

Q. IN ORDER TO GEAR CANADA UP FOR MORE TRADE AND TO BE A BETTER INTERNATIONAL TRADER WHO'S GOING TO HAVE A MORE POSITIVE INFLUENCE, WHERE DOES THE DIRECTION AND THE LEADERSHIP HAVE TO COME FROM - FROM GOVERNMENT, FROM BUSINESS, FROM LABOUR, FROM INDIVIDUAL WORKERS, ACADEMICS, WHERE DOES THE INFLUENCE HAVE TO COME FROM?

I think you've really got to get it from the government, you've got to really push the country, I don't think that you can push Canadians though.

P. SO YOU THINK IT HAS TO COME MORE FROM THE GOVERNMENT THAN FROM BUSINESS?

Yeah, business has a big hand in all of this.

I disagree on that, I really think it has to do more with business.

Yeah but they don't bother so the government has got to have incentives, to push.

I think the government should be doing this and talking to business about it. We've got so many forms of government and so many people that we pay to run the governments. As soon as they get in they forget about us, those guys should be working for us.

The government should become competitive.

Q. WHY DOES THE GOVERNMENT WANT TO GET INVOLVED IN THIS INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND THIS INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS?

They should get involved because they're working for us.

Hand in hand, government and business have to say, "Ok, we're going to revamp the system."

I don't care a lot for Margaret Thatcher and her policies but she is a leader, to me Brian Mulroney is a terrible whimp.

I think that Mulroney has let us down terribly, he's a liar and he's sold us down the river.

If there was more money made available for people to become more entrepreneurial, and I don't mean strip clubs in Quebec, but where you didn't need to have a \$20,000 business plan and you didn't need to have a \$300,000 house as collateral. If you have a group of women who want to sew and make something and they needed the money to rent or buy the machines and they took more chances on real small businesses, that could in fact generate more jobs and self-esteem for more people in this country. I think that would be money very well spent whether it came from business or whether it came from government. I work in social services and there are two theories that I want to throw out at you - one is that if people who are going to be on unemployment for a year or on welfare for a year were given all the money up front to do something with, they could in fact do something with a business instead of just having the \$400 a month. If you have \$4,000 or \$5,000 in your pocket some of those people would do something with that money. The other theory is a bit more radical and that is if you took the money that they spend to administer the welfare system, and that means all the salaries that go into paying the bureaucracy that administers the welfare system and you gave that directly to the people, those people would have a significant increase in the amount of money that they have to live on. It would also put a significant number of middle class anglos out of work which would create a whole other unemployment sector.

Q. WHY DO YOU THINK THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD BE LOOKING AT