

7:06 p.m.

Friday, May 24, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask everybody to take a seat, please. I'd like to commence the meeting. We'll get under way.

For those of you who weren't here this afternoon, I want to welcome you and advise that I'm Jim Horsman. I'm the MLA for Medicine Hat. I am the chairman of this committee. This is a select special committee of the Alberta Legislature, and we have as members a number of people. We're just short one at the moment, but I'll ask the members to introduce themselves quickly.

MR. McINNIS: John McInnis, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. ADY: Jack Ady, MLA for Cardston.

MR. BRADLEY: Fred Bradley, MLA for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. SEVERTSON: Gary Severtson, MLA for Innisfail.

MS BARRETT: Pam Barrett, MLA for Edmonton-Highlands, in which this hotel and a number of other things are located.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our hostess for this evening.

MS BARRETT: Correct.

MR. ROSTAD: Ken Rostad, MLA for Camrose.

MRS. GAGNON: I'm Yolande Gagnon, MLA for Calgary-McKnight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a number of people who are prepared to make presentations. Everyone is aware that they have 15 minutes. At the end of the evening after we've heard from each of the people who wished to make a formal presentation, we will have a time of about 45 minutes when people from the audience who wish to make comments or representations briefly are invited to do so.

We'd like to get under way right away, however, and I will ask the secretary of the committee, whom I did not introduce - I'm sorry, Garry; Garry Pocock is the secretary of our committee - to ask the presenters to come forward.

MR. POCKOCK: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the first presenters this evening are representatives of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta: Mr. Hirsch, Mr. Morley, and Mr. Glover. I'd ask them to come forward, please.

MR. HIRSCH: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Hirsch and Morley are one person, with their names reversed. I'm Morley Hirsch. I'm president of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta, and I'm here with Steve Glover, our executive director. On behalf of Alberta's 5,500 chartered accountants, we thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation.

As you have had an opportunity to read our submission, our comments will be brief so that we can answer your questions. We would like, however, to emphasize the following points. Our integrity as a profession is enhanced by the fact that we are viewed as a national body. As our submission indicates, this is

a consequence of our initiatives in ensuring that powers are shared in an efficient fashion between our national and provincial organizations. It is clear, in our view, that changes must be made in the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments. This will result in consequential changes in taxing powers so that all levels of government can finance their respective obligations. We emphasize, however, that whatever changes are made, Canada's integrity as a nation must remain intact. The division of powers ultimately agreed upon should minimize duplication. We believe that it is the cost of overlapping services that has caused a significant portion of our deficit.

It is also clear, in our view, that Canadians cannot continue to expect premium services from government for bargain-basement prices. Canadians and their respective governments must prioritize their needs and obligations so that the cost of government services becomes more manageable and does not increase our overall debt and tax burden. Finally, education must remain a major priority. Our competitiveness as a nation, and hence our ability to fund our social fabric, demands a highly educated and skilled population.

These are the essential points that we made in our written submission to you. We stand here ready to answer any questions that you may have with respect to that submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Are there questions?

Yes, Jack Ady. Jack, you'll have to use your microphone.

MR. ADY: I keep forgetting that. Thank you.

You indicate that you're really anxious that the overlap of powers be eliminated. On that view, it's going to have to go one way or the other: either more powers to the provinces or more powers to the federal government. Which way do you see that going?

MR. HIRSCH: I don't think I said that precisely. What I said was the overlap in the delivery of services must be eliminated to the extent possible. There clearly are areas in which there is both a national and provincial interest. The manner and means by which the national and provincial governments establish their respective obligations in those areas have to be worked out, but I don't think it follows that it's a one or the other type of situation. The delivery must be done in a fashion that is efficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Jack?

MR. ADY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: Thanks. Two questions. First, you cite the overlapping of jurisdiction with respect to financial institutions as being one example of inefficiency as a result of overlapping jurisdiction. Can you describe the inefficiency that you're getting at there?

MR. HIRSCH: I think I'll turn this over to my executive director, who is slightly more familiar with this.

MR. GLOVER: It's probably not possible to give you an itemized list of what the cost of the inefficiency might be, but inevitably if both jurisdictions are involved in regulating financial institutions, both must build up the infrastructure, the bureau-

cacy, and so on to carry out that regulation. Inevitably, there's going to be more bureaucracy and more cost in total if all of the jurisdictions, all of the provinces, and the federal government build up that type of infrastructure. There may be some offsetting benefits in terms of greater ability to fine-tune or control a local situation, but we're not convinced that there's been that proper cost/benefit analysis in the past, and inevitably there must be overlapping of services and duplication within that process.

MS BARRETT: So you're saying "inevitably"; you do recognize that. Okay.

The second question, then, is: have you envisioned a process whereby constitutional reform can be accomplished with support from a large majority of Canadians?

MR. HIRSCH: That's a very difficult question, because there have been a number of processes described, from a national referendum to constituent assembly to what has gone on in the past: meetings of provincial Premiers and the Prime Minister. We haven't really addressed which is the ideal process, but we do believe – and we compliment the Alberta government and all governments that have started the process of seeking input on issues of relevance to Canadians. I think whatever process is ultimately adopted, that input is a necessary precondition. I think in the final analysis it's our belief that the elected representatives are going to have to have the courage to make decisions because that's what they were elected for, but they must have the input from Canadians of various persuasions with various perspectives before they make those decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yolande Gagnon, and then John McInnis.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. Mr. Hirsch, two questions. First of all, you say that your bottom line is to maintain the integrity of Canada. Can you expand on that? What does that mean?

MR. HIRSCH: That means that Canada is a nation, not a confederation of equal nations, and that in the final analysis the national interest must prevail over provincial interests.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. Thank you.

My supplementary. Do you feel that education, being a top priority, and I think we would all agree with you there, should be a provincial responsibility, a federal responsibility, or a shared responsibility?

MR. HIRSCH: I think it would be naive in the extreme to think that the federal government will not have an interest in education when it funds such a large part of it, but the delivery of education clearly is a provincial responsibility. The balance of how to increase our education delivery systems has to be worked between the two jurisdictions in some fashion.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

7:16

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Hirsch, a question about education just to follow that up. I certainly agree that education is the highest priority in the provincial Legislature, along with our partners, the school trustees and the teachers and the staff. I think that's one of the most important things that we do. Does your association support the idea of national goals for education similar to what

they have in the United States, where they emphasize achieving a certain level of graduation, a certain level of scientific and mathematical skill by a certain point in time?

MR. HIRSCH: I think the performance of our graduates seems to have declined on a relative basis, relative to other jurisdictions, particularly in the sciences. Clearly, that's a priority. I'm not sure I'm answering your question directly, because I'm not sure, when you talk about national goals, whether you're talking from the perspective that this is a federally determined initiative or whether it's a provincially determined initiative. I think to the extent that there can be goals that are articulated on a shared basis between the various jurisdictions, this would be a plus.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps my question could be a bit clearer. Do you support the idea of national standards for education, say a national standard that you have to achieve in order to graduate from high school, for example, a performance standard? If so, with that I think would come the authority to make sure that it's carried out.

MR. HIRSCH: I think personally I would support national standards in that vein.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just follow up on that? You have a national association, and yet you have provincial bodies. Is it true that the chartered accountants of Canada have achieved through consultation amongst your provincial associations a standard of qualification that is uniform across Canada?

MR. HIRSCH: Yes, it is, and it was very difficult to achieve, but we have a shared uniform final exam amongst all provincial institutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And did achieving that goal involve the federal government in any way?

MR. HIRSCH: No, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

MR. GLOVER: Could I just add to that? I think that's an important distinction. I think my colleague was saying that because something is set as a national standard doesn't mean that it's set unilaterally by the national government or the federal government. I just wanted to be clear on that.

We've had the uniform national exam in place since 1939, and it has worked for some 51 years. Just one fact you may be interested in as perhaps an objective quality indicator. We just did some statistics that compared the results by university from all across Canada. The top performing group on a five-year average was the graduates from the University of Alberta. That was top compared to all Canadian universities. In the top 10 were the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge. There's many factors in that success, but it is one sort of objective national standard that demonstrates high quality by Alberta graduates.

MR. McINNIS: Does the national exam mean that a chartered accountant can practise anywhere in the country? Or is it like the law profession, where you have to be admitted to the bar in each province?

MR. HIRSCH: Because an individual passes our uniform final exam, there is an agreement amongst the provinces that, on application, he will be admitted. But it still is by application.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's some very helpful comments. Since you are part of a national organization as well as having specific responsibilities for education within Alberta for your own membership, I think your comments have been very useful.

Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: I just have one question. In your brief you suggest that governments are expected to do too much today given our fiscal capacity. Are there areas which you suggest that government should not be involved in that they're currently involved in?

MR. HIRSCH: No. I think that's a matter of establishing priorities. We did not address specifics, but clearly every interest group looks to government first. I think it's a philosophical problem as much as a financial problem. We have to educate ourselves to look to solutions that do not necessarily involve government.

MR. BRADLEY: Just a supplementary in a different area. You obviously have an interest in the area of duplication of services. You suggested that we should eliminate that duplication, and you've suggested in the capital markets area, the financial institutions. Are there other areas of duplication you can suggest that we should eliminate?

MR. GLOVER: Again it wouldn't be specific, but one general way of going about it that you have to look at: the unit being served is one possibility. The individual senior citizen in Canada is forced to look to probably at least three levels of government and probably more than one if not many departments within each of those governments to identify the full range of senior packages and programs to support them. One aspect of the overlap is what individual or what unit is being served, to minimize the cost from the perspective of the governments in delivering those services but also the cost and hassle for the individual in accessing those services. So I think you would have to come at it from a couple of perspectives, that being one, and we're not in a position to really comment on any specific examples. We put the one in our paper, which I think is realistic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just ask one question? You make a very good point in your brief about international competition and the ability of Canadians to compete in the global market. Would you hold it to be your view in your specific profession that Canadian chartered accountants are capable of meeting international standards relative to the services they provide to the people of Canada and their clients?

MR. HIRSCH: I would say unequivocally yes. We're very involved as a profession in international organizations and have taken many leadership roles there, particularly in the area of the establishment of accounting and auditing standards and ethical standards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a quick follow-up to that, and I don't want to be too long. As things change internationally, has it been possible for the educational systems in Canada to adapt to those changing international standards and developments?

MR. HIRSCH: If you're talking in the area of the profession of accountancy, then I think it has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am just referring to your profession specifically.

MR. HIRSCH: I think it has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MRS. GAGNON: I have one. Can I have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MRS. GAGNON: It was very interesting that in your brief you mentioned that Canadians have demanded premium services but only have been willing to pay bargain-basement prices. Are you referring there to the costs of food, to our tax system? Could you expand on that a little bit? What should we be paying for and how much more kind of thing?

MR. HIRSCH: I think that I alluded to it earlier in my comments, about a philosophy of looking to government without necessarily being cognizant of the cost of government providing services. The government is not always the most efficient provider of services. We look to government for our health system. We have probably a system that's the envy of many other countries. At the same time, it's not a system without a cost. I think if we're going to continue our system, which is an envy, we have to be cognizant of the fact that it is a costly system. Therefore, as citizens we have a responsibility to look both at what is being provided and what we demand from that system and what we're prepared to pay for it. I think sometimes we forget that when we demand services, somebody's going to pay for those services.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your presentation. I know you represent a very large segment of Alberta society. Thank you.

MR. HIRSCH: Thank you.

7:26

MR. POCOCK: Our second presenter this evening is Allen Clark, with the Western Independence Association.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. Good evening, everyone. Well, it is a great day to be an Albertan in my view. I hold in very high regard the aims and objectives of this special committee, and I feel a certain amount of honour in being allowed to sit here, taking home the knowledge that in some small way my comments this evening may aim the future course of the constitutional deliberations of my province. I submitted my brief to you earlier, and I'll take it that you've all had a chance to see it, but I'll just briefly touch on some of the major points of that.

In October of 1987 a group of west Canadians gathered here in Edmonton to plan the beginning of a new federal political party, with the chief aims and objectives of that new party to be to educate western Canadians towards the need for political independence. Now, most of the people shared two common beliefs. That was that the Canadian Constitution and the political system were completely unacceptable at that point, and that none of the existing political parties were capable of making the changes that we believed were necessary.

Why was it necessary to plan the beginning of a separatist party? Surely many felt, as some still do, that simple reform of the Canadian Constitution may have been adequate in addressing many of our concerns. Make no mistake; we studied in depth the possibility of simple reform answering some of our desires. In initially deciding whether or not we should start a new political separatist or reform party, we had to have a complete understanding of the mechanisms of the Canadian Constitution and the mechanisms of reform in that Constitution. We explored the Canadian Constitution and the mechanisms of reform. The result of our exploration into our nation's Constitution and the reason we became a separatist party is encapsulated in the introduction to that Constitution.

This is what we determined. In 1981 Canadians got a new Constitution, but no one cheered. In our bones and our hearts we knew that it was not our Constitution. We had had no part in its creation. What we needed then was a Constitution that included a triple E Senate and an end to bilingualism. We needed a Constitution that we could all understand, and of course the Canadian Constitution isn't anything close to that. We needed a Constitution that could not be changed without our consent. Meech Lake should have been impossible. We came to the conclusion that Quebec and Ontario would never agree to such demands. They would have to give up far too much; they would lose their power to control our government. So we became separatists with the belief that the changes we thought we had to have would never occur within Confederation.

Well, very much has changed since that original introduction was written. Quebec now seems to believe that their aspirations, too, may be better served in a Constitution of their own devising. I'm happy to say that this committee now also seems to be willing to address on a national level many of the concerns that are so important to the people I represent here. In our short history as a political party we learned that there seems to be a western consensus with regard to what the people of western Canada really want in their nation and in their Constitution. It occurred to us also that someone should begin to compile western opinion into a model Constitution, a new vision for a renewed federation.

Well, almost immediately after the 1988 federal election our group began doing exactly that, compiling western opinion into what is now A Constitution for West Canada, which we published in October of 1989. Now, the fact that this document sprang from a western separatist organization notwithstanding, I believe that all of the principles embodied in this Constitution are in accord with what is the majority western view; that is, all the things that westerners consider vitally important to their nation. It now appears to the members of my association that the Alberta government and, indeed, this committee have now begun down the same road that we took two years ago: compiling the interests of Albertans and soliciting their input into that process.

It also occurs to us that you're going to hear exactly the same sentiments expressed now that we heard two years ago. Moreover, we believe that what you will hear will transpose very nicely into a Constitution for Albertans if not for all Canadians. It's our view that that Constitution could become most valuable, if Dr. Peter Meekison was correct during round table 1 when he said that in the event of Quebec's independence, the constitutional order of the rest of the country would in effect be set aside. This is what we call granting the other provinces, by virtue of Quebec's independence, *de facto* independence also.

So it's for this reason that my association suggests that Albertans be prepared for such an eventuality by transforming

the consensus drawn from these committee hearings into a model Constitution. Prior to the commencement of further discussions down the road, the Western Independence Association further suggests that an Alberta public referendum be held to ratify that Constitution, to ensure that our representatives at the next round of constitutional talks are armed with the full faith of the people whom they represent, the people of Alberta.

I would like to discuss for a moment a significant happenstance during the third round table of the Alberta government task force, at which Lise Bissonnette enlightened us with the current goings on inside Quebec. Ms Bissonnette pointed out that the talk of separation in Quebec now has gone beyond the what-if stage, and they are now talking about when. Particularly, they are talking about what kind of association they can mete out with us, between then and now I suppose. She stated plainly that the burning question is about strategy. Apparently, they've been talking to some degree about a new Canadian community much like the EEC on the other side of the Atlantic. The members of my association now believe that the goals of Albertans and Quebecers are very much the same. At least we could agree, as our accountant friends have just pointed out, that economically speaking it's important that our nation appear to be rebuilding, even if what is being rebuilt is, as Stockwell Day pointed out during that round table, merely an umbrella. Nonetheless, it's Canada to the rest of the world.

So in summary, ladies and gentlemen, it's the belief of the members of the Western Independence Association of Canada that the Canadian Constitution is an aberration which does not serve the people that it purports to, and it is such a poor Constitution that it is not even suitable to use as a guide in making a new Constitution. We believe that Quebec's aspirations are compatible with those of most Albertans and that it is possible to reconfederate Canada along the lines of the EEC as proposed by Quebec and as related by Ms Bissonnette. Based upon what I have witnessed both here in Alberta and during the proceedings in Quebec, I believe that what suits the people of the two provinces best would be a new confederal system of mostly sovereign provinces.

Now, I'd like to repeat something that I said earlier; that is, that my association believes what you will hear during these meetings will be representative of a western consensus of exactly what it is we want for our nation and our Constitution. Therefore, we ask that when the deliberations of this special committee are complete, a referendum be held across Alberta to accomplish, really, two things. One, it would demonstrate to all the people in the rest of the provinces our vision of how consensual democracy should work. Secondly, it would ensure, as I said before, that the people who go into that next round of constitutional talks are representing nothing less than the views of the majority of the people of Alberta.

I'd like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to thank the Premier of Alberta and this committee for giving the members of my association the opportunity to make our view of a new Canada known.

Thank you.

7:36

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Well, I'm sure there will be questions.

Yes, John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: Yeah, I do have a question. It's something I've often wondered about people who are separatists. You know, there's a group in Quebec called the Equality Party. You may

have heard of them. They ask a very simple question: if Quebec can separate from Canada, why can't we separate from Quebec? Now, assuming in your scenario that Quebec does separate, what is to say that the rest of the units continue to function as units? I mean, why should Alberta be assumed to be a unit under those circumstances? Wouldn't it be possible that somebody in Alberta could decide that they don't want to be a part of this western independent nation? You might have the nation of Sherwood Park and the nation of Cardston, which would probably not impress too many people on a world stage. I mean, where do we stop? Which of these political units do we declare our loyalty to, or does the loyalty mean anything at all?

MR. CLARK: Well, I don't see that there's much danger of that, because as is the case with any other political thing, it has to gather support, so if someone intends to split Quebec in two or Alberta in two or any other entity, it's going to have to gain a majority of support. To quote Peter Meekison during the round tables, his contention was that most people wouldn't have much regard for the federal government anymore. It would be in chaos, held in contempt virtually. The Alberta government, then, would say, "Well, at least we're in control of this entity, and we can best handle what's going on in Alberta," so they would tend to withdraw into Alberta and proceed from there. I don't anticipate that Alberta would fall apart as a result. I think we'd take solace knowing that our government here was at least prepared should that come about.

MR. McINNIS: Don't you think it's at least theoretically possible that some of the resource-rich parts of our province might decide they don't want to take care of the dirt-poor farmers in some areas of the province and go their own way? I mean, don't you think that's possible?

MR. CLARK: I've never heard of that. Albertans have a unique affinity for one another, in my view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there other questions?
Fred Bradley.

MR. BRADLEY: In your brief you mentioned that you believe there should be an end to bilingualism. I've asked others here. There are some who suggest that language policy should become the responsibility of the provinces. Is that approach something which you would support?

MR. CLARK: I would support that in this day and age, because the province is the place where we have our most direct representation. My personal opinion is that culture and language belong to the people, and government has no right to legislate one way or the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you this question: are there changes to the Canadian Constitution that could be made which would make separation unnecessary?

MR. CLARK: It's difficult to fathom a single or even a reasonable number of amendments. First off, we have to find an amending formula that everyone's happy with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, leaving that aside.

MR. CLARK: To answer with a single word, I don't believe so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't think so. Not even changing the bilingualism policy, for example?

MR. CLARK: Well, that's not going to appease Quebec, which really at this point in time is a lightning rod.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a lightning rod; I agree with you on that. In any event, I just ask you that question, and you say no. I appreciate your frankness and candour. We're here to listen to the views of the people who come before us.

Are there any other questions? Yes, Ken Rostad.

MR. ROSTAD: In terms of your referendum, who would draft that referendum? If you were referring the eventual recommendations of this committee to that referendum, would it either reject or accept it in principle, or would parts of it survive?

MR. CLARK: I hate to presuppose what your recommendations would be, but I would hope that you would feel confident enough in what you hear from Albertans to propose a new vision of Canada primarily to Quebec, because obviously if they don't accept, then the whole process isn't going to even begin. I would think that you could come up with a proposal for Quebec that you might believe would be acceptable to them and have a referendum based on that proposal: should we offer this to Quebec or not? As for the mechanism, that's a function of the Legislature of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, and . . .

MRS. GAGNON: I'm sorry, I have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry, Yolande. I beg your pardon.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. I just wanted to ask you if you don't believe that in the last seven months since round table 2 or 3 – which was it? – took place, changes have occurred both in Quebec and in the rest of the country. This is an evolutionary process. No one is frozen in the same opinions and attitudes that they had in November, and I'm wondering if you're willing to concede that things have changed since November and that maybe we have to move with some of the new facts.

MR. CLARK: I'm willing to concede that there has been a tremendous amount of change, but not politically. In attitudes and in discussions, yes. The Canadian political system, the Canadian Constitution has not changed; our situation has not changed. I'll agree that what has changed is possibly the avenues being discussed in Quebec. Certainly things have changed out here. Albertans are becoming more in tune with what's going on and some of their options, but I don't believe the fundamentals have changed one iota.

MRS. GAGNON: If I might for a supplementary. You quote Peter Meekison. My understanding is that he is taking a sabbatical from the U of A in order to work to save Canada, yet in the way that you quote him, it seems as though he is in favour of separatism. Could you explain that? Unless I misunderstood.

MR. CLARK: I apologize to Peter Meekison. I know he wouldn't support that at all. I quoted Peter Meekison simply because I had the benefit of attending round table 1, when I had opportunity to ask the question: would the Canadian Constitution in effect become null and void with Quebec's independence

and thereby grant the other provinces de facto independence? He did not agree that that in fact would be the case. However, he said that the central government would be in disarray – how would the courts function; how would Parliament function, et cetera, et cetera – and that it wouldn't be de facto independence, but you may find that it operates that way. It's my sincere hope that it would.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much. You've raised some provocative thoughts for us as a committee.

MR. POCOCK: I would like to invite Leslie Moss to make her presentation to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome.

MRS. MOSS: Good evening, hon. Mr. Horsman and members of the special select committee. Thank you for inviting me to come down here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can everyone hear? Just speak a little closer to the microphone, I think. Thank you.

MRS. MOSS: Thank you for inviting me down here this evening. I'd like to thank your support staff for their letters to me and phone calls and for encouraging me to speak out what I think because it's our right to speak out what we think.

I'm here this evening to read a letter that I wrote to you several months ago concerning Bilingualism, Where Do You Stand? I realized this letter needed to be toned down, so I've rewritten it for you. I have a revised letter for you. Well, here it goes.

Bilingualism is not working in Alberta. The movement got off to a good start and merited the taxpayers' money. It promoted tolerance between the two founding nations – that is, Quebec and Canadians – and promised increased academic performance in the school systems.

7:46

There are many well-known arguments against continuing bilingualism. One such argument is the importance of French in Alberta when the main centre of Francophone culture – that is, Quebec – wishes to isolate itself. But in addition to this, I would like to draw attention to another factor in the language issue. This is written and spoken French, which receives little notice. Bilingualism is fine in Alberta as long as the two languages are vital and flourishing. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, the life and the richness have been kicked out of French. It's becoming a poor language in this province. Yearly it is being infiltrated by English structures, grammar, and worst of all the English way of thinking. More appalling is that the French language in Alberta is slowly resembling a sort of English language written and spoken with French words.

In addition to this problem, hon. Mr. Horsman, French in Alberta is plagued by linguistic intolerance. There is a tendency in the last three or four years for unknown vocabulary and expressions unfamiliar in Alberta but accepted on the international French scene and in the dictionary to be scorned and rejected. In time, Alberta French will not measure up to Ottawa French. This narrow definition of language that's encompassed in these developments bodes ill for the future of the French culture in this province, and unless it's modified, one could argue

that the extension of old and the creation of new services in the province, such as the laws in the Legislature Building and the other bilingual services, would be a waste of time and effort.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that it's the practice but not the concept of bilingualism that has gone sour. Albertans ought to stand back and ask why before proceeding further down this road.

Thank you for your attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Leslie. You're certainly welcome to express your opinions, and I'm pleased that you came tonight. I do want to make sure that you feel comfortable about coming and talking to us about issues that you feel so deeply.

I'll just ask you a question perhaps to start, and that is: in the overall Canadian context, would you feel more comfortable having language policy established by each province? For example, New Brunswick has official bilingualism in place; the government of Quebec has French, basically, although they are required in some instances to have French and English. Would you feel more comfortable for it to be done that way?

MRS. MOSS: I'm not a teacher, and I'm not a politician. In education – this is where French is being taught to the little Alberta children – I thought it was a provincial matter, that they decide. They have the education consultants, so I thought the transmission of the language from generation to generation was pretty well controlled by Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's basically it, but are you happy with it that way?

MRS. MOSS: Just so it doesn't become more ghetto French and more regional French with this sort of English way of thinking, almost American way of thinking. I don't like it. Maybe it could be just more Canadians and Manitobans and Quebecois and Nouveau Brunswick people. Everybody is able to speak his French and express themselves with different vocabulary, so maybe the French across Canada speak differently. I'd just like some richness back in the language.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Well, I think there are a couple of questions. Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, thanks. Are you originally Francophone?

MRS. MOSS: No.

MS BARRETT: But you are bilingual?

MRS. MOSS: Yes, I am now.

MS BARRETT: I see. Is what you are getting at – do you notice a lot of difference, for example, in the French spoken in Legal or Morinville compared to the French that's spoken in a small town in Quebec?

MRS. MOSS: I've only been to Red Deer. I've lived here for 21 years. I haven't really been around, but I have been to Quebec several times. It was mostly an attitude when I said something. Just expressions. Just describing how you're thinking in your head in a French way, not an English way.

MS BARRETT: Right. But you know that Francophones here or those who have learned French as a second language – I mean, which group is it that's learning it in English and using French words? Is it Anglophones, or is it local Francophones?

MRS. MOSS: I think it's local Francophones.

MS BARRETT: That's what I thought you were getting at. I don't know how to answer that. It's very interesting.

MRS. MOSS: Yes, but that's coming through the whole system. That's what I hear. I hear it because I've got old Anglophone ears. It's the way you hear it: that's what I would say if I were down in . . .

MS BARRETT: If I were English trying to speak French. Right. Thanks.

MRS. MOSS: Yeah. I'm finding that it's just a tendency towards this linguistic intolerance. If you do say something that you learned in Quebec or in France or in Haiti, don't say that. We have one word for everything; don't use another word for the same thing. I feel sorry for that, because the language is just going to fold in on itself. The language will become very, very flat and uninteresting, and then English will definitely dominate. That shouldn't happen, because this is a bilingual province and country.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Yolande Gagnon would like to ask you a question.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. I guess I'm having a little trouble understanding what it is you're suggesting. First of all, you have said that French as spoken in Alberta is becoming a dead language. I think that would be a great surprise to 65,000 Albertans . . .

MRS. MOSS: I revised that. I didn't want to say that.

MRS. GAGNON: . . . who are of French origin and speak French. I'm wondering if you could tell us how you arrived at this assessment? Why do you think this has happened? Is it because of legislation? Is it because these 65,000 French-speaking Albertans live in an English milieu? Secondly, because you say that this has happened, does that mean we should forget immersion schools; we should forget French first-language schools? What are you getting at, please? I didn't understand it.

MRS. MOSS: What I'm getting at: I would like to have improved bilingualism, an improved quality of French. The reason is that I'm speaking from experience. For the last four years I have been in a bachelor of education program in French immersion, and I've encountered so much intolerance, not just my Anglophone accent, because I understand that if I have an Anglophone accent; that's not very good if you're trying to teach French. But it was mostly in the written part. You know, your writing is not accepted, and much of your vocabulary and your expressions are considered too classical and too academic.

MRS. GAGNON: Where does the intolerance come from?

That's what I would like to know.

MRS. MOSS: Well, I just felt it was such a narrow definition of language. French is a very rich language. It is just full of images, and I think it's richer than English. I just felt that if you have people accepting so little from the other ways you can speak French, from the other people who speak French, from other provinces, even over into Manitoba and Ottawa, if you have this intolerance towards these people in education, I felt that was not going to help French.

MRS. GAGNON: But on the part of people at the university or on the part of whom? Who is being intolerant of what you call limited French?

MRS. MOSS: I ran into this very much in education, in the classrooms of 23 courses, student teaching practicums. I just was very scared of this attitude, this kind of xenophobia. I think the quality should be improved, because this is how future Albertans are going to learn French. I don't want them to be learning a poor regional French. This isn't against the Franco-Albertans, you know, the Franco-Albertans of Bonnyville, Falher. I'm not speaking against them. It's just the quality of French that I'm seeing that is being promoted in Alberta. Well, one thing is the school system. That's important. So I hope I've made myself clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you have very well now. Thank you very much. I appreciate you coming forward.

MR. KLAVER: Could I ask her a question?

7:56

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, I think perhaps it's not quite fair to somebody who's presenting to engage in debate from the audience. You'll have a time at the end of the day.

MR. KLAVER: May I ask Leslie if she is willing to take in a conversation with me in public about the English language and the French and the bilingualism? Is Leslie willing to do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not going to encourage a debate. This is an opportunity for individuals to come forward and talk to us. I'm sure you can have a good chat with Leslie. Perhaps if she wants to engage in a debate, well, she'll do it on her own, but this is not the forum to do that.

Thank you very much, Leslie.

MR. POCOCK: The next presenter is Mr. Robert Foerger, and I'd ask him to come forward, please.

MR. FOERGER: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform. As you can see, my name is Robert Foerger. I'm very proud to be able to participate in these hearings at such a critical time in Alberta's and Canada's history. I represent no one, but if it came to a vote, I suppose my wife and three children would vote for me. I suspect I'm like many Albertans with one exception: I'm here and they're not.

I find it difficult to talk about constitutional reform without talking about what it means and what it will mean to be a Canadian. Canada has changed since my parents immigrated in the early 1950s. I'm all for change, and I hope that I don't stand

in the way of progress and what Albertans, if not all Canadians, acknowledge as the need for constitutional reform. We Albertans are a generous people who've been blessed by the Creator, God, with a wealth of opportunity, heritage, and material, and as Albertans we have been especially endowed with both generosity and a great heritage of Judeo-Christian values. We have given to the rest of Canada through the federal government well above the national average, and somehow we have accepted this as an honourable role within Confederation. On an aside, this fact among others sets us as equally unique a culture within Canada as Quebec. In fact, in a typical Canadian way we have been smug about our wealth and our work ethic while Ottawa and the poorer provinces benefited from this, and I hope that this will never change.

Many things have changed since the Second World War. When my family immigrated to Canada, it was a clear choice to leave behind whatever was good or bad in order to come to Canada and become whatever it meant or means to be a Canadian. I don't see that anymore, and it distresses me. I see that people come with their own national agendas, values, and below all that they come not to become Canadian but to transport a part of their own country to ours. We all know that Canadian identity is fractured at best. It's not as susceptible to definition as our neighbours to the south, but you'd think after 124 years of Confederation we'd be able to better answer the question of our identity. I was amused to read in Grolier's encyclopedia of *Lands and Peoples* that we are described as monarchs of the north, and at one point the American encyclopedia says: Canada is, of course, as American as the United States. So much for the American perspective. In this city I'm proud to say that we have what appears to be the most successful Heritage Days Festival in Canada – you must understand that that's what we Edmontonians say about absolutely everything we do – but curiously our Canada Day celebration wilts in its shadow, and I ask aloud: why can't we generate for Canada the type of pride that brought us here in the first place?

So what does my Canada need? My nation needs representational government, I believe. Whatever we have here does not represent the people to the government. You people sitting on the committee have at times such antagonistic agendas that it's a wonder that anything gets done. I guess I should be grateful that we usually have majority governments; otherwise, we'd really look like Third World countries who have coalitional governments. I'd rather have my MP or MLA represent my views to government than have them represent their party to me. For example, why is it that the government – and these will be questions that I don't expect to be answered, as you know – does not follow the wishes of the majority of Canadians in things like something as simple and just as sending a person like Charles Ng to the United States to face the justice system in the country where he has committed these heinous crimes? Why do rich criminals like Donald Cormie get away with crimes against honest, hard-working people? Why is my government funding the indiscriminate murder of thousands of unborn human babies every year? Why can't my government balance its chequebook of taxpayers' money? If I overspend, obviously I face bankruptcy. I can go on, but I think you get the point.

The second point I'd like to bring up is about Senate reform. I think that a recent Senate satire brings profound shame to all Canadians, and let me just add my voice to throwing them off the cliff by saying that we need a Senate, if at all, that fosters representational government. It appears merely to be another bureaucratic black hole for spending, and it represents only the

current government's agenda. I personally believe that less government is better government, for I continually see wasted taxes and interference. I must be the only Canadian I know who doesn't mind paying my portion of the taxes because I believe that I am the beneficiary of a wealthy nation born from a generation of hard workers who are fiercely proud, but like all Canadians I cannot stand waste in government.

The third point I'd like to bring up is about lobbying reform. I see lobby groups influence my government. Here I am representing nobody, and I find that they're all well funded by my government but not well represented by voters or taxpayers like me. I don't want business, union, or bizarre special interest group leaders to represent me; I want my elected officials to represent me. In effect, I want to be empowered to influence my government as equally as these other groups that have access to your pocketbooks or to your "beds." For example, why is it that the status of women group gets money but not REAL Women when REAL Women has a far larger representation across the nation? I suspect that a group like REAL Women does not represent the political parties, yet they do represent a large number of women.

The fourth thing I would like to bring up is about family support. I don't understand why the government is so interested in funding all sorts of lobby groups when they fail to help the average Canadian family. Families where both parents choose to work outside the home get all sorts of incentives to do so, but not so for my family. It is an enormous cost that I bear in taxes in order to pay for subsidies that the well-to-do can enjoy. On top of it all, it is clear that we are seeing a pandemic on the scale of AIDS – and I don't mean this as an exaggeration at all – in the area of discipline and crime problems that arise directly out of the breakdown of the family. No socialist government, no matter how idealistic, can replace the family.

I have enough copies for all of you here. I thought there'd be 15 of you. Should I leave all 15 for you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. The panel is divided into two, and at this very hour in Calgary eight of our colleagues are hearing the same, but we exchange all information which we receive. So please do that.

MR. FOERGER: One of the next to last points is a discussion paper I received in the mail called *An Alberta Constitutional Vision*. I can't for the life of me find who actually sent it to me, but it had 10 guiding principles. I don't want to go through it. I have it in the appendix. I just want to comment on three of the guiding principles with which I have difficulties with the implications.

One of the guiding principles says: "The Constitution should protect individual rights common to all Canadians." I think it's axiomatic that we do protect human rights, but that is not the same as promoting life-styles such as homosexuality. For this reason I do not want sexuality covered in any expansion of the Charter when we look at constitutional reform.

Another point here is: "The Constitution should facilitate self-determination for Canada's Aboriginal peoples." I don't know if I speak for everyone, but I think many Albertans if not Canadians are pretty embarrassed by how we haven't come to some sort of agreement with our aboriginal peoples. Having said that, though, it appears that some aboriginal peoples, like some Quebecois, want nothing to do with being Canadian. In that case, why make me pay for their education? Why make me pay for their subsidies? Why make me pay for their life-styles?

If they are interested in being Canadian, in equality, then we should demand some sort of allegiance to being Canadian first.

8:06

The last comment here is that the Constitution should respect Canada's multicultural heritage. I appreciate how that's worded, for we are, of course, more than a people of British or French descent, especially in Alberta, where German and Ukrainian are the silent majority who have fronted this great land. But as I have said before, no ethnic cultural group should be protected or promoted to the extent that it hinders or detracts from the Canadian needs and future. [some applause] I have an unknown following. Believe me, I did not invite these people here; you did, and I'm glad for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These people are here to listen, and if they like what you're saying, they'll let you know. That's democracy, folks.

MR. FOERGER: Hear, hear.

Okay. Finally, I want to talk about reformational reform. Let me exalt the fact that this nation was founded on the predominantly reformational values from a Judeo-Christian heritage. Although I see these values erode in my country, I know them to be beautiful and right. They have formed the foundation for the ideals we hold today, and they are unique in the world. This is the true reforming for which I strive.

In conclusion, let me extol the fact that people like my parents and I, who proudly and bravely immigrated to this great country, continue to bear the weight financially, ethically, morally, and with hard, honest work. We are not the ones in the jails. We are not cheaters on our taxes. We pay our bills on time, and we give generously to those in need. I do not complain about the hard facts of life or try to undermine my government. I do not do ill against even those who would do ill against me and with whom I have profound disagreement. But I work hard to make this a better country and, therefore, ask that you consider what I have to say as that which is of great value. I do pray that you have the wisdom for the task ahead of you.

That is the end of my presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. While you may not represent a specific group, I daresay you represent the opinions of many Albertans, and I thank you for your candour and frankness.

John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: Among the concerns every now and then there are issues that really cut across in terms of what makes people upset with government. One that strikes me is the issue of the GST. It seems to me that everybody I know opposed the GST. Everybody I talked to signed petitions against it. All three of the political parties in the Alberta Legislature indicated opposition to the tax, but the Mulroney government went ahead and did it anyway, and it's that kind of government's doing things that people don't want that really crystalizes the concern that I think you're putting to us today.

Now, one of the things that came out of that was the Reform Party, because they certainly had strong opposition to the GST. Since that time the Reform Party has decided they're in favour of the GST, but still they continue to grow and expand into Ontario. What does that tell you about the way our political system operates?

MR. FOERGER: I'm not wise enough to answer that question.

MR. McINNIS: I guess what I'm getting at is that I think somehow in a democracy people drive the system – they have to – and if we want change, we're going to have to get real change somehow or other.

MR. FOERGER: Yes, I appreciate what you're saying in that way, that that party tends to represent a point of view. But I would rather not always have to be producing parties to get my point across. I would rather my MLA and MP represent my point of view. I understand I'm not the only one in the constituency, but what I get more of is that here's the party representing their point of view to me, and that is quite disturbing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. I think you'll be glad to hear that all parties in Alberta have been talking about free votes.

I want to ask you about the term you used: representational government; if you could expand on that. Are you talking about . . . I don't know. Well, you expand on it. I could give examples of what I think, but could you expand?

MR. FOERGER: Sure. You're right in picking up on that, because I use it maybe too loosely to be useful other than this general idea that it would represent the people who vote as opposed to maybe a party system. I don't know of a government that doesn't have a party system, so I don't have any other example.

MRS. GAGNON: But you're not talking proportional government or anything like that?

MR. FOERGER: Not necessarily that way, no.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fred Bradley.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In your remarks you mentioned, I believe, the need for Senate reform. Do you support the triple E Senate concept?

MR. FOERGER: Insofar as it would represent our needs. Clearly, what we have seen in the Senate is that it represents the agenda of the current government to the exclusion of the outcry of the nation. Certainly Alberta's point of view was not represented in the Senate. But again I must confess – I don't want to pretend to be wise enough to answer that question. That's why I've made narrow comments. I really honestly hope that you do have the wisdom. I don't mean to be cynical about that at all. You are elected, and I do hope that you can weed out these type of comments and put it together correctly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Ken Rostad.

MR. ROSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Robert, you and I had occasion not too long ago to discuss some of your representations, but I want to clarify because I think you're either the fourth or fifth out of about 12 presenters so far that

have brought up Mr. Ng and the frustrations that everybody feels. Being the Attorney General, I just want to make people aware that the extradition, first of all, is a federal responsibility.

MR. FOERGER: Yeah, I understand that.

MR. ROSTAD: You can make representations here. Alberta, quite frankly, processed Mr. Ng quite quickly in what jurisdictions we had. I'm not a protector of Mr. Ng, but we do have some protections for all of us built into our legal system, which have to be utilized. There is some frustration right now because there's all of a sudden a block at the federal level of one more procedural hurdle. I think most people around this table would share the same concerns and frustrations everybody else has, but . . .

MR. FOERGER: Yes. I brought it up as a case in point.

MR. ROSTAD: Yeah; you're about the fourth or fifth of people who are here this afternoon. I wasn't going to say anything about it because it really isn't in our milieu. The representations are certainly well received here, and we'll take them beyond, but I would suggest to anyone who does have those continuing concerns that they also take them to the federal level where the jurisdiction lies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you. Well, this has of course been a long-standing Canadian tradition: deciding whose responsibility issues are, the federal or the provincial government, and of course that's part of a federal state.

I should perhaps just tell you a quick story about a professor who, having a new group of international students, assigned them an essay on elephants just to test their writing ability. The British student turned in an essay entitled *Elephants and their Role in the Development of the British Empire*. The French student turned in an essay entitled *The Love Life of the Elephant*. The American student turned in an essay entitled *How to Raise Elephants for Fun and Profit*. And the Canadian student turned in an essay entitled *Elephants: Are they a Federal or Provincial Responsibility?*

Well, thank you very much, Robert, for your thoughts. Our secretary will distribute your remarks. Thank you.

The next presenter is Doug Tomlinson, representing the United Senior Citizens of Edmonton East.

Welcome.

MR. TOMLINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the select committee, and fellow Albertans. I first of all would like to apologize for not having my brief prepared for you before the meeting. I also would like to thank you very much for the opportunity to express my views here. I am not a professional person. I know the problems facing our country are very complicated, and I would like to deal with one aspect alone: what I would call possibly the national question in Canada.

8:16

I am a former Anglophone Quebecker. I have lived in Alberta since my service discharge in 1945. I speak French very poorly now from lack of use, but I still hold love and respect for la belle province and its friendly and kind people. Over the years I viewed with dismay the efforts of the federal government to implement bilingualism and federal service by edict. By and large, it has antagonized Anglophone Canadians and puzzled Francophone people from Quebec. I believe French Canadians outside of Quebec should have the identical rights that were

granted to me as an Anglophone in Quebec, such as in courts, Legislatures, schools, et cetera.

I believe Canada is a multinational state comprised of the peoples of the First Nations, the Francophone nation, and the Anglophone nation. Because of our failure to recognize this, we have a Constitution and Parliament since early days that leads from crisis to crisis and will not, because it cannot, solve the constitutional crisis so-called. Today, after the near disaster of Meech Lake, amidst the frantic manoeuvring of political parties and leaders at all levels, we now face a prospect that Canada as we knew it will change. Our basic failure, in my opinion, is not to recognize the existence of the people of the First Nations and the Francophone nation as nations within Canada. To relate my experiences in Quebec as part of a privileged Anglophone minority there would take more time than is allowed. May I just say that I am still ashamed of the domineering and negative attitude we held. No place in Canada experienced the terrible effects of the Great Depression as did the people there.

I am firmly convinced that Quebec will leave Confederation and form an independent state. I also believe the process will be very complicated for all. The people of an independent Quebec may face a severe drop in their living standards, which even today are not the best. I also believe that the people of Quebec have the right to self-determination. Quebec can survive as an independent nation on the basis of an historic nationality going back 400 years. It has a common language, a common culture, a common geographical area, and basically a common religion. We of the Anglophone nation come from many countries, including Francophone people outside of Quebec, and have largely developed a good living and working relationship amongst us, in spite of some exceptions, that sets an example to the world.

I believe our native peoples of Canada are on the move forward and will not be stopped. Thanks to a native person from Manitoba, Elijah Harper, we were all saved from the disaster of Meech Lake. Canadian history will record his name with honour for future generations.

It is wonderful that efforts are made here to allow French and French immersion and also other languages in schools. How wonderful for our children to be bilingual. The third and fourth language comes easy. Just go to Europe to see how many people there speak many languages.

My real fear is that we today as Canadians will fail to recognize the opportunities that exist to restructure the Canadian state that perhaps could include us all on a basis of national equality including an independent Quebec. I can understand why Francophone Canadians outside of Quebec are concerned on what their status will be when Quebec leaves. My hope is that there can be a mature and realistic political leadership developed that will recognize that drastic changes in our structure are necessary. It is so very difficult for people from western Canada, so far from Quebec, to realize the realities as they exist. We must all try, based on the recognition of the three nations in Canada, to prevent the disintegration of the Canadian state and our absorption into our giant neighbour to the south.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Tomlinson, for your heartfelt comments.

I have a question, and it goes back to the first part of your presentation. I'd just like to get a little clarification. You mentioned that the introduction of the bilingualism policy by edict by the federal government had caused puzzlement on the

part of Francophones within Quebec. Could you just explain that a little bit?

MR. TOMLINSON: Well, I have friends in Quebec, and they could never understand why in, say, a city like Edmonton, where in fact you could almost say one hundred percent of the people here speak English, even the Francophones, we would insist that the post office and all government offices would have French-speaking civil servants. They don't understand it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So am I correct in saying – and I don't want to lead you on this – that the federal government policy was not necessarily the policy of the province of Quebec or the people of Quebec?

MR. TOMLINSON: Yes. May I answer that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do.

MR. TOMLINSON: It just seems to me that the Trudeau government and particularly Prime Minister Trudeau himself, in the intense effort made to ignore the existence of Quebec as a nation, developed this policy across Canada to make the French Canadians feel more at home maybe in Vancouver and the east coast. It didn't work, and it's not working.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.
Other questions? Jack Ady, and then John McInnis.

MR. ADY: One of your opening statements indicated that you felt that Quebec would leave Confederation. What would you say is a fair basis on which Quebec would stay in Canada, or do you see no common ground where that could be accomplished? And one that would be acceptable to the rest of Canada, because there has to be a balance.

MR. TOMLINSON: That's correct. I think it's too late. I have a feeling that within two or three or four years Quebec will be out. What could I say now? I think we have to realize that Quebec will leave and that we in Canada have to negotiate an entirely new relationship within Canada. I'm hoping that if we can do that, Quebec in some form would stay within the Canadian state, if that's possible.

MR. ADY: Something along the lines of sovereignty association, then, you would be looking for?

MR. TOMLINSON: Well, I think it would go farther than that really, because I am thoroughly convinced now that the people in Quebec in a vast overwhelming majority are opting for independence.

MR. ADY: One last supplementary. In the event that Quebec did leave, then, you would see that as the demise of bilingualism in Alberta? As far as an edict is concerned, it would only be carried on by people who chose to carry it on?

8:26

MR. TOMLINSON: Well, I think it would create tremendous difficulties for Francophone people outside of Quebec the same as it would create for Anglophones who stay in Quebec. It's going to be a tremendously complicated situation, and I hope and I would believe that if that does happen, the people of Alberta, being the people that we are and where we've all come

from, would not necessarily reject or turn against our own Francophone Albertans. I don't believe that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Yes, John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Tomlinson, I very much appreciated your comments about aboriginal people and also about Elijah Harper in particular. You appeared to my hearing to give to aboriginal people the status of a founding people of Canada; I think you referred to three founding peoples. Would you therefore support some type of recognition in our Constitution of the inherent rights of aboriginal people – self-governing, that type of thing – within the Constitution of Canada?

MR. TOMLINSON: Again I would have to say that I'm not a professional person in this field. I would feel that at some time in the future there will be negotiations between the three basic nations in the country that could result in a new type of parliament and an entirely new relationship in the country between what I call the three nations in Canada.

MR. McINNIS: So if there are negotiations, you do feel that the aboriginal people should be directly involved?

MR. TOMLINSON: I believe the native people of Canada should be the first to be recognized as the first nation that exists in the Canadian state.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you.

MR. TOMLINSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Yolande Gagnon.

MRS. GAGNON: Yes. Could I ask you first of all: are the United Senior Citizens of Edmonton East a grouping of seniors, and are you their representative, or do you speak on your own behalf?

MR. TOMLINSON: Yes, I'm the president, but I'm also a member of two or three other seniors groups.

MRS. GAGNON: Was there some discussion that led to your presentation today?

MR. TOMLINSON: There are only 17 of us. We're a very small, declining group, but we're a very active group, unfortunately.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. Thank you for that.

I would like some clarification. You said that French Canadians outside Quebec should have identical rights as Anglophones within Quebec. Now, is that whether Quebec stays or whether they leave? You know, do you mean that no matter what, this should continue to exist whatever the situation is in Canada, if we have a renewed federalism or whatever?

MR. TOMLINSON: Well, if Quebec does separate, I think that the Anglophone Canadians in Quebec and the Francophone Canadians in Alberta should have equal rights.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. I understand. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Tomlinson.

Are there are any other questions?

Well, you 17 senior citizens have thought very long and hard, and I want to thank you very much for your considered opinion. Thank you very much.

MR. POCOCK: Our next presenter is Ron Boehm, and I'd like to ask him to come forward.

MR. BOEHM: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. The Canadian Constitution today, as we near the 21st century, I feel is a soother. I think it's a political soother that is pacifying provincial infants and interests. The time has come to grow up and to take our first steps toward national maturity. We must, as our domestic conflicts are becoming increasingly expensive, demoralizing, and hurtful. After all, we should be focusing our energies toward global issues and global markets, so that we can contribute to the well-being of the world and thereby to fellow Canadians.

The Constitution of Canada that will be developed must be a dynamic, unifying policy that will take a long-term view in effectively guiding Canada to democratic maturity. We must remove the complications within the Constitution so that the resulting document contains really only two basic components. The first: a clear definition of the individual; it would define what a Canadian is, the rights, policies, obligations associated with being a Canadian citizen. The second: a clear definition of a group. Today's society is a complex mesh of groups: political organizations, unions, religions, charitable organizations, provinces; the list goes on. What defines a group, and what are the associated rights, policies and obligations that should exist for Canadian groups? Alberta as a province would be only one group among many within Canada. The ultimate inclusive group would be the group of all Canadian citizens wherever they reside in the world.

I will first address individual rights. My view is that part 1 of the present Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms goes a long way to fulfilling basic human rights, but improvements must be made. I feel that the Canadian Charter should be updated to include two principles derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as set forth by the United Nations. These are:

- (2) Everyone is entitled to all rights and freedoms set forth . . . without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

and

- (17) (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others

and

- (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

In order to unify this country, we must incorporate the principles of these articles so that we can all freely speak the same language, in a figurative sense, benefit from the same rights, and have the same commitment to Canadian society. We must not identify particular groups in this section of the national document. Specifically, this would entail the removal of all references to the English language, the French language, and aboriginals, as these terms identify groups within the Canadian society. By subscribing to the fundamental human rights as mandated by the United Nations, we will be consistent with global rights, and we will be better prepared to take a global view of world issues and events. This is an important consideration in our ever shrinking planet.

I will now address the second fundamental principle that the new Canadian Constitution should adopt: a recognition of groups. An effective Constitution will take a more multidimensional view of Canadian society. Presently, we divide Canada into distinct geographical boundaries, tracts of land called provinces, that do little to represent the complex network of values and interests that exist in our society. The pressing issues of today, and that we'll see more of tomorrow, are not geographic in nature; that is, increasingly people are affected by numerous influences that span the nation, including religion, cultural background, family and friends, publishers and authors, coworkers, educators.

To me, being Albertan does little to define who I am and what my role within Canada should be. To illustrate, culture spans political boundaries. A family practising the traditions of Japan may have more in common with a family in Ontario than they would with their neighbours here in Edmonton. The voice of a representative group, such as a Japanese cultural society, if strong enough could initiate political, economic, and/or legislative change. Government would then be obliged to represent these groups in accordance with a prescribed procedure for groups as defined in the Constitution, and if support is strong enough, perhaps this would lead to a referendum. The concept of citizen-initiated change has already been successfully implemented in democratic societies and must be considered for Canada's new Constitution.

Culture is only one facet of the multidimensional framework I'm suggesting. There are many others. On a personal level, I'm pro-choice on the abortion issue, I favour open immigration policy, I'm against the GST, and I'm an advocate of the North American free trade deal. That's Ron Boehm. Provincial governments and federal representatives have done little to represent my views and concerns on these national issues in the past, and presently nothing binds them to do so in the future. I can, however, find organizations that will listen and that can represent my views through a communal, unified voice. The time for direct representation through organization, community, and consensus is now.

8-36

The clear definition of groups and their role within Canada will likely spawn a number of distinct societies, but these societies will better Canada. We will develop meaningful communities that will transcend geographic boundaries. We will develop many leaders that are knowledgeable and have a deep concern for the well-being of Canada. We will be able to voice our position on current, timely issues. We will be able to initiate action in a meaningful, democratic manner. I truly believe that the power, commitment, knowledge, experience, and spirit of all of these groups will converge, in fact synergize, to create a strong, new representative Canada.

This proposal advocates a form of unitary representation, but I feel that it will be a responsive unitary representation. We must provide Canada with the facilities it requires to address the major issues of the world that are transnational in scope. For example, the needs of the environment and the economy cannot be addressed solely by national action policies and law, yet we must provide our national representative with the scope it requires to adequately represent our country. Today the environment and the economy are obviously transnational issues; tomorrow it could be health care education. Already we are seeing how policies in these arenas are directly interrelated with the economy and environment. Increasingly the priorities and actions of provincial and municipal governments are in conflict

with, not in synchronization with or not responsive to, the priorities and actions of the federal level of government.

Our strategies for dealing with the issues must be focused between the different levels of government and between other entwined issues. As we address the complex issues of the 21st century, our solutions and policies must be consistent with each other and involve the appropriate experts if they are to be effective and efficient.

The Fathers of Confederation did what they could to represent the needs of geographically dispersed Canadians through the 19th and 20th centuries. It's a different world today: faster, smaller, and much more complex. To cope with the 21st century, we must address the issues by using the technological tools that are available to us to gain consensus and create community. If we can cast millions of votes weekly on Lotto 6/49 numbers, if we can vote for the player of the game using 1-900 telephone numbers, if we can watch TV to witness the events of the world as they unfold or to hear experts debate current issues, surely we must be able to apply technology to develop representative policy: a dynamic representative policy that can change with the interests and values of Canadians as we strive to demonstrate leadership in global issues and global markets in the 21st century.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ron.
Questions from the panel? Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. I can see that you've put a lot of thought into this. I have two questions. You talk about unitary representation. What do you mean by that? Only one level of government?

MR. BOEHM: Basically one level of government: the federal level empowered to react to transnational issues, as I've described.

MRS. GAGNON: Then would you leave anything, though, for the provinces?

MR. BOEHM: Well, as I mentioned in here as well, I would consider them one group within the many groups.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. My second supplementary. You talked about dynamic representation. We've been here since 3 o'clock this afternoon, and we've heard many, many views, some of them, you know, directly opposed to each other. Someone says, "I'm pro-choice on abortion." Someone else has said, "I'm avidly against abortion." For free trade, against free trade. Against immigration, for immigration. While trying to be representative of our electors and so on, we, I guess, as politicians have to see the balance, because there's a pluralism of views and of interests and of values. How would you suggest that we try and get around that, outside of a party system for instance? Sometimes parties help like-minded people to coalesce around some ideas.

MR. BOEHM: I'm saying that through the facilities that are available, the government would be obliged, if there is a demonstrated majority on a certain issue, to carry that through. Now, you'd have to determine that threshold, I guess, to change certain things. To change the Constitution might require a very high threshold. To change something on a smaller level, maybe not so great.

MRS. GAGNON: Then the personal view of the politician wouldn't count? You simply represent the majority in your riding, not ever your own philosophical or conscientious kind of value? I'm just trying to indicate the balance needed here. It's difficult.

MR. BOEHM: I guess so. Yeah, I would say.

MRS. GAGNON: So always the majority would rule?

MR. BOEHM: Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam Barrett, yes, and then John.

MS BARRETT: Yup. Pretty close to what I wanted to talk about, Yolande.

I think you've done a very thorough critique of what's wrong, and it's very, very topical and current. I'm just not sure where you're heading on how to fix it. I mean, you're right. You can play 6/49 all the time, and you can do 1-900 numbers and stuff like that, but are you advocating (a) a constitutional system that does that, or (b) a political system that basically, you know, conducts the latest Gallup poll, finds out where the public is, and does that, acts on that information?

MR. BOEHM: I guess the two would have to work together. I mean, the Constitution and the government definitely have to work together.

MS BARRETT: Okay. So what do you do? Let's say you find that there's a new interest in a public program that's never been of much interest before. You find 85 percent of Canadians want more effort put into this program, and you find 85 percent of Canadians saying, "I'm not going to pay a nickel more in tax." Have you thought about a mechanism for handling that?

MR. BOEHM: Okay. The cost definitely would have to be attributed to the majority. Yeah, the cost allocation would definitely be related to the facilities or programs available.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I know that you understand about the difficulty there.

MR. BOEHM: Maybe that's where the role of government really has to come in. We know they administer taxes, so they could administer that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, nobody likes paying taxes that I've ever run across, except one of the previous presenters.

John, and then Gary Severtson.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Boehm, I'm also intrigued by the home voting proposition. Our system is slow and cumbersome, and many people today have expressed frustration over the way it works, but at least it's an open system in which the information is not controlled. Anyone can form a new political party, run for office, and change the system. What concerns me about the idea of home voting is: whoever manipulates the flow of information and frames the question is in a very powerful position to influence the outcome of the vote.

Let me just give you one example. I heard recently two different formulations of essentially the same proposition. If you

say to somebody that it's very important that we have national standards of health and education so that people have access to the same services coast to coast, most people will say yes. If you say that people who are elected to provincial Legislatures are just as smart as people elected to the House of Commons and maybe they should be able to make decisions about health, education, social services, that sounds good too, and most people will vote for that. But they're in fact radically different positions. Are you not concerned? I mean, it's one thing who's declared the MVP of the hockey game or which numbers are lucky enough to win the pooled money. That's important but perhaps nowhere near as important as whether we enter a war or whether we have social programs and this type of thing.

MR. BOEHM: Okay. Maybe the first step would be to determine what the question is. That would be step one, and that could be done through the same mechanism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What mechanism? Now, be clear about this.

MR. BOEHM: Vote for the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What question?

MR. BOEHM: If you've got several different questions put forth by several different interest groups, vote for the question.

8:46

MR. McINNIS: But then somebody's going to make up the questions - right? - that you vote on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's an interesting perspective.

Yes. Gary Severtson.

MR. SEVERTSON: Yes. I was just going to pick up on Pam Barrett's question. I can see that if you went to representation by everybody voting electronically or whatever, if you had a question that you wanted to increase health care and education and then at the same time wanted to lower taxes, I mean, they're just counter . . . You can't do both; that's what I'm trying to get at.

MR. BOEHM: Yeah. Well, on any given issue there are given costs associated with that, and I think we would have to determine what the costs are related to the new program and relate that as well to the consensus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You've given us a thought-provoking point of view. A unitary state for Canada is one of the options in our discussion paper. We asked: can Canada be governed as a unitary state? You answered yes. Other people have come before us and have said no. That's part of the debate that we're into, and I think it's extremely important that we understand that. Thank you very much for your presentation.

MR. POCOCK: Our next presenter this evening is Lorraine Vetsch with the Edmonton Friends of the North society.

MRS. VETSCH: Good evening. I'm here to present the views of the Edmonton Friends of the North. We look at things from a bit of a different angle; we are an environmental society. So

in order to understand our point of view, it's necessary to know our start point.

We believe that if Canada and, in particular, Alberta continue to abuse and deplete our ecological capital, our economy will be lost. Anyone with even a remote inkling that this is the turnaround decade for the environment can understand why environmental concerns are high on the priority list for Canadians. What makes this reality so hard to deal with is that the problem can't be packaged off province by province. Environmental degradation is not confined to provincial boundaries, and some types of activities have global consequences. We need a level of government actively and aggressively asserting jurisdictional responsibility based on ecological boundaries: things like watersheds, land, soil types, and climatic conditions. The federal government, as far as we could see in our discussion, is the only level of government able to fulfill this role, but only if the concerns of the local communities in question are taken into account.

The next point is very important to our society. The nation must also honour agreements with the aboriginal peoples of Canada, and we must recognize that native issues are not confined to provincial boundaries either and therefore must be dealt with, we feel, at the federal level. We need just and equitable settlements for the native peoples of Canada, and we must trust them to govern wisely. I do want to say that again: that we trust the aboriginal peoples to govern wisely.

The native view that the earth is finite and cannot be owned is a valuable view because it promotes stewardship and not ownership. We're very concerned with the ability of multinational corporations to lease our Crown lands without mandatory, formal public hearings before independent, third-party, scientific panels, panels whose decisions are policy-making and not simply considered to be advice which can be disregarded. The recommendations of such panels must carry considerable weight, and politicians must then be held accountable for the policies they implement.

Ecological costs must be taken into account when assessing present and potential projects. Ministers of the environment at both the federal and provincial levels of government must be part of the inner cabinet or planning and priorities committees in order to ensure that the development of a vision for Canada incorporates ecological responsibility into all of our laws. Hopefully good environmental laws will ensure that ecological considerations are enforced. Provinces must remember that one province's dam is another province's drought and one province's effluent is another province's carcinogen. The things that we're talking about weave the web of life and force us to broaden our responsibilities beyond our provincial boundaries. We like to think about fostering multinational accountability and not multinational corporations.

Thank you for your time this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Questions? Comments?
Yes, Pam.

MS BARRETT: I understand the importance of the drift of what you are getting at with respect to one jurisdiction has to have the final answer or be held accountable when it comes to ecological and environmental concerns. You said: well, you can't do that without having sort of co-operation with the communities which it embraces. I wonder if you thought about or would care to spell out just what that would mean to the current relationship between the provinces and the feds with

respect to that. Probably a lot of Canadians feel the same way you do, but probably a lot of us, me included, have not worked out how you would do it.

MRS. VETSCH: Well, after three hours of discussion we didn't come to a consensus, but the model most talked about was something like this: federal government, native self-government, and then we called it local government. I think that could be municipalities or provincial. We would like to get away from those kind of drawn-up boundaries and think more of an ecological locality, local community, so that there would be federal, native self-government, and then the areas where you live, and the common boundaries that are created by ecological boundaries and not provincial boundaries.

MS BARRETT: Okay. So shared jurisdiction right now, which includes air, right?

MRS. VETSCH: Right.

MS BARRETT: How do you handle it though? If you've got a provincial government that says, "Well, I want a particular type of mill," and the feds say, "Oh, that's going to go beyond our standards for effluent," what do you do?

MRS. VETSCH: We saw one good example that we felt was excellent. That was the Al-Pac 1 hearings: joint federal/provincial hearings, blue-ribbon panel, recommendations made. Unfortunately, we know that the recommendations didn't come about. But that's the kind of model, and it worked. The panel was satisfied; the participants were satisfied.

MS BARRETT: So it was negotiation.

MRS. VETSCH: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: Lorraine, I'm very much intrigued by the idea of putting forth an ecological vision as a kind of a national purpose for our country, Canada. It seems to me that that's not really incompatible with local government or local decision-making, because you have broad principles of ecology, but then you have local people who know best how it works in the local area. To incorporate that, I wonder if you or your group have thought about its relationship to the basic laws, the Constitution of the country? Some people feel that, for example, it should be unlawful for governments to be able to do certain things which might destroy or harm our environment, and to build that into the Constitution of Canada. Is that an idea you would support?

MRS. VETSCH: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions?
Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: My first question follows on the same lines as John's: would you agree that we should have an environmental bill of rights, for instance?

MRS. VETSCH: Yes. We've talked about that a lot.

MRS. GAGNON: Both federally and provincially?

MRS. VETSCH: Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: Secondly, if aboriginal peoples have self-government, would they be subject to the same environmental laws and regulations and so on as everyone else?

MRS. VETSCH: We talked about that, and that's where the trust came in: that we have to trust the aboriginal peoples to self-govern and define what that means to them. We don't tell the United States how to govern their country; we trust. Well, we're not always happy, but we let them do their business. It has come time, we feel, in Canada to trust the aboriginal peoples, because perhaps they had the right ideal all along. Maybe we could learn a great deal from them, and maybe it's time that we sat and saw how they would self-govern. We have to trust them. It's not our decision to make. It's their decision to make.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

&56

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that the aboriginal nations would not be subject to the Constitution of Canada?

MRS. VETSCH: I think it's a big, self-defining role. They would have to see if their nation would be part of Canada. Land claims have to be settled. I wouldn't want to guess what they would see to be appropriate. I would want to hear what they consider to be appropriate. I don't know if they would buy into the Canadian Constitution or not in the end. It's difficult to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a very interesting point.

MR. BRADLEY: I'm very intrigued that the suggestion is that the federal government should have the responsibility for final decision-making in environmental matters, having had some experience in this. We've seen where the federal government has set national standards in certain areas and Alberta's provincial standards far exceeded or were higher standards than the federal standard. So in terms of quality of environment in Alberta, if we went and applied the federal standards, we'd actually be lowering our environmental quality in this province.

I can give you some other examples of where the federal government has had jurisdiction for environmental matters in Alberta. For example, the townsites of Banff in terms of responsibility for sewage treatment did not meet Alberta's standards for a number of years. I can also give you an example in the native area: the Peigan Indian reserve in terms of soil conservation. Because of the agricultural practices there, which did not meet Alberta agricultural practices standards, we could see soil virtually blowing off that reserve year after year. So it may be nice to suggest that we should transfer this responsibility to the national level, but in a number of areas those national standards are much lower than those which we have set here in this province for ourselves.

MRS. VETSCH: I wouldn't want you to think that by suggesting we are assuming that a federal level looking at these issues is at present doing the right thing. That's not necessarily so. The federal government has been dealing with provincial governments based on provincial boundaries. If we were to move to a model which looked at ecological boundaries, then you would have a different perspective feeding up to the federal level. If

you're sharing a watershed with somebody, it's completely different than being in one town with a mill, for example, pumping effluent downstream to somebody else. If you get the benefits of the mill in your town and you're upstream, you don't much care, but if you're sharing a watershed and the concerns of the people on the watershed are feeding through to the higher level, which we could only see as federal – and I don't know if that's the right place for it – it would be different.

MR. BRADLEY: I appreciate what you're saying there in terms of transboundary issues. There are examples where provinces and the federal government have come together by agreement to handle these things. One is the Prairie Provinces Water Board, which handles the Saskatchewan-Nelson rivers basin system.

MRS. VETSCH: Yes, there are some good examples of joint works, and the Al-Pac 1 model was one that we thought was great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just have a little point I'd like to make. I'm always intrigued by representations that the federal government can do things better. Whenever you mention the subject of aboriginal rights, I remind people that since 1867 the federal government has had the sole responsibility of dealing with the aboriginal peoples of Canada. I ask the question: do you think they've done a good job?

MRS. VETSCH: Well, I don't think that it's our role to have any level of government deal with the aboriginal peoples. The aboriginal peoples are here, and they have the right to deal with their issues in their own way. Just because their traditional way of dealing with things may be different than ours doesn't mean that we can't trust them to operate. I agree; the federal government has done a terrible job on aboriginal issues. I hope it doesn't sound like we're saying that the federal government is, as it stands, the place to do this. It has to change too. I think we have to start getting away from thinking about dealing with the aboriginal people and let them deal with themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point I'm making, though, is: why do you think they would do a better job in dealing with environmental issues?

MRS. VETSCH: Oh, than they have with the aboriginal issues?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or delivering the mail.

MRS. VETSCH: Yeah. It would have to be more than just turning . . . If we kept everything as is and turned the responsibility over to the federal government, we would be in trouble. But if we were to redefine boundaries and so forth, then I think the jurisdictional squabbles perhaps would be different and would be more based on environmental concerns and the wish to protect everyone, even if there are economic benefits on one side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much. You've made your point very well.

May I just make the next announcement. We are very honoured this evening to receive a representation from a very distinguished Albertan who has not had for the last six years an opportunity to state her personal and private opinions with respect to constitutional or any other matter on her own. Helen

Hunley is here this evening and I understand would like to address us. She has just finished a distinguished career as the Lieutenant Governor of this province.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee and to all, thank you for your welcome to this gathering. I understand that I have 10 minutes in which to make a brief comment. There are so many things that it's difficult to select the items which I feel have not yet been addressed that I've read about during the time that I've been able to think and read about this.

It will come as no surprise to you that one of the items I wish to address is the role of the monarchy. As a democracy with traditional ties to the monarchy many Canadians have high regard for and sentimental attachment to our Canadian Queen and other members of the royal family. Pomp and circumstance are often scoffed at by some, but by and large citizens enjoy the glamour which surrounds royal visits and other similar events. Everybody loves a parade and wants some excitement and beauty brought into their lives, which are often somewhat drab, and sometimes exciting, and this does add a dimension to our society. That has been my experience.

Over and above the practical side provided in Canada by the viceregal representation of the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governors, the overriding powers of the viceregal officers should seldom be used, but it is useful to have them in the event of a crisis when there is no time to have decisions made by the courts. The power of reservation is important not because of the power it grants the viceregal officer but because of the power it denies to others when the country or a province is in a state of crisis. I believe we in Canada treasure the tradition of our relationship with the monarchy.

As a neutral office the viceregal person is widely appreciated at important local events when a political figure is not necessarily welcomed with the same enthusiasm. More and more Her Majesty is divesting the throne of involvement in our national affairs, and this is reasonable and proper in a nation and a well-developed society. However, it would be a loss to our tradition if all ties were to be severed. We need and want a head of state who is free of political biases. When we stop to think about the abolition of the monarchy, we think of a severance of part of our history from the beginning of the development of our country. As I thought about it, I wondered how we would then address the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I remember the issue in Alberta when it was talked about, the fact that they would eliminate "Royal" from the title of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the strong submissions against that. I thought about the Royal Winnipeg Ballet and The Royal Canadian Legion and all of those whose great desire has been to achieve the title "royal" as part of their recognition of excellence and part of our tradition.

9:06

More important than the preservation of our traditions is our heritage and the prospect of this issue being raised at this time that's troublesome. If it should become part of the debate as to what Canada's Constitution will be like, I anticipate that that will be another divisive issue which need not necessarily be dealt with at this time. There are other things that I think are much more relevant, much more critical, and to bring up the issue of whether or not Canada retains a monarchy would perhaps be a mistake and a misplaced effort. Later on I expect there will be a time for that. Of course, many of us who are my age would not like to see that. But also, if we look back . . . What I heard recently about Ontario I found interesting, where the police themselves were told to omit the oath of allegiance to the Queen

and they found that objectionable. They are a young and highly trained and highly motivated group, and they did not appreciate the fact – according to the news, that is – that they were told to omit the oath of allegiance as they were sworn into office as police officers. That was indicative to me that it isn't only old folks like me that feel this great tie to our Queen.

Because of the restraints of time, I have eliminated some of the notes, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to comment particularly also about what happens now, when you close the hearings that are presently being held in Alberta. I understand that it's the intention to bring forward a report from the committee to the Legislature. I'd like to respectfully suggest that when that occurs, the House adjourn and become Committee of the Whole and again allow some public submissions if there are any issues which have not been raised during the course of your hearings. Following the debate upon this report and on the resolutions, I believe there should be a free vote in the Legislature, and that would be guidance only for the Alberta negotiators when that time comes to make the constitutional decisions for our country. It could not be binding, but certainly it would be informative and would provide guidance. If it were binding, why negotiate? Just send them a message if you can't negotiate.

Canada's been built on give and take, and that's how we got a Constitution to begin with: with some give and take and some negotiation and compromise. So that would be essential. But it would once again clarify and make available to anyone who has not yet had an opportunity – or if some issue comes up where perhaps some guidance is needed, an appearance before the Committee of the Whole would be, I think, very useful and dispel once and for all the hue and cry that the people are not being heard, though the opportunity to appear at public hearings such as this is certainly very valuable, and I understand they're being well attended.

If I have a moment or two more, I would like to comment on the aboriginal peoples. Financial matters and land entitlement should be agreed upon as early as possible, should be high priority with the federal government in consultation with the provinces. I believe that they should be settled expeditiously. I look with some pride at our province, which has dealt with the Metis associations in some instances and has made great progress in settling some land claims and establishing some guidelines. I think that Canada could look to those for guidelines for development. I do not believe that aboriginal peoples, the reserves, should become sovereign nations unto themselves. I cannot imagine a country the size of Canada possibly even managing with many little sovereign states here and there throughout this great country.

The same thing applies – it's my attitude and I believe that of the many people to whom I've spoken – about the province of Quebec. I do not believe that Albertans are anxious to see this country dismantled. I believe they have a great concern and a great desire for our country to remain sea to sea. I do not believe that Albertans want Quebec to stay in at any price. This has been repeated in my presence many, many times, and I endorse that concept.

The Senate has been debated and discussed many times. I have nothing to add that is not already widely known, but I do believe the Senate does need changing. A triple E Senate seems to be more – what shall I say? – timely, more in keeping with what Canadians seem to feel in many instances. I wish anyone well who tries to change it to equal representation. I believe it would have great merit, and I would like to see some efforts made toward that as we move towards the next century.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many things about our country, my country, that are so valued, and I don't believe that as Canadians we really realize how fortunate we are. I have had the opportunity to attend many citizenship courts and to talk with those who have become new Canadians. It troubles me sometimes when they forget that now they have a new country and a Canadian Queen and they still refer back to the old days, but by and large most of them are happy and excited and pleased and proud, and I think we are as Canadians. I often refer to us quite openly as considering us to be closet patriots, because we are patriotic and we love our country and we do not wish to see it threatened, but we feel a little uncomfortable doing our flag-waving, and I think this is unfortunate.

That hasn't much to do with how the Constitution will look, and I would have appreciated longer in which to develop some other arguments, some other suggestions for the benefit of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to appear on such short notice, Mr. Chairman. I'm grateful for the opportunity, and I thank you for the opportunity of being heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you so much, Miss Hunley. It's truly an honour for us, I think, to hear your wisdom and your experience and your sincerity as one who loves Canada. I would like to ask you what I think will be a difficult question, but it will allow you some more time to speak with us. You said that you would like to see Canada remain as one, sea to sea to sea, and I think many people share that vision. But you've also said that Albertans don't want that at any price. How far would you go? What would be the price? You know, we are not going to go the whole way and give up the whole ship, but how far should we go to maintain our country?

MISS HUNLEY: I think that's an unfortunate question, and if I were to be part of the negotiating committee, I would have facts and figures before me before I agreed to do my dickering. I do not believe that Quebec should receive an overendowment of public funds, and I don't have proof to give you that an undue amount of money has gone to Quebec from grants and so on. I do know the idea is prevalent out there, and it's unfortunate. I keep wishing that somewhere along the way the facts would become known.

I think it was very sad when Quebec made the decision to pass their sign law. I don't think we would have had nearly the problem with the bilingual aspect of our country if that had not occurred just at the time it did. I don't agree that the Official Languages Act has been a success. I think it has been divisive, and I think we should do away with it. I think that we should offer merit pay to a person who wishes to become bilingual and operate in the public service, so let us use the carrot rather than the stick in order to get bilingual services.

9:16

I believe that in Quebec they have the same English – I do not know this, because I have not traveled widely in Quebec. I believe, though, that where we find it not necessary to have our national parks with French signs as well – and I heard that earlier from one of the submissions that was given to you – I believe on federal institutions in Quebec those signs are there. They should be, if they aren't. I don't know what they add to any of us anywhere when we don't really need or speak the language, and I heard the eloquent gentleman earlier this evening speak about such things.

If Quebec should leave, I believe that we do have an obligation to ensure that those who are bilingual and who have a French background and culture need to be protected. That would have to be taken care of and must be done. We must honour the obligation that we had.

I don't have a good and specific solution. I wish I did. No one has. We don't have any Solomons around. We have only a lot of people who are attempting and trying. I think the concern is there, and I feel optimistic that we will arrive at a solution that will keep our country strong. The fact that it's receiving so much publicity is very helpful indeed. It's too bad we didn't talk like this 20 years ago or maybe longer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: Yes. What I wanted to do was just suggest that rather than respond to a particular question from me, that maybe you open up your mind a bit more on one or two of the other subjects that you think are quite a priority for us.

MISS HUNLEY: Are you giving me some direction, or are you asking me something?

MS BARRETT: No. I'm asking you for . . .

MISS HUNLEY: Are you giving me another opportunity?

MS BARRETT: You said you've got a whole bunch of stuff and that you'd really like . . . I thought, well, instead of answering my question, why don't you tell us what the other stuff was that you think is quite a priority.

MISS HUNLEY: I see. I did allude to them briefly.

I alluded to the aboriginal people. I'm very anxious to see that press forward. I would be very opposed to allowing them to become sovereign states, which some have stated that they believe they are, a nation unto themselves. I cannot imagine a country with so many sovereign states in it.

I would be opposed, for example, to any changes in the electoral Act by which they were legislated into Parliament. I believe that greater encouragement can be given to all people. I am even opposed to having women legislated into public office. You know, where will you stop? What is an aboriginal person, and where are the guidelines if this should occur? Which has nothing to do with the Constitution, but rather an amendment to a national Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just ask you for a clarification? When you say "legislated into office," you have no objection to having women elected?

MISS HUNLEY: Oh, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Guaranteed.

MISS HUNLEY: It's been discussed in some of the reading I've been doing that perhaps that would be a way to allow aboriginal people to have a say. I do not believe that this discrimination in reverse would adequately address the problem. Rather, we need to encourage them as much as possible and look with admiration at those who have succeeded. Having been considered one of the minority groups for 71 years, it is possible to make it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gary Severtson, and then Fred Bradley.

MR. SEVERTSON: Miss Hunley, you were discussing the process: how you appreciate this select committee, then reporting to the Legislature, then opening it up as a whole, and then going to negotiate. If it was negotiated, do you feel that we'd come back and let the people vote on that agreement, if there was an agreement? Would that be binding then?

MISS HUNLEY: I think government has to govern. There is no way that every individual can - there has to be some leadership. But in order to make the widest possible choice of decisions that Albertans find acceptable, it would be debated in the House. That's the final and ultimate clearinghouse for information. In that House we have people who represent all Albertans, who would listen to anything that is not already brought forward. It would be debated, and I read today - and I'm assuming this is the intention, Mr. Chairman - that the report from the committee will go back to the Legislature for debate. At that time I was suggesting that you must adjourn in order to allow the public access to the floor of the Legislature. This has been done before, in my experience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just interrupt you to say that the commitment has already been made that we would bring the report into the Legislature and then we would establish the House as the Public Affairs Committee of the House, which is the whole Assembly. The Public Affairs Committee, all members of the Legislature, would sit and hear the public representations. So we have made that commitment publicly, and I repeat it again this evening. It's an exceptionally good suggestion, and we are going to do that.

MISS HUNLEY: I thought it was original; I'm sorry. I hadn't heard it before. I've been reading what everybody's saying.

I was asked earlier about Quebec, how far we would go. I don't have that answer; I don't have that wisdom. But if Quebec wants to leave - I keep thinking of it as a divorce and the Matrimonial Property Act - I don't believe the Matrimonial Property Act should apply in this case. I believe that there should be a fair division of assets and liabilities if Quebec wants to leave us. They should become a sovereign nation unto themselves. Hopefully, they wouldn't expect us to have passports if we wanted to visit there; we don't have passports to go to the States. It's a terrible thing to even contemplate, but we must think about that as we look at the long view of our country and our nation. So if Quebec wants to leave us, they should have their own monetary system, their own defence forces, their own postal service. All other national services which are currently provided by the federal government using Canadian tax dollars would then become the responsibility of the sovereign state of Quebec. I even have trouble trying to say that.

Negotiations would have to be included to provide for the Trans-Canada Highway, for the St Lawrence Seaway, for anything that is very important to continue to bind the east and the west, even if we do have this terrible - one of the children missing from the middle. The provincial boundaries would need to be decided. If we decide to go back to the beginning of Confederation, and I don't believe that's possible, but if it were, then what would Quebec itself look like? I'm not sure, and I wish I knew, how much discussion such as this was occurring when they were doing their decision-making in the province of Quebec. I hope that this committee does have that and that by

the time they sit at the table, the people of Quebec have thought through the implications of such a drastic measure.

I don't believe negotiations should be bilateral, but I do believe the territories should be included around the table, all provinces and the territories. But if you can't get Quebec to the table, I'm not sure how that could be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I was going to say "Your Honour," but I know that's . . . Thank you, Miss Hunley.

Fred Bradley, did you wish to make a brief comment?

MR. BRADLEY: I just had a brief question that came from Mrs. Gagnon's question relating to bilingualism. You stated that you thought the Official Languages Act should be repealed and expressed some frustration with the Quebec decision regarding the sign law. I've asked others who've participated here today regarding language policy. Do you believe that language policy would be better vested as a responsibility of the provinces and that if it had been a matter of provincial responsibility, that may have ameliorated some of the divisiveness in Canada regarding the bilingualism policy?

MISS HUNLEY: No. That's a question to which I had not directed my mind as being a provincial issue. I have been very interested in New Brunswick and their approach, which, as near as I know, has seemed to be working rather well. I do believe that if we do away with the Official Languages Act and rather encourage and publicize the great advantage to be held by being a bilingual person - and I believe that's why some people are putting their children in French immersion; it's not a great patriotic gesture. Rather, I believe it's long-range thinking of the fact that two languages, or four or six or eight, enrich the individual, and that is one great advantage to those who encourage their children to be bilingual.

9:26

But I believe to make it essential in order to rise to the top in the public service . . . It should be based on merit pay. If you want to get some more pay for it, get it yourself, but don't get it at public expense the way it's been obtained in the past, from my personal knowledge. It would be an extra attribute for you when you applied for a job or applied for a promotion. You could upgrade your skills and you could upgrade your status and your category in the public service if you were bilingual, and you could be paid additional for it as an additional asset. Use the carrot approach rather than the stick in order to get bilingualism. But if Quebec leaves us, then who needs it, other than to protect the rights of those who live outside and do the best we can? It was mentioned earlier: what about the Anglophones that live in Quebec if Quebec leaves our country? That, of course, would be something we couldn't do much about except by trying to influence them, and Canada does have influence with other countries and hopefully would continue to have with this anomaly that exists in our midst.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have time for one brief question.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you. Miss Hunley, my question relates to that portion of your submission about the viceregal powers in times of emergency and crisis. I certainly agree that that's where you find out what institutions and people are made of, under those times. I thought I understood you to be referring to the powers of reservation and disallowance, which are viceregal powers under our Constitution. I'm not an expert in that area,

but I don't think they've been used since the padlock laws in Quebec, possibly the press censorship laws in Alberta. Are you thinking that those powers should be used by the Lieutenant Governor under direction from a senior government, or without advice? I mean as a kind of an attribute to the office.

MISS HUNLEY: It'd sure be very foolish to do it on your own.

MR. McINNIS: It would be a very difficult responsibility.

MISS HUNLEY: It has been. We think about it when we occupy that position, I can assure you, what I call the what-ifs. The what-ifs often come to your mind when you think of the notwithstanding clause that is now in our present Charter of Rights. You hope that you will never be put in such a position, and it must be used wisely. But there are times, and it has happened. Fortunately, in Alberta it has not happened in the last 50 years. I hope you listened to the one phrase that I thought was the most compelling, in which I said that it is not the power that rests within the office of the Governor General or the Lieutenant Governor; it is the power that is denied to others.

MR. McINNIS: I did hear that.

MISS HUNLEY: That's what you must always have in mind, if it's a crisis situation, which must be the only time that you act. It's always there. When I spoke to many groups and children about the duties of a Lieutenant Governor, I often referred to it as a fire extinguisher that you hoped you never had to use, but if you ever needed it, you were very glad it was there.

There are other times. I look back to Ontario when there was a problem over who would govern when the Conservative government was elected with a minority, and they had to negotiate: would they have another election, or would the Lieutenant Governor swear in the Liberal leader as the Premier of Ontario? There needs to be a referee, and that referee is there. So there is a practical side to it, and the reason the public don't always know about it is because it must be used wisely if it's ever to be used at all. It's there, like the fire extinguisher, in case it's needed.

MR. McINNIS: Thankfully, we're not in a crisis very often.

MISS HUNLEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Miss Hunley, for your very sage and wise advice after many years of experience and service to this country of ours and to our province. It is always a delight to see you, and we thank you very much for your presentation.

MISS HUNLEY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, now is the time for some people who want to come to the microphone and give us some words. Mr. Clarence Kenway would certainly like to make a presentation, and we would certainly welcome his views. We're not being rude, Mr. Kenway, but some members may just want to get a cup of coffee. Please proceed, and please speak right into the microphone so we can all hear your advice.

MR. KENWAY: Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I'm very thankful that I'm given the opportunity to voice

something from a single citizen who is part of the living history of this country. I've been raised at a time when oxen were used, and then horses came after and tractors afterwards, so I've seen a lot of changes in Canada. I was born in the west, in Saskatchewan. I became an Albertan by choice, and I've lived here for a long, long time. I've served this province as a teacher and as an administrator of the government for 48 and a half years in total, so I have seen people of all kinds. I have seen governments come and go, and I have some thoughts on this situation that has arisen in Quebec.

If you look at Canadian history, you'll remember that in 1759 the French lost something that was very dear to them, and that is this: they lost their colony. Well, ever since that time it has been always on their minds that someday, somehow they are going to regain some ascendancy in this country. If you go to old Quebec and if you look at the relics that have been left behind, you'll find engraved in cradle headboards, "je me souviens," "I will remember." That "je me souviens" still lives in their minds. Therefore, we must think differently of Quebec than we ordinarily do. In other words, the soul of Quebec is alive; it's still living. Somehow or other we must do everything possible so that we can live with it, that we can keep this country together as a Confederation "A Mari usque ad Mare," "From Sea to Sea." We should not give up too easily, and we know it's going to be a very difficult task. It's not going to be easy.

Now, if you look at the Allaire report - I've studied the Allaire report very carefully - you'll find that the Allaire report leaves only four powers for Canada, and Quebec wants all the rest of the powers. One power they didn't forget to leave to Canada is the distributing of the money to the so-called poor provinces. In other words, they want to remain sovereign and have us give them some money. Alberta is the biggest giver of all in that respect, and it gets practically nothing in return from the federal government. In other words, even rich Ontario gets something. Well, all right; this may set us to thinking that maybe there's something that's got to be done to change this.

However, I think our biggest problem right today is to keep Quebec within a confederated Canada, not at any price but at least with very severe negotiations, very intense negotiations. Let us negotiate what powers we're willing to exchange to the federal government and what powers the federal government should grant to Quebec.

In making my written submission, I made notes carefully. So that I don't take up too much of your time, I'm going to go point after point in this case.

Now, in the division of powers, if you look at the Allaire report, you'll see what they want. I would recommend to this committee, as a citizen that has had considerable experience and responsibility in this province for administration at the government level, that under no circumstances should we share such matters as fisheries, foreign policy powers, the post office, telecommunications, because the minute you share fisheries with Quebec, you're going to have disputes over territorial waters. You're going to have disputes as to what Canada can prevent and can't prevent. You have two islands at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. What will Quebec do with regard to French fishermen in there if they separate? Right now we have that as a problem, and Canada is trying solve the riddle the best they can.

9:36

In the matter of foreign policy the question is: who speaks for Canada? Who shall speak for Canada as a country?

In the matter of the post office, are we going to have two different stamps, stamps from the sovereign state of Quebec and another from the sovereign country of Canada? If I can use the expression, we don't want Canada in the eyes of the world to become what you'd call a political eunuch. In other words, we want Canada to be a country that has clout. It has reached great heights in the international world. We want it to stay that way. By Quebec separating, we are going to lose that prestige.

In the matter of powers of language. Now, the Hon. Helen Hunley has mentioned something about the French and the powers of language. I would suggest to you gentlemen that Quebec will never be satisfied until it has complete control over the language policy within its boundaries. That being the case, I think we can settle that matter by saying that policy on language shall remain a provincial jurisdiction. If a province wants to become bilingual, then it shall have the power to become bilingual. If it wants to foster the French language, then it shall become their power to foster the French language.

Enforced bilingualism has caused more trouble in this country and more cost than you can shake a stick at. We've spent millions trying to make adults completely bilingual. That's silly. If we want bilingualism, it should rise from our school system. It should grow gradually. The love of having two languages should grow with us. We shouldn't have to be forced and say, "Well, you're 68 years old, but you must be bilingual." You take the tramping on the Quebec flag in Quebec, a disgraceful practice. It's a disgrace when we trample on somebody's flag or we burn the flag of a country. It is things like this that make people do these things, and they shouldn't be doing it. We're living in a beautiful country here. We have lots of room to live in, but why is it that we're fighting over language? Let Quebec have their power over language. Let Alberta, let other provinces decide their language policies. I would strongly suggest that such should be followed.

I'm just touching on some highlights on matters of fundamental rights and freedoms. Lots of people say that the notwithstanding clause should be canceled; it should be just one rigid thing that's in that rights and freedoms, but even when they were formulating that clause in this little red book published by Canada, you'll find a comment that was made in that regard. The comment was to this effect: having this notwithstanding clause is like putting a red flag before the bull. The press doesn't like it, because the more adversarial a position you can take, the press can print more papers. The opposition doesn't like it, because the government is always wrong. I mean, the government is always wrong in the eyes of the opposition. Well, of course, that's their job. But the thing is this: hiding behind this Charter of Rights and Freedoms are people who do things they shouldn't be doing. The people are using our courts as a sort of a sounding board for their ideas.

Parliament shall be supreme. Parliament was supreme. A king was beheaded by Parliament because the king was not going to admit that Parliament is supreme. Parliament is the voice of the people. That's what the Parliament is. Parliament shall have the power to do the things people want it to do. The word democracy itself comes from two Greek words, "demos" and "kratia." It means ruling by the people, governed by the people. Also, if you look it up in the dictionary, you'll find democracy defined as the "rule of the majority," not the rule of the minority. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms often switches this around, and the minority tries to impose upon the majority things they think are right. So much for that.

Language. I've already touched on language. No enforced bilingualism, but let bilingualism grow from our schools, from

our desires. If you want bilingualism, if we want other languages as well, that's fine. There should be no restriction, but the province should decide. The province should pay for it.

Then reform of the Senate. I'm not going to go into that. I'm sure you've heard so much about reform of the Senate that probably I don't need to enter a petition. In other words, we have areas of widely dispersed people. Why does the diversification of the demographic intensify in each case? We should reform it, and you should leave it to experts. There's the hon. Mr. Clark now that's heading a committee. There may be others that are heading committees. We should reform the Senate in such a way that we as Albertans can be represented in Ottawa with about the same voice, as we should be.

The matter of immigration policy. You notice that Canada signed very quickly a bilateral agreement with the province of Quebec on immigration. They say: the kind of immigrants you give us are not the kind of immigrants we want in Quebec. Yet Ottawa can go out there, and they can bring scads of people from just anywhere they feel like and put them here in Alberta, and you and I and all of us are going to have to support them. It costs \$10,000 to teach each immigrant the English language alone. It costs us money to keep them here and so forth. I will submit to you, sirs, that the policy on immigration should be a clear signal to us to sign a bilateral agreement with Ottawa that we the people of Alberta shall have some say on what immigrants we want, where they are to come from, what skills they should have, how many, and when. We should not just have Ottawa decide that suddenly we need 250,000 people. They just let them loose, and then we're left with supporting these people. There's nothing wrong with immigration. We need people. But at the same time, we should have the kind of people that come here and produce things, that make salable goods for international trade. We can trade these things. We can sell so that we can create capital so that we can become prosperous so we can be happy in our country.

Gentlemen, I want to thank you very much for this opportunity, for letting me say these things.

9:46

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Kenway.

Perhaps if any member of the panel has a brief question, we could entertain that.

One of the things I just wanted to mention about immigration. You mentioned that. Of course, I'm not trying to flog the Meech Lake horse, but one of the things that Meech Lake provided was that every province would have the same right to an immigration agreement that Quebec achieved years before under Mr. Trudeau. The immigration agreement that Quebec has is called the Cullen/Couture agreement. That was arrived at between Mr. Trudeau and the government of Quebec at that time. That agreement was regarded by many as a very special treatment of Quebec. Meech Lake did provide that every province would have the right to negotiate a similar agreement if they wished to do so, but that's history.

Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: Yes, thank you. We've been talking a lot tonight about bilingualism, or linguist duality and so on, but I think it's important to differentiate between the minority language rights which exist in the Charter, article 23, and the federal Official Languages Act. We often confuse the two. So when you say that language should become a provincial responsibility, are you talking about removing it from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, where it exists as an educational minority

right, or removing it from the official bilingualism policy of the federal government, which is quite different, you know, than educational rights in the Charter?

MR. KENWAY: That's a very good point. I should have pointed out that the language of Parliament, of Canada, shall be as was contemplated by the BNA Act; in other words, French and English shall be the languages of the Parliament of Canada. We must recognize the French fact in Canada. We cannot erase it; we cannot be against it. We must recognize that the French were here, and so on. The BNA Act was passed. I think that we should not try to change that. No, what I'm saying is: take the language policy in the province out of the context of the federal government's jurisdiction. Where the federal government has not any jurisdiction in any area, it should not be imposed upon us.

You raised the question of the rights of language. I think that by saying that it shall be provincial policy, necessarily we'll have to remove that. We should not place an onus that we must teach French in Alberta schools if we don't want to. It should be left to the powers of the province.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Kenway, for your years of experience to our province and your obvious real concern and love for Canada. It's very much appreciated by everyone here. Thank you.

I have a number of speakers listed here. I have Kevin Borza.

MR. BORZA: I'd like to just come tomorrow and listen. Almost everything I wanted to say has been said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, sure. Then I have Chuck Bolton, followed by Bernie Shukalek.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I didn't get on that list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, wait. Maybe you're on it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, I'm not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wolikowski, Walter Doshkoch, Jim Rogers, Kathleen O'Neill, and Pat O'Halloran.

MR. KLAVER: Nobody told me that I had to be on a list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your name, sir?

MR. KLAVER: Cor, C-o-r, and then Klaver, K-l-a-v-e-r.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll try and get you on.
Yes, sir.

MR. BOLTON: Yes, good evening, panel. I'll try to be as brief as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. You're Kevin Borza?

MR. BOLTON: I am Mr. Bolton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chuck Bolton. Okay.

MR. BOLTON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kevin said he'd come and hear us tomorrow.

MR. BOLTON: First of all, I'd like to say before this crowd and the panel that I am proud to be a Canadian, and it befuddles my mind that I happened to serve behind the Vandoos in Korea, the French regiment from Quebec, and we never found time to argue. We got along damn well. Just a little joke. I hope people won't mind what I'm going to say. I used to forget the password once in a while. I could say "Black cow" or "Good night" or whatever. My French wasn't that great, even though I do have French culture in my blood right from France. I used to go up to the front at night, up to the observation post, and if I forgot the password, I used to say this word. It was an unbecoming word, but I'd say, "Comment ça va, you son of a bitch." They'd say, "Oh, there's that crazy Canadian, that crazy artillery," but they didn't shoot me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Obviously not, or you wouldn't be here.

MR. BOLTON: Okay. First of all, I'm going to make one remark tonight about Canada. I think in Canada today it's not just the French issue; I think it's an issue that we've all got to establish within our own conscience, and that is . . . We'll use the motor vehicle as an example. I've studied psychology and psychiatry. At about 5 o'clock at night some people go mad. Well, it's the same way here. I think we've forgotten who our brothers are in this country. We've forgotten the respect – and that's one word that should be underlined, the word "respect" – for one another. That's part of the unity that's going to hold this country or bring it back together.

Last year I stood in my Korean veteran's uniform – I'll just bring this up – in front of Canada Place. There happened to be people from Ontario, Quebec, and the maritimes on a co-operative movement out here. I stood there in my uniform and had them sign a petition: would you like to stay in Canada or see Canada go to hell? That was written in black and white. Eighty percent said they wanted to see Canada stay together. At my age – I'm almost 60 – I do not like a negative attitude towards Quebec or saying that we're going to separate this country. It takes more guts and fortitude to keep it together than it does to say, "Aw, to hell with the French." There's more to it than that. There's more to Canada than that.

I would like to see one thing: a Canadian driver's licence. First of all, I'd like everyone to be recognized as a Canadian. Sometimes I think we've become Manitobans, Albertans, Saskatchewanites, and Vegrevillites, and we forget that we are Canadian. We're all Canadian.

I would like some of those standards to be changed in the school curriculums. I think in the school curriculums in the country we should be taught what we have the ability to do best in our lives, not be geared one way or another in this society that someone else thinks we should go. I mean, one guy might be a great doctor, one guy may be a great mechanic, but I think when you get down to our systems a little lower down, say NAIT and SAIT, we lose this. People are shoved one way or shoved another or are expected to go this way or that way, and they're not able to perform. In the educational system I'd like to see that happen: to be able to function to the best ability. If you're a good bread maker, well make bread.

I hope I'm not getting off of the question of Canada, but I'm going to bring up health care in Canada. May I?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's very much a part of the issue, no question.

MR. BOLTON: No, I believe our doctors themselves – and I've got one of the best doctors in the province, a GP that I went to for several years who was suspended. He's going great guns again, but he was suspended. I think he had cats and dogs and everybody else on his list until they caught up with him and suspended him. So I think they're abusing the system in Alberta more than anybody else. I think we should all pay a small user fee. I'm a disabled veteran, but I still feel that I should pay – even if it's only \$2, \$3 – a very small user fee if you go see the doctor. So when the doctor says, "Come back and see me on Friday," it may not be necessary for you to go back and see him, so you bloody well don't go because you're going to have to pay three bucks. You think about it before you go back, and the doctor doesn't make another \$25 out of that, or whatever fee he gets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's a little bit off the topic, but anyway.

MR. BOLTON: Well, that's part of keeping Canada together, or we won't have a health care system pretty soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No question.

MR. BOLTON: Now, one other thing I would like to bring up is about crime in Canada. I've got to address this at this meeting, and this would involve Quebec as well. I would like to see some kind of legislation – I don't know if this is being recorded or not – where there is some policy of a permit for people that pack knives in belts. This is a federal issue. I brought this up with the Attorney General here, and he tells me it's a federal issue. I would like to see the province or the Legislature of Alberta give some direction to the government of Canada to put into place some legislation that it would be against the law to pack a knife any bigger than a penknife without a permit, because there are too many people getting sliced up. I was violently attacked in 1983 by people who wanted money for drugs and may not have even been here to talk to you, so I can speak quite clearly about it.

2:56

Anyway, I'll shorten my conversation here and my topic. I would like to see the country stay together. I liked what I heard the other day on television. I phoned the media when I heard that the Legion was going to stand up for Canada, and thank God. I hope the members of the Legion across Canada stand up and show people what they think.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Bolton.

Okay. Bernie, is it Shukalek? Come on up to the front and have a seat.

By the way, if any of you have written presentations you'd like to leave with us, we'll have them photocopied and circulated to not just the members of this panel but our other colleagues who are meeting in Calgary.

Go ahead.

MR. SHUKALEK: Okay. Thank you, panel, for providing me this opportunity. I'd just like to say a few things, and I'm going

to be as brief as I can. I wrote a four-page letter, which I sent out to various politicians throughout the country.

I think our biggest problem today is that we have too much individualism ahead of Canadianism. Okay? I think we look at individualistic principles and rights and everything like that. The Charter of Rights, or the Bill of Rights. As far as I'm concerned, I've been here 44 years, and when the Charter of Rights came into play, I felt gypped compared to the Canadian Bill of Rights. In order to gain rights, you should show respect and responsibility instead of gaining rights by doing wrong, and that's what I think the courts have to look at. Gaining victims' rights is very important. Okay? A victim never seems to be looked at when it comes to somebody doing wrong to them.

Overall – I have a sum-up here – I believe that the government and opposition parties have to look themselves in the mirror and face the truth. We're all afraid to do that, no matter what, but it is the truth that we have to face in the end. Quit fooling yourselves, us, and our children. Face reality. Work together in harmony, no division. Cut out these divisions by doing away with distinct societies, compensation to individualistic groups, and et cetera, et cetera for one united Canada. We have to look strictly at Canadianism ahead of individualism.

I have a letter, which I'll leave with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments? Well, thank you very much. This part of the evening is indeed just for people to come forward and give us their views. We'd like to have a copy, and we'll make copies of that available.

Now, is it Mr. Wolikowski?

MR. WOLIKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, hon. members, ladies and gentlemen, this is going to be a very brief offering or presentation, which is going to be a little different in scope and perspective than so far. My position, which would represent the view of faith and of the Christian from the mental view, is that we should do everything to keep Canada together not only for itself, not only for our service, but for the glory of God. How the glory of God can enter into the political process is part of our mission to explain and is absolutely beyond tonight's meeting. I would just like to introduce the very notion of it. It's real, it's going to grow in importance as we proceed, and it has a relevant solution for every single political issue that you are going to face.

Now, I just would like to refer to the paper that your task force has produced and which really brings out some very fundamental questions. We've been hearing here whether or not we can face Canada disintegrated: Quebec going apart, so-called First Nations in rebellion. We don't like that view, of course. We feel that this is no good for anybody, but we don't know; we don't have solutions.

My position of faith is that solutions without the help of God will not come, and that we here in Canada have been very fortunate that we do have this fundamental faith starting from the very motto of Canada, which we should be very proud of, because when the founders founded this country, they did not seek the solutions and all inspiration from the wisdom of men alone, but they looked up in the Holy Bible, and said, "Dominabitur a mari usque ad mare." They looked into the Wisdom of Solomon, because this is Solomon's psalm, and said: this is our hope; this is our future; this is our progress. So it is in this context that I would like to develop my presentation, which is not ready as yet, and discuss in detail the major and very thoughtful questions that your Alberta in a New Canada has raised.

I don't want to talk too much tonight, but I do have this point to make: that Christ is the King is not my invention, not anybody's invention. It is rooted in faith, and this faith is very significant and cannot be negotiated at any price. Also, there was at least one outstanding Canadian government leader had this notion of Christ the King as one of the fundamental principles of vision for this country. I'm thinking of Governor General Georges Vanier, 19th Governor General of this country. I think we should draw from his wisdom to go on and build a better country.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, and if you have a written presentation, please leave it with us. Thank you for your thoughts.

Walter Doshkoch.

MR. DOSHKOCH: How are you tonight?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR. DOSHKOCH: Members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, I had submitted a letter to you quite awhile back – I just forget the date – and I want to reiterate what I put on paper to you today.

I want to start by saying that I agree with the people who have said that there is only one Canada from sea to sea. I like the way Abe Lincoln put it when the struggle started in the south. It was an economic struggle, and he said: no one leaves the union, but that doesn't mean we can't change the Constitution. I'm one of those people who strongly believes that Quebec and Canada are two separate and distinct countries, but that doesn't mean to say that we can't have one Constitution. They have a culture, they have a language, and they have an historical boundary that is French Canadian. And they're not French; they're Quebecois. They don't speak French the way they do in France. There's 400 years difference. It's like a Ukrainian going to the old country. When you go there and speak Ukrainian, they say to you, [remarks in Ukrainian], "We used to talk like this a hundred years ago." That's what they tell you, and that's what the Quebecers think about the French and the French think about the Quebecers.

So our problem is a question of what jurisdictions. That's the only problem, and I don't think we have to have a great big emotional tirade over this question. I don't think it is a problem. We have other problems in this country. We've decided in our wisdom that we're now part of the international world trade, and what's happening to us? We've allowed the multinationals to come in here and exploit our natural resources. When this is all finished, what's going to happen to us? We're going to be a third-class country. We'll have lots of natural resources, but we're going to have nothing to say.

10:06

In this country, this province of Alberta, the construction industry has the highest productivity. Nobody anywhere in the world can compare. I've worked for many of them. I'm an old pipe fitter and an old construction worker, and I know the industry. This country is the greatest. Nobody compares with us, I don't care where you want to go: the United States, England, the Soviet Union. You can go anywhere you want. Nobody compares with us.

Yet we've allowed free trade to come in here and exploit this country and move jobs. We have a little country here of 26

million people, and we have 13 labour Acts. Christ, that's insane. There should be one labour Act right across Canada, not used as a football in every province. If we're going to go into world trade, then we have to establish world rights for working people. It's in this direction that we have to go if we're going to save Canada and have Canada as a nation for the people of Canada.

In the Dirty Thirties workers didn't have many rights. By 1940 they were dying for this country; they still didn't have any rights. In February 1944 the United States, under Sidney Hillman, who was the labour attaché to Roosevelt – I forget the Russian's name, and I forget the English chap. They established the World Federation of Trade Unions. They established and demanded that a declaration of human rights be regarded as legislation in this new order because people aren't just going to go to war, people aren't just going to die, and people aren't just going to come home and be unemployed. We wanted rights as working people. We needed rights. By 1948 we had a declaration of human rights.

But another thing came along. The declaration of human rights is a motherhood clause. You can't eat motherhood. It's like the weather: you can think about it, you can talk about it, but it means nothing. In 1976 the United Nations passed a Bill that was called the International Bill of Human Rights. That international Bill says that every working man is entitled to a job, everybody is entitled to an education, everybody is entitled to housing, everybody can join a union, everybody can go on strike, and we're going to do it equally. If we want to compete, let's compete on the ability to produce, not using one piece of cheap labour against another worker. This is totally unfair.

Everybody demands freedom, but how do you have freedom without responsibility? You can't have that any more than you can have life without death or heat without cold. If we want to compete, if we want to build a Canada, then we have to build it on that International Bill of Human Rights and ensure and guarantee that each and every nation that we deal with gives the workers and the people in their country the same rights as you demand. This is the direction we should go.

Canada as a country should change. B.C. is an economic unit. Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba are an economic unit. These units should develop a product and sell that product and not allow somebody to come in and develop it and skim the cream right off it. We want a country for people. We want our children to stay here. We want this country to grow, we want it to blossom, and we want it to be ours. And we want to be damned proud of it. I don't think there is any Canadian here who won't lay his neck on the line for it. It belongs to all of us. We're all equal, every one of us. The reason for that is that each one of us has struggled out of that womb and each one of us lays pretty still in that tomb, and in the meantime we all want our share of sunshine. We have to build a Canada that's going to cover those. We have to develop Canada so that we are each part of it, each make our contribution, and each take our share. That's the Canada I want to see. That's the Canada I fought for, that's the Canada I believe in, and that's the Canada I want for all of us.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Walter.

Jim Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Thank you very much for your tolerance and generosity in allowing me to be heard. I certainly want to

endorse what Walter has just said. I've written down here that all Canadians ought to be equal and that the object of having a country is in fact to meet the needs of all the citizens of that country. It should be through our Constitution and through the mechanisms Canadians are able to devise to represent them that all of our needs would be met without running down or injuring minorities or other groups or peoples that are also participants in our nation because they don't meet some particular criteria that are set out by a majority or a majority in a small area.

I wanted to just mention that I've written down on my little piece of paper there that I'm representing native and nonnative trappers in northern Alberta, but I haven't carried on some extensive kind of mandating process. It's just that that's sort of where I'm coming from.

My name, Rogers, is a little bit significant in the history of Canada in that there was a group called Rogers' Rangers that was involved in the capture of Montreal and various things like Queenston Heights and the signing of the treaty with Pontiac at Michilimackinac, et cetera. It strikes me as somewhat of a betrayal of trust that the Mohawks who were granted land as a result of their good services to the Queen, King, and us Canadians in past wars should be abandoned because of some ascendance of a need to appease the group they fought against in some historical battle. We should all be now willing to overlook and grant us all equal rights and some kind of generosity to live together.

I'll bring to your attention a number of distinct points that are of concern to me. I find myself particularly aggrieved that at this time in human history when we as a species on this planet are going to enter into a global population crisis which is going to bring about real confusion across the planet, our nation should be somehow burdened into this stupid exercise of: who's going to get their share of the pie, or who's going to get their wish list granted?

It appears to me that a significant little report came out about two years back, I believe, in Quebec that identified that the proportion of French-speaking people in Canada was declining, that if they were going to call, they had better do it right away, and that their hand at the Confederation poker table was going to be getting weaker hereafter in proportional politics. I find really objectionable that that is now the factor driving our national agenda. I absolutely reject the idea that 60 percent of the people in Quebec or something like that would feel that they have a right to talk about taking their entire province and everybody else, including the other 40 percent oppressed or against their will or compromised, out of the union with the rest of the country and that the other portions of our country should stand around like a bunch of stunned children and talk about: will Quebec leave? It's almost along the same line as: will we trade off Labrador for some population of French in New Brunswick in some high and mighty manner?

All Canadians have an equal right. I accept that we're going to defend the rights of the minorities in Quebec and not abandon those people whether they be aboriginals or more recent immigrants from other lands or English-speaking people of some past history within Quebec. We cannot allow our country to break up like, say, the partitioning of Pakistan and India into some kind of intolerant state where people will be identified for retribution or even murder based on their background or history or who they're seen as befriending like, say, partisans in Yugoslavia during the Nazi occupation or something. That's just absolutely unacceptable and outrageous.

10:16

If there were to be minimally some area of Quebec where the majority of people felt that they wanted to secede from Canada and were going to carry on a tantrum of violence and FLQ post office bombing or something or other unless they got their way, it may be necessary to grant them independence to some degree from Canada, but at the same time we already know that this appeasement path doesn't work. It doesn't work at any level, and it never has. It should be maybe seen that what started off as a policy of bilingualism has now worked us into a position where massive violence could become a real possibility, and great intolerance is being fostered to some degree by the economics of bilingualism, which has allowed that if you want to be a federal civil servant and French is not your mother tongue, then your bilingualism is really qualified.

I do wish that Miss Hunley's vision was the reality that I saw, that people who spoke two languages were rewarded in the Ottawa-Hull capital. In fact, it's been my experience that I was sort of looked upon with derision and scorn for even attempting to speak French there, and that people who were perfectly bilingual but who were not French in their mother tongue were not really considered for many, many jobs.

The concern that I'd have for our Constitution would be that some real consideration should be given to the proposition of proportional representation. It would appear that through a different political process it may be possible to better represent the diverse viewpoints and diverse groups that make up our country and get away from a situation where we have a now expanding number of parties but the majority of people are looking on and voting for the lesser of evils, or we find ourselves with a federal government with 12 percent popularity in the polls governing as if they had an absolute mandate. I bring to your attention that if we have, say, five or six parties on the federal scene, or for that matter the provincial scene, we could end up with 75 percent of Canadians not represented and 25 percent or less . . . Because we get about half showing up to vote, it turns out to be around 10 percent of the population actually controlling the government. Through proportional representation people would be better able to find or ally themselves with a party of some sentiment that would then enter into a coalition, and our country could be then maybe better governed or have more sensitivity to the people that it is intent on serving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to force you along too quickly, Mr. Rogers, but I have three additional speakers listed, and it's getting very close to 10:30. I'd very much appreciate it if you could come to a conclusion.

MR. ROGERS: I will. There was one thing: the native land claims. If they aren't just and honourable, then it's theft and fraud. In that case, then, the property reverts to the original owner.

The matter of Charles Ng. I bring to your attention the parallel case somewhat of Leonard Peltier, who was sort of whisked across the border into the United States by members of the FBI and the RCMP working together without hearing or justice at all. His real offence is that he was a native person, and he was dealt with very poorly. The case against him, I believe, is based on affidavits that have been refuted by the woman that made them saying that she was forced to make those statements.

Further to that, then, the matter of the department of Indian affairs, which I see as a department of our government designed and intent on subverting and injuring the natives' aspirations for

communication or government or even organizing themselves to be heard coherently. The matter that strikes me is that we have people out here in our government, in our employ, who are seeing their mandate as spin-doctoring history or designing the release of information so that a Harvard graduate couldn't figure out what's going on with our national debt. This great service is being offered to us at our expense.

The one last matter is that we have wandering our streets, and with some intent, right-wing think tanks and CSIS people who are apparently out there with the intent to defend our democracy and aid us internationally and as a society who find themselves leaning towards damage control or trying to censor or twist the Canadian persona and, feeling threatened by that, injuring our democracy in its hope to serve the people.

I thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rogers.

Kathleen O'Neill.

MS O'NEILL: Good evening and thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the task force, I appreciate the opportunity to put forth these comments on the constitutional issues we are facing today.

Just several days ago we read about Canada being the second-best country in the world in which to live; just imagine that: the second-best country. Yes, this Canada in which we live is indeed a great and bountiful country, and that didn't just happen. It happened because 124 years ago some giants of men and women had a vision of how we could be special and unique in the world and challenged us towards that vision. Through the life span of Canada others have picked up the torch and expanded that vision and made this country greater and more special. Ladies and gentlemen, Canada is working. Everyone in the world knows it but us.

Yes, we have some problems, and some of them are very complex, but none that can't be solved by goodwill and a spirit of compromise that will make the eventual solution a win-win for all Canadians. I for one happen to greatly value the special and unique gifts we have as Canadians: our universal health care and social programs, our higher than average employment standards, our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, our bilingualism and multicultural policies, our living and working together in harmony in spite of our diversity. A model to the world, a beacon of hope: that's how people throughout the world view us. That's why, ladies and gentlemen, it's very unsettling for me when I hear voices talk about a new Canada. I don't know what "new Canada" is and what it means. It sounds to me from what I read and hear that some of the changes proposed are pretty radical and have the potential to fundamentally change the nature of the Canada that I happen to love.

10:26

I don't object to change, and I think we all know that to grow and to be dynamic we are always in a state of flux; we must forever strive for higher ideals. But when change is regressive, when it sets us back, when it has negative consequences, I as a proud Canadian am prepared to fight that change, because, ladies and gentlemen, if we end up with a Canada where individual rights and freedoms aren't considered, where cultural diversity isn't respected, where health and employment standards are compromised, then we will be living in a much different Canada, one which I feel will be meanspirited and self-centred, where money not people becomes the bottom line.

One thing I would bet my bottom dollar on is that Canadians throughout the land want this country to survive and flourish. I believe there is a will out there, and I believe there's a compromise that will be acceptable for all Canadians, and that will preserve the integrity of Canada.

The challenge for all of us, and especially for our leaders, is to guide the will of the Canadian people to that end. If the Canada we love fails, I don't think it's because the people of Canada desire that it fail. I believe that it will be more because we have a crisis of leadership at this time. So in all our deliberations let us look first at the whole. Let's not dismantle Canada. Let's consider the consequences of massive decentralization before we start advocating it, because in a strong Canada we will be able to address our economic, environmental, and social justice problems, and in a strong Canada we will have a strong Alberta.

I thank you very much for being able to put forth these thoughts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. If you'd like to leave those notes, or type them up if you want to, we'd be happy to hear from you.

MS O'NEILL: I will. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Ms Pat O'Halloran.

MS O'HALLORAN: I want to thank you for this opportunity. I understand the day is already much longer than you had anticipated. My remarks will be brief.

First of all, I am a proud Canadian both at home and abroad, and I believe that Canada has great credibility in the world community. Canada has for many years been viewed as a nation dedicated to the preservation of peace and equity. I like that image of my country, and there are a great many peoples who wish to call Canada home.

Canada has an opportunity now to contribute in large measure to the future of the world community. The federalism which is Canada can provide for the rest of the world a successful model which is needed to fashion a world federalism. Instead, at a time when the world is becoming smaller and when people are traveling and moving more frequently, we consider a retreat to an old fortress mentality.

When my children and yours move from one province to another province or territory in this nation, they have a right to universally high standards of education, health care, and environmental controls which are guaranteed and protected by a strong centralist government. I don't want us to be restricted by a rigid preoccupation with local issues and with serving narrow, regional, and purely economic short-term interests. I want us to embrace all regions, all peoples of this country, to enhance our Canadian identity by the richness and colour of our whole family. I want Canada to be a consistent, benevolent, tolerant, responsible, and responsive federal union of its many unique and valued territories and provinces. Such a country will be the model in the world and for the world as we move towards central government in the world community.

I do not want to be part of a regressive and introverted local power struggle. I want to be part of an Alberta which takes its rightful place in a strongly centralized Canada, a Canada which brings the example of our creative and successful federalism to the table which will design the world order for the 21st century.

Thank you. Vive le Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Henry Ewasechko. My list comes to an end with you, Henry. I hope we're not missing anybody.

MR. EWASECHKO: Good. I've got the rest of the night then. Is that what you're saying?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you have some time.

MR. EWASECHKO: Thank you very, very much. I really appreciate the patience that you and the committee are showing. Obviously, this is a long, long day for you, but it's a very important topic. After sitting there and listening to all of the opinions and the advice you've been getting, I've concluded that you're going to need two things to come up with a recommendation: one is the Wisdom of Solomon and, secondly, time.

I have a suggestion on how you can buy yourselves additional time. What we're going through kind of reminds me of how a lawyer friend of mine describes a divorce that's going on. Each party hires a lawyer, and the lawyers are committed to discuss and disagree, discuss and disagree, discuss and disagree. In the end the two parties lose, and the lawyers walk away with all of whatever they had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gee, we lawyers really get it in the neck, don't we?

MR. EWASECHKO: In this situation we've got constitutional experts. Constitutional experts are discussing and disagreeing, discussing and disagreeing, discussing and disagreeing, and they're tearing Canada apart. My suggestion is that it's time for the politicians to have some courage and take the initiative away from the constitutional experts.

It's time that the politicians in the rest of Canada convinced the federal government to hold the referendum now. Divide the province of Quebec into many areas. Mr. McInnis asked the gentleman here who was the Alberta separatist what he would do if some part of Alberta decided to separate. The guy didn't have an answer. The separatists in Quebec wouldn't have an answer. Some parts of Quebec may vote to leave. My bet is that the largest portion of them would vote to stay.

A very good friend of mine is a Quebecker. Could I just be very brief and give a quick story? I was at a conference in Quebec City. We went out for dinner with this fellow from Quebec City, two guys from Toronto, and a guy from Ottawa. The guys from Toronto were giving this Quebecker a bad time about being French Canadian and things like that. At first I kind of agreed with them, but after about half an hour I realized I had more in common with the guy from Quebec than I did with the guys from Toronto. We used to get a little note in a Christmas card every year from this fellow, because after that we chatted for the rest of the conference. Anyway, he was very sad in one of his cards. He had three sons. They had gone to the CEGEP, and there they've learned to become separatists.

So I feel that there are the intellectuals, the politicians, and the artists that are probably the strong separatists. The ordinary Quebecker isn't. That's why I think it's a time when we should have the referendum. Divide the province up, and the separatists just couldn't control the agenda. Otherwise, if you hurry with your recommendations and solutions, you're not going to have the consensus that you need for there to be unity across the country.

10:36

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Henry, and I've appreciated the fact that you have been patient and waited till the end of the evening. My panel colleagues are grateful, as well, for the thoughtful comments given to us.

The news media asked me at the outset what I thought I was going to hear during the course of this discussion. I said, "Well, I think we'll probably hear from outright western separatists to people who believe in the unitary state entirely." I've heard both points of view, and of course those are the extremes. They said, "What would you like to see?" and I said, "Well, perhaps we can find the broad middle ground in the perspective from the great majority." I think we've been getting a feel for that tonight from what we've been hearing.

Canadians have one great, enormous, huge, gaping fault, of course, and that is that we've never really learned to laugh at ourselves as a country. I think maybe once in a while we should lighten up a little bit. Maybe I'll leave you with this little story. I was asked once: what's the difference between an American and a Canadian? No doubt you've been asked that question yourself, and maybe you've asked yourself the question. I think maybe the difference is that the Americans have a Constitution which says that they are dedicated to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," but we Canadians have opted for peace, order, and good government. And there's quite a difference. It may sound boring as Canadians, but quite frankly it is something that is just worth pursuing.

We're going to be going on tomorrow, starting at 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the evening. If at the end of the day we have not been able to hear everybody, we don't have the same flexibility that we had this evening and we will be devising a process by which we will hear other people who wish to give us their good advice. For those of you who do not wish to necessarily come to the microphone, drop us a line, give us your views that way, because we do want to hear from Albertans. Now is your chance.

MR. KLAVER: I was told when I came in tonight that the citizens who come here would have a 15-minute limit to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KLAVER: I never had that opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, can you come back tomorrow?

MR. KLAVER: Is there any guarantee that I can ask questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's your name, sir?

MR. KLAVER: It's Cor Klaver.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I didn't have your name on the list, and it's now a quarter to 11.

MR. KLAVER: Well, was my name supposed to be on the list when I came in the door?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I got a list, and I thought it was people who had asked to be given an opportunity to speak. I'm not trying to cut you off.

MR. KLAVER: Because when I came in the girls never told me. They just said that everybody had an opportunity on a 15-minute limit to speak here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe . . . Go ahead.

MR. KLAVER: Well, as I see it, the squabble in bilingualism for the two languages in this country will go on and on and will never end. The same squabble is in Russia. India had a big problem with it. In the early days they figured the French would integrate into Canada in the English language. I believe they would have if the English language was not such a complicated language.

First you have to learn how to speak it. When you speak it, if you could just look at the alphabet as the keyboard and the letters could be picked up and written, it would be easier for them to integrate into English. But the English tradition of: you add, you never subtract, and we're always right, is the blunder; they are the cause of this dispute. For instance, we have a lot of vowels that change the sound. We have words like "knee," and there is a k. These all have to be remembered. This is the cause, I read in the paper, why between 4 million and 5 million Canadians are illiterate. In Vancouver and some of the [inaudible] areas they have letters because a lot of Canadians born here cannot fill out their own résumés for jobs. Right? So if they can make a language which is simple to learn, the French would integrate into the Canadian. As I see it, in order to get harmony, the best thing now is to grab the two languages and make one language out of them. But the dickering will go on. Separation comes and goes.

I watched *The Fifth Estate*, and there was a girl who kept saying "gypsy" instead of "gypsy." She had a severe learning disability. I went to bed, and I said: "Yeah, 'gypsy.' In 'gosh' the g is pronounced like that; the i is pronounced like that; the y in 'pay' is pronounced like that." Then in the morning I woke up and said, "Well, she has a small IQ," and a lot of us have a smaller IQ. If she has a learning disability, by not simplifying the language I have to say we have an understanding disability. Bilingualism, with 4 million Canadians being illiterate? To ask the majority of the people to pile another language on top of them, I'm just thinking you're asking for the impossible. But the goal is right. He said if they speak French, we don't worry, because if they speak French they think French. That goes for the English too. We are in a situation of two frames of mind: the French frame and the English frame. They keep bumping at one another, and they will always keep bumping at one another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, and I'm glad we gave you the time to give us your views.

MR. KLAVER: You're welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no question English is a difficult language to learn and to learn how to spell. Some people never learn, including some of my colleagues in the Legislature, present company excepted.

MR. KLAVER: I can remember when Reagan got shot in the arm and the reporters were asking for a medical report from the doctor and said, "Sir, how do you spell this?" If I was a Frenchman in French shoes, I would say, "What are they shoving down our throats?" They can't even understand one another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, and thank you all. Good evening, and we'll be hearing more from the rest of Albertans.

[The committee adjourned at 10:45 p.m.]