

"THE CENTRE OF CANADA?"

NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY

THE HON. IONA CAMPAGNOLO

M.P. SKEENA

MINISTER OF STATE - FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT

TO

THE CANADIAN CLUB

TORONTO

ROYAL YORK HOTEL

TORONTO, ONTARIO

NOVEMBER 21, 1977

PLEASE CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Mr. Chairman, honoured guests; members of the Canadian Club; ladies and gentlemen.

First of all, I wish to thank you very much for inviting me to address your organization. The Canadian Club of Toronto is widely-known as one of the premier audiences in Canada, and I can assure you that it is a long way from Eighth Avenue in Prince Rupert to the Royal York Hotel.

It is also, however, a long way from the Royal York Hotel to Eighth Avenue in Prince Rupert, and that's an important part of what I want to talk to you about.

But before I do, I also want to thank Mr. Wilson for his kind words of introduction -- I wish he could convince some of the members on the opposite side of the House of Commons that I'm all of the things he's said.

And having heard Mr. Wilson's fine introduction, let me put some of the things he has said into a slightly different perspective for you; because -- for me as for everyone -- the opinions I express are in many ways the product of what I am and what I have done.

Before you stands a politician; who is variously, and often at the same time,

a woman, mother, and grandmother;

a British Columbian born;

a north coast British Columbian;
a Liberal;
a member of the federal cabinet;
a federal minister responsible for fitness
and amateur sport
and a Canadian who shares with you and millions
of others the wish to keep our country
together, from my coast to the Atlantic.

I am not, as some of you may be aware, known as a
vociferous women's libber. But as a female in politics who's had
her share of male chauvinism let me ask you: Have you noticed
the sisterhood of those of us in electoral politics? Flora
MacDonald and Grace MacInnis and Jean Piggott are not of the same
party as I and Monique Begin and Simma Holt. I am not of the same
party as the Honourable Betty Stephenson or the Honourable Lise
Payette. Yet all of us share. We have a bond. We have it with
Judy LaMarsh and Ellen Fairclough and Therese Casgrain and with
the late Agnes MacPhail. It's not that we're all against some-
thing or all for the same thing. But we all know how hard it is,
given the traditions and values in our society for women to be
seen as more than just token politicians or ministers.

The general position of women in Canadian society has
been comparatively good, especially out in the kind of rugged
country I represent, where for the most part it doesn't matter
who you are, as long as you do the job; but our society and you
still assign to me and other women a double role; firstly as a

part of society with the right to take part in that society and secondly as the one who has the main responsibility for the care and training of children. If we don't fill the first role we are labelled subservient; if we don't fill the second we are labelled unfeminine.

What this means is that the Canadian man's freedom to make a career, to take part in the affairs of society and to develop his personality has been and is still bought at the price of an uneven load on the Canadian woman. As a generalization!

I'm not whining. I'm just putting an opinion to you -- something for you to think about. Why are women in politics a sisterhood in a way that men in politics are not a brotherhood? The answer isn't flattering to men . . . yet!

A few weeks ago there was published in my name a "green paper" to initiate a discussion across the country on the present and future role of the federal government in amateur sport. It's happened rather quietly.

Many Canadians still believe sport is somehow frivolous, and not really as important, culturally-speaking as drama, opera, poetry, music, etc. We also think we're not very good at sports in comparison to other countries; that we're arm-chair quarterbacks who won't spend and support sport. It's not so.

The sports men and women and boys and girls of Canada are the most numerous group of volunteers and enthusiasts of any in the country, far ahead of those involved in churches or party politics or music or cards, almost as many, really, as watch TV. And our sporting traditions and inventiveness are unique. This is what we at the federal level have been encouraging and building on in the past 10 years. Now it's time, with both the federal and provincial governments more committed to sport and fitness and volunteerism, that we assess where we are in sport so we can go intelligently to where we might or should go. Public hearings on the Green Paper are being held across Canada, and there will be one here in Toronto on December 8th. I will be there; and I hope to see some of you present -- if not submitting briefs then just listening and learning.

Of those other things I am, the northern B.C. aspect is most vital. Before I come back to it though, let me remark on the opportunities I have had in the Liberal Party. I belong to a political party which is both capacious and modern in that it moves and develops with the times, and doesn't spend its time in preoccupations with old issues and misplaced nostalgia for a past that never was.

As a cabinet minister I would note that one of my major

difficulties in the role is created by my "boss" the Prime Minister. No, he's not a merciless tyrant. He's not one who interferes with minister's responsibilities. He doesn't rule our meetings with an iron will and a minimum of talk except his own. He is remarkably open to suggestions. Rather, the problem he creates for ministers is out in the public where his personality and clear-cut projection of discussions and arguments -- a never-ending fascination to the media -- simply over shadow us. Time and again I hear or read words to the effect that we're "ciphers", the ministers and the other M.P.s of the Liberal caucus, that this is a one-man government, very presidential in style.

Ladies and gentlemen, that has not been my experience.

And when I push away from my role as woman and Liberal and politician and simply consider Canada and the imperative of keeping it together, I scan the slate of men and women in politics or the lustrous ones elsewhere in our affairs and ask seriously: "Is there one better fitted to keep us together, to turn back the threat of separatism?"

My answer has not been automatic. I've thought about it. You think about it too. No one, I've decided, can match Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

Having given you this description of myself, which I

hope establishes who Iona Campagnolo is (and having plugged my Branch's green paper), I'd like to turn now to my main purpose in speaking to you this afternoon. That is our country's unity and what the term means to me as a person living in northwestern B.C.; and how that differs from what it means in Toronto or in Ottawa.

We hear alot about national unity in this country just now. No doubt some feel we're hearing too much, that the issue has gone beyond the saturation point. I don't feel that way. Keeping Quebec in Canada is very important to me. But there is more to national unity than meets the eye. There is more to keeping Canada together than holding on to Quebec. There are more voices to be heard than those in Toronto and Ottawa. More voices than those in Montreal or Halifax. More voices even than those in Winnipeg, Edmonton, Regina or the Lower Mainland of British Columbia.

I am talking about the people who don't live in the larger centres. I am talking about the people who don't live within 100 miles of the United States.

There is a sector to be heard from yet and that is my sector. Call it what you want. The Hinterland, the Rim, the Bush or the Boondocks. There are people out there, living day to day, far from the din of Toronto. Some of them are so far from the concerns of the big cities that they are only dimly aware of what

city life means. It is difficult to say just where these people are. I can rattle off the names of their communities: Atlin, Cassiar, Dease Lake, Spirit River, Elk Point, Squaw Rapids, Gods Lake, Weagamow Lake, Povungnituk, Wabush. You may have heard of them. You may not. They are home to the people who live in what we all fondly call The North, though The North evokes more in our emotions than it does in our sense of geography.

Consider how absurd the notion of North is in Canada. We would say with no hesitation that Thunder Bay is in Northern Ontario. But look at a map of Canada and use your logical faculties and you'll see that Thunder Bay is south of the 49th parallel; that "undefended line" which marks much of our border with the United States. Even Edmonton, which might more logically be considered a northern community, is less than halfway up the province of Alberta. And Alberta itself spans less than half the distance between our powerful southern neighbours and those barren Arctic Islands which may or may not conceal great petroleum reserves.

Logic cannot be used to describe or determine what The North means to Canadians. We each have our own cherished notions and emotions. In a sense, the remote regions which we call The North are dear to us all. But do we ever do more than pay lip service to this love affair we have had for so many years with this vast country of ours? I would say no, we don't. I would say we in the south have

neglected The North. We have neglected remote areas where so many Canadians live and where such a vital contribution is made to this country's economy. And I would venture to say that this neglect is as central to the forces of disunity in our country as the election a year ago of the Parti Quebecois and Rene Lesvesque. So long as we continue to neglect our remote areas, we will never achieve our full potential as a country. We will remain only half formed.

Still, when I first landed in Ottawa three years ago as a newly-elected M.P., I brought with me a northerner's outlook and preconceptions. One of them is worth sharing with you.

Shortly after my arrival in Ottawa I heard two of my Parliamentary colleagues discussing the "Regions of Canada". Aha! I thought. My favorite subject! And then I proceeded to tell them about our five regions; about B.C., the Prairies, Central Canada, the Atlantic provinces, and The North. And then I was told about their five regions; about B.C., the Prairies, Ontario, Quebec, and the Atlantic provinces.

Believe me, it was a bit of a shock to find that The North does not exist in the conventional picture of Canada. That picture, I would submit, needs to be revised.

Some of you may find it odd that I speak of neglect. You'll say, and rightly so, that far from being neglected, The North has been given great attention. You will mention the scatter

of mining towns, the timber towns, the pulp and paper communities which not only give people jobs but bring in the wealth of this country. You are right and these communities have served Canada well. But has Canada served them well? Have the companies which so often built the towns served them well? Have our governments - federal and provincial - served them well? Are these places truly a part of Canada, part of the extremely vital lifeblood which pulses in the big cities or along the arteries which connect them?

There is a dilemma in The North. The dilemma is the single resource town. The only problem with the single resource town is that, when there's no resource left, what happens to the town? The attitude is "get in, get rich, get out". How do we break this attitude? How do we breathe life into these communities to make them permanent and stable instead of uncertain, keep-your-bags-packed, don't-make-any-commitments paper towns or mining camps which sit warily beneath the damocletian sword of prices on the London Metal Exchange?

The conventional wisdom holds that The North is Canada's future and that the opening up of that future is just around the corner.

Well, northern development, particularly mining development, has been with us for quite a while now and we are still waiting for that future to unfold. Remember Dawson City, The Klondike Gold

Rush? Dawson City could boast a population of 35,000 at the turn of the century. It is now a quiet village of 700, filled with the ghosts of an exciting past. Towns like Dawson City dot the map. Once bustling places of commerce, they now lie peacefully under northern skies.

Kitsault, Cobalt, Pickle Crow, Nordegg. They've practically disappeared. Where would Timmins be today if the federal government of the day had not introduced the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act? Who wants to argue that Kirkland Lake is the hope of Canada's future?

This is the pattern and the history of Canada's northern and mid-northern development. Again and again towns have blossomed in the bush, only to die slowly. Today, we are told, things are different. We are told that governments, federal and provincial, have had their consciences pricked; that they are committed to developing the infrastructures, to providing access to social amenities.

All I can say is that what the bureaucrats show each other in their full-color brochures and pretty maps is one thing; what gets done is usually quite something else. Grand designs and master plans are great - if you're a grand designer or master planner. The men and women in the towns and villages I represent don't even listen to them anymore.

What about the companies which open up the towns?

They have acquired a social conscience and have discovered, as a result, that when employee turn-over decreases, profits increase. Instead of the old 'Hollinger Houses' and the primitive work camps, we now have the neat boulevards and community centres of a Leaf Rapids or a Fermont.

But has the problem been solved? Not really. I was in Faro during an industrial dispute two summers ago and the town had all the community spirit of the Maginot Line. The nasty little question which keeps popping up, popped up. What happens when the ore runs out? So, once more, we are faced with the conundrum - how do you turn a company town into a town, an instant community into a community with heart and character.

We start, I think, by understanding the importance of the word 'community'. A collection of buildings can be created. A community cannot. A community must create itself. It cannot be dropped into the wilderness or fed by force. It finds its own reasons for being and then 'is'.

Keeping this in mind, let's take another look at the history of our northern development. The key to this history is that most of its elements have come from outside. From the building of the C.P.R., through the various mining booms, John Diefenbaker's 'Northern Vision', the bureaucratic master plans for railways, highways, dams and only the governments know what else, to the phenomenal projects of the 80s, the pipelines, offshore oil and gas,

the tar sands. The one thing they all share is that the decisions are made by huge organizations and are made far from where they will have their effect. Whether the bureaucracies are of government or business or labour, they are all in a phrase I'll come back to, 'Employee Managed Enterprises'. They have no truly vested interest in the humanity of the communities whose fates they determine. What I am saying is that these bureaucracies which give us a framework for northern development do not give us communities which are durable, diverse and socially and economically stable. And they cannot do so, given the framework they have developed; a framework which is a straightjacket of dependency. To escape this straightjacket, we must have other resources to fall back on, other legs with which to prop up our shaky table. History, if it tells us anything, tells us that these other legs are not going to come from the big bureaucracies I have referred to. They may give us attractive, well-planned single resource towns. But the towns are still only that - single resource towns.

To develop these other legs, we must develop an economy for these towns which is based in these towns. This means we must develop a much more broadly-based, Canadian-controlled, financially stable place in the Canadian economy from what is commonly called 'small business!.

I know that some would call this kind of talk the standard political cliché. The people in my part of the country, however, know well the qualities of economic freedom and individual

initiative on which their area is founded. They also know the frustrations of dealing with the power of corporate giants, giants far removed from us geographically who only view our northern isolation as a chance to make an extra buck on freight rates, shipping costs and all the other north-south disparities.

We in The North have always been aware of how finite our resources are. We have chafed in frustration at the reluctance of the south and the east to use properly these resources in a responsible and controlled way.

There are new arguments to be considered; arguments by authors such as E.F. Schumacher, who wrote 'Small is Beautiful', and by that notorious economic radical John Kenneth Galbraith. Galbraith, in his book 'Economics and the Public Purpose', describes a fundamental distinction between what we usually refer to as big business and small business. Galbraith labels big business the 'Planning System', and small business the 'Market System'. And he points out that comparing the two is not a matter of looking at big and small apples but one of looking at apple trees as opposed to pear trees.

That is, two economic systems operate in our society simultaneously. If you accept this, then you get into probably the most interesting and important economic debate since Keynes. The notion of the two systems is one which has a prominent Canadian

exponent in John Rulloch, President of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. He doesn't use Galbraith's terms but his own; employee-managed business and owner-managed business. The distinction between the two is more important and fundamental than that between the old big business and small business.

I want to look at the owner-managed or 'small business' sector from my perspective as a northerner. I think this sector is the key to bringing economic and social maturity to single resources communities.

Take the Prairies for example. There, owner-managed business provided the basis for development which, in turn, brought a stable economy, durable small communities and a strong community life. The business I refer to is, of course, farming. The small and medium sized cities of the Prairies have grown with and around the needs of those small, independent businessmen-and businesswomen-the farmers. And with them have grown secondary industries - many locally owned and related to agriculture - thus strengthening further the community. Places such as Brandon, Swift Current, Dawson Creek, and Medicine Hat owe their permanence to the farmer. They present a different picture of economic longevity than do Schefferville, Lynn Lake, Clinton Creek and Granisle. There is a lesson to be learned from the Prairies.

We must not see our single resource communities as ends in themselves but as means to ends. When a new ore body is found,

that ore should not be viewed as simply an extension of the mining industry but should from the very start be seen in the overall context of Canada and Canada's economic future.

These towns must be planned with more than one economic base. The incentives must be there to allow local industry and business to take root.

And if we use these resource based communities to foster the owner-managed part of our economy, then they will also help provide the transportation, the communications, the community services needed by others in the market economy. Bringing the market economy to this part of Canada will mean that for the first time, we can develop towns and cities whose futures do not depend on the remote decisions of the planning sector.

I see five steps to turning things around. First, we must understand that the owner managed and the employee-managed sectors respond to different forces and that economic policy needs to be structured accordingly. Second, we must recognize the barriers to northern expansion of a market system economy and take steps to jump them, just as the 'National Policy' provided protective tariffs for Ontario and Quebec in the 1890s. In saying this, I am consciously giving a different perspective than the "traditional" western complaint about tariffs and freight rates. This means creating transportation and communication infrastructures; the building of a northern Trans-Canada Highway for example. It also means providing direct incentives such as tax incentives and industrial development assistance so that locally

controlled, owner-managed businesses can blossom in the north and mid-north.

Third, we must understand that more than short term assistance is necessary. DREE is fine but transportation costs will need to be subsidized as long as Flin Flon is further from major markets than Kitchener.

Fourth, the heavily populated areas of the 'Golden Triangle' of Montreal and Southern Ontario must be cracked to let people leave and move north. Moral suasion won't do the trick. Financial incentives and social and cultural amenities are required. And we must discourage the continuing growth of the south ... and yes I mean Toronto. Only by spreading the people around can we reduce the cost disadvantages of diversifying the economy of the other "regions" of our country.

And fifth, we must grasp the size of the problem we face. Remaking northern Canadian society will be a vast undertaking and if done will create an entirely new dimension to our nation. I look forward to the day such a new dimension is created because it will mean the south won't be remote to me as a northerner and The North won't be remote to you who live in our largest cities. We will all be Canadians, and we will all share equal access to the social and cultural amenities that our wealth has created. Call it my 'Northern Vision' if you like.

I said when I started that there is more to national unity than holding on to Quebec. I have told you that as a Northerner, a person acutely aware of her hometown and constituency, I feel new directions must be taken in The North, new directions, in fact, in all parts of the country remote from the major centres. In order to grow and to survive we must do more than convince our francophone partners in Confederation that they are wanted and that they have a part to play. This country must convince all its citizens living out there, in the Boondocks, the Hinterland, that not only are they necessary but that they are as important to the national fabric as the man or woman working in Vancouver, Winnipeg or Montreal. For we must not lose sight of something crucial. My people, all of those people out there, despite the fact that they are outnumbered by their city cousins, are the ones who mine the wealth, make the paper and grow the grain. Without them, the growth of our big cities, the high standard of living we enjoy today, would not be possible.

Stuck as you are occasionally on the 401 or the Don Valley Parkway, you may forget the vast size of Canada. Take the fifteen present federal constituencies with the largest area - from the Northwest Territories, the Yukon, my own home of Skeena, through the northern sweep of the provinces to Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador.

Those 15 ridings take up almost 80% of Canada's 3 million, 800 thousand square miles. Those really are the miles of water, forests and minerals. Yet the total electorate in 1974 in those 15 huge ridings was only 530,000.

Eighty percent of the area; 4 percent of the electorate; only 17 percent of the seats. Eighty percent of our country. Indeed that fantastic area with its paucity of people but all its natural resources on which so much of our economy, yes, even your Metro Toronto economy, is based, has seven fewer seats in the House of Commons than that great Toronto.

And it often takes me longer to drive to the airport in my riding than it does for my colleagues here in Toronto to drive to Ottawa.

So the next time you're stuck in the traffic on the Don Valley Parkway, take a look at all of those head office buildings of the insurance companies and computer companies and oil companies and ask yourself "Why should they not be in Kenora or Kitimat?" With the computer and the telephone, distance has become almost irrelevant. And ask yourself what is the real cost, and real benefit to all of us of seeking a new centre of Canada, for the new realities of our "reconfederation" nation.