

Your House, Your Time

Orientation for the 2019 newly elected Members of Parliament

Notes compiled by Louise Cockram (Carleton) and Ashley Fearnall (Carleton)

Location: Sir John A. Macdonald Building, 144 Wellington Street

Wednesday January 22, 2020

9:00 Orientation briefing from Maureen Boyd, Director of the Carleton Initiative for Parliamentary and Diplomatic Engagement

Maureen Boyd: Welcome to Wednesday, we're welcoming some new parliamentarians that weren't here yesterday, but I hope those of you who were there found it relevant, informative and interesting. We are particularly pleased to welcome spouses; you are integral to the role of MPs. Our panelists and moderators represent the diversity of the country. I hope you will read their bios in the program as well as the messages from our sponsors. I hope you will also have the opportunity to meet our sponsors today, as well as the participants from Carleton University. I would like you to note that CPAC is livestreaming the sessions today and are taping sessions for future broadcast. We've asked our moderators to adhere tightly to the schedule. I'm delighted to open the second day of the orientation by asking President Benoit-Antoine Bacon to provide remarks.

9:05 Welcome Remarks by Dr. Benoit-Antoine Bacon, President of Carleton University

Dr. Benoit-Antoine Bacon: Thank you for being with us today. It was wonderful to meet you over lunch yesterday. First, a very sincere thanks for taking part in the orientation for MPs. Thank you for your public service, what you do is very noble. I want to thank our sponsors and Maureen for making a very compelling program. Being in Ottawa is what we call the capital advantage, we always strive to be great partners. Carleton offers a broad range of courses, if you have any interest in future learning, we have a range of courses available to you.

When we work together, we create win-win solutions for everyone. As university president I rely on our local MPs. Your community will rely on you too as you have an understanding of how the system and advocacy work. The opportunity to speak with us matters, education matters. You have the opportunity to help Canadians through education. For example, universities across Canada received funding in the last parliamentary session to expand their research capacity in our communities. Partnership is a big word for us. Partnership with industry on key research projects, on topics such as sustainability and the environment. In

caucus, our on the ground knowledge of MPs are important to have these funding opportunities. You're an important part of that.

We have two big projects, I don't want to say too much about these two great projects, but I will say they are bigger than us. These projects are about wellness and sustainability of the community. I hope that day two of the orientation is as good as day one. Thank you very much.

9:15 How Ottawa Works

Presentation: Ian Shugart, Clerk of the Privy Council

Ian Shugart: Thanks for the invitation. This presentation is entitled how Ottawa works. I'm pleased to have the conclusion that even though there are mistakes, our system works quite well for the wellbeing of all. I came to Parliament 40 years ago, even though Centre Block is shut down currently we still have that special feeling of the place.

When I started my career on Parliament Hill, I worked very closely with a Senator. This was a good experience for me, and I have never lost sight of the lessons. It has been extremely useful and has made me a better public servant, a better Deputy Minister, I understand the reality that MPs have. I understand Senators but I particularly understand elected officials.

I think it would be good to start with an overview of the highlights of the structure of government. We have the departments e.g. Health Canada, the Canada Revenue Agency. The departments are the responsibility of the Ministers and that's the principal method of implementing the decisions.

There is another portfolio that Ministers report to - quasi judicial bodies, federal granting agencies but they are not necessarily departments per say. You will hear about other departments – Treasury Board (based in statute), the Department of Finance (which pays the bills), and the Privy Council Office.

As MPs, you will have varied interactions with government. As head of the Privy Council, I'm here to tell you that there are no actions you should resist. We are there in a spirit of openness, we are there to serve. If you do approach a department and you do not find it useful, let us know. Our objective is to coordinate information for you to receive a fulsome response. Typically, you will approach the public service to help a constituent (e.g. passport difficulties.) Sometimes you will do that through a Minister who is a parliamentary colleague or the staff through the Minister's office, that is the most typical approach but it will have to go to the minister responsible on behalf of constituents and our goal is to help. You might want

information, we have considerable info holdings, we will work with you and endeavor to help you. I see the Chief Statistician in the audience.

Then there are my favourite means of interaction, parliamentary committees! I guess if you haven't experienced that, then you will. Committees are an essential part of the democratic process. If you are a member of the opposition there is a particular sense of joy in holding government to account; if you are a member of government there is a particular excitement at committee; and if you are a witness it is a particular sort of fear. The work of a committee is not always a blood sport; it is a key part of our system. Committees have the ability to request witnesses. Normally the ministers will ask staff to represent the Department. I am answerable to Parliament for my Department; therefore, I will be at the table answering questions.

I have found that the Parliamentary committee process is never one to be taken lightly by the public service but is a place where we develop resilience and how our system is supposed to work. You will approach the public service with points to make, things you want to unearth and that is part of the partisan interaction

The first principle is permanency of institutions, not people. In the US, whenever an administration changes, five levels of the bureaucracy have to change and many of them have to be ratified by the Senate. Whenever there is a change in government, we have a permanent public staff ready to go. There may some changes (e.g. Deputy Ministers) but the system remains the same.

The second principle is professionalism, whether that's nurses serving Indigenous people, immigration officers guiding people to migrate to Canada, or auditors within government, there is a professionalism that guides what we do.

The third and most important principle is non-partisanship. Our interest is not the party. I've said to Ministers, my job is not to get you re-elected, my job is to manage your department in a way that doesn't get you 'de-elected'. Treasury Board is the employer of public service. The Public Service Commission is a body that ensures that we have merit-based appointments.

The public service is part of the executive level of government. Every government in the world has three branches – the judiciary, executive and legislature. In some countries the three branches of government are rolled into one. We [the public service] are accountable to Ministers, we are answerable to Parliamentarians (we can give you information) but we are accountable to Ministers in the executive branch. We do hold stakeholder sessions, but we are servants of the executive branch. 42% of the public service is in national capital region. 40% of public servants are between the ages of 35-54.

You will find that there is a mutual need between the executive and legislature. There has to be a living dynamic between the executive and the legislature, we need each other. We need direction from Parliament, or we have no basis on which to serve the public.

During the last few weeks we have been part of a tragedy [the Iran air crash], the public service has been interacting with Ministers to provide direction. Sometimes intimately, because they are helping people who have gone through a deep, deep tragedy in their lives. This help always includes weekends.

I want to say that all of us, regardless of our role in this system are human. Regardless of the workplace, in party headquarters, we need a space that respects our mutual humanity. We bring our past, our hopes and what is in our lives right now. As new MPs think about how you feel today and in six months compare that with how you feel right now. Never ever lose that sense of expectancy that brought you here, that sense of purpose that brought you here. It is my personal advice that if you lose it then it would be time to go. We should never lose that germ of incentive and motivation that brought us here. We need to be aware of the things that might blow out that candle – unmet expectations. You are more than an element of a machine. You are Ottawa, you're not just a mechanism to make Ottawa work. Take care of your mental health.

We are custodians, we are custodians for our constituency, we are here only for a limited time. We [the Canadian government] are different than closed, autocratic societies. We are here for a time and a purpose, for institutions and for the public welfare. We are holders of an amazing privilege.

Any questions?

Question from audience: I'm a Senator, one of the things I've struggled the most with is reading legislation (e.g. C-68) and understanding the process of regulation. I would look at the legislation differently if we had regulation that was service oriented. What are your thoughts on that?

Ian Shugart: Regulations are often the details of how things are done, how regulations behave. It's called secondary law for the Minister and government to set out the details of how things are to function. Within our system the regulations are developed in departments. They are not reviewed in detail, only by Cabinet and Treasury Board. The public part of that process is when it is posted in the Canada Gazette. When items are posted within the Canada Gazette there are opportunities for advocacy groups, individuals, and private partners to comment on the proposed regulations. I sense it's not as open as it should be. But it is open for stakeholders to provide analysis on proposed regulations. They have a duty to answer points of view.

Frequently draft regulations are changed and ultimately win, lose or draw the decision is made to proceed. In reality it is an open process, but it is best known to those who have a stake in the process. We could always do a better job of making those regulations more open.

Question from audience: I know you've said that officials are not partisan. I refer to your predecessor. What checks and balances do you have outside of personal restraint to stop you being partisan?

Ian Shugart: I think in our system an exceptional case does have the enormous power to change public perception. I mention this to public servants, all institutions are at risk of institutional gingivitis, where the decay is slow, and the results are real. The solution is daily flossing, it's being reminded all the time and reinforced in our behavior where the lines are all the time and I would simply assert that that's the law all the time in the public service. I would say also that there are many grey situations where civil servants are meant to figure out what is permissible. My method is to ask why certain things are red-lined, permissible but with very great care. My responsibility is to have clear thinking and work it out in the most appropriate way. I think it is a good thing to clarify that the responsibility of the Attorney General is reexamined, the report makes abundantly clear about the responsibilities. I discussed this past week with communication executives, what does it mean to engage in communications when the government of the day might have an interest in the dissemination of communications? What do we decide is partisan and non-partisan? I believe our system is a healthy one but we need to be attentive.

9:45 Engaging Canadians in a Changing World

Presentation: David Coletto, CEO, Abacus Data

David Coletto: I want to set the stage for our panel discussion, 5 areas to consider when we look at Canadians' frame of mind

Through my work I look at public attitudes – two forces that shape this are generational change and technological change. What were two largest companies in 2006? ExxonMobil, Microsoft, Citigroup, BP, GE but in 2020 it's Google, Apple, Amazon and Facebook. Think about what those choices represent, they represent technological change. The other force that represents change is generational change. Millennials and Generation X want to do things a bit differently.

The following are 5 considerations that shape Canadians' frame of mind:

1) World views shape how we filter information and how we view the world. I divide world views into two: fluid and fixed. I recommend reading *Prius or Pickup? How the Answers to Four Simple Questions Explain America's Great Divide*, which is a book that looks at how worldviews are formed. For instance, the divide between fixed and fluid worldviews is illustrated when we look at questions about child raising. Do we favour obedience or creativity? Those with a fluid work view are spontaneous and like change, those with a fixed world view look for order, predictability, structure. For them, the world is scary. You can see the difference between those with a fluid world view and fixed world view on questions like immigration, environment. There is evidence that answers to these questions are driven by personality or are maybe genetic.

2) Increasingly Canadians want more control over their lives. The idea that Canadians should have more control over their lives is not a new concept but has become an increasing concern. Canadians do not feel they have sufficient control over their lives. For instance, the question from the audience about regulation is illustrative of this. 58% of Canadians polled feel that they do not have control over lives.

3) The future feels more threatening. When we poll Canadians to ask if they feel that the future of the Canadian economy will have more threats or opportunities, an increasing number feel that there are more threats to the economy than opportunities. These threats are often related to housing, retirement, climate change, and paying their bills every day.

4) Can government help? We no longer trust government. However, those who engage more often with politics (e.g. by reading news articles) trust the government more. The challenge is to reduce this gap.

5) How we get information is rapidly changing, and there is a generational gap in how we consume information. The majority of Canadians that we poll say they get news via cable. Ottawa runs on Twitter, but outside of this particular ecosystem it is not used as much. There is a huge gap between generations: older generations use TV and younger generations use Facebook. For instance, when there was a tornado in Ottawa in 2018, my sister in Toronto did not call to ask how I had weathered the storm until four days later. The reason for that is because coverage of the tornado was primarily on cable news and my sister does not watch cable news. So, my advice would be to not think that Twitter has relevance outside Ottawa bubble. Recognise that just because something shows up on the National or CBC that people know about it. For instance, the federal budget in 2019 was

known as the “Millennial budget” but according to polling, only a small portion of millennials knew about the budget.

Panel:

Topics:

What do Canadians think about government; what is the impact of generational change; how technology is changing the role of Members of Parliament

David Coletto, CEO, Abacus Data

Farah Mohamed, Founder G(irls)20 and former CEO, Malala Fund

Farhaan Ladhani, Director of Digital Public Square and CEO and co-founder of Betterplace

Moderator:

Althia Raj, Ottawa bureau chief, HuffPost Canada

Althia Raj: David, what about polarization? Who should I engage with as an MP? Do I try to engage with everyone? Or should I target who I speak to based on their political beliefs?

David Coletto: I think you should represent all constituents. From a political point of view, it might be better to speak with those who agree with you. According to the data I included in my presentation, it’s hard to speak with everyone. Changing and shifts in behavior and technology means we have to rethink how we communicate with people. For instance, in four years people might not be visiting Instagram.

Althia Raj: Just to follow up on that, someone told me recently that it is a wasted effort to convince people with points of view that are different from your own.

Farah Mohamed: To go back to what David said, I think people use media differently. However, you come to parliament to represent your constituents, you have to pick your time and place to communicate. Don’t ignore your constituency office. People talk in small communities- I worked for Paddy Torsney [federal MP] and represented her at small events and people did not hold back. Stuff that is timeless, partnerships are helpful. It’s multidimensional, I think about the generational differences between myself and my parents.

Farhaan Ladhani: Technology landscape – trends – trust, while it’s holding you might expect a healthy level of skepticism. The pace of communication is very high – it used to be snail mail now is instant. Study in 2018 about velocity of false news versus real news. Everyone is

jockeying for position; you're trying to communicate but are you doing it for yourself or others? There are a lot of people who are also jostling for position. The question might be is it is safe to engage? The best social science research says that facts are difficult, facts are tough because when you challenge someone's belief, it's hard. You have to find a way to get people sideways, for example issues like food safety – good example. In context of game you're meant to be challenged. Game challenges you. That's just one technique, helping you to be creative and do it.

Althia Raj: MPs might think about more engaging ways to communicate with constituents. What suggestions do you have for MPs and Senators when they are engaging with constituents?

David Colletto: When MPs attend events in the constituency, take pictures of themselves doing activities and post them on social media (e.g. cutting ribbons), constituents don't necessarily view that positively. It would be more authentic for MPs to show mundane nature of job, for instance how much reading they have to do. I question the efficacy of constantly taking pictures of yourself in the community and then posting them on social media.

Farah Mohamed: There's another side of that, if you're not seen in the constituency then that's bad too. There's also a question of whose events you are going to. You are going to have people who have supported you [during the election] and expect you to support their activities. But please go to events from others you have not gotten support from. Think about how to connect constituency work and parliamentary work. Your constituents are your main boss. While politics is a team sport you might have situations where the position of your party does not align with that of your constituents. Of course, you're going to disagree but disagree in a smart way (e.g. in caucus, rather than through the media).

Farhaan Ladhani: You have to balance both constituents and parliament. You went through a whole lot of pain and torture to get here, listen intently and figure out how to reflect the opinions of your constituents. Constituents might share beliefs with others in other parts of the country.

Althia Raj: Can you give suggestions for tools?

Farhaan Ladhani: I will share slide with Maureen about tools to see how to communicate with broad sets of communities.

Farah Mohamed: It's not just about tools it's about listening. If you start something, please finish it. When I worked for Paddy Torsney, we did roundtables in the constituency, we sent reports to participants and the accountable minister. Got to be honest about what you're able to do.

Althia Raj: We spend so much time talking about social media, but MPs find that town halls are very effective (e.g. people might have reduced internet access). What would be your lasting thoughts?

David Colletto: The value of data not just to your party but the constituency office is important. People are increasingly reluctant to share information because they don't think it will be used the right way. One of the things I think is if you're holding a town hall then run some polling questions at the event. People think that their neighbours have different views than in reality so you might show that there is more consensus in the room than not.

Farhaan Ladhani: There is a push versus pull dynamic, visibility of constituents (which is great, nothing wrong with that) but you have to create space to do polling. There are tools, the power of that data is important for constituents but it's really powerful in Ottawa.

Farah Mohamed: I'm going to go old school a second, because there is so much cynicism in politics, I would try to show how you can work with the other side. Go back to what makes politics work – conversations, I think that would make you a better representative of your constituency. A lot of people in your constituency don't rely on social media. As you pick your issue, there are so many people who can help you in parliament. Don't give up on the levers you have, just use them in the right way.

David Colletto: We've entered a period where the public seems more engaged today than it was, citizens feel that politics matters. There was concern about low voter turnout in the 2019 federal election, it was lower than in 2015 but it was actually fairly high compared with previous years. Again, people want more control over their lives.

Althia Raj: Just a final thought that you can always engage with journalists, if you disagree with your party.

Question from audience: You referred to informed Canadians in your presentation, who are informed Canadians?

David Colletto: 24% are informed Canadians who follow news and current events and are attentive about what is going on, that's what they represent. The data shows that the gap

between informed and uninformed Canadians has grown. There is a sense from uninformed Canadians that there is a cabal of people who are informed.

Question from audience: So informed people get their information from the media instead of working out what is going on themselves?

David Colletto: So yeah, they are people who watch news. When you are more informed, you are more trusting of the system. In Canada we have it quite good, our most recent political scandal was that on a recent cabinet retreat Justin Trudeau bought doughnuts from a small bakery instead of Tim Hortons.

Question from audience: We heard the word polarization earlier – who or what is polarizing Canadians?

David Colletto: For me, the media does play a role. If I want to see someone I agree with in the media I can find them. In the past 50 years, democrats have fluid point of view whereas republicans have fixed. When you watch impeachment proceedings you realise that people are not talking on the same level. Leadership matters, if you want less polarization do not take advantage of the gaps that exist in the country – e.g. immigration and environment. I think both parties have had a role in polarization.

Althia Raj: Social media has created echo chambers, decline of local news. The media is responsible for grabbing onto conflict to get an angle, political parties exploit differences, party fundraising. Wedge politics create issues. I have a huge role to play [as a journalist], you have a huge role of play.

Farhaan Ladhani: I agree that tech does play a role, especially the hyper personalized method. What you said about tone, the way that tone matters. How you speak to your constituents and how you speak to those who disagree with you matters.

Farah Mohamed: We live in a world that is so polarizing.

Question from audience: It was refreshing to hear this panel. You're right, it's about listening to constituents and it's about them. It's not about MPs because constituents are our voice. I disagree with what you said about social media – my team make it seem that I'm everywhere and my constituents appreciate that. We've lost the art of human touch. We knocked on 40,000 doors, the human touch is more powerful than anything else. How do we engage the next generation?

Farah Mohamed: Meet them where they are, reach them on social media. Go back to partnerships, where do young people spend their time? Go to youth clubs. Young people have a strong bullshit meter. Don't lie to them.

David Colletto: Do not assume that everyone under 30 is a narcissist.

10:45 Presentation: Anil Arora, Chief Statistician

Topics:

How Statistics Canada can help MPs both serve and learn more about their constituents

Anil Arora: Let me start by talking about myself, I came to Canada when I was 11 and I have had the privilege of working most of my life in the public service. Thank you to all new MPs for your leadership, I recognise your journey.

I'm going to explain what Statistics Canada does and what value it can bring you and how you can mine our products and services.

We are an institution that looks to back up the democracy we have. The reason why we have so many MPs is based on statistical methods based on population. The second thing you should know is that we have a process of developing our methodology, it's always an active support of where you put your money and effort.

We want to make sure you have what you need to make good decisions and have a good debate. I urge you to look at the footnotes. I'm going to give you a crash course on the stats, it's a tip of a tip of the iceberg of what we do, most of this you'll know but you might learn a thing or two.

Most macroeconomic trends in Canada look good – there is good employment, steady inflation. It's really when you break it down regionally that you see the differences. Everything is local. Household net worth vs. debt. Toronto has increased by 58% in the last five years, in Edmonton there has been a 10% increase. About 10% of families in debt have some stress, only 10% have less than \$500, and families in Vancouver and Toronto are most vulnerable. Investments in housing are important for immigrant households. Investments in digital and technology is changing as everything based on productivity. Thanks to robotics, companies are using more technology. What does this mean for less educated workers when traditional employment is not prosperous? 14% of jobs in Canada are at some risk of automation.

Life expectancy in Canada did not increase between 2016 and 2017 because of the opioid crisis. During this time there were 12,000 lives lost due to opioids, and the statistics show that men are more likely to be affected than women. There are also economic pressures, especially out West, and this is resulting in increased crime.

One person households are more predominant within Canada. What does that mean? 2.2 senior women were living alone versus 1 man. What does this mean for resiliency? One person households are especially common with younger people in Canada.

Our population demographics are changing, some are aging. Yet, not all populations are aging, for instance Indigenous people are growing in population. Our workforce is changing too with immigration, immigrants are well represented in STEM fields, representing about half of the field. The gap between immigrants versus domestic born in terms of the economy is the lowest in a decade. Differences in social economic risks can have an impact on how communities cope in disaster situations.

Our Department is going strong, and we are celebrating our 100th anniversary. I believe this is the best statistics agency in the world. We now have 5,000 employees from coast-to-coast-to-coast, meaning we are able to provide localized information and perspectives. We are accountable, we protect privacy and have deeper insights into data. Ours is not the Statistics Canada of your grandmothers. We work with other departments and private companies to mine data and have it at your disposal.

Discover what Statistics Canada can do for you. It really matters that you know what we do and how we can help you. Finally, I will note there is an app you can now download to look up data from Statistics Canada.

11:15 Life in the 43rd (and Minority) Parliament

Presenter and Moderator: Kendall Anderson, Executive Director, Samara Centre for Democracy Canada

Panel:

Susan Delacourt, Ottawa bureau chief, Toronto Star

Megan Leslie, former MP for Halifax and Deputy Leader of the NDP

James Rajotte, former MP for Edmonton Leduc and Chair of the Standing Committee on Finance

Kendall Anderson: I am going to begin by presenting some information to frame the conversation:

Samara does action-oriented research, our biggest study item is on the role of elected Members. We have collected information on the vital elements of successful democracy to get at issues, this is done through surveys and exit interviews with MPs. Our exit interviews are now available in two books - *Tragedy in the Commons* and *Real House Lives*.

Last session we continued to survey MPs. When MPs from the 42nd Parliament were asked about decision making in the House of Commons, 45% thought that House was not good at decision making. When we ask MPs to evaluate their time in office as they leave the institution, they often say they ran out of time to pursue the issues they wanted to; there is not enough time for constituents, for debate, for change, or to get to know your colleagues. Time is a valuable resource. Samara has some suggestions for new MPs

- 1) Specialize – some MPs choose to specialize in one or more policy issues, meet stakeholders on that issue.
- 2) Use innovative tools in the constituency – two thirds of your year will be spent in the constituency. How can you make role effective but also have time for life? Departing MPs have reinforced how hard the job can be on family. There are many tools for public engagement. Some events (e.g. town halls) only draw some segments of people, others are better, for instance youth councils.
- 3) Use support that is available to you and ask questions. As a backbencher it is hard to effect change. Use the Library of Parliament, Officers of Parliament, House of Commons clerks, external stakeholders, media. The House of Commons Clerks can help you with parliamentary procedure. The media can be both a resource and a challenge.
- 4) Identify allies in parliament. One of the biggest regrets for MPs has been a failure to build relationships across party lines with their colleagues. These allies may be members from your own caucus, other MPs who become mentors, and senators within the system. The MPs we interviewed felt really empowered in their caucus discussions. We've also heard from MPs that caucus can be good for debate but is sometimes used only to inform you. You might also have an unexpected connection with people in other parties.

It is important to find ways to create alliances. One MP had a beer budget to get to know MPs from across the aisle. On the other hand, one MP said that she found it objectionable that MPs who had spoken poorly against her in the house of commons ask her out for beer. It is important to note the words and actions within parliament may be experienced differently. It is

also important that you build support with senators, you may need a sponsor for a bill at some point too.

5) Be true to yourself. Remember why you came to parliament. You might realize that you and your party are not aligned but you have to negotiate, MPs typically vote with their party 99.9% of the time and most rebellious MP in the 42nd parliament voted with their party 96.6% of the time. Think for yourself, build your own voice. This job will challenge you intellectually. You're going to hear a lot of views. You will receive a Welcome to Parliament package from Samara in the mail – with the two books I mentioned.

Kendall Anderson: Megan and James, you've sat through both minority and majority parliaments, does the job change in a minority vs. majority?

Meghan Leslie: You [MPs in the audience] are very lucky that you are in a minority, MPs are important and powerful, you will also see that in committees.

Just an example, when I was in office the NDP was the fourth party and only one MP in each committee. I was in health committee, and I created relationships with organizations, and I established relations with other MPs. For instance, if an organization had a report, I would call that organization to see if the report had legs. Develop trust across aisle and understand what other people's mandates are. I tried to figure out how to work with the Bloc Quebecois even though I'm a federalist, how to work with the Liberals even if I don't trust them.

James Rajotte: I have served in both government and opposition. To cooperate with other parties in the minority, don't personalize your arguments. There are some items that are cross party and others that are not (e.g. the NDP and Conservatives will probably not agree on corporate tax policy). In 2006 we [the Conservative government] had a small minority, and we had a minority on committee, so we had to reach out across the aisle. In one committee we looked at the manufacturing sector. Our committee created a report with 22 recommendations. The NDP member in committee in camera refused to support 23rd recommendation (on corporate tax policy) so we decided to limit our official report to 22 recommendations and make a statement that the NDP and Conservatives had different views on corporate tax policy. All that is to say that you can accomplish a lot if you try hard.

Kendall Anderson: Susan, some people say that the media is to blame for political divisions

Susan Delacourt: The best way to make friends with the media is to call us and tell us what happens. I understand why people say the media is an obstacle. I don't want to be a reporter that circles the wagons. Build relationships with media by reaching out and talking to us. You've

already been told that you might be forced to tell us talking points (we can get that elsewhere). Just be human, don't say no comment just say, you know I can't talk about that.

Meghan Leslie: I found talking points helpful as a partisan but when you receive them think about them. When you are speaking to a journalist you can express yourself differently.

James Rajotte: Do your own research. There are independent sources. I love the Library of Parliament because you can just say "don't give me the spin." You don't want to answer a question, just say I'm not prepared to make a statement. The best advice I've heard from reporters is when they said to me that they do scrums to trip people up.

Susan Delacourt: I wrote a book about Shaughnessy Cohen, the MP who died on the floor of the House of Commons. She was a person had an ability to get what she wanted. She did that by going into a room and saying, "here's what is in it for you." Do a tit for tat. You need to give reporters something for an incentive – exclusives, leaks that sort of thing.

Meghan Leslie: Back to those relationships, you don't want to be the unnamed "Conservative source" otherwise people in your caucus will think badly of you.

James Rajotte: You can always go across the aisle and ask your colleague to speak on an issue. Use a human approach, see where their interests lie and what they can speak towards to support you. They may welcome the opportunity to speak on an issue or topic.

Susan Delacourt: We had an example of that recently. Two Iranian Canadian MPs were trying to get compensation for the victims of the Iran air crash – it was a story in the Toronto Star. Try to find a way of making national stories local.

James Rajotte: The 24-hour news cycle makes it hard for both politicians and journalists. Don't drink before tweeting.

Kendall Anderson: I want to talk about the other side of the job – being a representative and also being in the constituency. How do you handle the two different roles and still do both jobs well?

Meghan Leslie: We both have different tips and tricks. The constituency demand is very high. You can find staff or volunteers to represent you. One thing I would caution though is getting too focused on one or the other. The constituency work can inform your world view and those conversations are so incredibly helpful and shaped my thinking. I said that didn't put my name on the ballot to do casework, but I should soften the edges of that comment – being able to knock on a door and ask someone's worldview is a privilege.

James Rajotte: Remember that you have two full time jobs. When I was in office, I attended an event in my constituency where someone said I was the best MP because my office had solved his wife's tax problems. It was my staff, but I was willing to take credit for it. Take pics of yourself doing constituency work. If there's a report that you like, tweet it out.

Susan Delacourt: I interviewed Prime Minister Trudeau when he was a backbencher and he said that his father didn't do casework and that he was surprised at how it is a fundamental aspect of the job. He was also surprised about how much he enjoyed it. MPs are more valuable at home. I've always seen MPs get more caught up in Ottawa and tend to neglect their riding, which is a path to defeat.

James Rajotte: Find a routine for yourself. For me that was Saturday morning going first to hockey and then speaking with constituents. You're in a unique position where you can phone anyone (e.g. in NGOs, research organizations) and ask about what they do. People want you to be more informed and that's the case for groups right across the spectrum.

Meghan Leslie: The Canadian Medical Association had this program called MDs for MPs. I had an MD and we would go out for coffee once a month and we would discuss health policy. I cultivated my own program along those lines, for instance when I was environment critic, I cultivated a relationship with a Professor at Dal who studies the environment. Sometimes I would go to question period and ask a question of the environment minister and the professor would be watching on CPAC and would text me to say "here how she is wrong"

James Rajotte: We do that across the issues, especially in the finance committee. If you're not from Alberta, tour the oilsands. As an MP you have a duty to service the whole country.

Kendall Anderson: How might the newly invigorated Senate shape parliament?

James Rajotte: I finished in 2015 but I found it helpful to engage with senators. As members of the House of Commons you can utilize senators. I'm not exactly sure how the Senate operates now. Get involved in parliamentary associations. Travel to the extent you can with both MPs and senators. Utilize different people, ask for advice.

Meghan Leslie: On the parliamentary associations, they can be really good, but they can also be completely lame. I had the opportunity to be on the Cross-Parliamentary Association for the Prevention of Genocide – all members made a commitment that we would try and get the themes that we discussed in the Association in our party platforms. I've not been here since 2015 but I don't know how you get by without a caucus, I feel that you can rely on colleagues if you are part of a caucus. You have staff but if you want cumulative perspective, get views from constituents.

Susan Delacourt: We [journalists] like new Senate for two reasons, it's more interesting & unpredictable and it is more democratic. Samara's reports are full of MPs regretting things they did for partisan reasons, it's a good experiment for how a legislature can exist without parties.
2) It's not the US. It compares not at all to what is going on outside.

Question from audience: (MP) I'm new, I believe in the system and I'm surprised about how much power we have (I can speak in question period). Have you ever had to make that decision about whether you go with your own beliefs or whether you go with your party?

Meghan Leslie: Yes, but as someone who belonged to a political party it was important to be able to respect my party. Example, I was asked by my party to make a statement, they didn't like what I planned to say so they asked someone else. There's that mutual respect. There are some lines in the sand, try to find those lines you don't want to cross.

James Rajotte: My party was best team I ever had (in all my experience with team sports). If you're a conservative member you have to vote a certain way. My concern was for issues that were not core to the principles of Conservatism – e.g. shark fin bill. I like the quote that if you agree with me 12/12 times you should see a psychologist.

Susan Delacourt: If you are switching parties, call us first.

12:15 Life with the Senate

Facilitator: Dr André Plourde

Discussion: Senators Diane Bellemare, Peter Boehm, Frances Lankin

André Plourde: We have a newly invigorated Senate, which we did not have in the previous two elections. Diane Bellemare, your appointment came before 2015 so you have a perspective of the Senate before and after the changes.

Diane Bellemare: I was appointed to the Senate in 2012 by Stephen Harper. There were two caucuses at the beginning – Conservative and Liberal. There were two independent senators. When the expenses crisis took place several more independent senators emerged. Prime Ministers used to appoint senators to get a majority in the Senate but now that's not the case.

The other difference is that we used to be part of regional caucuses, with MPs from our parties. The process was more opaque than it was now. There was no government caucus but there was an opposition caucus. There was a huge change, I hope it will remain that way. There is the opposition group (partisan Conservatives), there is the independent group, then there is the Canadian Senators group, which is the newest group. This makes it impossible to have a

majority, so you have to negotiate. Now it works that appointments are based on merit now we have a sea change that makes changes to the way process and amendments work.

One third of all government bills are amended in the Senate. In 1960, only 5% of bills were amended. If you look at the 2006 Parliament only 10% of bills are amended so you can see the impact here.

André Plourde: Peter Boehm, what is your experience?

Peter Boehm: I have only been in the Senate for one year and 4 months. In my previous career, I received senators as an ambassador. Moving forward, we can make adjustments based on changes in the Senate.

André Plourde: Frances Lankin, you have a different perspective with your career in provincial politics.

Francis Lankin: I'm an independent but with a partisan background. I served in a provincial legislature, so I understand both the benefits and drawbacks from being in a caucus. I was one of the first seven senators appointed as independents following the disenfranchisement of Liberal senators. We [the newly appointed Independent Senators] were reviewed by a committee, I received a call from the Prime Minister (which was a surprise) and he asked me to be an independent senator. My partisan background is as a New Democrat, but I worked in a nonpartisan way during the rest of my career. As a provincial member of the NDP, my whole career was on abolishing the Senate. My question to the Prime Minister was what do you mean by independent? I thought about it for a nanosecond, I wanted to be part of the change process. What are the goals of it?

The canned reading notes we've been talking about, it distresses me when Senators use them. The Senate needs to be value added, let's give life to the idea of sober second thought. I know from my career how important it is to stay away from group think, this is true in partisan politics as well. When I talk with a Conservative from Alberta about energy as someone with a background in the NDP, in that sort of conversation there are things I agree and disagree with. We should bring ideas together on behalf of Canadians. There are criticisms of the new project, some say it is a method to dilute the official opposition – "Liberals in sheep's clothing". This is not true, even though the majority of people who are independent senators are centre left. The success of the project rests on willingness to appoint centre right/right senators. Focus energy on scope, there has been a decline of the Senate & senators. We should not be in competition from the House of Commons. We are there to do great committee study work, we are there as legislators to do legislation. Is legislation Charter compliant? Are certain regions affected disproportionately? How does this legislation shape Indigenous people? It's a very different job

to that of an elected member but it is a complimentary job. We need to reinforce the difference and be value added.

André Plourde: What relationship do you have with MPs and what relationship would you like to have with MPs?

Frances Lankin: I often reach out to government, I rely on research that comes out of committee, the Library of Parliament, I reach out to different organizations with different views than I have. It adjusts my thinking. I reach out to MPs that I know have particular expertise.

Peter Boehm: There is currently only one formalized consultative mechanism between the House and Senate – the Conservative caucus. For instance, I work with Mike Lake (MP) on autism. Have to become more circumspect.

Diane Bellemare: In the old system we could meet MPs in national and regional caucuses, nevertheless our conversations didn't deal with legislation. In the new system what has to be added is the manner in which we could improve the dialogue between senators and MPs, not just between partisan issues but on other issues. We have a role towards the regions, especially for minorities. The Senate was supposed to represent regions/minorities. A role of complementarity is important. The Senate has an important role to play in the House of Commons. You set up joint groups, we call them open caucuses that are open to both houses. For example, the open caucuses might address a subject like poverty. I think we have an opportunity to set up those groups.

André Plourde: This is a minority parliament, how will the relationship between the House and the Senate change?

Peter Boehm: The Senate now looks very different, thinking about amendments you might have to think more seriously about if you think the amendment might be able to pass.

Join parliamentary associations, participate in trips. There is that time honoured system of pairing that will allow you to be away from the House, whether that will continue in minority government I don't know. We have to have a better collaborative spirit.

André Plourde: What are your comments?

I was Peter Harder's assistant; we were quite concerned about what the temperature would be. Now we will have to cope with the uncertainty of a minority government. Now the Independent Senators Group is more independent. There are a number of laws which led to negotiations in the House, now we have a Senate that is more independent.

André Plourde: Which key elements are yet to be discovered?

I think that we must ensure that we stay within the scope of the Senate. We all come wanting to accomplish something but if you want to change the law and move the amendments, run for elected office not the Senate because it's different. Legislation is negotiated a lot in the House, we should not open up a can of worms that does not need to be opened.

Every vote counts in a minority, MPs will be busy and may not get to go on cross parliament trips

André Plourde: What role is there for individual senators and MPs to ensure the House functions?

Peter Boehm: There's a lot we don't know. I think it will depend on how committees work. Your time becomes precious, in terms of time and travel. There are some who think longer view versus those who want immediate change.

Diane Bellemare: In terms of getting together, I think there is a topic we can get together to talk about and that's assisted death. I think if MPs and senators get together to discuss that topic it would be productive.

Frances Lankin: look to your parliamentary staff to create relationships with staff in Senators' offices. For instance, I'm currently doing a report on workers & the gig economy, ask your staffers to get in touch with my office.

André Plourde: I think we can conclude that it's a leap in the dark

2:00 Canada and the World - The Right Honourable David Johnston, 28th Governor General of Canada

David Johnston: I have lots of admiration for your leadership, lots of admiration for people here today.

Today I will be addressing the topic of Canada in the world. Kevin Lynch wrote six triggering events affecting us in the next year: 1) global economy 2) trade 3) global ally 4) global information technology 5) capitalism under siege or in revival 6) compromise

Not all of the above things are binary, some are opportunities. Trust is a fundamental feature, which is the topic of my most recent book [*Trust: Twenty Ways to Build a Better Country*]. One of the things I noticed as Governor General from 2010-2017 was an erosion of trust in public institutions. How can we be a trusting nation? Trust in communities, trust in individuals. What

makes for a trustworthy person? A trustworthy institution, how does that accumulate to a trustful nation?

There is a novel I read recently entitled *Voiceless in Time* that takes place in the aftermath of a civil war, nuclear bomb. In the novel an old professor reminisces about the pre-war years. He remarks that society is like a garden next to a jungle, the jungle will take over the garden if you don't tend to it.

Democracy matters, debates count. I was the former director of the Leader's Debate Commission. It's important when we think of trust, you are champions of trust, you have loyalty to your party and parliament but also to your constituents. You're not delegates from constituents you are representatives. In 2012 my office reestablished the Caring Community Award to honour volunteers. Fostering community building spirit is important to build trust.

I have seen democracies come under siege. The Economist intelligence unit measures democracies but has found only 20 fully functioning democracies. In those democracies there is a higher degree of trust in democratic institutions.

As Hugh McClellan said, we are the guardians of civilisation. Canada is the most respected country for soft power. We are the best brand in terms of doing business. If you want to do business in Canada, investors know that the rule of law prevails. Important feature all over the world. Trust comes in many forms and the speed of Trust is important Trust equals speed plus cost. If we distrust one another there is a lot of back and forth and costs our society. Trust is both the grease and the glue in our society.

Maureen Boyd: You talked about trust and the importance of rules of law, what can individual MPs do to strengthen Canada's place in the world?

David Johnston: We've managed to form a government that can work well. The core principles of government in Canada are peace, order and good government. Empathy is an important factor. There are constitutions which are more Lockean, like in the US with the ethos of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. However, this is now seen as the pursuit of wealth. Wealth inequality creates problems for democracy.

What can you do? The Governor General travels at the discretion of the Prime Minister. When I first entered office Stephen Harper and I sat down to figure out where I should make my international visits. We decided to take 7 visits to the US to highlight Canada's soft power. This had not happened since Ronald Reagan and Vincent Massey met.

I also went to China. Canadian ambassadors have a discretionary fund to strengthen Canadian values. Disability rights is not a focus in China. Canada brought in Braille exams and Braille tours in Chinese universities. We are also helping Chinese athletes to compete in the Winter Olympics because the President of China wants China's winter sports teams to improve. Canada helps.

How can MPs help? By using all agencies to convey soft power to world. Look beyond regions and the world.

Maureen Boyd: The people to people ties you were talking about, there is an opportunity for MPs to lobby for the GG to go to certain places

David Johnston: We have an opportunity to spread the diplomacy of knowledge – we have a good education system in terms of equality of opportunity. We should be the Athens to the world. It's not just GDP, it's how you develop that talent. We should do much more. Only 5% of Canadian university students study abroad, that should be 100%

Question from audience: The thing that concerns me is the fact that knowledge is not accessible (e.g. paywalls). What advice do you have for parliamentarians in how we mobilise information?

David Johnston: Make sure that our institutions are as strong as possible. Collaboration between industry and institutions is important. We are too small not to collaborate. You can do so much more to collaborate. We are very competitive on the world stage; we have 4% of refereed publications in STEM. Of those articles 50% are collaborations with others in the world. There is a study on social mobility – 80% of people in Canada have more advanced education than their parents. 20% of the population is not up there and we need to work harder to get them there.

Question from audience: You've spoken about "soft power", "we punch above our weight" – these don't mean much. You talk about trust and rule of law, but the rule of law has become undermined. Investor confidence has gone through the floor.

David Johnston: The rule of law needs to always be respected and is fragile. What scares me about the US is not who the president but whether the rule of law is respected. In terms of investor confidence, regulations are necessary, we need to build trustworthy institutions. Modern generation prefers social media versus traditional media.

Question from audience: With respect to cultural diplomacy, do you have any other insights on that?

David Johnston: With respect to cultural diplomacy we are punching above our weight. We publish a lot of literature in French & English. We are also leading in animation. Celine Dion has

sold 50 million records. We have brought standards up, with respect to the Montreal Symphony orchestra. Our healthcare could be improved but it is good compared to other countries.

Maureen Boyd: What are your hopes for Canada over the next year?

David Johnston: I want us to be a smart and caring nation that answers the call to serve. We want our family to be happy, but we have a broader vision. David Brooks [NYT columnist] talks about two mountains – the first is mountains for type who get up the mountain with relative ease, the second mountain you see people are struggling and need help. Going from first mountain to the second leads from happiness to satisfaction to joy. Hope for not just next year but for decades to come.

2:30 Canada: Challenges and Opportunities

Presentation:

Economic Outlook – Glen Hodgson, economist, author and former Chief Economist of the Conference Board of Canada

Glen Hodgson: Global economy is at its slowest since the financial crisis. Donald Trump is causing most of the slowdown but not all of it.

In terms of the world outlook – Japan is the oldest population on earth, growth is happening in Asia. Old industrial countries not in charge, global outlook projected to improve. Uneven growth but dominated by Asia. Africa will start.

China has gone through an economic miracle – higher rate of income - slow growth (6% slower this year). They have a lot of debt - China's population will peak in 2028. We must regularize our business relationship with China.

US: private investment coming back. Debt is high. A lot of churn going on. Current deal with China. Long way to go. There was a recession in 2009, then it picked back up, but the US is slowing. Peace deal with China = good. Job creation = 3.5% unemployment. Soaring debt, tax cuts = caused by borrowing. Debt is almost 100% of GDP. There is no conversation to discuss why national debt is soaring. Leading indicator of next president

Interest rates = fed started cutting rates. Inverted yield curve is a leading indicator of recession and is still a risk factor. Rates are low, people can finance their debt.

Canada is held back by external and internal factors. We have a lot of debt - we are the third largest holder of debt in the world. Debt is manageable but we are exposed if rates increase.

Alberta has a recession right now, in Saskatchewan too. There is a risk of importing a recession to Canada. For instance, if the US continues trade war in China then consequences might spill to Canada. Debt story. You do not want to win bronze in terms of debt. Canada does not do a good job of investing in the economy.

Striking how different provincial economies are with growth. E.g. growth of BC is good.

Risks – property protection. Brexit is still on the table. EU and Britain in negotiations. NAFTA ratifications. Small things we have to give up, we had to give over some propositions. Turmoil in the Middle East.

The long view in debate – driven by supply side, demographics is slowing growth.

Following the financial crisis, it took the US about 10 years to recover.

Climate Financing Video Presentation - Mark Carney, UN Special Envoy on Climate Action and Finance and Governor of the Bank of England

The US and Canada want to have a net zero economy, MPs will be responsible for that. Financial sector plays a pivotal role in this process. Those who fail to adapt will cease to exist. For example, the world's largest asset manager BlackRock has said that climate change is the biggest thing that will impact investment. What needs to change for that to happen in the financial sector?

There are three R's that are important: Reporting, Risk and Reward

UK and Italy have ambitious targets for climate financing.

Reporting – two years ago the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), held a meeting to figure out how to reward those who report climate change. People who have signed onto TCFD = pension funds, companies. 4/5s of companies globally act in line of TCFDs recommendations. Now we have to ensure that TCFD disclosure is better, perhaps mandatory.

Risk/risk management – Climate change creates physical risk and financial risk. Physical risk in terms of damage. Transition risk – disclosure needs to go beyond static and has to transition. Bank of England first regulator in the world to stress test banks in worst case scenario of no improvement in climate or in late climate scenario. Canada can be among the leaders in this regard.

We must do more than finance deep green technology. All technology must transition from brown to green. Green investments are still on the small scale, higher carbon sectors need

much more green investment. We need to ensure that sustainable investment is also in brown industries E.g. GPIF, world's largest pension fund has considered global warming and has changed their investment plans accordingly. Financial policymakers will not shape green economy, that is the job of parliaments and governments.

Feedback between the three R's = MPs will help markets become more sustainable. We have the ability to grow the economy sustainably.

Keynote Social and Demographic Outlook - Darrell Bricker, author, commentator and CEO of Ipsos Public Affairs Research

Today I want to talk a bit about The New Canada. I want to start with a quote from Mark Twain "It ain't what you don't know that gets you into trouble, it's what you know for sure that ain't so." Most people don't know about how Canada has changed demographically over the past few years. Why look at demographics? Demographics are about people and we're in the people business. Decisions are already made by grandparents, parents. Demographics are projectable. Demographic changes are facts; however, we can disagree about pace of change. Demographics are like glaciers – see from far away and are projectable but get closer and closer and closer.

Emerging demographic forces

- Fertility in 1960 the average Canadian woman had 4 kids. Now 1.5 kids. For replacement rate need 2.5. Japan is 1.4.
- No country in the world (except Israel) has a fertility rate that is at replacement rate.
- Biggest challenge for China, they will get old before they get rich. China is a rapidly aging population.

Why is fertility declining?

- Urbanization – children burden in cities, not an extra help on the farm
- Empowerment of women
- Gender and age structure of population. Women tend to get married at age 30 and have two kids in very close succession.

This demographic divide means that we have to think about policy tradeoffs. For instance, education for young people vs. healthcare for seniors.

Aging. Average lifespans of Canadians went from 57 in 1920 and will be 87 in 2036

In Canada we are good at keeping people alive, but we are not good at making new people

Number of Canadians aged 100+ 7,900 by 2061 will climb to 78,300

Urbanization – we spend a lot of time talking about migration in the world today. The percentage of the world's population that does not live in the country they were born is only 3%.

The biggest change in migration is going from rural to urban. Becoming 68% of urbanization in 2050 and today 54% and 34% in 1960. Urban policy will be difficult, especially housing (big policy issue)

95% of us live within 5 km of the US border. One of the biggest issues we are dealing with is survivability in smaller communities. These communities have smaller populations that need a lot of services.

Big shift- diff parts of the country are experiencing different demographic shifts. West and Ontario are growing. Atlantic provinces not.

Alberta is one of the most rapidly growing places (esp. Calgary)

For Atlantic Canada – we have to have a serious discussion about the population because it's not sustaining itself.

The prevalent family in Canada is a person living by themselves, especially single women. This is the first in Canadian history and tells us a lot about social cohesion.

Immigration is Canada's secret weapon to slow population decline. Canada leads in attracting immigration growth. Canada is becoming a Pacific nation – migrants are more oriented towards West than east coast. Only 10% of migrants to Canada are refugees and this has not changed. The demographics within refugee populations are more focused (i.e. most are from Syria). Most of the refugee population settles in Ontario and the West. 9 out of 10 immigrants live in urban Canada

50% of people in Toronto are from another country. In St. John's that percentage is 1%.

The French language will take a hit as most migrants are anglophone.

Global phenomenon – we don't have as many babies. Perennials vs. millennials – cannot achieve what parents achieved.

Growing segment are women over the age of 50. Living alone together, we have become a metropolitan species

Diversity is a necessity for replacement growth, we have to have open minds and open hearts.

3:15 Health Break

3:30 Panel Discussion: Challenges and Opportunities

The Honourable Perrin Beatty, CEO, Canadian Chamber of Commerce

Graham Fox - CEO of the Institute for Research on Public Policy

Darrell Bricker - CEO of Ipsos Public Affairs Research

Carol Anne Hilton, CEO and Founder of The Indigenomics Institute

Moderator: Chris Hall, CBC's National Affairs Editor and host of The House on CBC Radio

Topics:

Canada's economic, social and demographic realities and the challenges and opportunities that presents from First Nations, business, labour, municipal, western, and Quebec perspectives

Perrin Beatty: Welcome to Ottawa. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the business community have concerns that we would like to be discussed. It comes down to the issue of competitiveness. Too often competitiveness is seen as boss dictating workers but that's not the whole picture.

Carol Anne Hilton: Indigenomics is based on truth that Canada was built on Indigenous exclusion, what we advocate for is Indigenous inclusion. What does that mean as a foundation? Indigenomics is modern indigenous practice. It is essential to the future of Canada. Canada was established on the centre of the Indian problem. Emergence of \$100 billion Indigenous economy = engagement. We have worked to advise Morneau at the economic growth council. There is a limited understanding on how to embrace Indigenous economic growth. It's often seen as the economic cart pulling the social horse. We can continue to fund the problem, or we can start the foundation of constructive economic design. There are economic levers to support growth. 12 levers or mechanisms. We need to move onto language of closing the socioeconomic gap and look at Indigenous economic activity. Entrepreneurship, trade, levels that shape \$60 billion of economic activity. New language is based on UNDRIP. Indigenous

people are the only ones in this country have had to fight for the right to have an economy. Most real conversation on what we want as a country

Graham Fox: Federation, not just federalism (systems) but what are the relationships between regions? The key turning point in political history is the restructured party system. Party was not completely sovereigntist or federalist won a strong majority. Divide in Quebec is no longer based on independence. Reorganization of politics – moved from a discourse on the relationship between Quebec and Canada. Notion of centring discourse around nationalism – not just independence but how do we sort ourselves? Stable minority in House. Government has several options to deal with allies. I believe the government will have to choose the Bloc as a dancer partner once in a while. Will Bloc and Quebec government align? When we think back to the Harper government, he could not reduce wait times for hospitals as this required needed strong intergovernmental skills. All of Justin Trudeau's priorities require strong intergovernmental skills.

Darrell Bricker: Innovation is a concept that is spoken about a lot at Davos, but the public do not resonate with that word. People are pessimistic about the future. People get excited about new technology but worry about social consequences of technological progress. The public are not in that conversation and do not feel spoken to.

Chris Hall: Implementation of legislation for new NAFTA agreement – what is the challenge there?

Perrin Beatty: Investors hate uncertainty. Their inclination is to keep money in bank. Since Trump, we have had uncertainty. Are we going to be plunged into a trade war? USMCA falls far short of what we could have aspired to. However, the alternative could have been a trade war so it's better than that.

Chris Hall: Graham, is there a Quebec angle to this?

Graham Fox: No, the policy discourse in Quebec media is not in opposition to this agreement. It's not perfect but we will get quietly to consensus.

Chris Hall: What about pipelines and indigenous interests?

Carol Anne Hilton: Just as a disclosure, I sit as a director on the Trans Mountain Pipeline project. There has been a shift from isolated project of consultation to understanding risk from an Indigenous perspective. Seeing new hereditary versus band leadership construct establishing band vs. hereditary structure. More complicated process of getting to "yes."

Chris Hall: What about the environment?

Darrell Bricker: The issue of the Trans Mountain pipeline is inability of governments to find a way to bring public opinion onside. You ask Canadians what they think about pipelines, they support it (60%). Now, there are situations where active minorities of the population can block projects they don't agree with. The problem with the Trans Mountain project is not a government relations problem but a public opinion problem, no way to bring these minorities together. Everyone is afraid of these things proceeding.

Public do not understand what tradeoff is in environment. This is a public policy problem - it was a mistake to link pipelines and carbon tax together. These two things do not need to be in opposition. There's a sense that if you support a carbon tax, you cannot support pipeline development. This is a case where you can have your cake and eat it too.

Perrin Beatty: Canadians are well ahead of politicians – they realise we need to respect our environment and climate change. We've lost our sense of civility in talking about climate change. We need to have an honest conversation. We didn't discuss it during the election. We treated it as a binary issue. We are shouting at each other. Foreign policy is becoming partisan as well, we need to restore a certain part of civility. The good news is that we have a room of people who have come in off the campaign trail.

Chris Hall: How about federalism? This government may enact an encroachment on provincial issues – e.g. pharmacare.

Carol Anne Hilton: We need a better design to facilitate economic growth, which will also go into things like land rights, moving beyond funding processes (from departments). Constructive design has not been in policy.

Chris Hall: How do we develop the economy that includes ways to incorporate Indigenous people?

Perrin Beatty: Indigenous people are the fastest growing population; we are wasting human resources. There is a problem of equal equity. The best thing is respect – we need to have common goals. No one is going to refuse to come to the table if you ask them. We need solutions that trump ideology.

Question from audience: I am 18 months into the job of Senator, and I have realised that most Canadians are shaped by regulation and not legislation. There is a lot of regulation that is a real drag on productivity. Regulations are necessary but how do you stay competitive?

Perrin Beatty: The answer is that we need regulations, do we have a clear understanding of regulations? The government to its credit came down with a series of regulatory reforms. The

key thing for us in regulation is that we do it in a way that is consultative and ensure the ones who are affected most are the ones with the strongest voice. It has to be fact based.

Question from audience: NAFTA, timely conversation about Canada/China relations. How are we going to solve the issue of people being detained in China? Knowing there is a huge learning curve of what we can and can't do. What can we do six months from now?

Perrin Beatty: These are tough questions; lives are at stake. First, dealing with hostages - the judicial system in China is concerning. What do we do in the short term? We could launch an extradition request but there are still issues with the president. China is not going to go away. Canada still maintained relations with Soviet Union during the cold war. China will be more important economically in future. We need a good strategy in relation with other western democracies in how we deal with China, but they are here to stay. Obviously, I would make it that they did an advisory panel during NAFTA negotiation of former MPs and citizens. There are a lot of people who can put citizenship above partisanship. Need to do something with China. Lives are at stake here. It shows what you can do when government trusts committees, NAFTA. E.g. electoral reform committee. Power in minority house.

4:30 Closing Remarks: The Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, 20th Prime Minister of Canada

Maureen Boyd: You were first elected in 1963, what advice would you have for parliamentarians?

Jean Chretien: I arrived on the Hill 57 years ago. It is an honour to represent your neighbors when you arrive on the Hill for the first time. I was a bit lively as a kid, I was distributing the pamphlets. I told my father that I wanted to be an architect, but he said I wouldn't be good at that and sent me to law school. Over my time in politics from 1963-2004 I saw a lot of progress. When I was first elected there was not much diversity, lots of poverty in different parts of Canada. Now we're an example to the world. When I was elected, I was 29 years old, I promised my wife I would leave before I'm 69, after 40 years. There is no security of employment in our business. In 1967, Prime Minister Pearson asked me to join cabinet, I was 33, I could not speak English and I served in the Cabinet for 20 years and 10 years as Prime Minister.

During the campaign, I went across Canada to fundraise for the party and campaign. When I was Prime Minister, I travelled the world with the G7, NATO. Being the Prime Minister of Canada is such an easy job compared to other countries. This country works quite well, you have new problems and you do your best. You have the satisfaction of doing your best if you work hard. We have to say thank you to them for offering their services. In our system there is something that doesn't exist in other places, if you win it's because of you but if you lose it's because of your leader.

I loved question period, some people hate it, because it's a challenge when you go there. If you're Prime Minister you take half of the questions. You don't know if you've done well or not. There's always the applause but you don't know if you've done well or not.

Question from audience: MP for Calgary Centre, the great advantage you brought to Canada was that you treated the natural resources industry fairly. We are so polarized. Do you have any ideas of building the gap?

Jean Chretien: The problem is that the price of oil is \$50 a barrel, it's a world problem not a government problem. For instance, the Keystone XL pipeline is blocked by environmental groups and Indigenous people.

It's easier to be friendly with the opposition than the people in caucus (people in caucus want your job).

If you're from Alberta talk to other people from the other parts of Canada. I did not speak much English when I first came to Parliament, but I sat with the Anglophones. Similarities between Canadians span provincial lines – fisherman from Gaspé might have more in common with a fisherman in Atlantic Canada than someone who lives in Montreal. I was a federalist and proud Canadian, many of the people in Quebec I know don't like my views.

Maureen Boyd: Do you have any thoughts about being in a minority government as a backbench MP?

Jean Chretien: I said to Justin Trudeau that I never had the privilege of running a minority government. You have to compromise, I had to do that quickly because I was Pearson's parliamentary secretary. When I was parliamentary secretary, it was exciting because you never knew when you'd be on a road. Twice Pearson was elected PM and twice he was elected in a minority. The minority was also productive. The election was rough – John Diefenbaker was a tough speaker. Don't be too worried, the only thing that can happen is you don't get reelected.

Question from the audience: There are many new MPs in the room. I'm newly elected at the age of 29 and you were 29 when you were first elected. You've had a long and successful career; how do you suggest we do the same?

Work, survive, be in the committee, talk to the people in your riding. That's it, it's a job with the people. There is no substitute to work.

Question from audience: During your tenure there were lots of tax increases, lots of service cuts – how did you get Canadians to come together during this time of difficulty?

Jean Chretien: I've been around since 1963, all times are hard. Good news is no news and bad news is news. We increased taxes because we did not want to increase the debt that your grandchildren might pay. I was reelected in 1997 even though I had increased taxes a lot. I was in London and PM Cameron asked how he could do the same. I told him that I didn't have problems with the unions because I used to be a lawyer for the unions early in my career. The people accepted that, and we had ten years of surplus. Be relaxed, don't be nervous. When you're on the hill, try to collaborate and find a solution.

I had to go against my constituents for some things, for example my constituency was in favour of hanging and I voted in favour of abolishing capital punishment. That was difficult.

5:00 Closing Remarks and Evaluation: Dr. André Plourde, Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs, Carleton University