

7:03 p.m.

Friday, May 24, 1991

[Deputy Chairman: Mr. Schumacher]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would you come to order. This is the second session of this committee in Calgary today. The Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform would like to welcome you all to this session. I will quickly introduce the members of the committee and move on to the presentations, because we found during our first session that time certainly becomes a premium, and we want to allow and permit as much participation on behalf of Albertans as we possibly can.

Commencing with my colleague on my right, the Hon. Nancy Betkowski, MLA for Edmonton-Glenora; then Stockwell Day, MLA for Red Deer-North; beside him is Bob Hawkesworth, MLA for Calgary-Mountain View; beside him is our host of today, the Member for Calgary-Buffalo, in which we presently are, Sheldon Chumir. Moving across the table: our newest MLA, Barrie Chivers, MLA for Edmonton-Strathcona; and on my left, the Hon. Dennis Anderson, Member for Calgary-Currie. I'm Stan Schumacher, MLA for Drumheller.

Our first presenter this evening is Heinz Barkan. I'd invite Heinz to come to the table.

I just should say before starting that the schedule has been designed so that we could accommodate people in 15-minute segments, and we'll do our very, very best to stay with that.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Barkan.

MR. BARKAN: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I represent a small group, the Calgary South Citizens Committee. It's a group of men and women who felt that we're not properly represented at the federal level and have found it necessary to create a movement. We have about 50 committed members, if you may call them such, and we feel we can aggregate about a thousand votes. Unfortunately, they are not in the same jurisdiction.

You have my presentation. Modesty and good upbringing prevent me from actually saying what was said and what the opinion is of the ladies and gentlemen, mostly ladies as a matter of fact. I'm very much surprised at the concern of women in politics on what is going on in Canada. This is why it is a refreshing contribution. Most contributions, of course, are biased, and very few people have the opportunity to present an opinion such as we do. I will read.

Shortly after the devastating victory of the federal Progressive Conservative Party, the need was to find a way to represent the 60 percent or so of Canadian people who found that party unacceptable and loathsome. The Calgary Southwest district was the first one to react. I'm talking about federal. After it became known that very rapid action to protect the citizens and political entities was urgent, the good citizens of Calgary Southeast federal district became interested, and the movement by the name of the Calgary South Citizens Committee was born and informally charged to apprise the citizens of the area of irregularities in the federal administration and ways to express the wishes of those emasculated citizens who were and are denied a voice in Ottawa.

Then came Meech Lake. Meech Lake was created for the benefit of Quebec by Quebec supremacists. Canada and Canadians escaped one of the greatest dangers in its history by the failure of this infamous document. Indeed, one must be grateful to all those outstanding patriots who were instrumental to avert the diabolical Meech and its resulting damage done by

those who sided with Quebec against Canada. With a new onslaught by Quebec, apparently aided and abetted by Ottawa, to destroy our country, the great peril we have escaped became clear for all to see.

"Lest we forget" and "stand on guard" must become the battle cries of all informed Canadians from now on. We must still be alert to the dangers that lurk in potent fury within the walls of the Parliament Building in Ottawa and in the back rooms of our rulers and are kept secret from us. We have let ourselves be lulled into a false sense of security by trusting those that are now betraying us, and we are now called, perhaps for the last time, to come to the defence of Canada.

It started with the leadership of Lester B. Pearson, who laid the foundation of the house that shall destroy Canada. His motives are well known. His preoccupation with the promotion of world communism is now recorded history. A weakened Canada would have facilitated the destruction and eventual control of our nation. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the fanatic Quebec supremacist and radical left-wing politician, erected the walls of that house, but it took Martin Brian Mulroney, the fanatic Quebec supremacist, to attempt to complete that house by placing the roof to top it off, and he almost succeeded with Meech.

We Canadians, new and old, of every race, creed, or colour, would take note that every committee, board, or what have you connected with the Constitution is chaired by someone who sided with Quebec against Canada. Those who only a few months ago sided with Quebec supremacists are now again controlling the constitutional inquiries. If we want to save our great country, we must take matters in our own hands. This must be done without violence but must be decisive and undeterred. We must write and speak for our beleaguered Canada at every opportunity, on Moscow enemies, and we must be steadfast in our resolve to defend our country with every shred of our being whenever we think, whenever we speak, whenever we write, indeed in all our waking hours. When Canada and Canadians are free, one nation, and the evil which now occupies this nation, its oppression, shall be no more, think of the great future that awaits us.

We should also recapture the wealth created by our sweat and blood and extracted from us. We must recover the worldly and material wealth that has been taken from us by our oppressors. It's not so much for ourselves but for those generations of free Canadians yet to come. A tribunal shall be created entirely composed of Canadians, duly selected and chosen by Canadians, not political appointees who can be manipulated and are expected to serve those that appointed them to those lucrative positions, as we have seen in the past, but really honourable men and women, just and concerned but firm and steadfast in their determination to see that justice is done. Those who have taken from us will have to make restitution. Those who have betrayed us, committed crimes, or debauched Canada and its people will have to pay the price like those before them in Nuremberg. This is not just a dream. The world helped feed Saddam Hussein; surely it could help us in our need and render MBM, Martin Brian Mulroney, harmless. We are Canadians, and we are strong. We have suffered, and we have survived Pearson, Trudeau, and Mulroney and their insensitivity, arrogance, and the ineffable debauchery by Ottawa. Now is the time to stand up to be counted.

This is a condensed form of our manifesto, tuned down a little bit, in good taste. Those who seek to take away our human freedom - that is, take away the right of the people to make their own decisions - are evil people. They are not consciously,

necessarily vicious but are serving the antinature purposes of negative and evil, and the horrifying thing is that it is usually done in the name of justice and good, and though it is to take away our freedom, is good lest we misuse it. In Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, and now Quebec, Canada, people who have the guts to resist totalitarian powers around them are very rare. There were and possibly are in these jurisdictions as well as in our own country those who don't like what is going on, but most manage to convince themselves that things we hear about are not really happening. The point is that even when tyranny is brutal and obviously diabolic, very few people will stand up to it. The majority shrug their shoulders, make excuses, or climb on the bandwagon. When it is done subtly and the only person to be heard is someone else, not us or I, then the incentive to rebel or even complain is greatly reduced.

People who want to take away political freedom don't begin by saying they wish to take away or destroy liberty. They begin by playing on the prejudices against certain groups whether it's Jews, blacks, Roman Catholics, reds, or, as now, non-Quebeckers. Nonpure line, you know, as it is now called. They are able to use the divide and conquer method. They set up some of the population against the rest, and the manipulators end up with the power. The Keith Spicer commission, et al, are good examples. The enemies of freedom will profit. The beginning of fascist victory occurs when some self-appointed group of supervisors establishes that it has the right to decide individual behaviour. Dr. Victor Goldblum is alleged to have received large amounts of tax moneys to author the original Bill 20 which became Bill 21 and finally the infamous Bill 101, the first explicit pure racist legislation in Canada, and he got away with it. This is another abridged speech to Canadians.

7:13

The disregard of those who pledge to represent us and the contention by the Ottawa-Quebec axis on the consequent immunity of those involved in wrongdoing stirs the fires of discontent and cries out for repair. Unashamed discrimination by our servants goes not only unpunished but is ignored. The agent representing the Calgary Southwest district for Ottawa has been made aware of these goings-on. The minister responsible has been shifted to another portfolio. Corruption and incompetence in this department still prevail. In the meantime, that same minister has been assigned, you know, to supervise the department.

As a Canadian living in western Canada, there is no recourse. A result of the administration in Ottawa which cannot be touched is the latest rulings. Mr. Harvie André, faced with more criminal accusations alleged to have been committed by his colleagues, has taken care to protect his confrères from Quebec even if convicted. Our files show that a Quebec politician who suffers from claustrophobia, is stir-crazy, is housed in a hotel instead of in jail where he belongs. So much for asymmetric laws.

Mr. Joe Clark has been commissioned to sell an asymmetric Constitution. It was not so long ago that this very same Joe Clark urged members of the African National Congress in South Africa to necklace proponents of that system: no good in South Africa but perhaps good in Canada. Well, who is supposed to speak for Canada and Canadians? Mulroney, the unashamed Quebec supremacist who said I'm a Canadian just like you and I a few months ago and now says he wants to be distinct and separate? Mr. Chretien, who when the Deputy Prime Minister openly stated that we must stop the economic power of western Canada, we must destroy western Canada, June 1979 - it's in

*Hansard* - and promptly created the national energy program, will make good his word. Where was Mr. Chretien then? And the other - the lady from Yukon: after the Ontario disaster I do believe that only those that are fanatics will support her. Maybe the Reform Party will be forced to assume that role.

No decision taken by the present administration must be allowed to stand. With only a handful of Canadians not outraged and opposed to that administration, we would be entirely disregarding the slightest pretense of democracy. An election or a plebiscite, not a referendum, which allows all Canadians to participate, naming the options and allowing Canadians to exercise their franchise is the only answer. Those who did not affix their signature to the infamous Meech are by their submission partially to abstain or made harmless in any part of the plebiscite. There are only two of those still in office. Those who did affix their signature to the infamous . . . It is alleged that many supporters of Meech have large bank accounts in Swiss banks. Alleged. Considering their background, this could very well be so. They should be allowed to have their same rights to participate and a bowl of lentil soup but no more. This should be made law, and disobedience should be punishable by a stiff jail sentence.

We are presently working on a just method of amending the Constitution which would hopefully alleviate most asymmetry and injustices in the Charter of Rights that can be adhered to. As an added remark, I just received the details.

Anyhow, this is my submission. If you want to have some more details, I'm a Quebec refugee. I have seen atrocities which were committed in Nazi Germany. I myself come from Europe, and I have strongly opposed and even fought in this war against my brethren because I do not believe in this system and I don't see, you know, why we in Canada should suffer this. I have seen the crystal night in Quebec when windows were broken because there was an English sign. I have seen the little preschool children, their faces bashed into bloody pulps - photographs on request - by the goons that wanted to indoctrinate them with their philosophy. I see with her that we are not far behind here. I know of a case where a handicapped got thrown out in order to facilitate the institution of French indoctrination of children. I've seen a school, \$26 million, named after Lester B. Pearson. I see signs here that worry me and that scare me. I may have offended some people, but I don't think I was strong enough.

I have a solution. We have several solutions. We discussed it. We are told, and we are scared, that if Quebec separates, we are going to die. Quebec is not going to separate. I don't think anyone here present thinks that Quebec will ever separate. They will not. But if there are some Quebeckers that do want to separate . . . I am a charter member and cofounder of the freedom of choice movement. We are some people that are known here perhaps: Eugene Forsey, Dr. Shaw, Dr. Hemsley, Dr. Lee - they call it, actually, the doctor's movement, because there are so many doctors involved in it - Mordecai Richler, Roger Doucet. He's dead now. He used to sing *O Canada* at the hockey games. Actually, we're not fighting but strongly supporting bilingualism. What happened was we were called racists because bilingualism doesn't go in eastern Canada. It is French, and you have to be pure line. As our propaganda minister Mr. Marcel Masse said, he doesn't want to have bilingual people around him, he doesn't want to have French-speaking people around him, he wants Quebeckers who have to be pure line.

Now, culture is fine, and we all should . . . How much have I got?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, we're about at the 15 minutes already, Heinz.

MR. BARKAN: Okay. In that case, I think I drove my point home.

I say this without malice, and I overcompensate. The words used in my group are much stronger, and we're much more to the point. I neither believe in radicalism nor in violence. I have seen too much in my 69 years of life and travel three times around the world.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Is there anything anybody wants to ask? I can substantiate everything I said.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Barkan.  
Our next presenter is Joshua Adeoshun. Welcome.

MR. ADEOSHUN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be here today. I'm going to make mine very short now, and I hope everybody will listen carefully because it's something that is brewing in our society. Although we always have promises upon promises from politicians, as soon as they get that title MLA or MP attached to their name, they forget everybody, and they think Canada is okay.

First of all I want to talk about the abolition of multicultural policy, and then I will go into provision of strong employment equity in a new Canada. I will start with the abolition of multiculturalism.

7:23

Well, the present policy by the federal, provincial, and local governments is a way of creating strong unity and interaction among Canadians, also a system whereby people can learn about each other's cultural heritages and religious beliefs. Without any doubt the system has developed to emotional segregation, hostility towards each other, and formation of more hatred groups in our society. It is visible in our country that the thresholds of tolerances among Canadian citizens are growing tenser every day, and in due course the friendly atmosphere attached to the meaning of the policy may turn to irreparable havoc beyond the control of everybody, not to mention generations to come.

To my view, the policy is creating public awareness to some Canadians that some Canadians' cultures are being fine-tuned to suit others' culture at the expense of those who have adapted themselves to their old culture. We should also notice the fragmentation of our society's neighbourly love; it is dwindling moment by moment, resulting in our community's negative integration as the population grows. So without any hesitation our government should find a solution before the tension explodes beyond repair. They should allow each individual or family to practise their religion, culture, or heritage in their domain without any interferences. The government should assist in funding education for new immigrants whose mother tongue is not English or French. Also, create loans or bursaries for those who wish to upgrade their professional qualifications so as to meet Canadian standards.

That's about multiculturalism. It's a little bit short, but I hope you guys can understand it.

I have to go into the employment equity now. While the Canadian government is showing its active role to teach democracy to the outside world, it is very shameful that in Canada people are still being treated like second-class citizens, from blacks to native Indians and women. It is ironical that we are fighting to eliminate injustices in South Africa, freedom of

movement and expression in Russia, and even risk lives of our armed forces during the Gulf war so as to bring new world orders. But here in our country many are being denied employment because of their gender, colour, race, and creed.

It is an absurdity to learn that the government at all levels – whether federal, provincial, or local city hall – hired 7 percent of minorities to their work forces in the past five years. Needless to say that some races cannot be trusted to any supervisory positions. Also, it gave opportunities to many Canadian industries that have been skeptical about hiring women engineers, native Indians, and blacks.

Nobody ever does any follow-up to research upon research done to eliminate unequal justice in our society, simply because they are too afraid to lose majority votes. As long as black graduates can drive taxicabs on our roads and then wash dishes in restaurants and deliver mail to their white classmates, or women can remain in our kitchens, natives locked up in their reserves, Canadian society is happy. We don't care. Do our politicians care to find solutions as to why our correctional centres are being overcrowded with nonwhites or native Indians, youths, or why we have many teen pregnancies in one race compared with others? The answer is no, as long as Quebec is recognized as a distinct society.

The future of Canada is not in the hands of French- or English-speaking Canadians; it is in the hands of everybody including our youths.

That's it. It's a little bit short, but I don't have time to . . . They say it's 15 minutes, seven minutes reading and then rebuttal. So if you have a question, you can ask me, but as far as I'm concerned, you guys notice it and everybody has their own conscience. So when you go down to your office, you make a research upon research and find out what I've said. It's nothing like a lie there. We have so many graduate students from the University of Calgary, University of Alberta, universities all over Canada, driving taxicabs. Is that a way of life in the new Canada? That's what is passing as a democratic country, where one race has to be deprived of their rights to work. It's not only that particular person. You are mistreating their family, because if a man doesn't have work, his children will suffer. Then the whole country suffers.

I've been to Ontario, and I've seen so many areas where they said that it's even tougher, where black kids are dropping out of schools every day. What they're doing is just engaging in drugs, selling drugs, and illegal means. Every day we land in the news on television, how they engaged with policemen. These are innocent policemen, but the conditions makes them hostile to people. It's not the question of these people; it's the question of the government and the politicians we elected. The only time we shake hands with the politicians is when the election comes. They talk to you, they come to your house, make you sit down: I do everything, make you happy, this and that. As soon as they are elected, there goes the freedom of everybody, back again to the old idea. So if you wanted to make new Canadians, remember that it's not only French- and English-speaking you have in Canada. You have people from various disciplines and various cultures, and whenever we deny them, we should take a look at our southern borders, the United States of America. They could have repaired it. Now it's costing them millions and millions of dollars to save the lives of innocent citizens, and I hope it doesn't happen to Canada.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just a minute. There may be some questions.

Bob.

**MR. HAWKESWORTH:** Okay. I'll jump in. I'd like to ask you two questions. I appreciate your presentation this evening. As far as our committee's mandate is concerned, I think two questions present themselves. One is: what are your views about the role of the provincial government in immigration policy? To what extent should the province of Alberta, for example, determine immigration to Canada or to Alberta? Secondly, from your point of view, which level of government, the federal or the provincial level, has been stronger or more effective in promoting human rights or protecting against racism?

**MR. ADEOSHUN:** Well, the last question first, because my brain is still fresh. I can tell you that none of the governments have ever improved their levels of equal rights. You know, they print it, in their forums they say it, but it's still there. You can understand that whenever there's job openings for a position in the federal government, they put it in the paper. We have about 300 whites that applied, and only 10 blacks applied. If you calculate the mathematical aspect of it, that means that the chances of those black guys, even when they are qualified, to get that job are limited. So I don't know what they want to do about it.

Then about the provincial government. Actually, I don't know what Mr. Don Getty's doing.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I guess your answer, Joshua, would be that they're both the same.

**MR. ADEOSHUN:** Yeah, both the same.

Then the other one, on immigration. I'm not a politician and never dwell or inquire about immigration, what it is. I only know about what is happening in our society and my view about Canada as a whole. The immigration has never been good to us since the beginning. For instance, now people from Africa, they only give us 1 percent of immigration; 1 percent while Britain is having about almost 16 percent or 20 percent.

Then I wanted to make clear to all the Canadians and Calgarians sitting down here today that I've been hearing recently about dropping down the standard of hiring minorities. I would think that it is just an absurdity for people to think that way, because many blacks who apply for jobs know that they are qualified or think they are qualified. That's why they apply for that job. They don't seek any favour from anybody. Most of them have given up looking for jobs with the federal, provincial, or local government because it's always the same old story. Now they hire these human rights and everything to look after it, but whenever a report is done, it's always an inconclusive report or "We shall follow it up." Nothing is done. I'm telling you the truth.

7:33

My generation is being so soft. The generation after me may be harder than me, and these are the things, because your children, my children have to work together. They have to go to the same schools together. They may not take it easy the way I am taking it now. You know the mind of the youths nowadays is stronger than their fathers' minds.

I hope I answered your question. Thanks a lot.

**MR. HAWKESWORTH:** Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Mr. Adeoshun.

The next presenter is John Currie, on behalf of the Calgary Chamber of Commerce. Welcome, Mr. Currie.

**MR. CURRIE:** Good evening. We submitted a very brief comment, and I don't intend to read it. I'd like to just overview it.

First of all, a little bit of qualification regarding the Calgary chamber. It is the second largest chamber in Canada. It's recognized as probably the most dynamic. We have well over 600 volunteers working on 19 standing committees, which cover areas anywhere from native Canadian opportunities, education, environment to natural resources, international trade, social issues, et cetera.

We have decided that the business community and ours in particular, which represents well over half the jobs in Calgary through its membership, can't stand aside and not get involved in this issue, which is important to us as individuals and as businesspeople. So we have recently created a Canadian unity task force, which I chair, and we will be developing policies which we will be debating among our membership and which we hope to be able to insert into the various processes as they develop within the province and within the federal state. In addition, we will take positions on Canadian citizenship, particularly with respect to the school systems. We have windows into the school systems now through our business partnerships, the school partnerships, and in other manners, so that we feel we have an obligation to talk about this issue with the school population, and we will be doing that over the next few months.

In addition, I can say that a group of chambers was recently brought together with the initiation of the two Montreal Francophone chambers, two Quebec chambers - Quebec City and la province - the city of Saint John, New Brunswick, and the city of Winnipeg. These six chambers called on another 12 of us representing the major chambers from St. John's to Victoria, requesting that we join together in an effort to get involved jointly and to each take strong positions on this issue. We've had one conference so far in Winnipeg about three weeks ago, and the result was unanimous both with the Quebec chambers and all of the non-Quebec chambers that the business organizations of the chambers of commerce have an obligation to take a leadership role.

There were some policy statements developed over those two days, and they are within our brief, really. One is that the status quo is no longer available to us and can no longer be supported. Secondly, these discussions have to be a Canada round and not a Quebec round. All Quebec chambers that were there were in agreement with that sense. We also felt as businesspeople that Canada is certainly not competitive in a global context in many, many areas, that our costs of government are too high through too many layers of government and bureaucracy, not just politically but in so many other areas of policy and regulatory fields. We also, of course, felt that our education is letting us down, that our standards nationally and federally are not of the level that is required for us to compete globally. Naturally, being business organizations, we will be concentrating more on those areas because we feel more comfortable with them.

But this particular chamber, the Calgary chamber, will probably put as first of its priorities the need to address the aboriginal issue. The Calgary chamber is the first chamber to have ever initiated an opportunities thrust for native Canadians. It's been in existence 12 years, and now many other chambers in Canada follow that lead. Native Awareness Week this week is the thrust of the Calgary chamber. I may say in the last three

years it's grown so rapidly that all of our meetings were sold out, lunches were sold out, et cetera. There is a very strong sense in the business community that fairness has not been done, that the business community has to provide greater opportunities to our aboriginals, and we are working together with them with some degree of comfort. Admittedly it's complex; we don't have the answers. But on both sides there's a distinct generosity of spirit – should I put it that way – in attempting to find answers. It fits in very well with our whole question of the deterioration of values in the business community and perhaps the exploitation of resources. And so I may say that we feel we are learning a great deal from our native brethren.

The area of school systems. Strangely enough to some it seems that the children are looking for some leadership from businesspeople – they're worried about their futures, their careers – and so that area we're looking forward to. We are astonished that a very amateurish or superficial poll that we did in the Calgary public system found out that it's very hard to find a Canadian flag. It's very hard to find any classroom that's singing *O Canada*. This is within the discretion of the teachers, and this type of citizen expression is just about lost. So we intend to concentrate on some of those areas which we don't think are superficial.

Now, I may say that we don't set ourselves up as having the answers to the Canadian problems. We do feel that a lot of our social issues in this country are caused by poor structures. We are in a federal state, and this federal state is a difficult one to manage, and in our sense it's not working. We're not suggesting that we throw out the federal state and become a unitary state, but we do feel that perhaps the Quebec crisis and the Oka crisis and these other crises may in the long run be a good thing in that they are forcing us to take a very serious look at the structure of this nation, and it is not working. So we are hoping that out of this we can add something to the dialogue so that we can feel there will be more efficiency, more fairness in the government structures federally and provincially by the time this process ends.

I'd be happy to make observation on anything other than where are we going to be in 20 years time with or without Quebec, or something like that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sheldon.

7:43

MR. CHUMIR: Well, John, thank you for your presentation. As we all know, there's been a strong push for decentralization from Quebec and some other parts of Canada, and I'd appreciate it if perhaps we could hear the view of yourself and the chamber with respect to what role the federal government should be playing in terms of, for example, establishing minimum standards as they presently do with respect to medicare and social programs. Perhaps you might also comment whether you would envisage a federal role in education and in the environment, and if so, what role?

MR. CURRIE: Well, with respect, in the context of this brief and in the context of the work of our unity task force, we have not reached conclusions to those issues. We intend to spend a great deal of time on study and hearing briefs from experts in the fields, but I think I can say, from the resolutions that we passed forward to the provincial government and the federal government, that we feel very strongly that there has to be a federal/national role in the setting of standards in education and

the establishment and maintenance of standards in environmental issues.

I would not go so far as to say that we suggest that education become a federal matter under federal jurisdiction. In fact, I'm not certain what type of federal state we should end up with at the present time, and you have to, as you people are doing, try to jump a hundred years away, distance yourselves from thinking a hundred years old and a society for which our Confederation was established a hundred years ago. But there's no doubt in our minds, particularly with respect to education, that national standards are required and that all the provinces are going to have to reach and reach very far to meet these standards. There's some work being done right now, and the Alberta government, the Alberta Research Council, is supporting it.

With respect to medical areas, this is a personal one. I think there should be a national medicare system with national medicare standards. However, I do feel very strongly that a lot of the difficulty in the medicare system is local and domestic and can be resolved locally and domestically. The Hyndman commission report and recommendations we endorse fully. In fact, at the Alberta chamber tomorrow there will be a resolution that there ought to be user fees. Our particular chamber says that's not getting at the issue. That's band-aid. Let's go back to the Hyndman report, which gets down underneath to find out these problems. So from that point of view, I don't think that could be done from Ottawa. That will be best done locally.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Day.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. John, does your chamber have a position in terms of support or nonsupport of triple E Senate, and if you are in support of that as a concept, are you working to bring the Quebec chambers onside on that issue?

MR. CURRIE: No, we don't. We have generally a position that there must be a substantive change to both political institutions, Senate and Commons, to provide more appropriate regional representation. I think most people that I talk to in the chamber endorse the triple E Senate, but we have not taken a formal position with respect to that. At our meeting in Winnipeg the Quebec chambers couldn't understand why we thought that was a solution to very much that was wrong with the country, so there is a gap in perception. I don't think it's a difficult one for them though. We haven't sat down and negotiated with them. They're concerned about other matters, and Senate reform, to the extent that our discussions went, was not an issue for them. Aboriginal rights is a major issue for them as well as for us.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, my second question is just on that point. On the aboriginal rights and land claims, has your chamber or the chambers you're working with come up with a definition of self-government, or are you advocating the idea of aboriginal self-government?

MR. CURRIE: At the present time we're suggesting that the land claim issue has to become a priority, and we have to get serious and honest about it. I don't know if we ever will come out with solutions ourselves. I don't know if we're qualified to say self-government is the right way or partnerships is the right way or stewardships is the right way, but I don't want to prejudice our group.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. John, you dealt a little bit with the distribution of powers and indicated that you would support national standards for education in particular and talked about some others. Would that national standard be established by the provinces, given their jurisdiction for education, getting together to establish such a standard, or do you in fact envision the federal government itself setting standards that the provinces would have to follow?

MR. CURRIE: My own personal view is certainly that there has to be a dialogue. There has to be a collaboration. I think at some time, though, a decision has to be made by a government which is working within the world community more than a province is. I think the federal government has a better understanding of our competitors and the competition levels in Germany and France and Italy and Japan than does the province. But it would bother me that some bureaucrats or politicians sitting in Ottawa would say to Alberta, British Columbia, or Newfoundland, "Now this is the standard; meet it" and have no consultation. But when you get into the dynamics of how you reach a settlement on consultation, I haven't thought that one through.

MR. ANDERSON: That was my follow-up question. I suppose we all would agree with national standards and with raising those to as high a level as Canadians can meet, particularly in education. The question is in determining what those standards are and who establishes them. Is there not a fear that the needs and concerns, in fact the competitive advantages, that are required by the most populous parts of Canada will gain the most consideration in those educational standard developments and that those particular needs, be it in Newfoundland or Alberta, might not be as readily met by a federal government established standard as opposed to provinces ensuring that their requirements are part of whatever standards are established?

MR. CURRIE: I'm not suggesting this is easy. My concern is that the output is not working. When a high school student completes and obtains his certificate in Germany, that student has been in school two years longer than an Alberta student. Two years longer than an Alberta student. So in the very leading developed countries, where we really are competing, we're running up continually against this that we're not matching now. I think it's a new world. In talking to the native Canadians this morning, Chief John Snow talked about the need for more industry and the need for more employment in, say, Morley, and it's always bothered me that it's difficult to provide that because of the cost on an economic basis. How do you cover transport? How do you cover all these things? But today, with proper education in computers, word processing, and electronics it doesn't matter whether it's in Morley or it's 2,000 miles away. With electronics and telecommunications I think the natives can start competing. I'm not saying next year, but we work on that thrust. So that's the type of thing where the local disadvantages of Newfoundland or Morley may not be as serious as they were 10 years ago, five years ago.

7:53

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I know you want to move along and that we're too long into our session, but this is a most interesting question, and I appreciate those examples. Does the Calgary chamber have no fear that if we move to a national standard and national funding on education, the position we're in now, which in Calgary is the highest education in the country,

the highest education standard here will not be reduced to that average as opposed to an increasing overall average? The dollars obviously have to go somewhere.

MR. CURRIE: No fear.

MR. ANDERSON: No fear?

MR. CURRIE: No.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Very briefly, Mr. Currie. I was intrigued by your comment and description after your meeting, your conference with the other chambers in Winnipeg. You indicated that you felt that the status quo with respect to relations with Quebec was no longer available. I'd just like your thoughts on what form the relationship might take in the future.

MR. CURRIE: Well, we had a lot of agreement. There were areas of great agreement, both in what's wrong and in solution, especially in the business end. I talk about overlap and standards and these things. We don't have a problem with their concern about language and their concern about culture and their concern about distinctiveness. That's no problem to any of the chambers that are non-Quebec. So we perhaps started from a different place on the track than many citizens of Canada. We may have some stretching to do, but we think that the price of losing this great country is just so foolish. So they were representing 18 major chambers in Canada. All came to that conclusion that the prices paid if we let this happen are so enormous and are so rash and irresponsible and perhaps immoral, because the strengths of this country are so phenomenal. The Quebecers around the table - after two days of talking, we were not that far apart, except perhaps in accents.

And you recall that Quebec City is a twin of Calgary. We've never done much about it except have Bonhomme out to the Stampede, you know, and a cowboy goes down there. But we really haven't worked it as well as we've worked our sister city in China. So we talked about that, and this chamber is going to insist that we get those things back.

MR. CHIVERS: I'd like to pursue this topic with you, but I think the chairman would like us to move along. Thank you very much.

MR. CURRIE: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The next presenter is Stephen Kahn. Welcome.

MR. KAHN: I'll try a new mike. I'm left handed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nice to have you there. As Dennis says, it's a change of perspective, and it's refreshing.

MR. KAHN: Probably will be.

Well, thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, committee members, audience. I would like to start my presentation with a definition: separated from others by qualities, different in quality or kind. I will refer back to this a little later on.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer, constitutional or otherwise, but simply a Canadian who has been steeped in Canadian history since a child and whose roots go back in this country a very long and very proud time. It seems to me that the biggest problem we have in this country today is politicians. All smile at that one. Politicians who think of themselves before they think of the people they are elected to serve. Politicians who don't listen but just do as they are told by their leader, whether he be a Prime Minister or a Premier. Politicians who don't seem to care. Example one: when I pointed out that it cost over \$100,000 to fly Mrs. Mulroney home two days early from an African conference, my MP said, "Oh, you're talking pennies." Well, I would like to have a few of those pennies. Two: keeping track of our money. *Calgary Mirror*, January 2. I'll show you a photocopy of it. I love the first one. They point to a study of the fool in the historical development of western civilization: \$24,450. They need not have done the study. I could have told them that the Canadian taxpayer is the fool in this country. I could go on and on, but I'll spare you. But there are some things I won't let you off the hook on.

Prior to the death of the Meech Lake accord, I phoned the following people to discuss the Constitution. One, my MP Mr. Lee Richardson; two, Premier Getty, twice; three, Mr. Peterson, then Premier of Ontario; four, now Senator Claude Castonguay; five, Harvie Andre, MP, the Tory House Leader, I believe he is called; six, the Prime Minister, Right Hon. Brian Mulroney. Not one, and I repeat not one, returned my phone call. On a matter of national unity not one of these people thought it important enough to talk to one of its country's citizens. As a matter of fact, when I asked the assistant of one of the above why I couldn't speak to the person, the answer was, "He hasn't got time for you little people." How's that for telling us average people where we stand with government? We don't count except on voting day. Do you want to know who said that to me? Maybe you don't, but I'm going to tell you. None other than the Prime Minister's office: the most sensitive political office in the country. So this is what it appears to be, a charade being played with my country, no less. No doubt my brief, like so many others, will just be tossed in the scrap heap. I'm only a peasant and don't count, according to the PM and the other six mentioned above. But I couldn't face my children or my grandchildren, if I'm fortunate enough to have any, if I didn't appear here and try.

But now to get on to the nuts and bolts of this meeting, some of my thoughts on a new Constitution. One, a Constitution should have as its opening remarks a statement of general principles of what our country stands for, such as a compassionate society, equal justice for all, freedom from sea to sea, national standards, et cetera, et cetera. Two, there should be a statement that all Canadians are equal and should be seen as equal. There should be no distinct society, unique character clause for any group, as these terms have the connotation of better or superior and are reprehensible and unacceptable to many Canadians. Refer back to the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition I mentioned at the beginning of this presentation. Of course, one exception: if you will ensure that put into the Constitution is a clause saying, "Steve Kahn and his descendants are a distinct society," well, fine; then it's okay.

But seriously, tell me: before you followed Premier Getty blindly and voted to adopt Meech Lake three years ago, didn't one of you look up the meaning of these words in a dictionary? Didn't you realize the problems these words were going to cause? I've given you one dictionary definition. How about you giving me your meaning of those words or, better still, the

government of Quebec's meaning of that term? If the price we have to pay to keep Quebec in Confederation is to make you and me second-class citizens in our own country – and I contend that is what those words do – then I say the price is too high. If Quebec can't live as a province in Canada, albeit as guardian of the French language and their culture, then it has to be sovereignty, not sovereignty association. I'm not going to have non-Canadian Quebecers attending a Canadian Parliament and telling me what to do. We in Alberta should start talking to B.C. and perhaps the Yukon to form our own distinct society and our own social and economic agenda.

8:03

Three, the present three-year timetable for ratification is fine. It probably should be lengthened, not cut short. Since constitutions last for a hundred years, we, all Canadians, had better be sure we get it right the first time.

Four, the Senate as presently constituted should be abolished. It's only a patronage barrel.

Five, the formula of 50 percent, seven provinces seems to me to be a good formula for amendments to the Constitution, especially with a majority required in each region. Remember, I'm not a constitutional lawyer or any lawyer.

Six, MPs and MLAs should be elected for a two-term maximum. They should get no pensions but instead receive one-month's severance pay for each year served up to a maximum of six months.

Seven, national referenda on national issues such as the Constitution, GST, items that cannot readily be changed through a change in government, should be mandatory.

Eight, since MPs, MLAs, et cetera are representatives of the people, there should be mostly free votes whereby they are to vote the way a majority of their constituents want.

Nine, MPs and MLAs should be more accountable for their votes. That is, if a government suggests in a budget that a certain measure will have a 1 and half percent inflation rate and the rate turns out to be 2 and a half percent, then the MPs, et cetera, certainly those voting for the measure, should lose a portion of their salary for, say, every half percent that they're out on their projection. If employment measures are estimated to create 50,000 jobs and instead 30,000 jobs are lost, then again a portion of their salary should be forfeited. Conversely, if a better result is achieved, then a bonus should be paid to those legislators voting for those proposals that were successful. You'd certainly be more careful in your numbers.

Ten, MPs, MLAs, et cetera should not – and I repeat not – receive any tax-free allowances. There should be taxable benefits against which they can claim legitimate expense deductions to the tax man like everyone must do. They must not be seen to be a distinct or superior group to all other citizens.

Eleven, immigrants to Canada shall not be entitled to any social benefits for a period of, say, five years. I believe one should contribute first before you take out of the system.

Twelve, governments should be obliged to have balanced budgets, again on pain of losing some salary for the people involved.

Thirteen, unemployment insurance should be returned to what it was originally intended for: a coinsurance program of a limited length of time, not a welfare program.

Fourteen, within the next 20 years or so clean water and its availability will become the most precious natural resource we have. Albertans had better make sure we have our fair share.

These are some of my thoughts relating to government in general. Some of these points relate to the Constitution itself while others have to do with the economics of the country. I expect that many points can be debated from various points of view, but I feel that that is exactly what should be done. They should be examined and discussed by all Canadians through referenda, public meetings, this kind of thing, et cetera, and if it takes five years to get it right, so be it.

I hope some of these ideas may be helpful in finding a solution to our current constitutional problems. I remain hopeful that solutions can be found, but they must be fair to all Canadians, not just one group, province, et cetera, and they must not be pushed simply to get the job done.

I thank you for hearing me.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Nancy, followed by Sheldon.

**MS BETKOWSKI:** Thank you for your presentation, sir. It's very helpful. With respect to your comments on referenda, we had quite a few discussions on it this afternoon here in Calgary.

One of the questions we have is: if there were a national referendum on a particular issue, and given the geographic and demographic makeup of Canada with obviously the centre having a greater portion of the population, what happens if in a national referendum you have a split in terms of your vote? If you've got, say, Alberta voting for something and the rest of Canada voting against it, what kinds of mechanism should be put in place in a referendum?

**MR. KAHN:** My thoughts would go back to this 50, 70, with a majority in each region.

**MS BETKOWSKI:** Return to the amending formula as the test?

**MR. KAHN:** That's right. I think that provides you the protection, and it provides Quebec, for example, their protection to solve that problem. I don't know. Remember, I'm an average citizen; I'm not a constitutional expert. I think that would solve the problem.

**MS BETKOWSKI:** Thank you. That's helpful.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Sheldon.

**MR. CHUMIR:** Thank you. Mr. Kahn, in your quick outline of the statement of general principles that might be considered, I heard you very quickly mention something in respect of national standards. I'm wondering if you could . . .

**MR. KAHN:** I'm almost afraid I've said it, having listened to the gentleman before me.

**MR. CHUMIR:** I wondered if you could elucidate. I would like to ask pretty well the same question, as to whether or not you're in favour of some common denominator in respect of standards for medicare and social services.

**MR. KAHN:** The short answer is that I am.

**MR. CHUMIR:** What about education and the environment?

**MR. KAHN:** Well, after listening, as I said, to the gentleman before, I think I have basically his thoughts. Again, as a

businessperson I'm concerned that we've got to have our youth or the next generation as well as our own competitive, but I think in general that I was thinking more of the medical aspects. I happen to come from a family where my father was sick for six years before medicare, and we lost everything. I saw a whole family's life-work down the drain on one illness, so I'm a great fan of medicare whether there be \$5 surcharges or whatever they call them, balanced billings, et cetera, as long as there's a provision that if you can't afford it, you get the medical care anyway.

In terms of education, I sense that you have to have some strong input from the province because, as it was pointed out, obviously the concerns of, let's say, Ontario or Nova Scotia or something may not be identical in terms of what you're studying here; you know, even in engineering. As a general rule you're not going to study oil engineering in New Brunswick; perhaps and perhaps not, but certainly the emphasis would be more here. So I think the province would have to have some say in it, some strong say in it. But I think in some ways a national standard appeals to me, if I can put it that way. I guess I'm more of a federalist than a strong provincialist in that respect.

**MR. CHUMIR:** In terms of that national standard, if I can anticipate Dennis Anderson, does that necessarily involve the federal government in establishing those standards? Do you think that's the only practical, realistic way of doing it?

**MR. KAHN:** Well, I think they'd have to be in consultation with the province. As I said, I think the province has to have a strong voice, but I don't know whether - I really haven't thought it closely through. That remark was made simply to give you an example of what I think a Constitution having . . . If I'm not mistaken, when I took a quick look at the Meech Lake accord, it had nothing but dry bones at the beginning, and I think that a little flowery language goes a long way with a Constitution.

**MR. CHUMIR:** And the environment?

**MR. KAHN:** Definitely I think the province and the federal. The federal has to, because you're dealing with other countries. You're dealing with everything in it, so it would have to have an input. But I think both; you know, you can't have one or the other. I guess the short answer to your question is: do we need both parts of the government or should we just do away with one? Obviously provincialists would say, "Well, do away with the federal," and the federalists would say the opposite. I don't know if I have any more comment on that.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Barrie.

**MR. CHIVERS:** Yes. Mr. Kahn, you commented on the timetable for ratification. I'd be interested if you could elaborate on that a bit more.

&13

**MR. KAHN:** I just think we have to take as much time as it needs to get it right. I said that from the beginning of Meech Lake. Meech Lake, in my mind, was done in secret by people and never explained. I spoke to my MLA a little while ago, and I asked him, "How come you send me all kinds of questionnaires on the economics of the province, on education?" I said, "I never saw one question on Meech Lake." His answer was, "Nobody was interested in it." Well, that was incorrect. An awful lot of people were interested. I get people by the

hundreds in my office saying, "My God, I don't like that 'distinct society' term," or "I don't want this." I see a lot of interest in my office on that score.

So my answer to you is very simple: if it takes five years, so be it. Take five years; let's get it right. Now, I realize that Quebec is in a hurry. That's their problem, from my point of view, or our problem in the sense that you didn't do it right. You guys, all of you, whether federal or provincial politicians, just didn't do it right. If "distinct society" was correct, again I go back to my question: what did it mean? Nobody in this province, in the government, ever explained to Albertans what it meant. They all said, "Oh, it's nothing." Well, it isn't nothing, not in my definition. Therefore, after Mr. Getty approved Meech in the "secret 11 deal" - I think you should have spent the last three years before you voted on it telling Albertans why you thought it was right. You never bothered. Therefore, I say take five years if you need five years.

MR. CHIVERS: Well, I think there's a lot of agreement that the process of Meech Lake was flawed and that the product was flawed. I certainly agree with you that we need to take our time. That's why we're here soliciting people like you.

MR. KAHN: But I also get the sense that one of the strong remarks, certainly by the Prime Minister, is that we have to shorten the time so that this can't occur: a Mr. Wells or a Mr. Harper, et cetera, disagreeing. I say that's absolutely wrong. We should take longer not shorter, until we're all happy with it or a majority of us are happy with it. I guess I stand out as the oddball.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: No.

MR. KAHN: No? I guess I'm not the oddball then. Sorry; I certainly felt like it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bob?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do we have a copy of your written . . .

MR. KAHN: No, you don't.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I'd really appreciate if you could maybe leave it with John so all of us can have copies.

MR. KAHN: I just have one. Maybe you can photostat it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It can be copied.

MR. KAHN: I purposely didn't give a copy. I thought I was the oddball, and I thought it was shock value, quite frankly. It would appear I'm not. I understand that in Edmonton today an awful lot of the same sentiments were being heard, from what I heard on the radio this afternoon.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I really appreciate the thought and efforts you've put into your presentation tonight. You've given lots of good suggestions. There is one that I'd like to ask you about, some thoughts or suggestions, and that is your comment about all Canadians being equal. At the same time, Canadians are different; that is, in Quebec there's the Civil Code as a basis of law; in the rest of Canada, it's English common law.

MR. KAHN: Can I ask you just one quick question on that?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Okay. Sure.

MR. KAHN: Can you name me three laws of Quebec, with their different law, that make a material difference to their citizens? In other words, if somebody there kills somebody, they go to jail the same way we go to jail here, or if they have a traffic infraction, they get a parking ticket the same as we do. What are the basic differences? I've always wondered about that. Do you know? Everybody uses this as a reason, but nobody gives me the answer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kahn, I'll say this. You're referring to criminal law, and there is no difference in the criminal law. The Criminal Code applies in Quebec as it does everywhere else in the country. What we're talking about is on the civil side. Their system of civil law is entirely different from the rest of the country.

MR. KAHN: That makes them different but not distinct, in my mind anyway.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not going to argue that point with you. I was explaining to you what the Civil Code is.

MR. KAHN: Yes, I appreciate that. Please forgive me. I lived in Quebec for 30-odd years. I was born and brought up there, and that's why I asked the question, because I've never found . . . Mind you, as a child, what was I going to find?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I guess if you had an estate to deal with, you'd find that property was distributed differently. If your marriage broke down, you'd find that certainly the community property laws are entirely different.

MR. KAHN: I can agree with that, but again I'll come back and simply say that to me that's a difference, not a distinction. That does not make one distinct or, in my definition, superior.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In any event, we'll get down to questions about the future rather than rehashing the past.

MR. KAHN: I'm sorry. Yes; I agree.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: No. This is exactly what, I guess, I'm getting at and the kind of discussion I'd like. How do we recognize our differences without falling into the problem, that I think you've correctly pointed out, of creating two classes of Canadian?

MR. KAHN: If you take the Meech Lake accord, the first paragraph or two said - and I'm not quoting; I certainly don't have it with me. It said something about where it is recognized that most English-speaking people live outside Quebec but not exclusively, whereas most French-speaking . . . That is all. And we're all Canadians. That solves the problem from my point of view.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Okay. I'm glad to have met you.

MR. KAHN: I guess I'm against the idea of having Francophones, Anglophones, allophones, telephones, and every other phones. Okay? We're all Canadians.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I appreciate what you're saying. Thanks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Day.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kahn, you've got some intriguing comments, especially as related to sort of a commission approach for MLAs and MPs. I might want to pursue some of that.

MR. KAHN: I thought you'd enjoy that one.

MR. DAY: Actually, you talk about the free vote. I'd like to pursue that a bit. If I can plug a commercial here, I do have a motion on the Order Paper in our Legislature here asking for elections to be set every four years, thereby enabling MLAs to have a degree of free vote. This is on a set date. You may also be interested to know that in discussing that with the Premier, as I discussed it with him personally he was very open to that debate coming forward and was looking forward to it. He wasn't closed to that at all.

MR. KAHN: You must be the only person he talks to. He certainly didn't phone me back. I guess he was busy playing golf or something.

MR. DAY: I'd like to go on, though, and pursue the question, the question being this, because it's one I have even though I have this motion on the table. Are there times that you would see, other than a direct nonconfidence vote, where the government in fact could or should fall if the government lost a vote? Are there times where it would fall, given this freedom that I'm talking about here?

MR. KAHN: I'm probably not well versed enough to give you a proper answer. I don't know enough. I don't really follow that kind of thing. As I say, I don't know. I just don't know.

MR. DAY: Okay. I appreciate that.

In the other area of two terms for MLAs and MPs, what about the situation – perish the thought that it could happen – where an MLA or MP was actually well thought of by his or her constituents and doing a good job, and this law was in place, and they said, "You are overruling our right to vote you in a third time just as much as we have the right to boot you out." Is there any thought there?

MR. KAHN: My answer would be simply: that's too bad; there are other good people around that will take their place.

MR. DAY: Okay.

Senate reform: triple E. Are you a supporter?

MR. KAHN: I haven't made up my mind, quite frankly. I don't know whether it solves the problem. Okay?

MR. DAY: Okay.

MR. KAHN: I'm not against it. I certainly would rather have an elected Senate than the patronage system there is at present, but I don't know if it really solves our concerns as Albertans.

MR. DAY: So one E for sure. Okay. Thanks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kahn.

MR. KAHN: You're most welcome.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Denis Biswanger.

Good evening and welcome.

MR. BISWANGER: I'd like to thank you folks for allowing me to speak tonight. I'm representing myself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You're a very important person to us.

MR. BISWANGER: Well, thank you. I was born and raised in Alberta, and I've seen a lot of changes over the years. Most of them have been good, and I'd like to see that pattern continue. I think some of the things that are happening around us have got the potential to affect us very adversely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you pull the microphone a little closer, please?

MR. BISWANGER: Like that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's better.

8:23

MR. BISWANGER: Okay.

I'm not a parliamentary expert, so rather than defining the kinds of things I'd like to see, I'd like to talk about things that have happened and illustrate what I don't like and what I think should be changed. For example, in Canada as it's presently laid out we have Quebec, we have Ontario, and then we have a group called TROC, which is the rest of Canada, and this seems to be a recurrent theme in many of the publications that I read. I find that kind of offensive. I think there's more to Canada than just those three groups.

If you take a look at the economic activity in this country, in 1990 alone something like \$40 billion-odd in real estate transactions took place. Now, \$20 billion of that occurred in Ontario. There was another \$10 billion that occurred in B.C., another \$4 billion that occurred in Alberta, and another \$3 billion that occurred in Quebec. The thing that I think is interesting about this is that you have Alberta now with the third largest real estate economy in the nation. If you work it out on a per capita basis, a province with the population of, say, Quebec should be churning over or should have a level of real estate activity of some \$10 billion to \$15 billion per annum. I think this indicates some rather serious problems within that provincial economy.

The other thing that I think is interesting is that the relatively high level of activity within Alberta has been developed and has occurred without any great participation or interest on the part of the federal government. This is a homegrown phenomenon.

Now, from a study that was conducted by Dr. Mansell – apparently it came out in the round table discussions that preceded this – he did a series of calculations in which he added up all the federal taxes that were taken out of an area and then deducted from that the transfer payments by the federal government back into that area, giving a net contribution to or extraction from. Using those numbers over a 10-year period, and I'm sure this not new to anybody here, Alberta was a net contributor to the dominion of Canada, or the Confederation, I guess, of some \$100 billion. Over that same period of time we

had a net injection into the Quebec economy of about \$105 billion. I think a couple of things come out of that. One is: what has the country, Canada as a whole, received for this very disparate allocation of funding? What has Alberta received for its great contribution over these years? I haven't seen, looking around this province, a heck of a lot of activity going on other than what has been generated right here. We seem to be standing on our own very, very well, and I think we could do an awful lot better if we had - how would you call it? - less interference from the outside.

Back at the beginning of the decade - you all remember the national energy policy. This was probably the vehicle that started this extraction of funds from Alberta. In Calgary the average value of a home dropped from about \$108,000 in 1981-82 to just under \$75,000 in 1985. Now, this was an over 35 percent decrease in real value. It demonstrates an amazing extraction of wealth from this area. The government of the day was questioned on this, and the best they have been able to come up with to this point in time is that this was an unexpected side effect. They didn't see the foreclosures; they didn't see the bankruptcies; they didn't see the migration of people out of this province. It took a complete change at the federal level in order to have that policy reversed.

As near as I can tell from everything I've read, that really has been about the only basic change that has affected Alberta over the last six or seven years. We've been working our way out of a recession, probably one of the most severe we've ever seen. This has had, as near as I can tell, a real impact on the industry of this province. Over the last few years there have been continuing restructures within the major oil companies in Calgary. This year we seem to have a rash of layoffs; virtually every major corporation is downsizing or readjusting their corporate direction. Now, these are the companies that had a terrific impact on putting Calgary and Alberta where we are. From this town we direct, or have directed and controlled, developments around the world. We export technology to bloody Russia, and this is a cow town. That's something I think we should be proud of.

What's not, I guess, remembered so very well is that several hundreds of years ago Spain was an economic power. One of the things that seemed to lead to their demise was the biased mining laws for the precious metals gold and silver. It took a long period of time for them to go down, but they have been destitute ever since.

We have seen, I think, laws and policies invoked that have significantly impacted our basic industry, which is the petroleum business. Just over the last couple of years we've seen changes, shifts, movements among the major players. I think there should be an awful lot of concern given to whether or not this is just the beginning. We've got an electronic world around us, and from Calgary we can talk directly to installations in the Bering Straits, in the Beaufort Sea. We can talk to and control events in Hibernia, for example. There is nothing magical about Calgary. There is no reason why all of that control, all of that expertise, can't be moved elsewhere and those projects directed and controlled from there. We haven't heard of any major exploration activity within our area, yet just the other day Shell and BP were talking about a major discovery down in the Caribbean.

The National Energy Board, fortunately, is moving out to Alberta. I hope that's still on. Is it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As far as we know.

MR. BISWANGER: As far as we know. I think it's amazing that a group like this was brought into being a number of years ago. They were set up - if you recall, seven out of 10 directors had to be from Ontario. Essentially, what this meant was the oil and gas industry of Canada was being directed and controlled by a group of people who had no interest in the investment and the growth of that business. It was being directed and controlled by people who were consuming. These kinds of things have been affecting and impacting us for quite a long time, and I think they're going to continue to have an impact on us.

&33

In summary, I personally believe that our federal government has repeatedly demonstrated that at best it doesn't consciously have the best interests of Alberta at heart, that it has a substantial bias for preferential treatment for other areas in this country. I believe that our federally elected and appointed representatives are not able to protect and promote our interests for any great length of time. We've got an interesting situation today: we've got three very strong ministers in the current government. But how long is that going to last, and then what are we going to do? We've made some great strides, I think, with minimal input just over the last three or four years. I believe that our Alberta economy is going to change, and I think that if we shape the changes, we will probably fare a lot better than if we allow other people to shape those changes for us. If you remember, back at the time of Confederation the maritimes were apparently a very wealthy area, and now they're just another member of TROC.

I don't think it's likely that Quebec or Ontario are going to change their predisposition for promoting their own interests at the expense of other areas, and I say that with a bias because I'm from Alberta. But I do believe that if Canada is composed of strong, economically profitable regions, it will be far better as a country than if it's composed of a bunch of weak areas that are beholden to one central dispenser of whatever. I think if we as a province are going to grow and prosper, then we have to protect ourselves as best we can. I think we require effective safeguards at all levels in whatever political structure is created or evolves from the discussion we are having. I don't think we can count on the whimsical goodwill of other people. I think we have to ensure that no other combination of provinces or the federal government can ever again impose a thing like the national energy policy on us and, by extension, on any other province of the Confederation. I think we have to have a level playing field, and I think that we as Albertans, as Alberta, have to have an equal position at that table. It's not much to ask for.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated very much the remarks. They were of a general nature about Canada and about how we should operate as Albertans in the country. Would I be right in interpreting your remarks as indicating that you would favour a less central, more decentralized form of government? I guess on Mr. Chumir's behalf, since he did me the favour of not wasting the time last time . . .

MR. CHUMIR: Good notes, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: . . . would you, along with that, favour a federal government role in establishing educational standards, health standards, those kinds of things? Or do you believe those

standards should be established by provincial governments as per their constitutional responsibility?

MR. BISWANGER: In five minutes or less?

MR. ANDERSON: In five minutes or less.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BISWANGER: Let me answer it this way. I believe that our form of government has been derived from the British model, and that model works very, very well in a compact country. Canada is not compact. We can take just about any province and put Britain in a small corner of that. We've got problems with distance; we've got problems with communication; we've got problems with differences in environment: a lot of serious, practical considerations. I think that structure has to be modified. I think over the last hundred years it's been demonstrated that the model we have right now does not work very well for the best interests of all the areas in the country. We need something different.

Now, I'm not skilled enough in parliamentary procedure or structures to be able to say, "Well, this is what we should do; that's what we should do." I think it's the effect that counts. What we want to do is create a structure that's going to develop all of the areas and allow them to grow to their best potential. There has to be interaction between the various groups, no doubt about it, but there are many concerns, for example, within the province of Quebec that I just don't have a valid opinion on. I'm not close enough to it; I don't understand the local circumstances. I think exactly the same situation applies for them when they start talking about our situation out here. There are things they just don't know and can't handle properly.

I don't think I answered your question directly. I think I indicated more confusion.

MR. ANDERSON: I think you were moving in that direction, but it's fair to say that you feel that whatever we determine should be the rights and responsibilities of the various partners of Confederation, they have to allow the region to recognize and develop to its maximum potential. Is that right? Is that a synopsis of what you're saying?

MR. BISWANGER: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: And you're not sure as to the specifics of what should go where.

MR. BISWANGER: Within the context of the country. Canada is a great country, and I think it would be a bloody shame if this place were torn apart. But I also think there really is something wrong with the way we're doing things now, because there are too many groups within our society whose needs are not being met. Part of these are aborigines; part of these are new immigrants. My grandparents were immigrants at one point in time, so I guess I can relate through the generations. These are very real problems, and I think we can handle them a heck of a lot better than we are now. But the control and the direction seem to be too far removed from the problem. I think we need something closer, something more hands-on without adding more layers of 'adminisfusion'.

MR. ANDERSON: 'Adminisfusion': I have to write that one down. Thank you.

MR. BISWANGER: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The next presenter is Gavin Anger. I hope I didn't mispronounce it.

MR. ANGER: It's like it sounds: anger. It's German, not French.

I'm very nervous here, so I'll read what I have here. I've got a second copy for yourselves. It's just hot off the press.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That can be reproduced.

MR. ANGER: It's hot off the press here; my wife has just done this for me.

A couple of things I'd like to try and do - nothing specific because I'm not anybody professional, so I don't have a lot of the ins and outs of things. But I'll go through this and read this as quickly as I can so that we can all do other things.

When a westerner thinks about a problem, whether it is major or minor and affects him or her in any way, it's always the next successive thought to wonder why this problem happened to start with. If it's an age-old problem, why hasn't it been taken care of before? The picture in the mind next is who to blame. Usually it's not the person. It's self-denial: "It's not my fault. It's somebody else." Usually it's a politician. That's the easiest scapegoat to find. We can allow them to do whatever they want to. That's what we're doing. If we don't stand up and say, "Hey, this is what we want," or "This is what we don't want," then we've got nobody to blame but ourselves.

&43

Anyway, we are generally a placid, patient, trusting people and heavily influenced by American values. We Canadians have wrestled and struggled with many differences in values between our two countries, but one of the most striking is the American inbred ability to accept change and make the most of it. Their ability to cut the apron strings and stand on their own initiative and energy has generally been the envy of most people in the world except, of course, for those who hold political views left of centre. Even some of us here, we'll just pretty well have to say it's almost sour grapes anyway, as far as I'm concerned. We really have not got a lot of the infrastructure they have, such as Uncle Sam and that kind of thing, so we're really behind the eight ball.

What I'd like to point out are a few of the things we do have that are being cut to shreds. The CNR, which used to be a wonderful railroad at one point, is basically nothing anymore. The CBC I'm iffy on anyways. I don't like publicly funded anything, but that's the way it is. The RCMP: we don't have to go too far into that to know where things have been changed there. Even the maple leaf on our flag is not indigenous across the country. I'm from Ontario originally, and I've never really seen a maple leaf out here, so how can we actually say it's a national thing? I mean, maybe a pine tree because that grows indigenously across, but not maple. There's really nothing we have anymore that's Canadian. We're being shredded apart, and we're allowing ourselves to be that way.

I would like to skip on down here, if you wouldn't mind. Some of things that I'd like to suggest here - these are general suggestions, and you can take them or leave them as you will. In order for us to become efficient as a people, I think we must have an efficient government. I would like to see some radical changes happen here, and quickly. We kind of need them.

Number one: in the west we have two virtually identical provinces, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, both with a great deal of departments and ministries such as transportation, resources, and agriculture, with policies that are often conflicting. Both provinces run deficits annually and could be far more efficient combining efforts to co-ordinate their policy and activity. I'd like to go as far as suggesting they combine their governments into one, but this probably wouldn't sit well with most of the people who run these governments, because the downsizing would be efficient and a lot of ego postings, et cetera, wouldn't be there. But I'm sure it would be much more efficient.

Maritime Canada: the same thing. I think it's ridiculous that P.E.I. is actually a province. It's a joke. It's ridiculous to have something that small as a province. It would far, far better serve Canada if all three of the provinces and probably Newfoundland and Labrador were allowed to become one province politically, the whole region. I think they probably would end up becoming a better province, so to speak.

I don't like the rhetoric that's being used in the papers and things where Quebec is saying: well, make us an offer to stay. That really just drives me crazy. I don't feel we should be offering them anything. I think, more or less, it really should be that if they want to stay and help us begin a new country, so to speak, then let them stay. Then we'll work on it from that point on. But don't say: "Well, okay, we'll stay, but we want the cookie jar. We want this; we want that." Like, hey, forget it. It's yes or no, and then we work on it. I don't like that. It's just my personal thing here. If they do end up leaving, if they do end up separating, I really won't feel any remorse. Even though I'm from Ontario originally, which is much closer than here, I still feel no sense of . . . I was treated badly when I went there, so I really won't feel any remorse, so to speak.

If they do go, I certainly would like to see them take their per capita share of the national debt, and if they do separate, I don't want to see any adjustments for emigration from Quebec afterwards. So you take your losses, and you take what you end up with. I think that might be a better bargaining position. Maybe not; I don't know.

Anyway, I think this may be pretty hard for a lot of people in Quebec, but I think English should be used universally across the country. It's probably rather bigoted and whatever, but to be perfectly blunt, I feel we must have one language for efficiency in all levels of government for cost-effectiveness and a sense of commonality that we strive for but we obviously haven't got.

I would like to see autonomy granted to native reserve areas, and I would like to see it happen soon. I'd like to have them at that point, though, if they are separate political entities, abide by all the laws of the nation as far as human rights and standard freedoms. I'd not like to see them end up havens for criminals and subversive groups that just sort of mount insurrections and civil disobedience. I think that would definitely not be a good idea for all of us.

On foreign aid I don't like the idea of giving dollars away for nothing. I'd like to see us give credits to buy commodities and such from Canada. We could send professionals. There are probably thousands and thousands of professionals that have just been laid off in Canada recently. We could probably end up having them contract to the government as part of that foreign aid. I think that would be a lot better for our economy. It would certainly help us out, and it would help them out as well, as far as I'm concerned.

Education I think has been covered quite well, and I have nothing more to add to that.

This is a pretty major point here, what I am getting into. I'd like to see a concerted effort to build up our military, not necessarily like the star wars, Ronald Reagan type of thing but in such things as mandatory military service two or three weeks a year or so. Switzerland and Israel do this and have prospered quite well. I like their system. I like the way they do things there. It would provide a regular shot of discipline, pride, and patriotism, and mostly, I think, it would psychologically remind us that while we have the freedom today, somebody paid for it with their life previously. We may finally develop a sense of our responsibility to defend our country and protect our democracy, which we don't often do.

We don't necessarily have to think of it in the physical type of defence but in the realization that we must take an active part in the function of our nation, in fighting complacency and prejudice by ignorance. We may realize that we must accept responsibility for our actions and, of course, voting habits and learn to work as a team. Imagine what kind of camaraderie we could develop by going through a two- to three-week basic and survival training and strategy session in a different part of the country with people holding the same goals from varying areas of the map with one overriding purpose: defending Canada physically and philosophically. Wouldn't we all benefit, especially our teens and our early 20s age group? Wouldn't it also help bridge the generation gap and produce friendships never before imagined? In my opinion, I think it would. We should try and think about something like that. Our armed forces are a shame. They're a shambles right now, and a lot of people just basically say, "The semiarmed forces." It really bothers me.

We should have the taxes reorganized, as far as I can see. I'd like to drop universal medicare and implement user fees as a deductible. I would like to see a plan to quickly reimburse or exempt altogether poorer Canadians. I would like to have it more like a "protection from catastrophe" medicare. I would like to hack away at personal taxes to restructure them so that we could all have healthy write-off potential, business and personal, for setting up day cares, research and development, reforestation projects, charity, et cetera. Corporations have always had one motto, and that's profit, profit, profit. Now, there's nothing wrong with that; it's good for everybody. But incentives to have direct payments from these businesses, et cetera, to these people, like the food bank, et cetera, I think would work better because it's not flowing through the government. If we would have it go directly to them instead of going through the government, I think there'd be fewer hands in the pot and fewer chances of it being wasted. It's like sending money to CARE: you don't get a hundred percent of your money going towards Ethiopia, for instance; there's always something taken back. I'd like to see more direct aid.

&53

I would like to see a national energy program or policy, so to speak, to switch from these damaging gasoline and bunker fuels to natural gas and propane. We produce this commodity far more inexpensively and have much more of it. If we sell the expensive goods and use the cheaper, more efficient, cleaner, and more abundant fuels, this would make us far more competitive and wealthy in the end. It behooves me as to why we haven't done it already.

The last point here I'd like to get to I'll read verbatim. We in western Canada must not allow ourselves to be manipulated or coerced into the thought that if we don't stay together as a country, we will perish. I have much more faith in the stuff of westerners. We may lose ground in our standard of living, but

we will make it in the end and may well be better off going our own way without the eastern provinces. We will tighten our belts, straighten our stetsons, roll up our sleeves, and get down to business. As politicians you may be of the opinion that we are all a bunch of complainers. While there are a great many of them, the majority are decent, productive, hardworking, and very loyal people if they believe and trust in you. If you don't let us down, we won't let you down either. But have the courage to grab the bull by the horns, because as sure as the sun sets, we are headed down the path to oblivion anyway. Remember, if the horse trusts you, he'll go where you pull the reins. But rest assured that if he doesn't, you'll be picking burrs from your backside. And that is true. That was told to me by my grandfather, who is not a cowboy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Are there any questions?

MR. DAY: Maybe just a quick one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Day.

MR. DAY: Gavin, I was interested in your comments, for instance, that P.E.I. shouldn't be a province. I think the folks there might have an opinion on that.

MR. ANGER: I'm certain.

MR. DAY: Are you suggesting that the federal government just unilaterally declare, whether it's P.E.I. or somebody else, that they not be allowed to be a province?

MR. ANGER: No.

MR. DAY: Or encourage them to think of themselves in terms of regions? Is that what you're saying?

MR. ANGER: At the moment they're basically talking about economic union, and obviously that is good. That's one portion of it. I find they'll have a lot of problems trying to get to political union. If you only have one Premier, there's only one guy that's going to get it; there won't be three or four guys that are going to get it. There are not going to be 70 cabinet ministers; there's going to be, like, 20 or 30. So there's going to be a lot of political resistance, so to speak, and I find that that's probably going to be their biggest drawback and their biggest hurdle to overcome.

They would be much more efficient, I'm sure, if they became one province. There's no doubt, if you really think about it. They have three or four ministries of fisheries, three or four ministries of the environment, three or four ministries of transportation, of this and that, et cetera, et cetera. If you could combine them all into one, I think you could run it more efficiently. I don't think there's any question about that. It should be logic. Maybe there's something I'm missing, but I think it should be logic.

MR. DAY: Yeah. I was just wondering about the process to get there; that's all. Thank you.

MR. ANGER: Well, you know, I don't like putting heavy hands on anybody. I certainly would like to do the incentive program, the incentive type of thing. I'm not really fussy about government. I think government should be more an incentive type of

government as opposed to somebody like the NDP. When I was younger, I used to be a member of the NDP. I went to the Kingston convention in '75. But then again I've sort of had a bit of a change of mind.

MR. DAY: I sensed that.

MR. ANGER: Yeah. But it's not like I'm a Social Credit or something either. I don't really hang my hat on any particular banner, except that I don't like a lot of government. The more hands you have in something, the more meddling you get. The red tape just gets thicker and thicker and thicker, and you just don't get through it.

MR. DAY: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. ANGER: Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You haven't inspired any other questions. Thank you.

The final presenters on the list are Vern Overdeyest and Raj Sekhon. Sorry, Raj; I had your name spelled incorrectly as it was given to me.

MR. SEKHON: It's all right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Maybe you're like me: call me anything you want except late for dinner.  
Welcome.

MR. OVERDEYEST: Thank you for allowing us to appear before you this evening. Today we are witnessing an explosive growth in the levels of immigration to this country. This immigration is needed as the current birth rate in Canada is approximately 1.6, well below the rate of 2.1 which is required to sustain the present level of economic activity in Canada into the next century. With the increase in immigration has also come an increase in misunderstanding of the various peoples coming to Canada and Alberta. The danger in the situation is that currently there is no mechanism in place to teach well-established Canadians the customs and behaviours of newer Canadians. Instead, everyone is left to learn haphazardly on their own. In his 1982 study Alberta anthropologist Norman Buchignani found that ethnocultural associations in Calgary spent the least amount of time as organizations instructing and educating the indigenous population about foreign cultures. These associations do not place enough significance on actively changing current misunderstandings that native Calgarians and Albertans might have about one ethnic group or the other. The perceived widening gulf between English and French Canada only adds to this burden.

The original borders of this country do not encourage individuals to explore nor cultivate relationships with other Canadians. Instead, by virtue of provincial cultures we find ourselves looking across the street rather than across the country. For example, can a woman employed as a lawyer and working in downtown Calgary understand the cyclical unemployment and its effects on those in the maritimes? Can a tobacco farmer from Jonquière, Quebec, understand the feelings of economic isolation experienced by those living in Williams Lake, B.C.? Finally, can an Ottawa bureaucrat at Indian Affairs really perceive the centuries-old frustration of his clients?

In short, one of the problems in Canada today is that as individuals we are suffering from an inability to draw upon our

own personal experiences to understand someone else's personal, political, or cultural predicament. That which has an influence upon our own psychological stream of consciousness is regional in nature, not national.

In describing our concerns to you this evening, we would like to briefly outline one possible solution to deal with the problems mentioned herein. The solution revolves around one central idea, that of an exchange program between students from various parts of Canada. By this we do not mean the exchange programs already in place in universities or in local schools, where participation is voluntary and is a one-shot deal, nor do we mean the federally sponsored programs of the past such as Katimavik, which had young Canadians out in the middle of the bush hacking down dead trees. Rather, when we refer to an exchange program, we mean the following: one, where participation is mandatory; two, where participation is on a national scale but organized at the provincial level; three, where the end goal of such a program is to deliberately and intently foster a clearer understanding of the regional personalities of this country; and finally, four, where exchanges take place on a frequent basis as part of a school's regular academic curriculum.

9:03

In outlining this idea, we would like to share with you tonight three specific examples of just how such an exchange is currently taking place. The first pertains to myself and my colleague Raj Sekhon. For the past three years we have been actively sharing and exchanging our cultural experiences with high school students in and around Calgary. The result of this work, as reported by the media, students, and teachers alike, is a positive and conciliatory change in the way born and bred Calgary students are willing to view members of different racial and ethnic groups. The approach is based on the interactive model and encourages as much discussion of the current understanding that students have of multiculturalism.

The second example relates to the work of the Calgary board of education. The board organizes a program called Connections in which students from all 14 public high schools are brought together to listen and exchange their views and current understandings of certain ethnic and racial groups with the individuals from those backgrounds. This year's program, held at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, drew approximately 200 students and teachers. The program was described by students as highly successful because of one main factor: participants were allowed to share beliefs and perceptions, correct or incorrect, in an atmosphere that encouraged a clearer understanding of different forms of behaviour and culture.

The final example we would like to bring to your attention is that of the educational system in Japan. Annually, thousands of students across Japan are sent off to live and learn in other geographical regions of their complex country. The process is simple, straightforward, does not cut any corners, and it works. Beginning with what we refer to as kindergarten, Japanese toddlers are sent to their local zoo for a day. They are given well-prepared instructions on how to deal with the events that will unfold that day and are told to observe. By the time they are in grammar school, they will visit a neighbouring city for a weekend and study the local history. When students enter the junior high school system they will take two- and three-day trips to neighbouring prefectures or provinces and again begin to acquire a taste for local customs and habits. By this time the students, now in their teens, have a well-rounded view of their country, a perfect experiential base from which to tour one of

Japan's four main islands for a week or more. By the time they leave grade school, the Japanese educational system has provided its students with a complete understanding of their country from city to city, prefecture to prefecture, and as a nation as a whole.

One of the reasons there is no constitutional crisis in Japan today is that the Japanese understand themselves. In sharp contrast, I will say that Canadians do not.

The three programs we have touched upon all have the same following characteristics. One, they allow individuals to explore beyond the realm of their current level of understanding. Two, they all encourage debate of various opinions and ideas in a nonthreatening atmosphere. Three, positive attitude change is more likely to occur because participants of these programs are exposed to new experiences that previously were not within their own repertoire of experiences. Finally, four, these programs do one thing that University of Lethbridge sociologist Reginald Bibby says Canada does not do; that is, allow people to talk to one another, discuss their differences and similarities, and, most importantly, allow Canadians to demonstrate problem-solving behaviour.

In summary, the solution we are suggesting this evening is not a quick fix. We agree that what we are proposing will take years, patience, and money, but when your identity as a member of a nation is at stake, these costs are to be expected.

We leave listeners this evening with one parting thought. By the time the Canadian government had finished its part in bombing Iraq back to the Bronze Age, 100 million tax dollars had been spent. At the very least, it seems reasonable to consider the comparatively fractional costs of supporting an exchange program to save our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you for your presentation this evening. I guess I have some thoughts that if there's no residue of goodwill or tolerance for each other in this country, then there's really no basis on which to build from where we're at. What I find intriguing is that you didn't talk about sort of constitutional arrangements. Do you think maybe we're becoming too preoccupied with the legalities - you know, Constitution laws - and we aren't really getting at some of the basic attitudes we need to develop if we intend to maintain a nation?

MR. OVERDEYEST: In my opinion, yes. I think that is correct. My academic forte is in sociology; it is not legal or political or management or anything along those lines. I really have no knowledge of the legal system in Canada. Like the previous gentleman, I am not a lawyer of any stripe at all. I know that amongst colleagues I circulate with, we ask ourselves that same question. It all seems to be about the Constitution, about legal matters, and we take a step back and say, "Hey, look, I really can't deal with this." It's something we're not well versed enough in in order to compete or to actively give a good opinion. So by far I think some of the matters, some of the issues being dealt with by the Constitutional Reform Committee should be things of a more top-of-the-mind nature that, I guess, the general public can simply chomp into and participate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We appreciate your contribution.

Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the time given for people who had registered. There is now going to be a period for open discussion. The committee has received notice of two individuals who would like to make short presentations, but it would be helpful to us if we knew whether there are more than two. Would those who want to hold up their hands so we can count? Eight. I believe we are going to have to restrict each person to five minutes then.

We'll start with the two names we received in the order they were received. The first is Peter Aubry.

MR. AUBRY: Mr. Chairman, I object to being limited to five minutes. I feel that if I can't have 15 minutes to make my presentation, a decision should be made to reconvene this committee so I can get my other 10 minutes in. [some applause]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before everybody breaks out in applause, for your information, this week is not going to be the only time spent by this committee, we believe. After we're finished the hearings between now and next Saturday evening, we will be meeting the following week to discuss further requests for input.

MR. AUBRY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Let me make that decision, will you, please? I would like to speak for 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I imagine everybody in the room would like to speak for 15 minutes, and we just don't have the time, Mr. Aubry.

MR. AUBRY: I'm prepared to stay here until midnight. I drove in from the country to speak for 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have a procedure of getting registered. You had the opportunity of getting on the list.

MR. AUBRY: I did phone, sir. I phoned and I was told to come here and I would be given 15 minutes to speak to this committee. Now, I request 15 minutes to speak to this committee, sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, if you take 15 minutes, you're going to be taking time away from other people, because the committee is not going to meet until all hours of the day. I know you don't think politicians do anything, but we've all had a rather long day.

MR. AUBRY: I didn't say that, Mr. Chairman. I did not say that. You said that.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can just clarify. There was the registration list. We have indicated that we would come back. For anybody who wants the full 15 minutes, we as a committee, it was my understanding, agreed that we would come back to do that on another occasion. This time period was for those who hadn't indicated that they wanted to but have been somehow encouraged by what they've heard today to become involved. I don't know how we can work any more fairly than that.

9:13

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Aubrey, using this time will not prejudice your right to return to the committee.

MR. AUBRY: M. le président, mesdames et messieurs, je suis Canadien. I'd like to firstly talk about why I'm here. I'm here because this is my country. I'm disappointed. When I asked to speak to this committee, I asked if the hall we were gathering in would be big enough. Obviously it's too big, and that's regrettable.

My family on both sides came to this great country in 1791 and 1792. In those days, with the lack of communication and transportation, there were large families that came from parts of this country, and those large families dissipated into all areas and all regions of this country.

I'm here because I can talk about Quebec. I can talk about the Quebecois; I can talk about the Canadien. I never lived in Westmount. I never lived in Montreal or Quebec, but I worked in Quebec province. I worked in the northern parts of Quebec where the young people were illiterate and had to leave home to stake claims in the bush so their families could be supported and they could eat. I was there as a university student to write their letters and read their mail, and those young people were Canadian. They were not Quebecois first; they were Canadien. They dreamed that someday they could come to Alberta or come to British Columbia and see what this country was all about.

In those days Quebec was ruled by the professional. If your daddy wasn't a doctor or a lawyer, or if you were not a priest, you were a zero. We could see it in the factories in Quebec, where English predominated in the supervisory and management positions. The Englishmen who ran those factories didn't know one word of French, and the 1,500 people who worked the machine tools were French-speaking.

The Quebecois are not demanding anything from this country. The word "distinct" is just a slip of the tongue. The people who are destroying this country, who are wanting separation in Quebec, are people who have never known what it is to go hungry. They are the professionals, the people who stand to gain from any form of sovereignty or separation. We must as a province, we must as individuals ensure that this country never becomes disunified.

The problem we see today has existed for many years. I'm not here to bad-mouth politicians or leaders of this country. This problem has been festering for years. This problem should have been corrected, the start to correct this country, and what's happening today should have started after Duplessis fell from power.

The Quebecois is the person that I know. The Quebecois is not Jacques Parizeau or Lucien Bouchard or anybody who stands to benefit from what these people are trying to do to my country. This is Canada. Quebecois is Canadian, Albertan is Canadian, and let's not ever lose sight of that. We are dealing with individual people, and it's time the advisers be made up of more than presidents of companies and lawyers and doctors. It is time that people go to Chicoutimi, Roberval, and Amos and find out what those people think of Canada. Quebec, I believe, is the province that will save this country, because if it had not been for Quebec in the past several years, we wouldn't be gathered here to find out what we could do to improve this country.

As I said earlier, I'm not here to bad-mouth any individual politician, but I'm here to say that I did not cause the problems in this country. The people in this room did not cause the problems in this country. It's the form of government, the form of party politics, that has caused the problems in this country, because the party always comes first, the political career always comes first. I look around this table and tell myself, "I think I know more about this country than any of you, because I worked

in the areas where it counts." One of the elected Senators in this country told me that he knew the Quebecois because he had lived and worked in Westmount. He knew different Quebecois than I know.

What can we do to improve this country? What can we do to keep it unified? Thank goodness our young children are learning about this country in schools. I never had that opportunity when I lived in Ontario, my mother and dad never had the opportunity when they lived in Quebec, but the kids today have that opportunity. No child is born hating anybody. Children are taught to hate. When I was in school in Ontario as a French-speaking Canadian, I attended mixed schools where there were two classrooms out of 10 that had French-speaking kids. I had fistfights every night as a minority because I was called a frog. Who taught that child that called me a frog to hate me? The children today are demanding justice, they're demanding unity, and some of them are still being taught to hate. Who benefits from this sorrowful thing we're going through in this country? There are other parties who benefit. There are people like Lucien Bouchard and Jacques Parizeau who benefit. There are other parties who are preaching the gospel of hate, and believe me, there are people in this country who hate. They hate Frenchmen, they hate Jews, they hate Chinese, and they hate Indians. That has to change, because if they hate at age 50 or age 60, their children and grandchildren are going to hate.

We talk about a reformed Senate. There will never be a reformed Senate in this country, because there's too much power in the hands of very few who are more concerned about their party and their careers. That, committee members, has to cease. The advisers have to be other than ex-politicians or presidents or lawyers or doctors. If you want to know something about the trucking industry, talk to the truck driver. If you want to know something about the oil industry, talk to me; I'm a geologist, not a politician. I'm not here to talk about the oil and gas industry; I'm here to talk about people.

We talk about the welfare system. There are two forms of welfare in this country, the individual welfare system and the corporate welfare system. I'm in an industry that is one of the biggest bloodsuckers as far as the corporate welfare system is concerned.

Cut programs. If you're going to cut programs from people, then cut programs from industry and that will be an equal playing field.

We have some tired bureaucrats. I have never heard a politician say that a senior bureaucrat was inappropriate in his work or incompetent. Well, believe me, committee members, there are a lot of tired people, lacking in innovation, that help cabinet ministers in this country make decisions. In my business, if it doesn't run well you change your advisers.

9:23

We talk in this country about minorities, and we talk in the country about people with disabilities. What do we do about the homeless in this country? What do we do about the battered wives in this country? What do we do about the mentally ill in this country? We talk about it. Those people are disadvantaged. Nobody asked to be homeless. Everybody was born eight or 10 or 12 inches long. What happened that that person is on the street? What happened that that person is disadvantaged or ill? Illness and disabilities aren't prayed for.

Aboriginal rights: what's the problem here? We're dealing with people, dealing with human beings, and the way to solve those problems is not to throw money at these people. You

have to have dialogue and more dialogue and more dialogue until the problem is solved.

The question that I guess has to be asked in politics is this: where is the accountability, except at election time? In my business, if you have someone who is not doing the job properly, you have an out: you can cease that person's employment. In the political arena you can't do that, except at election time. Perhaps we should have a process that enables voters to fire people between elections if they're not doing the job properly.

I urge you and beg you to recognize that we are dealing with people. We're not dealing with corporations or whether somebody's making a profit or whether somebody is doing well in school. We're dealing with people, dealing with human beings, and to me one person is as important as a thousand.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Aubry.  
Mr. Frank Finn, please. Nice to see you, Frank.

MR. FINN: Mr. Chairman, I'll only be two or three minutes. I have some notes here, so I want to be where I have them in front of me. I don't have a written presentation.

I, like Mr. Aubry, I guess, can trace my ancestors in this country back to the 1700s. My father and my uncle fought in the First World War. I was in the air crew in the second, as were several of my cousins, two of whom who happened to be prisoners of war. I was born in rural Alberta over 70 years ago, and I've lived in a number of towns in Alberta with a broad cross section of ethnic people. I just have a few quick ideas on what we can do to maybe continue to unite this country. They're not constitutional ones.

I feel it's most desirable for us to remain one country with one set of laws and rules for all, including provinces and municipal governments and people. By this I mean no distinct societies, no ethnic or minority special preferences, the French language only in the provinces or municipalities where the majority want it and English where the majority want that language, but I do think we are a bilingual country. To ensure we have equal or fair regional treatment, I think we have to have a Senate that is equal, effective, and elected.

Native people should be given the land they are entitled to in writing by treaty or existing legislation, and where there are none of these, they have to be dealt with straightforwardly and reasonably under today's conditions. You can't go back 150 or 200 years, but get it settled and get it settled quickly. You can't go on negotiating for five or six or 10 years. It's been too long; it's got to be done quickly, whether they have self-government on their individual reserves and are funded like any other municipal entity or continue to accept their existing federal aid and then have to be run by the department of Indian affairs and not given a blank cheque. Regardless of which option they elect, they must be subject to all Canadian laws and law enforcement that the rest of us are. We can't have an Oka or an Oldman River dam or anything else. They've got to be subject to the same laws that you or I would.

Now, the biggest problem, I think - a couple of other ideas very quickly. Firstly, we must convince all our citizens, both old and new, that they must become proud to be Canadians, and they must be Canadian first and foremost regardless of their racial heritage or customs. To start with, Premier Getty should convince Saskatchewan and New Brunswick to fly our Canadian flag over their provincial institutions; they don't do this. When he achieves that, because they appear to want to be a continuing

part of Canada, then he should convince Quebec to do the same thing before we're ever going to think nationally.

Secondly, we should compel our schools to start the day by singing *O Canada* or *The Maple Leaf Forever* in every classroom, which I also happened to learn and sang quite regularly when I was growing up and going to school in the '20s, so our own children - my kids and grandkids don't know the words to it - will realize what Canada is all about and be proud of it.

The politicians have to publicly recognize that those new Canadians who insist on forcing their former country's religious and visible symbols on our everyday life and demand that we change are just as racist as those of us who want them banned completely.

Bilingualism shouldn't be forced on all Canadians. Local language, French or English, should be determined in every province at the municipal level by the majority in that area. Federal civil service jobs should not demand bilingualism as a requirement.

Just one other slight thing, Mr. Chairman: I was a little upset, I guess, at reading in the paper last week about this Sikh gentleman who became an RCMP. The thing I'm getting at here once again, to quote what the paper said, and it was a direct quote: he said he was proud to be what he is and wear a turban. He was proud to be a member of the RCMP. Never once did he say he was proud to be a Canadian and appreciated that Canada had given him a chance to come over here and do what he's doing and be what he is. I guess that's my big beef. Where we have to start is, I guess, with all our new Canadians, with a lot of our older Canadians - even our hockey players don't stand at attention when they're singing *O Canada* at a hockey game, but if you watch the American players, when they sing the American anthem, they stand at attention.

We've got to teach our children, my grandchildren and all the children of new Canadians when they come here, that they are now Canadian: you're going to learn our songs; you're going to learn our customs. You came here because you thought what we had was better. Then do things the way we want to do them. If we have a dress code, the employer should be entitled to enforce that dress code. If you don't want to obey it, then quite frankly you should go find a different type of employment. There's no reason why when a new Canadian comes here we suddenly have to adopt his customs and rights. He has come here because this is better, and he should be glad to be here, glad to be a Canadian, but we've got to do everything we can to make him a Canadian, not something different or anything else. He's a Canadian once he comes here and is a landed immigrant.

That's basically all I have to say.

9:33

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The Chair doesn't have any more names.

MR. REID: May I speak, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, you may. For the record I guess we should have you identify who you are, though.

MR. REID: Sure. I'm glad to do that. My name is Mike Reid. I live here in Calgary.

Very briefly, I believe in a strong centralized Canada, a unified Canada. I grew up convinced that Canada was a confederation of provinces, and I've come to realize from working across Canada that it's actually a confederation of individuals. You have to wonder: if the people who originally

set up the structure of Canada, specifically geographically, had it to do all over again, how would they do it? We've got, to a certain extent, almost ecological zones. You've got watershed boundaries for provinces, and you've got some fairly artificial boundaries as well, where the boundaries follow longitude.

I often wonder if all of this arguing and debate and combativeness would exist if you didn't have those boundaries over which to fight. In order for someone to say: I want something and I have something and I'm not willing to give it up and I'm willing to argue about it, you have to be something other than a Canadian. The provincial boundaries suggest to me that they've been there for so long we've come to accept them, and they are now almost barriers to Canadians working together.

I have a feeling - and I know I'm going to sound like a bit of a goof, perhaps - that if we were to consider the abandonment of traditional provincial boundaries and the adoption of purely arbitrary administrative zones with a strong centralized administration for Canada, many, many, many of these arguments would simply disappear because they have no geographical basis upon which to argue. Canada is traditionally split up from north to south in multiple provinces. If you, for instance, had sweeping zones from the northwest down to the southeast - these could be long and narrow - you'd have a little bit of the north, a little bit of the south, a little bit of the east, and a little bit of the west. They become administrative zones. People have no choice but to start working together, and all of these traditional arguments simply disappear.

We've got a fabric in Canada which is going to exist culturally whether you like it or not. The only reason it has become something over which we can argue is because it has become centralized in geographical zones. Do away with those zones, and perhaps you'd do away with the arguments.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Would you like to come to this mike, sir? Then followed by Mr. Dean.

MR. MURRAY: Bob Murray. I have written a number of letters to your committee, and I'm anxious to hear some answers or a time when I might obtain some of these answers.

First, I'd like to say I agree very heartily with Mr. Kahn over here, who has indicated to you, and I believe speaks for a lot of us, that you should keep your constitutional discussions fairly simple. We seem to be so involved right now with procedures, with topics. A Constitution is something that you should develop that lasts for a long time, and therefore it has to be basic and fundamental.

I think we have to start looking for some of those truths that we hold self-evident, some principles. What do we believe in, and what are we? I think you can enunciate some very simple principles and then establish a Constitution that applies to all people. I think the one thing you've heard here and the one thing I have heard is: everybody is looking for an honest to God equality. We don't want an independent state of Quebec. We don't want an independent state of Alberta. We want equal for all.

Now, let's face it: it's only been a few years, since 1927, that women were regarded as persons in the eyes of the law. Right now there seems to be a lot of concern that native people, minorities are not yet regarded as persons in the eyes of Canada. I suggest that really what you have to do in your constitutional developments is develop some principles. Once a person is defined, then you define the rights that person has, and we all

have them equally. The same thing goes for provinces or regions. You define the principles that you want, and then all of us have them equally. That's really constitutionally what I'm looking at.

Before we get panicked by a referendum and further media hype that's coming from Quebec, when is somebody going to speak for Canada and for me and start telling the truth, the way it really is? When are we going to start telling Quebec or the rest of Canada what we stand for and what they are not going to have?

I ask you simply this: who owns Canada? Let me preface that by one more little example. I own my property here in Calgary. It's fully paid for, tax free, no liens. I own my property, but I don't. The city of Calgary can expropriate my land, and they don't have to pay me what I think it's worth now or what some independent individual says it's worth. It's sort of a committee kind of approval that will decide what my land is worth and who is going to take it over. If the province of Alberta wants the land for some legitimate purpose, they can expropriate it from the city of Calgary, and they do it all the time. They don't have to pay to the city of Calgary what the city of Calgary thinks it's worth. If the country of Canada wants to make it into a park, they can expropriate it from the province of Alberta. Who, then, owns Canada?

If it is as I believe it to be, that Canada owns Canada, then frankly a referendum by a group of people in an isolated region of Canada does not set the laws of Canada and does not expropriate a portion of Quebec. When is somebody going to stand up and say to Quebec, "Look; if you do separate, where are you going to separate to? Because it sure as hell isn't going to be to my Canada." That's what I'm trying to say. How can you assume they are going to be entitled to what are the current geographical boundaries of Quebec? Hell, the geographical boundaries of Quebec were not even established until 1927 or later, when certain other regional lines were cut. So if in fact they are not going to separate to what are now the provincial boundaries of Quebec, where are they going to separate to? I don't plan to give up any of my land to an individual group who wants to set up some kind of unique sovereignty association. What I'm really saying, again, is: if Canada owns Canada, when are you going to start telling them what the consequences and what the realities of this thing are? How long are we going to have to sit here and wait for somebody to speak for what Canada is all about?

Personally, I want Quebec to be a part of Canada. I want Canada to remain whole. I want Canada to be equal. But I don't think it's going to get that way by merely waiting and extending the time frame without talking in terms of what the realities of the situation are. If I'm wrong, now, and if in fact Quebec by virtue of a referendum can in fact separate, then I am trying to stop them from doing something they should have the right to do, and I won't do that. But if Quebec is trying to sneakily, divisively take something that belongs to me, then when is somebody going to stand up in the rest of Canada and say: "Stop. We're not going to go along with that"?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dean.

MR. DEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ross Dean. I'm from the village of Lyndon. I'm a little ways out of town also.

Just a couple things. It's been mentioned about our form of government, and it's been mentioned here also that our system of government was not set up for the likes of thee and me; it

was set up and was made by the Crown and by the church to meet their needs. It's not meeting the average man's needs today. I think that has to be changed.

I think what people have to do is define what they want our government to do. Personally, I think they should be a protector. I think they should make a level playing field for businesses. I think they should make a level playing field for human rights, and it should not be just human rights; it should be human rights/obligations. When you bestow on me or when I demand a right to marry, I'm also imposing on a woman an obligation to marry me. We've got to be careful when we talk about rights; "obligations" has to be said also.

9:43

Again I come back to: we have to define what we want our government to do. They should be able to set building standards across Canada, set safety standards, so that if I buy a car in Saskatchewan, if it's still Saskatchewan tomorrow or Quebec tomorrow or whatever, it's not going to fall apart and I can drive it in Alberta, if it's Alberta tomorrow. Medical, educational: set the base standard that everybody must have. If the province of Alberta deems that they want better, fine; you've met the base requirement. That's all anybody cares. If I'm an employer in Ontario and somebody comes from Alberta - "What education did you have?" "I had XYZ" - I know where I stand with that individual. I know I have to add to their education or that hey, bang, I've got a crackerjack here, because they're giving better than we are right now. A standard, and a standard applied equally to everybody. If a politician breaks the law or if a poor man breaks the law, if the penalty is 10 days in jail, then it should be 10 days in jail for everybody, with no circumstances and no trading off. There's too much of this trading off.

You're not going to like me, Stan, but I think maybe we can no longer afford our Prime Minister and Premiers. I think they should be conscripted. Honestly. If our problems in Canada or the province are economic, let's conscript somebody like Lee Iacocca, if he exists in Canada, and say: "Bud, you're working for us until the problem is solved, and your company is paying your salary. We're giving you \$1." If it's social, we get the best social mechanic we have, and we get them in there, and we get our problem solved. You work yourself out of a job.

Those are a few of the things that we might be able to do. There's a lot more, but I think there are some other folks that want to talk. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Next, please.

MR. COLLIER: Is it over to me now? Okay. I do have a short paper, and I do have copies, so maybe I'll come to the front, if that's okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Certainly. If you'd just identify yourself, please, for the record.

MR. COLLIER: My name's Richard Collier. I've lived in Calgary for 23 years. I have a fairly specific sort of concern, rather than a wide-ranging one. I think this paper, which is only two pages long, won't take more than about five minutes, so with your permission, I'll just read it.

Although I recognize the imperatives attached to social and political matters such as language rights, aboriginal issues, regionalism, and multiculturalism, I would prefer to leave these complex and emotion-laden matters to those commentators with

keener minds and loftier vantage points than I. I wish, in fact, to confine my remarks to the possible inclusion of a charter of rights for the environment within a new Constitution for Canada.

Undoubtedly it is a remarkable advance in human consciousness for constitutional debate to consider environmental matters to be within its legitimate boundaries. Such an historical change suggests two things: first, that human beings have become increasingly aware of their interdependency with the fragile ecosystems of this planet, and two, less optimistically, that time is running out to repair the damage done to the environment by unrestrained industrial exploitation.

The list of concerns, for example, that ought to be addressed either implicitly or explicitly in an environmental section of the Constitution is staggering. I list them: the right to clean, breathable air, especially in cities; the right to clean, drinkable water; the right to unspoiled and undammed rivers; the right to soil unpoisoned by chemicals, bacteria, or radioactivity; the right of access to green spaces; the preservation of animal and plant species from unnecessary suffering, slaughter, or extinction; the right of access to visually and auditorially pleasing topographies; the right to have our natural resources husbanded and gardened with appropriate sensitivity; the right to a food chain unpoisoned by toxic chemicals and antibiotics; the right to shelter and transportation that is not contaminated and that does not itself contaminate the environment. I'll stop there. I could go on, but that's all I have on the paper.

It would be possible to speak at length about each of these issues and about why such rights should be part of a Canadian Constitution. Again, because I am not expert in these areas, I choose not to do so. What I am expert in and what I do wish to emphasize is the following: the right of Canadians to preserve and to enjoy in their natural state throughout the country tracts of indigenous wildlands. By wildlands I mean the areas of mountains, valleys, grasslands, lakes, seashore, and the like in this country that exist today much as they did before the arrival of European settlers. Another way of putting this is that they have not yet been disturbed or destroyed by mining, timber cutting, damming, road building, or other industrial, recreational, or technical projects.

We have precious few of these areas preserved for us today, especially in the populous south of the country, and what we do have is constantly under attack by entrepreneurs and by government. For example, the wildlands surrounding the national parks of Banff, Kootenay, Yoho, and Jasper are being eroded, disturbed, and altered by the building of roads, golf courses, hotels, resorts, ski areas, lodges, marinas, cat-skiing facilities, hot tubs, condominiums, guided tour sites, alpine huts and shelters, off-road vehicle use areas, and helicopter tourism staging pads. Helicopter tourism, incidentally, includes the following activities: heli-sightseeing, heli-skiing, heli-hiking, heli-bicycling, heli-fishing, heli-picnicking, and I just heard of another one today, heli-scuba diving. It's getting out of hand. Even within our national and provincial parks we find developments that are contrary to the concept of the preservation of natural wildlands: alpine ski resorts, hotels, mountaineering centres, high-altitude huts, radio towers on mountain summits, and, again, excessive helicopter use.

A constitutional clause on the environment that deals with wildlands should need to state explicitly or empower government to: one, put a stop to any further development in entrepreneurial activity within Canada's national parks without full review and inquiry; two, expand the boundaries of the national parks to include and protect surrounding natural wildlands, reclaiming them from industrial and recreational exploitation when

necessary; and three, expand the system of protected natural wildlands until it includes 12 to 15 percent of Canadian territory by the year 2000.

I just want to point out that my brief here is written on unbleached, recycled paper.

Thanks very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

Yes, sir.

MR. MacISAAC: My name is Sean MacIsaac, and I'm a citizen from Calgary. I just have a number of points that I urge you to consider in the constitutional debate you're involved in. I'm trying to distil some positive suggestions that I think will help, because I feel we have the best country in the world. There was a UN study that put us second in our present condition - second - well ahead of the United States, well ahead of all the major European countries that we tend to feel we're not the same as. In other words, we have an awful lot going for us in the eyes of outsiders. Please, let's just look at what it is - it's a wonderful country - and have some regard for all the good things it does have.

The concerns I have from a constitutional point of view are the inability of Canadians - and I think we have a cynicism and a real desire to backbite Quebec and French and this type of thing. I really feel they've contributed their share, and it's unfortunate that it's not perceived that way by many. I think that if they spent time and visited that part of the country, they'd realize they're a hardworking, productive people with whom it would do us great credit to continue to be associated. I think, you know, we should just get down to that human level of not taking these line scores of so-called statistics, which I think have been manipulated beyond belief to suggest that, for instance, the Saskatchewan's farmers, who've had it in a very tough way in the last seven years, have not taken out a lot more from this country than, say, Quebec, which is an advanced industrialized area that's contributed a lot. We continue to be possessed by the desire to want to think about those negative things, and I really think they're in our minds and are not the facts.

9:53

The next thing is that I think we've got to look at some form of effort to perhaps break down some of our provincial barriers. My concern is that if things go in the track they're on now, I can well foresee Quebec having a situation where there's greater provincial rights. Perhaps it's not such a bad thing. Surely a lot of people are saying from an Alberta perspective that we should have more local power. I suggest that we don't just sit in a situation where we have 2 and a half million people, or however many we have in Alberta, but I would like to see efforts by our provincial and federal politicians to have much closer co-operation between, say, B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. We could get, for instance, 9 million people in an economic free zone.

I know professionals aren't popular tonight, but it is a tragedy that you can't move from Winnipeg to Calgary in your profession, if you are a professional. Simply, there are all these boards and regulatory authorities and unions and things that prevent the ability of citizens to move within this area. So I'm saying: what if we had 7 million or 8 million people in that group where there was true freedom to move? Then I think we could say: "Right. We have our group of 7 million or 8 million; Quebec's got theirs; Ontario's got theirs; the maritimes have got theirs." Geography and a lot of things would say that thing would work.

Then you could perhaps have, you know, investors from other countries. I don't think they're sinister; I think they're positive. They could look at us, and they won't say: "Well, look. You're 10 little countries. How could I ever set up something here to operate in North America when if I go stateside, I deal with one organization and I can establish in four cities. You have more regulation." We're the most overregulated country on earth, and I think we've got a real problem.

So that's the business thing. I think we have to streamline all of our regulations across the west. We can start the communication process right there by streamlining all those things. I think if we did that, if we showed the ability to work together, perhaps Quebec might be more enamoured with the idea that the country's not losing its economic shirt or the citizens aren't losing their self-confidence and it's worth being part of a group with us.

The next part is the legitimate role of government. I think the Charter of Rights is probably a statement of principle that is worthy of consideration by some of the groups that say we don't stand for what we've said. Well, we have something, and it's called a legal document, and it's a Charter of Rights. It's one of the best documents ever drafted. We've got a Bill of Rights. It's a predecessor of 10 years earlier. It's an excellent piece of draftsmanship. We have those things.

We also have a civilization based on two cultures, two founding peoples, not one, that accept others. I think that is a tremendous thing. I think it's better than, for instance, Japan, which is an ethno-racial culture. I think we've got a wide open one. I think the people that say, "You know, French Canadians, Canada was here first," this type of thing - they've been here 300 years; Albertans have been here 100 years. So, you know, just give them a break. You're going to wreck the country if you go the way you're going now.

The last point is health and education and environment. Those are the priorities for provincial governments and for federal standards. Those are the areas, but get out of business. Get out of Treasury Branch. Get out of Alberta home. We're now talking about half a billion dollars that the federal government's going to put into de Havilland. What's the reason for that? Apparently, de Havilland is a company in Toronto that has 5,000 jobs. They're being bought from Boeing. In other words, they're being sold to an Italian company, and the federal government's being asked to put in half a billion dollars when we have to pay GST. Why? I just don't understand the mismanagement, and I think a lot of Canadians have some real questions about that.

Those are some matters I urge you to consider. Thanks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. COOPER: My name is David Cooper. I've been a resident of Calgary for 12 years. I came as an immigrant from Wales. I've worked on voluntary boards and directorships, and my opinion is based on working in the oil industry, the Olympics, and various different industries.

I see a great rift in this country between the haves and the have-nots. The country is playing on the global stage, but I really think that like a family that doesn't have its act together, the Canadian family should get its act together internally before we spend billions of dollars on the global stage.

I apologize to any legal friends I have, but I'm concerned about our legal processes. They seem to be rather overbearing, and the costs seem to be rather overbearing. I think when you

look at the number of citizens that you would consider to be in the close to poverty range in this country, the cost of process of legalities is much too high.

I think what we're seeing is a maturation of the country. It perhaps could be described as going through its teenage years at this point in time. I believe this process right now is a natural process, and I think it's for the best.

This time is a critical time. I see that the unrest will continue for at least another year or so. I think there are grave dangers if we do not soon look after those individuals in our society with constitutional change that allows those who are under great stress at this time to have some kind of supporting assistance.

The double income has become the standard in this country. That in itself is an erosion of family life. We need to see the costs of utilities and services, and, I regret, dentistry, legal costs - these are very frightening costs to the average person, and the average person is not earning \$50,000, \$60,000 a year. I consider that these kinds of hearings will never attract the kind of person who should really be the hub of our concern; that is, those people who cannot speak for themselves. We have the situation that most people do not come to hearings, do not come to microphones. They are what I would call the silent majority of Canadians, who I believe are honest, upright citizens who have worked hard. They're not necessarily what you might categorize as high-powered businesspeople, but they are the essence of Canada. It is the essence of the people who are honest, with faith and with a conviction that this country is a good country.

Therefore, I think the constitutional changes must very definitely take stock of those individuals who will not speak for themselves. I think there is a great risk that unless you reach out to those kinds of people, be it in the community hall, be it in the workplace, then you will not hear the majority opinion from these kinds of hearings, much as I congratulate you for having them.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.

MRS. WALKER: My name is Eileen Walker. I guess I come from the farming sector. I live north of Strathmore. Some of these points you've already heard, but maybe sometimes repetition will sink into people's heads a little bit more.

First, equal representation for every province in the federal government. No province shall have the right of veto. Majority to rule.

If Quebec leaves Canada, it takes its share of the federal deficit. No special concessions.

Abolish the Senate completely in its present form. Senators must be elected by the people and have no affiliation with any political party. Have two from each province: one represents your urban area, one to represent your rural population.

Have a freedom of information Act in Alberta.

Abolish bilingualism in Canada, and have one universal language, which I would take as English.

Close doors on immigration until we have zero percent unemployment and zero welfare recipients in this country.

Capital punishment brought back in. Extradition of foreign criminals back to their country to be tried for their crimes rather than us wasting millions of dollars keeping these people in this country.

We want our government to stop destroying the family unit. Most of our government funding goes to our welfare, single parents, and nothing in return is given to a family where a

husband and wife are struggling so that one of the members can stay at home and take care of their family. Why could we not pay one of those parents to stay home and look after their kids instead of day care where the government starts to take control of our children? That's exactly what's happening as far as I'm concerned.

10:03

I'd like to abolish pension funds and severance pay for politicians, and I'd like yearly referendums at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels where the people decide on important issues, not just a political party.

Another thing: I'd like you people to stop lending our money to your buddies in your provincial and federal systems. I'm getting tired of it.

Why is our native Canadian culture to be displaced by cultures from other parts of the world? My father came and accepted Canada as his country and accepted the Canadian way of life. Why do immigrants come to this country if they do not want to accept the Canadian way of life?

One final thing that I heard on the news media, said by the Pope: capitalism without morals is worse than communism.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MRS. KAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nancy and gentlemen, my name's Pauline Kay. I'm really excited about what's going on with all of the discussions that we're having all across Canada about some of the things that those 11 people did think was their own prerogative to sit and discuss. I'm really excited about this. The only thing I'd like to see is a few more women at that table and perhaps a little ethnic diversity next time, thank you.

Mr. Reid's comment about getting rid of boundaries is the first time that I've heard that suggestion, and it's been really mulling around in my mind for a long time. We talked a little bit about who's going to be arranging for standards in education. Certainly the role of the province in looking after our provincial interests is very important, but I would like just to remind everyone that those boundaries are imaginary lines. They're imaginary lines, and they do divide us. Perhaps in that sense it creates a community; it creates Alberta so we feel pleased and proud to be Albertans and have elected representatives looking after our affairs.

Nationally, I'd like to take a chalk and erase all of the boundaries that are there. If we have interprovincial committees, we have ways of communicating. I'm afraid that I've seen a lot of the provinces simply raising their arms and their fists, that the idea of a province is to fight other provinces and to fight Ottawa. My sense of Canada puts those arms in perhaps a different configuration: we join, we cradle our nation. If we can get rid of those provincial boundaries, just mentally, for a few minutes and imagine and take advantage of our electronic presence, we have an electronic facility now so that certainly every person in Canada should be able to vote on a Canadian issue.

Perhaps our MPs lose too much of their credibility when they go over the border. When they leave Alberta and go to Ottawa, yes, they are part of a party system and perhaps vote a little too much along the party line. Perhaps those three MPs from Alberta who are very important are suspect because we think they're bringing party line to Alberta. We don't really trust them to represent us because they really don't have a vote for

us in Ottawa.

Now, how are we going to solve this? To me this was the problem when we were talking about Meech. It didn't matter whether we Meeched or we didn't Meech; our MPs were still not going to have any voice after they left Alberta. I really like the idea that if I'm going to be voting for a Member of Parliament who's going to represent me federally, I want him to be looking after my national interests. If we are looking at our national interests, then perhaps there's some way in which we could vote nationally for the people who go to Ottawa.

I'd like to play with the words "House of Commons." We're commoners, I guess. If we look at the House of Commons and play with the word "common" as a common area or a common interest, perhaps if we used electronic voting from all across Canada we could ask certain people to run in a certain area. We could elect six MPs from the point of view of looking after our parks. We could elect another six or 20 MPs to look after our environment. We could elect another six or 20 MPs - whatever the number is - to look after our business interests. They certainly should be looking after our northern interests, our borders, our American or international interests. Every Canadian could at this point, with the electronic setup we've got, vote for every Member of Parliament.

Nancy mentioned the idea of: how would we make this fair? How would we make sure that the golden triangle still doesn't control us? I think the answer there would be proportional representation. If we did have this opportunity for all of us to vote for all of our MPs and we had a certain number of parties, perhaps the proportional representation would be the way that we would end up with a cross-country balance in that.

I'm not sure that we have to establish a Constitution that is solid and rock hard. I do think that if we have the opportunity for total input from all of the people in Canada, there's no reason why we couldn't consider changes as we go along.

Anyway, thank you. Just wipe the country clean, and let's take another look at it, because we are talking about constitutional change. The thing that really upsets us most is that our Members of Parliament are not able to represent us as well as we would like them to.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK: My name's Gib Clark. I'd like to ask a question. The committee's going to sit tomorrow, I believe.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is.

MR. CLARK: Okay. Could I make a specific suggestion? I make it in good faith, and I'm quite sincere about this. You cannot make a decision about how Alberta approaches constitutional reform in a vacuum. It so happens that coincidentally Jacques Parizeau is in Calgary tonight and will be here tomorrow. I strongly urge that you get members of your secretariat to get him down here to sit in the chair in front of you tomorrow and allocate 15 minutes to him as a citizen of Canada representing an area that some of us perceive to have adverse interests, to hear what he has to say about the aspirations of the people that he represents so that you have that as background information to formulate a report on the aspirations of the people that you represent.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll be seeing Mr. Parizeau at lunch at the chamber of commerce. We'd be glad to have him here if he wanted to attend.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does that conclude the speaking list?

MRS. WALKER: Can I just ask one question? We live quite a ways out in the country. Why are you not having meetings in the smaller centres of Alberta?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As the Chair attempted to point out earlier, we're just commencing now. This week is not the only time that we will be holding hearings. The committee will be gathering on June 6 to assess what has happened and what the demand is for further hearings. From the very beginning I have been very supportive of more hearings, but we had to make a start. It was felt that the mere fact that these hearings were being held this week would generate more interest in the subject. The committee will do everything it can to accommodate all Albertans, because that's the whole purpose of this. That is certainly going to be dealt with, Mrs. Walker.

MRS. WALKER: Is that a promise?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't know if you're familiar with where else this committee's going to be going in the next week. There's a like number of us in the other half of the committee that's also going to be traveling the province. This committee on Monday morning will be going to Fort McMurray; on Tuesday morning, Grande Prairie; on Wednesday, Hinton; on Thursday, Red Deer; and then Friday and Saturday next we'll be in Edmonton. The other half are in Edmonton today and tomorrow, and they're going to, I believe, Lloydminster on Monday, followed by Camrose, and then they're going down to Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and they'll be back here in this building next Friday and Saturday.

Yes, Mr. Aubry.

MR. AUBRY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to apologize for barking at you. If it makes you feel any better, I bark at all chairmen. I think that this committee owes me four minutes.

10:13

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, Mr. Aubry, I also wanted to apologize to you, but my main concern was to try to accommodate everybody possible. I hope everybody will understand that we've been meeting here since 4 o'clock, following our other work, and we've got to be back here tomorrow morning to try to be able to listen to what is being presented to us.

On behalf of the committee I would like to take this opportunity of expressing our sincere appreciation to everybody who has come here today to help us to help all Albertans decide what Alberta's position should be in the months and maybe years ahead in making our country a better place.

Yes, Mr. Kahn.

MR. KAHN: Could you just tell me what happens now? I mean, what do you do with the information you get?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The whole purpose of this committee is to make a report to the Legislature. So we want to listen to Albertans, then we will make a report to the Legislature, and that report will be fully debated as an assistance to the government or the Legislature in dealing with this matter when the time arises.

MR. KAHN: But not with a free vote, because you're constrained by party lines. It becomes redundant in a sense. I don't want to make an issue of it. I understand what you're saying: you're doing a report. But if you're constrained by party lines and somebody says, "No, you're not voting that way," what are you going to do?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I guess that's one of the reasons we get those big bucks. But that doesn't mean there's going to be a unanimous report.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let us hope it's more debated than Meech Lake was when it gets to parliament.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think it will be.

[The committee adjourned at 10:16 p.m.]

