following:

Food Security: the need to ensure adequate supplies of safe, quality foods for Canadians and people throughout the planet, along with appropriate support and fair return for domestic food producers (i.e., peasants, small and medium-sized farmers, etc.)

Labour Standards: the need to ensure full respect of basic labour standards such as trade union freedom, collective bargaining, child labour and forced labour as established by the International Labour Organization conventions.

Environmental Safeguards: the need to ensure adequate safeguards against all forms of pollution and toxic waste disposal as well as full compliance with the standards

"The needs of the poor have priority over the wants of the rich; the rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits; the participation of marginalized groups has precedence over the system that excludes them."

BISHOP JAMES WEISGERBER, CANADIAN CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS (SASKATOON)



and targets set by international treaties such as the Montreal Protocol on Ozone Depletion and the Kyoto agreement on greenhouse gas emissions.

Cultural Integrity: the need to ensure that Canada and all countries have the right to preserve and enhance indigenous cultural expression through an international Charter of Cultural Rights, including support for local producers (i.e., artists, writers, entertainers).

Public Services: the need to ensure that Canada and all countries have the right to provide essential public services such as health care and education for their citizens and to prevent the erosion of these public services through privatization and/or deregulation.

Vital Resources: the need to ensure that vital natural resources such as seeds, genes, water and air do not become tradable commodities and the objects of profit-seeking investment.

Human Rights: the need to ensure that no foreign investment, including the operations of Canadian corporations, is used to strengthen the hand of repressive regimes and the systemic violation of human rights.

Canada should insist that any international trade and investment agreement provide ironclad guarantees that these and related areas will be fully protected, along with the regulatory capacities of governments to protect them through the application of the agreement. Some witnesses

proposed that several of these priorities be woven together into a “Social Charter” for incorporation into trade and investment agreements. Others, such as MP Judy Wasylycia-Leis, suggested that use be made of the “precautionary principle” found in international treaties to protect these common priorities. There was no clear consensus on this point.

C) BUILD SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

Throughout the Inquiry, witnesses placed great emphasis on using international trade and investment agreements to create sustainable communities. Some witnesses pointed out, however, that this goal is somewhat antithetical to economic globalization and the new trade and investment regimes. After all, creating sustainable communities essentially means employing local resources and people to produce goods and services for local communities within ecological limits. Rather than promoting export-oriented economies, priority is placed on achieving greater economic self-reliance. To be sure, this poses a fundamental set of contradictions that need to be resolved. At the very least, said Geoff Richardson of Greenpeace and Shirley Lord of CHOICES, we need to question the model of economic growth that underlies the global economy and to recognize that if building sustainable communities is to be a goal, then limits will have to be put on international trade and investment.

Nevertheless, concrete proposals were made for tailoring investment to serve sustainable community development. In Saskatchewan, for example, it was suggested that public control and ownership of some agricultural and forest lands, through “community land trusts,” would ensure that local resources are deployed for sustainable purposes. A non-profit corporation would run the trusts with open membership and an elected board of directors. Elsewhere, community economic development strategies were proposed as a means for gaining greater local control over the economy. Similarly, community development corporations and public investment banks were advocated as ways in which Canadians can create pools of “social” capital for investment in development that serves the needs of local communities.

D) RESTORE POLITICAL SOVEREIGNTY

Most witnesses recognized that if foreign investment is to serve the democratic rights and development needs of people, then it is imperative for national governments to possess sovereign rights and regulatory powers over transnational corporations. It was noted that, under the UN Charter on the Economic Rights and Duties of States, national governments used to have the rights and responsibility to establish development priorities and to regulate the operations of transnational corporations to serve these objectives through “performance requirements”. But the new free trade and investment regimes have effectively removed this authority and substantially reduced the capacity of national governments to regulate the operations of transnational corporations. As several witnesses told the Inquiry, any attempt to restore or rebuild the political sovereignty of governments would have to include the renegotiation or abrogation of existing trade and investment deals such as NAFTA, especially the investor-state provisions that allow foreign-based corporations to sue governments directly.

Economics professor John Loxley, who coordinates the working group that produces the annual “Alternative Federal Budget” in Canada, proposed that Ottawa follow France’s example and establish clear economic, social and political objectives for national development and compel foreign investors to serve these priorities. To do so, however, Ottawa would have to rebuild its own policy-making apparatus. As Tom Graham of CUPE Saskatchewan told the Commissioners, steps would have to be taken to re-establish the Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA), which the Mulroney government dismantled in 1985, with a new set of objectives and powers to monitor and regulate the operations of transnational corporations. David Robinson of the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) suggested that such an agency could be rebuilt and strengthened by including new social accounting mechanisms and investment covenants between transnational corporations and communities.

E) RE-ASSERT DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

Most civil society groups felt that the task of developing an alternative trade and investment agenda should not be left to the federal government alone. No one in Ottawa, save the three top economic ministers and a handful of senior bureaucrats at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), knew from the start that the MAI was being negotiated and that it would have far-reaching implications for virtually every government portfolio. This raises serious concerns about what is now referred to as the “democratic deficit.” Indeed, many civil society groups have concluded that policy-making on trade and investment has been largely hijacked by the special interests of transnational corporations. Moreover, the federal government made no real effort to reach out and talk to Canadians about the MAI and their agenda for economic globalization.

New mechanisms are needed for citizen participation and democratic control of international trade, investment and finance. Since there are no signs that Ottawa is prepared to make this a priority, civil society groups will have to undertake much of the work themselves. During the Inquiry, the Commissioners heard several proposals for the formation of “community parliaments” and/or “community investment boards,” which would be composed of elected officials and operate in ways similar to local school boards. Others proposed creating a “constituent assembly,” composed of elected representatives from national civil society groups, which would develop policy recommendations and monitor government decisions on international trade, investment and finance. It is clear, however, that more work needs to be done on these and related proposals.

TRACK TWO

There was also a general consensus that new policy options and tools need to be developed and that they should include the following.

A) MONITOR TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The Inquiry heard a number of proposals on how the federal and provincial governments could monitor the operations of transnational corporations and make them more accountable. David Robinson of the CCPA called for a more rigorous screening process that would assess the merits of planned investments and determine the net benefit to local communities. Such a process, he suggested, could include a “social audit” of the corporation’s operations, examining its impact on jobs, the environment, the community, the health and safety of citizens, and a variety of other areas. Once the review was complete, the corporation would be allowed to proceed with its plans provided that it adhere to certain performance requirements. These requirements, Robinson proposed, could form the basis of an “investment covenant” between the corporation and the community.

Ron Colman of the Genuine Progress Index took this a step further when he argued that governments need to go beyond mathematical formulas to develop an accounting system that inte-

grates a full range of social, economic and environmental variables. Current formulas, he said, measure whatever increases production at low cost in market terms, but fail to account for the long-term costs and benefits. What is needed, he said, is an accounting system that measures and values whether foreign investment plans protect or destroy the resources of the host country; whether investors use child labour or sweatshops; whether they employ adequate safety standards; whether new investments are earmarked for health clinics or casinos, schools or arms production; and whether investment increases or undermines food security and self-sufficient agriculture in host countries. To assess transnational corporations and make their investment plans more accountable, he suggested, Ottawa would have to learn “to count some of these missing numbers.”



B) RE-REGULATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Clearly, Canadians want Ottawa to start re-regulating foreign direct investment in ways that serve national development objectives, and to do so in direct consultation with civil society. As outlined above, this calls for a new Foreign Investment Review Agency to be built that would enforce (a) performance requirements to achieve national development objectives, (b) social audit mechanisms to evaluate the full impacts of investment plans, and (c) community accountability mechanisms. Economist Paul Phillips emphasized that governments need to retain regulatory and policy-making power to implement national development objectives. Through a revamped FIRA, he said, Ottawa could more effectively monitor and control corporate mergers and takeovers in ways that truly benefit a range of Canadian interests. Other submissions referred to the responsibility of federal and provincial governments to secure control over strategic sectors of the Canadian economy (e.g., finance, energy, communications, agriculture, forestry, etc.) through public enterprises. In some cases, this might require new nationalization initiatives, but with a greater emphasis on ensuring democratic participation and control.

At the same time, it was recognized that in today's global economy these initiatives could not be pursued effectively in a narrow nationalistic vacuum. Concerted action must be taken simultaneously by many nations to re-regulate foreign investment in the interests of their citizens. Although there is still debate as to whether this regulation should take the form of a global investment treaty, there appears to be a growing recognition of the need for international cooperation to regulate investment. Fair compensation for "direct takings" of property by the state, for example, should never be extended to "indirect takings" such as social and environmental regulations or compensation for planned investment or taxation. There must be no investor-state mechanism allowing corporations to sue governments directly. And any negotiations for global investment rules should be conducted through the United Nations, not the WTO or the OECD.

C) CONTROL FINANCIAL SPECULATION

Throughout the Inquiry, witnesses expressed strong concerns about the Asian financial meltdown and the need for governments to control capital flows. Several witnesses made reference to the "speed bump" measures introduced to regulate capital flows in Chile, where the government requires that 10 percent (previously 30 percent) of the value of any foreign direct investment be deposited in domestic banks and all portfolio investments remain in the country for at least one year. With these measures in place, Chile was able to prevent the Mexican peso crisis of 1994 from spreading to its country and, unlike Southeast Asia, stabilize its economy in the wake of the recent financial meltdown. Ottawa, the Commissioners were told, should take similar actions. Tom Graham of CUPE Saskatchewan urged that the Bank of Canada be empowered to play a more active role in international money markets by requiring that the country's private chartered banks once more deposit a percentage of their reserves with the central bank. He also proposed that the foreign content provisions of Registered Retirement Savings Plans (RRSPs) be lowered (and perhaps phased out) because they exert considerable



downward pressure on the Canadian dollar and encourage capital outflows that could be better spent on job-creating investments at home.

On the international level, a number of witnesses advocated that Canada play a leading role in promoting the adoption of the Tobin Tax as a means of curbing financial speculation. With close to \$2 trillion moving around the world daily—most of it in the form of short-term currency speculation—Nobel prize-winning economist James Tobin has proposed that a small tax (between 0.1 percent and 0.25 percent) be levied on all foreign exchange transactions. The tax is meant to be small enough so as not to discourage long-term investment, but sufficient to restrict short-term speculative investments. It would also generate a pool of capital that could be channelled for development priorities in Third World countries. Several witnesses, including the mainline churches involved in the Jubilee 2000 Project, also urged the federal government to take the lead in calling for the cancellation of debts incurred by the world's poorest nations as a step towards promoting financial stability and encouraging more productive use of capital. In fact, the federal government has already taken a few steps towards supporting these proposals, although it is too soon to determine the success of these efforts.

D) RENEGOTIATE TRADE AGREEMENTS

As already noted, most if not all of the policies proposed above would violate existing international trade agreements, especially NAFTA. The Canadian Environmental Law Association, for example, has shown how the FTA actually encourages the rapid depletion of our energy resources by prohibiting Canada from putting quotas on oil and gas exports to the United States. And the Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice has noted the list of performance requirements, including job creation targets, which are now prohibited under NAFTA. Both of these agreements—as well as the WTO—constrain Ottawa's capacity to re-regulate foreign direct

investments and control fly-by-night capital flows in and out of the country. If Canada is to adopt a Citizens' Agenda to control trade and investment, it will have to either renegotiate large parts of NAFTA (e.g., Chapter 11 on investment) or withdraw from the agreement altogether.

Although the Commissioners did not canvass the opinions of witnesses on this question, it is evident that some civil society groups favour Ottawa's renegotiating the contentious parts of NAFTA, while others insist the government should invoke the six-month abrogation provision and withdraw from the deal. Although civil society appears split on this question, there is a compromise strategy. Civil society groups could demand that Ottawa call for an immediate renegotiation of NAFTA on a range of hot issues (e.g., culture, energy, water, health care, environmental safeguards, as well as the definitions of "expropriation," the "investor-state" provision, and the "national treatment" clause). If satisfactory changes result, then the most negative aspects of NAFTA would be effectively removed. If, however, neither the United States nor Mexico were willing to renegotiate, the ground would be laid for Canada's withdrawal from the deal.

"Under the MAI, public intervention would no longer be sovereign and sectors over which government has control would be destroyed."

SERGE ROY, SYNDICAT DE LA FONCTION PUBLIQUE DU QUEBEC (MONTREAL)

Public enterprises that provide uniform, affordable postal or even daycare services could be challenged as "discriminatory" against foreign-based corporations.

WENDY VANDERSTEEN, CANADIAN UNION OF POSTAL WORKERS (HALIFAX)

E) CURB CAPITAL FLIGHT

One problem that surfaced repeatedly in discussions on alternative trade and investment strategies was the threat of capital flight. If Ottawa were to introduce the measures outlined in this report, foreign-based corporations would simply go "on strike," refusing to invest in Canada and shifting their operations elsewhere, creating dire economic consequences for the country. At times, the threat of capital strike and capital flight is overstated. When all is said and done, transnational corporations do want access to Canadian resources and markets and are willing to make the concessions necessary to achieve this. But there is no denying that corporations are far more mobile today than at any time in history. Although the Commission did not specifically seek input on the question of what kinds of policies could be implemented to halt the threat of capital flight, several submissions stated that one way to resolve the problem is for Canada to become less dependent on foreign and private investment.

The strategic options identified here include revitalizing and expanding public enterprises, community and/or worker-controlled industries, and socially controlled pension funds. Unlike their private counterparts, argued David Robinson, "publicly-owned corporations are not likely to engage in an investment strike nor pack up their operations in favour of other jurisdictions.... By their nature they are contained within a political boundary." That being said, many crown corporations today tend to operate much like private corporations, and, therefore serious measures are needed to make public enterprises more democratically accountable. Other witnesses recommended that labour unions make more strategic use of worker pension funds as a substitute for reliance on private and foreign capital investments. By gaining some control over the management of their pension funds, workers would be in a position to direct a portion of this capital towards investments that reflect economic, social and environmental priorities. The same holds true for public pension funds. A move in this direction, however, would likely require changes to federal and provincial legislation governing such pension funds.

THESE THEN ARE THE BASIC THEMES and policy options that emerged from the Inquiry's search for an alternative Citizens' Agenda on trade, investment and finance issues. It is important to note, however, that deep structural limitations and obstacles exist to advancing this Citizens' Agenda. Several witnesses reminded the Commissioners that in addressing transnational corporations, the state and the forces of globalization, citizens are dealing with the pervasive dynamics of capitalism itself. In Montreal, Luc Desnoyers of the Canadian Auto Workers pointed out that "governments have not been the innocent victims of the globalization of production." On the contrary, they have joined with big business to form a corporate-state alliance to advance a particular globalization agenda. In fact, not only did governments and corporations work hand-in-glove to fashion the MAI, they also worked together to create a new institution for global corporate governance—namely, the World Trade Organization.

These and other observations raised at the Inquiry pose major strategic challenges for civil society groups in Canada. On the question of sovereignty, for example, some witnesses pointed out that the prime focus should be not governments but people. It is the sovereignty of peoples and their communities that needs to be strengthened. Indeed, the fact that witnesses constantly emphasized the need to "reclaim democratic rights" and "reassert democratic control" indicates that many citizens are no longer convinced that strengthening the sovereignty of governments alone is the answer. Only by rebuilding peoples' sovereignty can we begin to revitalize democracy and the role of government to serve citizens rather than corporations. Related to this is the challenge of changing international structures. Some witnesses argued that the most effective way of changing international structures is to build a strong popular base for change within each country. Indeed, this is the lesson of the MAI struggle. In large measure, the MAI was stopped at the OECD because resistance was organized and civil society groups in several countries waged the battle in terms of national politics. Yet the task of building and sustaining a strong popular movement of civil society groups for the purpose of changing the dominant trade, investment and finance agenda remains to be undertaken.

As Desnoyer told the Inquiry, we now find it possible to question the credibility, competence, vision and anti-democratic character of the country's economic and political elite. For the past 25 years, he said, transnational corporations and their government allies have largely controlled the economic and social agenda. Now, the temporary collapse of the MAI, coupled with the financial meltdown in Asia and elsewhere, have exposed the fault-lines in the global economy. Yet civil society does not seem sufficiently organized as a political force to take advantage of this moment. The immediate challenge for civil society groups now, therefore, is to build a strong popular movement of resistance and change in Canada and elsewhere. Otherwise, the alternative agenda emerging from this Inquiry will not be realized.

Finally, as many witnesses reminded the Inquiry, the MAI as such is by no means dead. At this moment, steps are being taken to incorporate the core principles and mechanisms of the MAI into international trade deals such as the Free Trade Area of the Americas, and build them into global financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and institutions of global

governance such as the World Trade Organization. Each of these provides a strategic opportunity for civil society groups in Canada to bring forward the critical observations and alternative proposals identified through this Inquiry, as well as to continue the task of building a broad-based popular movement for resistance and change. Perhaps the most immediate challenge is the move to kick-start a new set of negotiations for a global investment treaty through the proposed "Millennium Round" of trade negotiations at the WTO. The unequivocal message coming out of this Inquiry is that there should be no global investment treaty negotiations at the WTO. Not only has the MAI model been proven totally flawed, but also the power constellation of the WTO, which is heavily weighted in favour of transnational corporations and their government allies in developed countries, is hardly the venue to negotiate a just and sustainable investment treaty.

In the time remaining before the WTO ministerial meeting in Seattle at the end of November 1999, the task of civil society groups will be to bring the Citizens' Agenda from this Inquiry, including its message of resistance and change, to the attention of both the federal government and the Canadian public. The question now is, will the Chrétien government listen to the voices of civil society and the demands for an alternative agenda?

List of Witnesses

Vancouver

September 25-26, 1998

National Commissioners:

Murray Dobbin, Buzz Hargrove, Judy Rebick, R.H. Thomson

Regional Commissioners:

Marjorie Griffin-Cohen Simon Fraser University

Presenters:

Alex Bell B.C. School Trustees Association
Murray Dobbin The Council of Canadians
Phillip Legg B.C. Federation of Labour
Fred Muzin B.C. Hospital Employees Union
Ellie O'Day Vancouver Cultural Alliance
Maura Parte Canadian Federation of Students, B.C.
Kathleen Ruff former director, B.C. Human Rights Commission
Steven Shrybman West Coast Environmental Law Association
Jean Swanson End Legislated Poverty
Chief Saul Terry Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs

Resource People:

Larry Baird Ucluelet First Nations
Roger Crowther Canadian Auto Workers
Seth Klein Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, B.C. Office
Joan Smallwood NDP Member, B.C. Legislative Assembly

St. John's

October 3, 1998

National Commissioners:

Maude Barlow, Murray Dobbin

Regional Commissioners:

Ted Blanchard former Newfoundland cabinet minister
Dr. Maura Hanrahan sociologist and current affairs commentator

Presenters:

Leo Broderick Colonel Gray High School
Earl McCurdy Fish, Food and Allied Workers
Tom Osborne PC Member, Newfoundland House of Assembly

Toronto

October 6, 1998

National Commissioners:

Warren Allmand, Maude Barlow, Buzz Hargrove, Joan Grant-Cummings, Elizabeth May, David McDonald, R.H. Thomson

Presenters:

Bill Blaikie NDP Member of Parliament
Mark Ciavaglia Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation
John Clarke Ontario Coalition Against Poverty

John Dillon	Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice
Helen Kennedy	Metro Toronto District Labour Council
Garry Neil	Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists
Geoff Richardson	Greenpeace Canada
Ken Traynor	Canadian Environmental Law Association
Fely Villasin	National Action Committee on the Status of Women

Montreal

October 14, 1998

National Commissioners:

Warren Allmand, Maude Barlow, Judy Rebick

Presenters:

Ahmed Abdiraman	Operation SalAMI
Luc Desnoyers	Canadian Auto Workers
Anne Kettenbeil	National Action Committee on the Status of Women
Lucette Lupien	Union pour la diversité culturelle
Serge Roy	Syndicat de la fonction publique du Québec

Winnipeg

November 12, 1998

National Commissioners:

Warren Allmand, Tony Clarke, Buzz Hargrove, Carol Shields

Regional Commissioners:

Ruebin Bellan	University of Winnipeg professor, retired
Elizabeth Carlyle	Canadian Federation of Students
Cynthia Devine	lawyer and board member, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
Cy Gonick	University of Manitoba
Brian Hunt	United Steelworkers, Manitoba
Anne Lindsay	Manitoba Eco-Network
Bill Loewen	CPI-Comtec Inc.
David Martin	Manitoba League for the Physically Disabled
Mary Scott	Council of Women
Louise Simbandumwe	human rights activist
Jan Spielman	Manitoba Teachers' Society
Susan White	Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Manitoba
Dr. Eddy Win	University of Winnipeg
Presenters:	
Wendy Land	Manitoba Teachers' Association
Kerniel Aasland	CHOICES
Phyllis Abbe	individual
John Bahry	Canadian Association of Non-Employed
Margaret Byrans	University of Winnipeg Students' Association
Derwyn Davies	retired teacher

Ken Emberly	individual
Carolyn Garlich	Council of Women
Charles Gruden	Manitoba Society of Seniors
Barry Hammond	individual
Rob Hilliard	Manitoba Federation of Labour
Pat Issac	Seven Oaks Teachers' Association
John Loxley	CHOICES, University of Manitoba
Paula Mallea	Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Manitoba
John Mackenzie	Marquis Project
Neil McDonald	individual
Jack McLachlan	Justice, Economics and Integrity of the Earth Committee, United Church
Paul Moist	Canadian Union of Public Employees, Manitoba
Jeremy Nelson	MAI Awareness Coalition
Paul Phillips	University of Manitoba
Carl Ridd	Justice, Economics and Integrity of the Earth Committee, United Church
Tim Sale	NDP Member, Manitoba House of Assembly
Arthur Schafer	University of Winnipeg
Muriel Smith	Council of Canadians, Winnipeg
Murray Smith	Retired Teachers' Association of Manitoba
Jan Spielman	Manitoba Teachers' Society
Jesse Vorst	University of Manitoba
Judy Wasylycia-Leis	NDP Member of Parliament

Saskatoon

November 13, 1998

National Commissioners:

Tony Clarke, David Korten, Elizabeth May

Regional Commissioners:

Wendy Manson	Report on Regina Inquiry event
Tim Quigley	Report on Rural Inquiry events
Nettie Wiebe	National Farmers Union

Presenters:

Rev. Glen Ash	Anglican Church
Johanna Bergerman	Breast Feeding Matters Group
Michelle Beveridge	OXFAM Saskatchewan
Renita Falkenstern	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada
Rose Gilkes	Saskatchewan Culture
Grade 11/ 12 Students	Saint Angela's Academy, Prelate
Tom Graham	CUPE Saskatchewan
Merv Harrison	Multi-Faith Social Justice Circle of Saskatoon
Kateri Hellman Pino	Oblate Justice and Peace Commission

Dale Holmberg	Moose Jaw Community Health Coalition
Cathy Hotslander	environmental activist
Jo Ann Jaffe	Saskatchewan Council for International Cooperation
Don Kossick	Council of Canadians, Saskatoon chapter
Chris Lind	St. Andrew's College, University of Saskatchewan
Wendy Manson	National Farmers Union
Joanne Miller	Project Ploughshares
Garth Nelson	Nature Saskatchewan
Jan Norris	Saskatchewan Environmental Society
Philip Penna	Canadian Uranium Alliance
Warren Peterson	Saskatchewan Community Health Coalition
Michael Poellet	individual
Rev. Tom Power	United Church
Tim Quigley	University of Saskatchewan
Pricilla Settee	Indigenous Peoples Program, University of Saskatchewan
Bishop James Weisgerber	Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, Social Justice Committee
Howard Wodehouse	University of Saskatchewan

Edmonton

November 14, 1998

National Commissioners:

Tony Clarke, Judy Darcy, Joan Grant-Cummings, David Korten, Elizabeth May

Presenters:

Audrey Cormack	Alberta Federation of Labour
Barbara Himmel	Canadian Federation of University Women
Myrna Kostash	Alberta representative to the Canadian Conference of the Arts
Ann McGrath	OXFAM Alberta
Raj Pannu	NDP Member, Alberta Legislative Assembly
Harvey Scott	Alberta Environmental Network
Heather Smith	United Nurses of Alberta

Halifax

November 28, 1998

National Commissioners:

Maude Barlow, Judy Rebick, David Suzuki, Elizabeth May

Regional Commissioners:

Krishna Hooja-Patel St. Mary's University

Presenters:

Bernd Christmas	Membertou First Nations
Ron Colman	Genuine Progress Index, Atlantic
Devorah Leo	Gandhi Farm
Alexa McDonough	Leader, New Democratic Party of Canada
Pat Riley	New Brunswick Federation of Labour
Barbara Rumscheidt	Atlantic School of Theology

This list does not include the numerous Inquiry events and workshops organized across the country. We recognize the British Columbia legislature for their hearings on the MAI, which also included broad community participation.

COMMISSIONERS

Warren Allmand

Warren Allmand is President of the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, a non-profit organization that promotes and defends the rights enshrined in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. A former Solicitor General, he is a well-known advocate for social justice.

Maude Barlow

Maude Barlow is National Volunteer Chairperson of the 100,000-member Council of Canadians, an independent public interest organization safeguarding and promoting sovereignty and democratic rights for all Canadians. The author of numerous books, including (with Tony Clarke) *MAI* and *MAI Round 2*, she is recognized internationally for her work on social and economic justice.

Marilyn Buffalo

Since being elected President of the Native Women’s Association of Canada, Marilyn Buffalo has worked tirelessly to promote the profile of Native women in Canada. In varying capacities, she has been a dedicated advocate for human rights recognition for aboriginal people.

Tony Clarke

Tony Clarke is Director of the Polaris Institute and works with citizens’ movements worldwide in challenging corporate-led globalization. The author of *Silent Coup: Confronting the Big Business Takeover of Canada*, he is recognized internationally for his knowledge and commitment to economic and social justice.

Judy Darcy

Since being elected President of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Judy Darcy has gained national recognition as a skilled negotiator and a passionate voice for public services and the people who provide them. A general vice-president of the Canadian Labour Congress, she is the only woman to lead a national union in Canada today.

Murray Dobbin

Murray Dobbin has been a journalist and broadcaster for more than 30 years. The author of four books—the most recent being *The Myth of the Good Corporate Citizen*—he is recognized for exposing the role of corporations in Canada and around the world.

Susan George

Susan George is an internationally renowned author and the president of l’Observatoire de le

Mondialisation in France. An outspoken critic of global capitalism, she is the author of *How the Other Half Dies*, *Ill Fares the Land* and *A Fate Worse Than Debt*.

Joan Grant-Cummings

Joan Grant-Cummings is in her second term as elected chair of Canada's largest women's organization, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. She is a long-time advocate for women's rights, especially for racial, social and economic equality for all women.

Buzz Hargrove

Buzz Hargrove is National President of the Canadian Auto Workers Union. He has extensive bargaining experience and commitment to economic, social and political issues affecting workers and their families in Canada and internationally. He is also a vice-president on the executive committee of the Canadian Labour Congress.

Martin Khor

Martin Khor is Director of the Third World Network, an umbrella group of non-governmental organizations in the developing world.

David Korten

David Korten is President of the People-Centered Development Forum and Board Chair of The Positive Futures Network. He is the author of the groundbreaking book *When Corporations Rule the World* and a member of the International Forum on Globalization.

Elizabeth May

As Executive Director of the Sierra Club of Canada, Elizabeth May is a well-known environmentalist, writer, activist and lawyer. Author of three books, she is the first chair-holder of the newly created Elizabeth May Chair in Women's Health and Environment at Dalhousie University.

Ovide Mercredi

Ovide Mercredi is a Cree lawyer, negotiator, author, professor of Native Studies and long-time activist on behalf of First Nations in Canada. Serving two terms as National Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, he has a reputation as an articulate spokesperson, statesman and political activist.

Judy Rebick

One of Canada's best-known political commentators, Judy Rebick currently hosts the weekly CBC Newsworld show *Straight from the Hip*. A former president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, she is a leading advocate for economic and social justice, especially for women.

Most Rev. Remi de Roo

Rev. Remi de Roo, now Bishop Emeritus, is former Bishop of Victoria. A former president of the Western Conference of Catholic Bishops, a representative on the Vatican Commission for Culture and founder of the Centre for the Study of Religion and Society at the University of Victoria, Rev. de Roo is a well-known advocate for human rights and social justice.

Carol Shields

One of Canada's most acclaimed novelists, Carol Shields is winner of the 1995 Pulitzer Prize for fiction and numerous other awards. Her books include *Swann*, *The Stone Diaries* and, most recently, *Larry's Party*.

David Suzuki

A Canadian household name, David Suzuki is an award-winning scientist, environmentalist and broadcaster, and the author of 32 books. Former host of CBC's *A Planet for the Taking* and the long-running *The Nature of Things*, he is recognized internationally for his role in teaching and promoting environmental stewardship.

R.H. Thomson

R.H. Thomson is a member of the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Arts and has achieved international recognition for his roles on stage, screen and television. He has not only been involved in promoting Canadian culture both in Canada and abroad, but also has a deep commitment to furthering social and economic justice through the arts.

Bob White

Bob White is a long-time spokesperson for greater justice in the workplace. He is outgoing President of the Canadian Labour Congress and former president of the Canadian Auto Workers. He is the author of *Hard Bargain: My Life on the Line* and the central figure in the critically acclaimed NFB production *Final Offer*.

Lois Wilson

Lois Wilson is an author, minister and internationally renowned authority on human rights issues. The first woman Moderator of the United Church of Canada, she is recipient of both the Order of Canada and the Order of Ontario. Dr Wilson was appointed to the Senate in 1998.

Principal Organizers:

National Organizer:	Anna Dashtgard, Council of Canadians, National Office
Vancouver:	Steve Staples, Council of Canadians, British Columbia
Edmonton:	Bill Moore-Kilgannon, Parkland Institute
Saskatoon:	Don Kossick, Council of Canadians, Saskatchewan
Winnipeg:	Shirley Lord, Carrie McElroy, CHO!CES
Toronto:	Catherine Goulet, Council of Canadians, southern Ontario
Montreal:	Michel Lambert, Alternatives, Montreal, Council of Canadians chapter
Halifax:	Antoni Wysocki, Council of Canadians, Halifax
St. John's	(held as part of the Council of Canadians' 1998 Annual General Meeting)

The Council of Canadians wishes to thank all those who took part in the Inquiry process. In particular, we thank the Inquiry Commissioners, who generously donated their time to listen and respond to Canadians' concerns on economic globalization. Special thanks are also due to Tony Clarke of the Polaris Institute for preparing this report, and numerous organizations without whose assistance the Inquiry would not have been possible. The Council gratefully acknowledges the support of the Atkinson Foundation for background research and analysis.