In companies large and small, people are exploring social media—getting up to speed, educating staff people about the possibilities, and wading in. Some are up to their shins already. Are there ethical considerations attached to web 2.0 that corporations should be considering? The ethicscentre interviewed Mathew Ingram, Globe and Mail technology columnist and blogger, and Seymour Trachimovsky, Division Counsel at GE Water & Process Technologies Canada (also on the ethics centre editorial board) to explore the possibilities.

MATHEW INGRAM: I think the biggest issue is that, whether it's blogs or websites or Facebook or YouTube, social media is really just about effective and distributed publishing tools. And they have given people an easy-to-use and simple (and in most cases free) way of publishing pretty much anything that pops into their head. Before these new media, if you wanted to say something about an issue or about the company you worked for, you had to publish it in some way that took a long time, and in many cases required specialized knowledge. So very few people did that. You could talk about your company or your thoughts about an issue over beers at a bar or at someone's house for dinner but there was a very clear division between that and publishing in the sense that we think of it before the Internet came along. Now, you've got conversations that you might have had in the past are heard at someone's dinner party showing up on blog postings, in MSN conversations, on web pages, and on Facebook and so on. And so I think you've got all the issues, legal and ethical and otherwise, that would pertain to publishing, but they are now being distributed through all these new means of publishing that are incredibly easy to use, fast and cheap.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: Suddenly you're having beers with the world. And it can travel like wildfire. One of the dangers in that is nobody is doing any editing. One of the advantages of buying the Globe and Mail or the New York Times or the Wall Street Journal is it has been edited for accuracy. When we're talking about platforms that everybody can contribute to, it's another matter. There's no question that on balance, these new forms of communication are extremely valuable and positive but they also have potential for a lot of negativity.

MATHEW INGRAM: From a legal point of view, in many cases it's not just what you say or whether you even publish it, but how many people could theoretically have seen it or heard it. If you are standing in a bar and you say something loud enough for 20 people to hear, that's one thing. But if you post something on the Internet where a few million people can see it, that increases the potential liability. At the same time, however, one of the benefits of electronic publishing – whether it's a newspaper's website or a blog – is that you can change something very quickly, whereas if it appears in print to some extent it's always going to be there on microfiche or in a library. Online, a mistake may only exist for a matter of seconds or minutes. And that can actually reduce your liability.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: I suppose that's true on one hand; on the other hand, because there are people out there who are watching everything so carefully, whether or not you are able to do an editing job on your website, there's every likelihood that it has been copied and pasted into somebody's e-mail...
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and whatever and travels around the world at the speed of light.

SHELLY POTTER: Is there specific guidance to give leaders who are thinking about either using new media or wondering if they need to give guidance to their employees?

MATHEW INGRAM: When I talk about these things with companies, I talk about the fact that there's no way to put the genie back in the bottle. You can't un-invent the Internet. You can't un-invent Facebook. And in most cases, it's very difficult, if not impossible, to prevent people from using all of these tools at some point. You can block them from using Facebook at work. You can keep them from accessing certain sites at work and you can even try and do it at home, but in the end, I think to some extent you're fighting a losing battle. People are going to use these tools and they're going to say things and I think what we need to do is educate or try and encourage employees to use them wisely and to realize that when they say something, it's not just between them and their small group of friends who are reading that Facebook page. Theoretically, it's available to everyone. And so it then becomes much closer to publishing than to just having a chat with someone.

And I think even a lot of the people who are using these tools don't understand that—particularly younger people. They don't appreciate the risks or the dangers of what they are saying getting out to a larger audience. So I think education is the first step.

SHELLY POTTER: If the spirit of social media is more about participation and contribution – conversations in all directions – and if corporations are used to more controlled communication, what do leaders need to consider before wading in?

MATHEW INGRAM: It's definitely a conceptual shift that companies have to come to terms with. You can't use these tools effectively – or at least I don't think it makes sense to use them – unless you change the way you're thinking about how you interact with people through those tools and why you're doing it. Every company is not likely to want to sort of dive in head first and may not even need to. But I'm willing to bet that the number of companies that don't need to use social media, or wouldn't get any benefit, are pretty small. If you focus only on the risks, then you are going to miss the fact that there are benefits to opening up a dialogue with your customers, your users, your constituents.

SHELLY POTTER: Can most companies benefit from social media? It sounds like you're saying yes.

MATHEW INGRAM: I think so. One of the most obvious benefits that I like to suggest to companies is that this is effectively free market research. And you can get a far broader cross-section theoretically of people than you would through say a normal phone survey or people standing in a shopping mall, stopping people as they walk by.

SHELLY POTTER: Companies traditionally would do this through much more controlled and closed channels. So if you're willing to take the benefit, you also have to be prepared to also take the candid comments and, sometimes, negative reactions.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: In that regard, that's exactly what they would want because if you are doing market research you want the negatives as well as the positives. I was thinking that, to use an automotive analogy, we are at the Model T stage. We've only been using the web capabilities in this more social form for about 10 years—with huge uptake in just the past few years. As with anything, we have to evolve in our understanding of how to use it. It's like email was a few years ago – everybody should be extremely alert that just as it allows you to say smart things, it allows you to say stupid things very quickly and have it travel around the world. So think about it.

MATHEW INGRAM: That's right and the same applies to posting things on Facebook or MSN chats or blogs. Companies have to find a way of responding to these things because they are going to happen. It's not as though you can stick your head in the sand and hope that nothing bad happens. Start thinking today about
how you’re going to deal with that eventuality. If someone is saying something negative about you or your company—something either true but unpleasant or wrong and unpleasant—the most effective way of dealing with that is to have a means of response yourself. Have your own corporate blog, where you can address things directly and get the information that you want out there out there. The only effective response to bad comments or bad information about you or your company is good comments and good information from your side on your own blog.

SHELLY POTTER: I wonder if some companies might take another view.

MATHEW INGRAM: Some companies would probably argue that it’s better just to stay silent and to effectively to not dignify those sorts of things with a response and hope that they don’t turn into something negative. I think that strategy works right up until it fails. And this is where, in the ultimate corporate nightmare, negative things said about you on someone’s blog start showing up higher and higher in a Google search for your company, until all of a sudden those are the number-one results.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: You can’t ignore these things any longer. You know, you could ignore things that might have been said in an obscure newsletter or a local newspaper but I think anything you put on paper these days or at least on the web, you can assume it’s going to reach the world. It’s a challenge to keep up with the proliferation of sites, but you’ve got to go out there and stay ahead of it. The biggest problem is instead of tracking a hundred sources or a couple of hundred sources, leading journals, newsletters, or newspapers that might mention your company, you have to track the entire Internet or 50 million blogs.

MATHEW INGRAM: There are several services that will do that. There’s one called BuzzLogic and there are a couple of others that do similar things. And your P.R. company can easily create keyword searches and Google keyword searches in blog engines and so on that track your company’s name and any variety of sort of adjectives or nouns that you want, and then create RSS feeds of those terms. It’s a good way to give you a sense of when something is turning into an issue or when it’s bubbling up and could flare up and become something larger.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: There is an underlying challenge—the predilection in many organizations to reject information that is inconsistent with their own beliefs. The challenge is to be open enough, if you’re getting negative feedback, to take that feedback objectively and go back and look at the product that you’re selling or the activity you’re conducting, and making the appropriate adjustments. It’s challenging, but it’s important to avoid rejecting the information and telling yourself the person doesn’t know what they’re talking about.

MATHEW INGRAM: And just as we have to question our reactions, we also have to question how we use the technology. As far as ethical behaviour is concerned, it’s hard in some cases to draw a line because there are so many different ways of using these types of tools. I can think of a couple of companies that paid people to pretend to be users of their products and go on to various discussion groups and blogs and say positive things about the product under assumed names. In some sense you’re trying to use the tool the way it’s meant to be used—as a means of conversation amongst people who share interests—but at the same time, you’re paying people to pretend to be something they are not. It may achieve the goals that you wanted and get positive comments about your product out there, but as soon as someone finds out, they’re going to look at your company pretty negatively. It’s effectively fraud, or it verges on fraud and you’ll find yourself actually further in the hole in terms of trust with your customer base than you were before you tried that strategy.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: Yes, and you probably will never recover your reputation if you’re caught with your pants down with something like that. It might work for a brief period of time, but in the grand scheme of things, you’re taking an awfully big risk. Failing to disclose who you are is clearly, beyond argument, an ethical violation.

MATHEW INGRAM: If I were a company looking at these types of tools, all I would try to do is point out that these are tools that are designed to help people connect and have some form of conversation. It’s called conversational media in some cases and I think that stresses the idea that it’s much more like people getting together over a beer or over dinner than it is like publishing. If you think about your company and the way you approach your marketing or your public relations or your sort of external sales efforts, try to think about how you would approach someone if you were actually standing there talking to them, face to face. If you ran into someone in a bar and they said, “Oh, I love that new LG LCD TV” would you, if you worked for LG, start talking to them about the TV and how great it is and how other people’s products are inferior, without telling them that you worked at LG? I doubt it because that would feel wrong. I think it’s easier to do when you’re sitting at your computer because the people that you’re talking to seem sort of faceless or nameless or impersonal. But I think if you approach it from the point of view of what type of behaviour would I think was appropriate if I was actually in a group of people talking, then I think that gives you a kind of a handy tool to look at what you’re doing and whether it’s right or not.
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The Ethics of Aging
By Flip Oberth

If you look into the mirror one morning and spot an extra grey hair – or even your first – take some solace in that you are not alone, figuratively speaking. Canada’s demographics increasingly indicate an aging population. The 2006 Census shows that Canadians’ median age is now 39.5 years. Even increasing immigration, which helps to provide for a higher rate of population growth, is not slowing the aging of Canada’s population. Also in 2006, the number of Canadians aged 80 or more topped one million (1.2 million) for the first time. Nearly two-thirds of those aged at least 80 are women. The numbers of our centenarians rose more than 22 per cent since the 2001 Census, with 4,635 people aged 100 or more. Latest population projections from Statistics Canada estimate that the number of centenarians in Canada could triple to more than 14,000 by 2031. Those aged between 55 and 64 - many still in the Canadian workforce but approaching retirement – stood at 3.7 million in 2006. In Quebec, more than one million people are aged 65 or more - that’s one in seven Quebecois.

For those of our readers who are baby-boomers – people born in the 20 year period following World War II (1946-1965) – you and your fellow boomers were aged between 41 and 60 in 2006. Almost one in three Canadians is a baby boomer. While Canadians are aging, with 65 year olds and older making up almost 14 per cent of Canada’s population, Statistics Canada reports that the proportion of the under-15 population fell to 17.7 per cent – the lowest that we have yet seen. The Prairie Provinces have the highest proportions of children under age 15, with almost one in five in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in 2006.

Age is one of several prohibited grounds of discrimination under Canada’s provincial human rights codes, as well as for federally-regulated employers. In 2006, seven per cent of signed complaints received by the Canadian Human Rights Commission cited age as a prohibited ground. Disability-based complaints comprised 41 per cent, followed by sex (16 per cent), national or ethnic origin (10 per cent) and race (10 per cent). Of these, employment-related complaints comprised 73 per cent of all complaints. In Ontario, Human Rights Code amendments came into force on December 12, 2006 to reflect the end of “mandatory retirement” and to protect all persons aged 18 and over against discrimination in employment on the basis of their age. (Some employment positions may be able to defend mandatory retirement based on bona fide occupational requirements.) Prior to this date, the Code did not protect discrimination in employment against persons aged 65 or older. The Ontario Human Rights Commission also updated its Policy on Discrimination Against Older Persons because of Age in February, 2007. While the amendments in Ontario may be welcome to many the interesting ethical twist – from this editor’s perspective – is that Canadian human rights codes do not yet provide for protection from age discrimination for those under 18.

While Codes provide a legislative framework, in practice, many employees perceive that ageism continues within organizations, particularly at the point of hiring and during corporate downsizing. “Young” and “old” individuals face potential discrimination based on age. Younger workers may be seen to lack adequate experience or credentials, while older workers (especially those over age 50) can be seen to lack energy and enthusiasm and to pose a greater risk to employers in terms of benefits costs and time off. Questions may be raised with respect to return on investment in training older workers and whether such an investment should instead be diverted to those with “career potential.”

While ageism reflects attitudes that make assumptions about older persons and their abilities, both ends of the spectrum – “young” and “old” raise ethical considerations. More seniors and fewer children undoubtedly will have far-reaching affects upon Canada’s infrastructure. Statistics Canada projects that the number of seniors aged 65 and more could outnumber children aged less than 15 within 10 years. The first baby-boomers turn 65 in 2011. Canada’s fertility rate of 1.6 children per woman is below replacement level and is a key consideration in Canada’s immigration policies. The good news is that Canadians have an increasing life expectancy (currently 82.5 years for women and 77.7 years for men). More Canadians are not only reaching the age of 65 but are also living longer.

The not-so-good news is that the projection of a doubling of Canadian seniors in the next 25 years places the viability of the Canada Pension Plan in jeopardy. Will a declining younger workforce be forced to pay through increased CPP contributions? Our over-burdened health care, already perceived by many to be in crisis, will be stretched significantly beyond its limits. If current eight and nine hour waits in the ER seem intolerable, perhaps these will pale in comparison in the near future. How might an aging population affect the pragmatic decisions that must be made with respect to treatment options, surgical elections and palliative care beds? Long-term care facilities already have lengthy wait lists of up to four years across the country. The crisis is real and may challenge ethical decision-making with respect to who gets what and in what order.
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The aging of the Canadian workforce also affects employers, the nature of pension plans that might be offered and the costs to those companies that provide employees with health and dental benefits plans. Employers will need to manage the challenges associated with four generations in a multi-generational workforce. Recruitment and selection decisions may need to be made by thinking more and more out of the box. With soon-to-retire baby-boomers amid an anticipated skills shortage on the very near horizon, we may not see a buyer’s market for employers. Might there be a growing – and perhaps a real challenge to ethical considerations – bidding war for “young” talent alongside growing re-employment of former employees as “consultants”? For some companies and for current job seekers, the perception of “double dipping” for those who collect a pension from a company while on contract post-retirement with the same company, poses an ethical issue. While many corporations currently place a ban on re-employment of former employees on pension, skills shortages may reverse such policies.

The relatively high rate of defined benefit pension plans offered by some large employers, – including the public service – along with indexed pension plans, has already raised a red flag in terms of sustainability. Some employers have “grandfathered” groups of employees while introducing non-defined benefit plans for new hires. While at first blush this may appear to be a practical solution, it also creates a greater ethical divide between those employees who have more provident plans and those who do not. And it is the taxpayer who must foot the bill for retired civil servants.

The advertising and marketing industries have been quick to recognize Canada’s changing demographics and are targeting more products and services with explicit “Grey Power” messaging. Look for discount insurance ads, an increasing number of home care aids targeted to seniors and travel geared to the image of a more youthful, energetic and adventurous senior. Retirement is often portrayed as a magical world in which sound investments made earlier in life – for those who have money to invest and who can weather market volatilities – will make one’s dreams come true in retirement. Retirement in this century may indeed be vastly different from former generations, but it won’t always be a rosy picture for all.

Advertising agencies have also played it both ways and have become more gender-neutral. If this infers a compliment, read on. In developed nations – previously referred to as the “First World” – women have long been bombarded with anti-aging products and services. Slowly yet surely, men are now falling prey to the same advertising modus operandi. Recall the man with greying hair who can’t get a date – until he colours his beard. Reference too the businessman with apparently-overnight grey hair. He feels isolated, even shunned – until he too reaches for hair colouring. The cosmetics, aesthetics, holistic health and pharmaceutical industries have thrived on “anti-aging” themes purported to help us not only live longer and better lives, but to look good doing so. But some ads are also telling a somewhat different story by their apparent acceptance and approval and – perhaps – capitalizing of aging.

Statistics Canada reports that people are retiring earlier. In your company’s experience, is the average age of retirement in Canada increasing or declining? Will the end of “mandatory retirement” in Ontario change this picture? Please send comments to the Editor@ethicscentreCA.

Navigating Web 2.0
Continued from Page 5

SHELLY POTTER: Does the advent of social computing make it easier or harder to recover after an ethical lapse?

MATHEW INGRAM: I think in many cases it can actually make it easier to recover from negative events. I’ve looked into a few cases where companies got into trouble for either not being transparent or not being responsive enough, but they made up for it by jumping in there and responding to people honestly and openly. I think if you’re prepared to open up as a company and acknowledge you made a mistake, prove you’re listening and trying to make things better, the more credit you get — even if you don’t fix the problems immediately.

SEYMOUR TRACHIMOVSKY: Yes, and there have been a number of examples that are consistent with what you’re saying. You know, the companies that go out and deal candidly and take the bull by the horns I think in general have survived difficult situations quite intact.

MATHEW INGRAM: And I think the hardest thing is to overcome is when you delay your response. I think the typical response from companies and their PR representatives is to go into bunker mode and spend hours and days going over your strategy and how you’re going to sort of get the message out and how you’re going to attack this problem. To some extent, the longer you take to do that, the harder it is going to be to get out of the hole that you’re in.
The 

Federal Accountability Act

A Legislative Update from Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP

The Federal Accountability Act, formerly Bill C-2, received Royal Assent on December 12, 2006. The purpose of this omnibus statute is to increase transparency and make the Federal Government (the “Government”) more accountable to the public. The statute covers a broad range of accountability issues in the public sector, addressing such matters as ensuring government appointees are suitably qualified, reforming the rules applicable to financing of political parties, strengthening the role of the Ethics Commission and providing real and adequate protection for whistleblowers.

In accordance with its terms, different sections of the Federal Accountability Act come into force at different times. The most recent set of provisions to come into force amend the Access to Information Act (the “ATIA”) effective September 1, 2007 (the “September Amendments”).

The ATIA is the statute which provides Canadians with a right of access to information held by government institutions, subject to certain limited exceptions. A set of amendments to the ATIA through the Federal Accountability Act came into force on April 1, 2007. These amendments expanded the coverage of the ATIA to include the Canadian Wheat Board, Crown corporations, agents of Parliament and government-funded foundations.

The September Amendments will go even further. They will clarify certain definitions in the ATIA and expand the ATIA’s coverage, delineate the duty to provide access to information exigent upon government institutions and exclude from compliance with the ATIA certain government-related institutions.

Expanded Coverage. In addition to any department or ministry of the state of the Government, the definition of a “government institution” will be expanded to include any parent Crown corporation and wholly-owned subsidiary of such a corporation.

Expenses. The definition of “expenses” will be expanded to include specific examples of travel expenses that must be provided when requested. The ATIA also clarifies that information that relates to travel expenses such as lodging and hospitality will be specifically treated as information related to the “general administration of a government institution”, which generally must be provided when requested.

Government duty. An amendment to s. 4 of the ATIA will require government institutions to make “every reasonable effort” to assist a person who makes a request for access to information. This will require the institution in question to respond to requests accurately and completely without regard to the identity of the requester, and on a timely basis.

Economic Interests. A section to protect the economic interests of designated government institutions by allowing the head of a government institution to refuse to disclose any record related to trade secrets or financial, commercial or technical information that belongs to, and has consistently been treated as confidential by these institutions, has also been introduced. This shield will also be extended to information belonging to the Canada Post Corporation, Export Development Canada, the Public Sector Pension Investment Board and VIA Rail Canada Inc. It also requires disclosure of information that relates to the general administration of these institutions or, in the case of Canada Post, any activity of the Corporation fully subsidized by moneys appropriated by Parliament.

Third Party Interests. In the same spirit of protecting sensitive interests, the September Amendments also extend the requirement to refuse to disclose confidential information received from third parties to the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and the National Arts Centre Corporation. The heads of these institutions may refuse to disclose information obtained in confidence from a third party if they have consistently treated the information or advice as confidential.

The last of the September Amendments will exclude certain institutions from the full ambit of the Access to Information Act. Subject to the general administration disclosure exception, these will include the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

The September Amendments do not conclude the changes that are contemplated by the Federal Accountability Act. Several sections of the Federal Accountability Act remain unproclaimed, most notably the amendments to the Lobbyists Registration Act, which will be renamed the Lobbying Act. These amendments will, among other things, create a number of new independent “officers of Parliament” all of whom will be vested with substantial investigatory powers to ensure that lobbying is done in a transparent and ethical way. The Lobbying Act will also significantly increase the reporting requirements for all corporate and consulting lobbyists in contact with designated public office holders of the Government. 🚗
The approaching end of another year provides an opportunity to reflect upon the Centre’s achievements during 2007. Membership – individual and corporate – has steadily increased, providing tangible encouragement to the directors and staff whose time and efforts result in activities and products attractive and meaningful to our members and others interested in business ethics.

We have continued to attract high caliber speakers for the Speaker Series lunches as evidenced from the diverse and interesting roster of the past year (in alphabetical order: Tom Caldwell of Caldwell Securities – the hollowing out of corporate Canada; Mary Graham of Starbucks – the business case for CSR; Claude Lamoureux of the Ontario Teachers’ Pension Fund – the ethics of financial reporting; Richard Pound – ethics and sport; Professor Rick Powers of the Rotman School of Management – executive compensation; Ontario Ombudsman André Marin – puffery, the public trust and public agencies and corporations; and Gwyn Morgan, retired CEO of EnCana – the values drift). The past year has also seen us move our Speaker Series events to a new home, the Albany Club. The Club’s main dining-room has proved to be an ideal venue for our meetings providing up-to-date technology, excellent food and friendly, efficient staff.

At the December 5 lunch featuring Ontario’s Ombudsman, we launched our “student table”, welcoming students from the Rotman School of Management at U of T and the Schulich School of Business at York University. At subsequent Speaker Series lunches the Centre will continue to sponsor a table of students from the business schools of universities in the GTA. This will allow business students to hear speakers on topics related to business ethics while having the opportunity to meet members of the business community.

The Centre has continued to publish its newsletter Management Ethics under the leadership of Flip Oberth and her Editorial Board. One of the challenges of producing a successful newsletter is coming up with topics of interest to the readers. In this regard, Flip welcomes your suggestions for topics for future pieces as well as submissions of articles related to corporate ethics, CSR, corporate governance and the like.

In the New Year we will continue our successful Speaker Series as well as increase the number of “member only” informal breakfast sessions. The latest such event featured one of the Centre’s directors, Louise Cannon, Senior Vice-President Compliance of Scotia Bank, speaking on the efforts made at the bank to manage reputational risks. Louise provided a very interesting and candid description of the bank’s employee training and communications programs.

The Centre has another project, referred to internally as the “Codes Project”, which is nearing completion. This has involved a review of the literature on corporate codes of conduct by Professors Scott Carson and Mark Baetz of Queen’s School of Business. The project will conclude with the publication of a report which will include article summaries, a bibliography by industry as well as recommendations on best practices.

I have thoroughly enjoyed my first year as Executive Director of the Centre. In addition to my involvement in the events and projects noted above, I have participated in conferences as an invited speaker, liaised with other ethics organizations, met with representatives of our corporate members as well as other organizations we would like to welcome as members and generally had the opportunity to engage in interesting and stimulating conversations with a variety of individuals interested in corporate ethics.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Centre’s members for their continued support which enables the Centre to fulfill its mission which is to champion the application of ethical values in the decision-making process of business and other organizations. I am also grateful for the support members of the board of directors (including the two Chairs to whom I have reported over the past year – Christina Donely and Derek Hayes) and to Lois Marsh, the Centre’s administrative assistant. The Ethics Centre has a great team and I am indeed fortunate to be one of its members.

May the New Year bring peace, health, love and friendship to you and continued success to the Ethics Centre.

Hélène Yaremko-Jarvis, B.C.L., LL.B.
Executive Director
December 13, 2007
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