

1:04 p.m.

Saturday, June 1, 1991

[Deputy Chairman: Mr. Schumacher]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the committee come to order, please. Welcome to the afternoon and final session of this stage of the committee's proceedings. There has been some change in the members of the audience, so I'll quickly introduce the members of the committee so we can then proceed with the first presenter. As pointed out this morning, our available time has been divided into 15-minute segments. If you would like to have some dialogue with the committee, you must complete your presentation before the 15 minutes are up. But far be it from us to say how you make your presentation. The whole purpose for us being here is to hear from Albertans in any manner in which they wish to present.

On my far left is Barrie Chivers, our newest MLA, the MLA for Edmonton-Strathcona. Between Barrie and the next gentleman is John McDonough, our administrator. Beside me is the Hon. Dennis Anderson, the MLA for Calgary-Currie. Nancy Betkowski - she was on my right, but she will be coming back - is the MLA for Edmonton-Glenora. At the end of the table is Sheldon Chumir, the MLA for Calgary-Buffalo, and our host for the day, the MLA for Edmonton-Highlands, is Pam Barrett.

Welcome to everybody. We will now invite the reeve of the county of Strathcona, Iris Evans, and Sandy Lipka to come forward for the first presentation. Welcome.

MS EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Reeve Iris Evans. Councillor Sandy Lipka has been doing a great amount of the work that you will see before you today. She is the chairman of the resolutions committee.

I'd like to begin by quoting from Eugene Forsey: governments in democracies are elected by the passengers to steer the ship of the nation. They are expected to hold it on course, to arrange for a prosperous voyage, and to be prepared to be thrown overboard if they fail in either duty. We are very mindful of that as we ponder the Constitution and also the role both the province and municipal governments play.

Strathcona county believes that Canada is a nation that should continue to remain united from sea to sea. We recognize and are proud that Canada is a multicultural nation. We believe people must be the driving force behind the desire to see our culture, our community grow. Different cultures must be guaranteed the right to exist and develop to meet their own needs, and all cultures must have the same powers and privileges to meet those needs. To do anything less would set these cultures apart as being greater or lesser than other cultures in Canada.

The political community, through its own decisions and legislative enactments, should serve the people. We have defined the role of governments not exclusively but as follows. The federal government of Canada should tend to matters of national and international concern. It is important that the federal government and its elected representatives consult and seek advice from provincial and local government authorities in order to more equitably and sensitively administer their responsibilities. As an example, appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada, a judicial body which makes decisions affecting all Canadians, should be made on the basis of input from all levels of government in order to fairly address the needs and concerns of all Canadians. Strathcona does not quarrel with the position cited in Alberta in a New Canada that identifies that the

provinces should introduce members that could be available for appointment for the federal government's disposition in that regard.

The provincial government of Alberta should look after the provincial concerns of all Albertans. Matters of international and national importance which directly affect the people of Alberta must be attended to provincially. As an example, provinces are responsible for developing their own economies and their own natural resources and must - and I stress "must" - have a role in the negotiation of agreements that may impact on provincial jurisdiction.

The local government of Strathcona county, as all local governments, should be elected by local people and should serve the needs of those people within the authority given and as required and endorsed by the people themselves. We further believe that local municipal government should duly respect their neighbours and work co-operatively wherever possible for the betterment of all people in the region, not exclusively for themselves but in fact for the betterment of all people. We believe governments at all levels should co-ordinate their responsibilities to respond to the needs of all Canadians.

In a brief comment on fiscal relations, we believe that if Canada is to remain one nation and be progressive, an innovative system of government should be contemplated. The government that is directly accountable to the people should provide the services required by the people, and the government that is responsible for providing the services should be the government that raises the revenue.

We strongly support the position Alberta has taken on Senate reform. In trying to leave enough time for questions, I'll simply state that the triple E approach - elected, effective, and equal - provides a democratic basis for the Senate, sufficient powers to ensure that both Chambers of Parliament exercise their authority responsibly, and provides a greater voice in the federal decision-making process for less populous provinces. Communities, regions, and provinces will work together co-operatively when equity is ensured.

Now Sandy Lipka will present, and later, in conclusion, I'd like to reinforce our position on the triple E Senate with action we have taken in Strathcona.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Reeve Evans.

Councillor Lipka.

MS LIPKA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On education, health care, and social services - and please note that in your presentation the written word is "fundamental." We believe it should be "basic." However, the computer didn't quite agree with us. It thinks basic is a little bit too BASIC. So I will use the word "basic," if that's permissible.

A basic and uniform standard of education, health care, and social services must be available to all Canadians. This can be negotiated between provinces and the federal government based on consensus at the municipal level and sensitivity to the local norms, values, economies, history, and culture. Once a basic and uniform standard is applied equally across Canada, local governments must provide the uniform standard as a service and exceed that standard at the discretion and support of local people. Mr. Chairman, I cannot stress too strongly a belief that is shared by the great majority of our community, a belief that parents have the primary responsibility for educating their children. It thereby follows that a central Canadian education

institution would be remote at best from the community classroom.

On the environment and natural resources, provinces must have the right to manage and protect their natural resources and determine their economic future. The federal government should work with and draw on the expertise of the provincial government to develop environmental initiatives and goals that will be of global and mutual benefit. Provinces should work in partnership with the federal government in managing environmental matters, with each jurisdiction taking responsibility for matters under its control. At a local level, environment has been identified as Strathcona county's number one concern, and the children in our community seemingly have embraced this issue more than our adults. The schools are championing the three Rs, and we are striving to make wise regional decisions concerning the future of our people, our lands, and our disposables.

In summary, we respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that, one, Canada must remain united as a nation, proud that we are a multicultural nation and that all people have equal privileges and powers. People should be the driving force behind the desire to see Canada grow. Two, the triple E Senate is essential to ensure the same voice for all provinces in the federal decision-making process and acknowledging that we are in fact equal partners in Confederation. Three, all provinces must be constitutionally equal, with no selected right to veto being delegated to any one province. Four, basic and uniform standards for education, health care, and social services must be available to all Canadians. Provincial and local governments should be able to exceed those standards, should the people so require, and provide the resources to pay the costs. Five, the government that is responsible for providing services should be the government that raises the revenue. Today there is some uncertainty about the level of accountability in delivery of services to people. This sometimes results in universal blame for cutbacks rather than pride for results achieved. Services that are sponsored by two or sometimes three levels of government need to have funding initiatives clearly directed. Six, all levels of government must work together to develop environmental initiatives and goals of global benefit to people of both present and future generations.

1:14

MS EVANS: Canada should remain united, and the people must be allowed to control their own destinies through a voice in the government that is directly responsible to and accountable for their needs. We believe that if equity is provided, then the system is fair for the people. We believe that Canada indeed will be a nation strong and free when we join our hearts, our minds, and our wills together to serve our people.

As an appendix, Mr. Chairman, we respectfully submit a report that previously was submitted, our response to the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries. Simply put, we have defined a compromise solution for Strathcona in its electoral representation which acknowledges rural, urban, and 'rurban,' that special population on the cutting edge of the fringe. I present this once again on this occasion because we believe compromise is possible, that demographics alone should not dictate representation. From the conclusion you may draw our belief in the triple E Senate. We believe every province should be represented as we have previously identified the three Es.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Reeve Evans.

The first questioner is Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for a very articulate, concise, and I think reasonable presentation with regards to the Constitution. I particularly appreciate your stand on the triple E Senate, along with others who have spoken. As the one who chaired the committee that defined it originally, it's gratifying to see that kind of support.

My question is with respect to the distribution of powers and the health care and education standards you speak of. The way I understand the brief is that you believe taxing powers should be with the level of government that is going to carry out the programs, so presumably the taxing power for health care and education would be with the provinces. Do you see the standards being established by the provinces and the federal government in concert or by the federal government alone?

MS EVANS: Mr. Chairman, Hon. Dennis Anderson, primarily by the provinces, because they are much closer to the people, and in the last 14 years of my experience, clearly the federal government has withdrawn significant levels of support. I think it would be fair to say we're somewhat surprised there is a reinitiation of interest in that regard, to move to a federal system. We do believe in a minimum standard of education available for all Canadians, supported in an extra fashion when those communities and the provinces are willing to pay for that.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: If I might just pursue Mr. Anderson's theme here. You've indicated that you're very concerned about environmental matters. Let's postulate a situation where you've got a river that's a boundary between two jurisdictions. In this idea that the province would be responsible for the standards, what happens when you have standards that are in conflict with each other? How can you have national standards if you leave the decision-making power with the provincial governments?

MS EVANS: I'd like to begin, but I'd ask Sandy to supplement. We've actually had that circumstance, with the county taking a very rigorous position in opposition to Aurum. As you will know, that opposition stemmed from the concern we had for the river valley and the river and future generations. Federally, we saw concern expressed by other provinces. I think our position was that we wanted to encourage other provinces to get into the act, so to speak, but we believe local people must take that responsibility themselves and not abdicate that to some other level of government.

Did you want to comment from the environment committee?

MS LIPKA: Just further to that, what we were actually looking at was that at the national level there would be global types of issues. We consider that water, air - something that is global - cannot be controlled by just one province. As Iris has mentioned, if you have one municipality that's willing to do something and another municipality that isn't, nothing really gets accomplished. So we would see the federal government at that level. The provincial government would then work in concert with the federal government and with neighbouring provinces to

establish further standards so the municipalities within the provinces are following the guidelines indicative to the province. We're not all the same. In Saskatchewan you have fertilizers; in Alberta, of course, we have the gas and petrochemical industry. Those are different concerns and have to be handled differently.

MR. CHIVERS: So would it be fair to say, then, that in a number of the areas you mentioned – health care, education, social services, environment – you feel there's a role for the federal government to establish basic standards that would be uniform across the country?

MS LIPKA: Very much so.

MR. CHIVERS: And that would not be left to the discretion of the provinces.

MS LIPKA: No. We really do believe that the federal government has to be involved. We are a very transient society, both today and in the foreseeable future. If there isn't some uniformity passed down from the federal government, then the provinces have no real direction they can go in and, therefore, cannot give any direction to the smaller individual municipalities.

MR. CHIVERS: That then leads to the funding issue, which is Mr. Anderson's concern. How do you fund these things? If you establish national standards, what happens in terms of "He who pays the piper calls the tune"? What do you do with things like taxation and raising the revenue in order to fund these programs?

MS LIPKA: In the education end of things specifically, and probably also with the environment, we see that the federal government could maybe release some of their powers or some of their determining standards by simply giving a guideline to the provinces. The provinces would be the parties to raise the taxes for the major initiatives and for the direction they would be giving. For example, in environment, with the NRCB they would do the taxing that's necessary to provide that commission, but at the same time, the work the municipality does would have to be raised at the local level. So there is a concert. I guess basically what it comes down to is prorating it.

MR. CHIVERS: I'd like to have time to pursue this, but I'm sure the chairman wants to move on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sheldon, would you like to supplement Barrie's initial . . .

MR. CHUMIR: I'm a bit concerned about the funding aspect and the statement that the government that's responsible for providing services should be the government that raises the revenue. I'd like to take, for example, medicare. Presumably we'd have federal standards, as at the present time, and the provinces then would be responsible for providing those services. In fact, that's what happens now. The provinces really make all the decisions re hospitals and so on. But if we say the provincial government should be responsible for raising revenue, what about a province like Newfoundland, that's so poor, that doesn't have the resources at this stage? In 20 years it may have the resources, but today it doesn't have the resources for the minimum standards. If you're saying that Newfoundland has to raise its own money for that, then it won't have a certain standard, and if you say the federal government is going to put

some in, then you've already deviated from your principle that that should be the government that raises the revenue. I'm seeing us getting sandwiched into some federal funding.

MS EVANS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Chumir. I see Newfoundland as a particular case. They receive 47 percent transfer payments from the federal government at the present time and are in a unique circumstance where every dollar from Hibernia will displace a federal transfer payment. I think there has to be some acknowledgement in the Confederation of Canada for those provinces that have lesser than. Certainly Strathcona county didn't attempt to solve all the problems of administering the funding, but we really did believe – and I think probably the committee's emphasis was really looking at education and the fact that Strathcona has said no to corporate pooling and has not carried it further to examine the principle in depth, as you have with health care. The health care matter, I believe, could be accommodated. I think there is a compromise role necessary with all three levels of government, and as we've pointed out, we tend to feel we get into the greatest difficulty when those levels of authority and levels of funding are slightly diffused and not too clear themselves.

MR. CHUMIR: So you think there needs to be some firm clarification of who has the funding jurisdiction in these areas.

MS EVANS: As much as possible, I would say. Sometimes it's a little difficult to be as precise as you'd like to be in politics, but I would say as much as possible.

MR. CHUMIR: Given your Newfoundland example, I sense you don't have any real objection to the federal government having a funding role in these as long as it's precisely defined.

MS EVANS: That's correct.

1:24

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We appreciate your presentation; it was well-delivered.

Is Shane Venner present? If so, please come forward. Welcome, Shane.

MR. VENNER: I apologize for not having a written document for you people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Some of our best ones have not been written.

MR. VENNER: I swear that I've torn up enough paper to make *War and Peace* look like a recipe.

I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to talk to you and to express my views on the difficulties that face our nation. Unfortunately, I have an hour and a half presentation to squeeze into 15 minutes, so I'm just going to have to skip a whole lot.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would you like me to let you know when you've reached 10? I will if you would like, sir.

MR. VENNER: Thank you.

It's important to recognize that the human traits that make us equal and give us a common understanding are the same barrier that stands in the way of our really understanding each other. First, I have to define the existence of persons who, up to now, have not been recognized. I have to call these people the only

thing I can, and that's the restive minority. These are the people represented by Harper, Manning, and Parizeau. These three leaders all represent the same type of constituents. These constituents are demoralized, disenfranchised, and disempowered. They look to their respective leaders as having a political force that they don't have, and they have surrendered some of their personal identity for the purposes of acquiring power. They didn't do so as a first choice; they did so only as a last resort. It's time we had a different kind of discussion, one that makes theological imposition of knowledge from the top just plain wrong. The leadership I'm talking about are not politicians. They're doctors, lawyers, social professionals, teachers, journalists, and artists. They've imposed their own ideas, without consultation, upon us as individuals.

I have a metaphor that might explain the position a little better. In a hockey game it's not as frustrating to be checked and have the puck taken away from you as it is to lose the puck by your own clumsiness. It doesn't hurt as much to shoot on the net and have the puck stopped by the goalie as it does to not be able to hit the net at all. We're finally realizing it's not because we're stupid; it's because our coaches don't know how to coach. We are desperately looking for a new kind of coach so that we can be a winning team again. Every time we change politicians, we change coaches, but it doesn't matter. The skate sharpeners don't change. The ones who bind our wounds don't change. Those who soothe our bruised and aching parts don't change. Those who pay our wages don't change. Those who tape and patch our ragged, nicked, and shattered armour don't change. Their unions are too strong and beyond the power of our inadequate coaches to fire or inspire.

We must understand that this restive minority does not feel as though they can control their own destiny, and they rebel, not against the other team but at not being able to play the game at all. Picking a fight with the other team is only a side effect. So to the restive minority it doesn't bother us as much to have an opposing team. It's more like not being able to skate forward, backward, shoot the puck, or make a pass. We feel inadequate and unable to do anything.

Our leaders: well, what can I say. I have thousands of descriptions, so I'll start with the doctors. The doctors have been fighting a losing battle, an unrewarding battle against dreaded thousand-headed dragons of disease. No sooner have they hacked and chopped one disease into remission than two take its place. Doctors have allowed the practice of medicine to decay into where a glorified bunch of knife-happy meat cutters rule our medical profession, where better medical care means more heads on the table to cut. The rate of caesarian section in this province proves the level of medical care in this province is not for lack of money. To allow our physicians and surgeons to have total control of the development of medical technology and treatment is a gross conflict of interest. This is only an example that once more our leadership did not listen to the people and has gone its own way.

Lawyers are, of course – how many times have people requested that our legal system protect the innocent and punish the guilty, and all we get are excuses and thousands of exceptions till we believe the innocent are never protected and the guilty always go free? Most often in recent years lawyers will tell us that the Constitution does not allow for people to have their needs fulfilled, but when the constitutional machinery was rejected and Meech Lake died, Quebec took that rejection personally. What we rejected was a Constitution, not French. The lawyers created the constitutional machinery to protect the people from the people. If that's not dehumanizing, what is it?

To believe that a machine can tell a human being the definition of being human is a deadly mistake. The lawyers have an incredible arrogance and stupidity telling us that the machine is more trustworthy than human creations, our Parliament, and our representatives. The Constitution is fundamentally, by intention of its creators, a stupid, unthinking, blind, unreasoning creation, but it's supposed to be able to tell living, breathing creatures how to live their lives.

The control of the Constitution is out of the hands of most normal citizens. The people cannot change it. Time and time again the Constitution strikes down laws made by men for urgent human purposes. The Constitution strikes down those laws because our laws, our human laws, do not conform to it. We, the people, and our representatives do not compute. This, of course, is nonresponsive government.

The litany of social professionals: they have many problems. I can't get into them all because my time is short, but there is one other group of leadership which is most significant in this battle, and that's the journalists. If you ask them what makes democracy work, they give you hours on end of singing the praises of the free press, telling you in no uncertain terms that they are the linchpin of democracy and they are the only ones to keep everyone else honest. If you ask them who has the responsibility in democracy, they will point with all 10 fingers and both thumbs at everyone else. If you ask them why they have no responsibility, they will answer that they're just a talking head in front of a camera and nobody's stupid enough to listen to them.

The journalists have turned into professional buck passers like their bureaucratic counterparts. The French wing of the CBC made one 12-month old incident in Brampton a nightly reoccurring reality in the minds of their French viewers in the most blatant display of distortion and newspeak of our times. The television and its power is the only thing standing between us and oblivion, and it's controlled by professional buck passers. The separatists, on the other hand, have very intelligent, highly motivated, professional television separatists. They know what they're playing at, and it's not good journalism; it's separatism. It's time for us to embarrass the journalists into action. They are, as a group, at least partially responsible for the Quebec debacle.

The Indian question: intrinsic to our European heritage, we have an obsession with the need to own land in order to be free. That's what freedom means to us. The equation between owning land and being free is so much a part of our personal heritage that it's gone unnoticed. The present negotiations of Indian land claims, of course, have some very important implications. While most Canadians favour settlement of Indian land claims, they have no idea what that will mean. Most of them presume that those land claims will not impact their lives in any significant way. That might be true; for others, that might not be true. Those others fear that the resulting Indian land monopoly will be too large, and the nature of the Indian attitude as a good corporate citizen remains unknown. Other groups fear their economic rights will be eliminated and their human rights will also be in jeopardy.

The native peoples see themselves as demoralized and have seized upon traditional symbols to express themselves, just as we try to get back to the good old days. The bogeyman they have recognized is, of course, the white man. He's the one that's been standing in his way all along, and they have chosen a collision course, apparently, rather than a parallel destiny. Unfortunately, they've chosen to attack from all sides at once, and there appears to be nothing to gain for anybody that might

have wished to make a deal with them. I don't personally believe that. I think they are willing to negotiate. They have also stated that no reasonable amount of concessions will be able to appease. I think that's posturing.

1:34

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes have gone by.

MR. VENNER: Ten minutes, okay.

The Constitution. There are a lot of problems with the constitutional battle, and they have been missed by many leaders. We fail to recognize the implications. First of all, the best the Constitution can be is a document that describes the end limits the legislative authority can do to an individual and also declare the distribution of power between other government agencies. It cannot tell people how to be people. It cannot, and people won't listen or even care when it tries. The Constitution cannot make a country what it doesn't want to be, that the people will not accept. The Constitution cannot guarantee rights; people guarantee rights. I've got to emphasize that again. There's no machine on this planet that can guarantee the rights of human beings except human beings. To believe the Constitution is superior to human control procedures is a dehumanizing and corrupting presumption. The use and abuse of the powers of government are a problem that can only be limited by a vigilant population always on guard against such abuses.

The creation of a pseudo machine that pretends to guarantee freedom and human rights by limiting human intervention is dangerous. It is more likely to lull the population into a false sense that something is already being done, not about the problem. It will simultaneously build resentment of unresponsive government legislation that doesn't listen to the needs of the people. Never, ever give an easy excuse to a bureaucrat to avoid making a decision. They'll use it first, not last, and the Constitution is the perfect excuse.

The federal government right now is experiencing a number of weaknesses, some of which were consciously chosen. The leadership role, because of the absolute need of the government not to appeal too strongly to any cultural group, is made very difficult for the federal government and all central governments, the provincial government included. Since the creation of the multicultural myth in Canada, this has been a problem and continues and will forever be with us. I did not originally agree with multiculturalism, since it does make loyalty to the central government inherently weak and it becomes unable to move various culturally centred groupings in any coherent direction. Even the greatest of the fiery speakers cannot inspire the same dream in different languages and appeal to cultural individuality at the same time. I have watched thousands of doctors, PhDs, philosophers, journalists, talking heads, captains of industry, and floor sweepers look with eyes transfixed to the one place that leadership cannot come from, and that is the federal government. Leadership has to come from our professionals, our leaders of our communities, our doctors, our lawyers, and most especially our journalists, because journalists have the greatest power of any professional group. They have more influence and more credibility than any group.

We cannot forget the weaknesses of Harper, Parizeau, and Manning. They're politicians too, and such politicians as they are always looking for the enemy on the outside. They're never vigilant against decay from within. Much of the problems of organization is mismanagement, and Kanesatake is no different than any other town council, only a little more angry and a little less vigilant. This is really missed by the journalists. They have

not fully tried to express the restive minority's opinion. They haven't even, as far as I have seen, expressed some very valid criticism which they've had of the Quebec government and of the federal government. They just haven't been there. It's not tough to do; you just have to do it.

The constituents of Harper, Manning, and Parizeau are not a solid bloc. The restive minority are still individuals and still have their own identity. They will only surrender it completely to the extremists reluctantly. They don't trust the extremists to express them as individuals, only to hit back with the political force they don't have. They would rather accept an understanding government far off and noninterfering than accept a zealot on their doorstep dictating their future options and endangering and squandering any economic advantages they might gain for petty revenge and boastful posturing. I do believe the Indians are aware of this, and I do believe that ultimately I don't think we have a great deal to fear from even a sizable land claim.

As for the Constitution, what do you put in it; what do you guard against? Well, at the top of the Constitution in great big capital letters, I think we have to put: "I didn't do it. It's not my fault, and human beings should make their own decisions without me." Okay?

One other philosophy which I believe is most applicable would be that the most important contribution to peace a man can make is to maintain his own peacefulness. I also believe that land is not wealth; it is the people on the land that make it wealthy. I don't think we have anything to fear from losing half our land, because the land did not create the wealth. We did, we the people, not the Constitution, not the mining companies, not the logging companies, we the people. In spite of the fact that we've tried to strip everything we could off the planet, we create the wealth.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Shane. We seem to have gone a little bit over time.

MR. VENNER: My fault.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This table is here to hear you and allow you freedom of expression as you see fit to use it, and we appreciate your presentation. Thank you.

MR. VENNER: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next presenter will be Marc Arnal for the Edmonton Multicultural Society. Welcome, Marc.

MR. ARNAL: We have a brief, which I'll leave with you following my remarks. I guess rather than read the brief, which is quite long, I'll just summarize its high points and maybe add the appropriate emphasis that may not have been added in the text.

For those of you who are less familiar with us, the Edmonton Multicultural Society is a nonprofit volunteer society dedicated to the promotion of diversity and understanding. We wanted to appear before you today for a number of reasons: obviously, to support federal and provincial initiatives in the areas of cultural diversity and cultural and racial equality; obviously, to comment on issues related to the distribution of powers in Canada, although it is not our main focus and not our principle area of expertise; perhaps less obviously, to support bilingualism, aboriginal rights, full equality for the disabled, and the full and equitable participation of women in Alberta and Canada. All

these matters are discussed directly or tangentially in our presentation to you, and they will be put forward to you – and have been I'm sure – by organizations dedicated to each of those specific ideals.

Our main purpose in appearing today is to share with you our global understanding of the fundamental principles which underlie our society, which animate the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and which are translated, albeit unevenly, into both Canadian and Albertan laws, policies, and institutional infrastructures. In our country's almost 125 years we have not yet defined our societal values cohesively. We have stumbled forward guided by our common sense, notions of right and wrong, and it has served us reasonably well to this date, so well that we are regarded as a model for citizenship around the world.

1:44

As we enter into this important phase in our history, we need to take stock of what we have become, of what makes this nation great and respected. We need a renewed and enduring understanding of ourselves, a set of commonly held ideals which can guide our negotiations and help us to find our way in the future. It's also time, I think, that we started treating Albertans like intelligent human beings, time that we shared that vision with them and let them decide the future as the responsible, caring, and decent people that they have always been. It's time to lay out the blueprint, basically, the values, to tie government programs to those values cohesively, giving all Albertans a sense of what the big picture looks like, the interconnectedness between such policies as bilingualism, multiculturalism, equality, et cetera.

Like all great principles Canadian values are simple. David Crombie expressed them most clearly as three interconnected, interrelated, interdynamic principles: equality, diversity, and community. Equality here means equity or fairness, not sameness; defined by some, academics among others, as equality of results. Every Canadian, every Albertan deserves an opportunity to participate with dignity in our society. This concept is well presented for Albertans with disabilities in the report of the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities. I think it asks some fundamental questions along those lines.

Diversity means that we support and encourage diverse perspectives as an enrichment of our society. Diversity is dynamic and enriching, but it can only work effectively in a context of equity. The Alberta Cultural Heritage Council some time ago developed a policy on economic integration of Albertans which lays out those principles quite clearly. Diversity also has a dark side, and I'm sure you've had that represented to you on more than one occasion. It can lead to social disharmony such as we are currently experiencing, but only in the absence of equity or of the third principle, community.

Community is our strong commitment to live together in respect and understanding of each other – in our organization we've declared a permanent moratorium on the use of the word "tolerance" – in a dynamic society characterized by openness, understanding, peace, respect, and growth. Are these not the very principles which have characterized Alberta's history and Alberta's regional culture?

Our diversity has been formalized in a number of ways reflective of our history. Bilingualism and multiculturalism are two of its manifestations, as is our commitment to aboriginal rights. Community is expressed through volunteerism, universal health care, fiscal equalization, universal access to quality education, et cetera. How many Albertans have been given the

opportunity to understand our constitutional challenges in these terms? We may differ on what they mean in everyday life, we may argue about how fast we need to move towards these ideals, but surely we should agree on those principles. If we don't believe in the richness of diversity, if we are not committed to equality and community, let's decide that consciously. Albertans must be given the opportunity to understand our superior societal model, to discuss it. Let's put an end to our unfocused bickering on means, and let's focus on the objectives that drive those means: pretty basic stuff in organizational or other theory.

We in our organization are somewhat concerned by the Reform Party. We'd love to hear Preston Manning argue against those values. In our view the Reform Party is a frightening aberration which denies the very essence of Alberta's history and regional culture, preying on the fear and misunderstanding which have been fueled by our own failure to define ourselves coherently. Is it surprising that many Canadians, particularly in Alberta, are throwing up their hands in frustration? Is it surprising that Quebecois are fed up? I think not. Herein lies the greatest danger and also perhaps the greatest opportunity in our history.

Our message to you today is one of hope and one of fear. We urge you to focus on the objectives which have made us great. We urge you to encourage a debate on those common objectives. Only then should we discuss the means. We fear the alternatives and what we will become. The Edmonton Multicultural Society is dedicated to the promotion of these ideals. If we can be of any assistance to anyone in government, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Thank you.

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

The first responder will be Pam.

MS BARRETT: Thanks.

This is your first call for help. I've been on the road for a week, and I must say that I have heard some comments, some of which were balanced when it came to the notion of getting rid of multiculturalism, some of which I believe certain people would find racist. I want to ask you how, if you were on our committee, you would handle this, because we have to be responsible to a lot of people. You know, when we go to the next round of hearings, guess what? The Legislature is open, you're all allowed in, and we've got to answer to all of you, including those who say: multiculturalism has been divisive; you're just standing up for those new immigrants. What do you say?

MR. ARNAL: Well, I think there's a couple of answers that I could give to that, one of which I'll borrow from David Crombie himself. I had the good fortune to sit at the drafting table when the Multiculturalism Act was drafted. David Crombie specifically directed his civil servants to make sure that the Act did not contain the word "ethnic." If you read the Multiculturalism Act, it speaks to the notion of cultural diversity. I can tell you exactly what Dave Crombie said. He said: Cultural diversity includes regional cultures; it's a policy for all Canadians; it can be ethnically-motivated diversity; it can be regional diversity; it can be any form of diversity essentially; it can be deaf culture.

The mistake, I think, has been to equate the concept of multiculturalism with ethnicity and race. That unfortunately makes the policy a policy for about one-third of Canada's population, and if you equate it to race relations, probably for about 8 to 10 percent. So I think if the notion were redefined

in the spirit in which it was initially intended, there could be room in that notion for everyone. I would argue that the issue of divisiveness is only an issue if we're not committed to the common ideal of community. I think there's room for everybody's diversity in our society, and surely it doesn't take a PhD to understand the value of differing perspectives on any given problem or situation.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nancy.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you, Marc, for your presentation. I wonder what you mean by equitable participation of women.

MR. ARNAL: Equitable participation of women? Okay.

MS BETKOWSKI: As opposed to equal.

MR. ARNAL: I'll give you a fairly concrete example, I guess. It's the same issue, but perhaps it would be more striking if I used the native issue. The oil companies in Alberta, for example, have been falling all over themselves to bring native employees into their organizations, and they've been very successful in recruiting and in the entrance. What they have been much less successful at is keeping those employees in the organization. They have an attrition rate that's astronomical. I would argue that that's partly because the equalization process hasn't been taken beyond the intake. The organizational work culture hasn't been adapted to reflect the perspectives, the culture, the desired working conditions, if you will, of those groups.

1:54

I would argue that the same thing is happening for women in a lot of our institutions. I worked with the federal government for a lot of years in the department that was supposed to be promoting the status of women, and it wasn't very successful. Why? Because women were less educated? No. Because women were less ambitious? No. Because our society is set up in such a way that when a woman leaves work for child rearing purposes, for example, that hiatus in her career results in a down-the-road effect.

I think there are all kinds of institutional barriers that need to be worked through. That would be, I guess, the big difference between equality and equity. I would say that if we recognize that women are going to continue to play certain roles in society primarily – and I'm not sure that we need to recognize that – then I think our whole understanding of our organizations needs to be modified to accommodate that understanding.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Marc, thank you for coming before us today. Although we've heard viewpoints that are contrary to yours, we've also heard viewpoints that support your view. You're not alone. You made the point that we need to discuss the points of commonality: what are our common goals, what are our common values, what are our common objectives. You've discussed them in terms of, for example, the equality value that you identified, and I think you made a very good point when you spoke of equality in the sense of fairness rather than equality in

the sense of sameness. It seems to me that there isn't an agreement on the definition of equality. Now, how do we go about developing a basis of commonality, a common understanding as to what equality means?

MR. ARNAL: Well, I think there are some government institutions that have the responsibility of promoting those principles. Perhaps organizations like ours need to be encouraged and stimulated to do a little more of that global promotion. The definition of equality as equity I think is an emerging kind of definition. It's a result of people realizing that defining equality as sameness is an absolute rather than a relative, and I think one of the things about our society is that every application of every policy we have requires judgment. We'll always be arguing exactly what constitutes fairness, what does Quebec need to feel secure. Right now that may be one thing. In 10 years that may be something else; 10 years ago that was something else again. So I guess it's a societal model where it's very hard for us to stand up like the Americans do and say that we the people, blah, blah, blah, believe in this, this, and this. We believe in principles that need to be applied. I don't know how you . . .

MR. CHIVERS: Could I just put a solution that's been advocated in a number of different contexts, and that is the emphasis that's been placed even here today on education and understanding, the ability to experience other cultures, the ability to experience other ways of life and other values. Is there some way in which you can assist us in that regard?

MR. ARNAL: Clearly, I think that whenever somebody is talking about societal change, the first place one looks is the education system. I'm sure the former Minister of Education has heard all those arguments on several occasions. We can certainly work with the school system, but I think the education system itself needs to address those.

MR. CHIVERS: That brings me to the last question, which is the funding. There have been presentations both for public funding of multicultural activities and against it. It seems to me that if we're going to have education, there has to be funding for it, and I was just wondering what your views are.

MR. ARNAL: Yeah. I think I would say that within the existing educational system it's possible probably to do a lot more than what is currently being done. In my other life as a real person I'm a student at the University of Alberta in education and educational administration. Without being too critical of the U of A, in my PhD program I have been unable in my area to find a course on managing diversity or a course that deals with how to deal with diversity as an administrator. As I said, without being too critical of the institutions – I was teaching a group of fourth year education students, and I asked them how many of them in their program had been involved in any kind of training related to the promotion of diversity, how many of them had a dynamic understanding of what diversity was all about. Only those that had been involved in the special ed sector, which deals specifically with what's now called exceptional children, had any access to that. So I guess the answer to your question isn't necessarily more money. Maybe it's just doing better things with the money that we do have, and it wouldn't require a major refocusing. I think it would just require some tinkering. It would require some imaginative programing in the schools. Obviously, I think organizations like

ours, to the extent that they're committed to the bigger picture and not just promoting a narrow self-interest, could also be valuable allies.

MR. CHIVERS: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you very much, Marc. I would like to echo the view that's been expressed. We've been hearing a lot of people saying that whatever we've been doing with respect to multiculturalism, we've been doing it in the wrong way and focusing on divisiveness. I was quite fascinated by your thoughts that, if I understood you correctly, the focus on ethnicity is really a much narrower focus than was originally conceived and that you perhaps had in mind. Multiculturalism generally, certainly in my mind's eye, has been identified with ethnicity, and I'm wondering whether or not, if there is value to those programs of a government hands-on role in promoting diversity, we should be changing the term, whether multiculturalism hasn't been identified with that ethnicity irrevocably.

MR. ARNAL: We have spoiled a lot of good words, I guess, in this country. Perhaps that's the solution. I guess I had to come to grips with this myself. I'm a French Canadian. I was born in Manitoba and raised in Manitoba, and I spent some time in the east and couldn't get back fast enough. I have no desire to live anywhere else than in the prairie provinces because that's my home. I guess I've been arguing quite a bit with my own community about multiculturalism. For example, I think the Francophones like to see themselves as different, as somehow one level above other groups. I guess I've resolved that dichotomy in my own mind through a discussion I had some time ago with Manoly Lupul, formerly of the university and the Ukrainian community. Manoly said: If you speak French in western Canada, you're basically promoting two different things; you're promoting a language, so you've got a constitutional responsibility, if you will, or a validity to your language, but you also have a responsibility to your culture.

Culturally I see myself as part of the diversity, much the same as the Ukrainian community or other ethnocultural communities or the western community in general. You know, I learned about western culture when I moved east. We just do things differently around here. I tell you, I like it better here.

2:04

MR. CHUMIR: You mention that that may perhaps be the solution. We've been hearing another view expressed, and that is, if I can perhaps paraphrase it, that in terms of public policy we have so many problems as a society simply bringing people together that our focus, in terms of public policy and funding, should be on bringing people together, bridging the differences in education, and that we shouldn't be focusing in public policy on those elements that maybe satisfy the cultural needs of different groups but would tend to divide them. We should leave that to the groups. Create a climate in which they can really enjoy those, but with limited resources. Public policy should focus on the community and the understanding aspects.

MR. ARNAL: I would make a distinction between government policy and government programs. I think the programs should be directed to those that are most in need or those that are most at risk in a society. However, I think policies need to be made

for all Canadians. I guess you could probably argue that in society right now the various racial communities and ethnocultural communities are more, if you will, at risk in terms of their ability to contribute to the diversity than are the proponents of the regional cultures in the various regions of the country. It's almost a contradiction, but by acknowledging diversity as a unifying principle, I think you get rid of a lot of the divisiveness that's potentially inherent in it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much for your presentation, Marc.

MR. ARNAL: Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Our next presenter is Michael Hermansen. Welcome, Michael.

MR. HERMANSEN: I'll try to speed this up a little, and rather than reading my paper by rote, I'll just try and go through it.

I'll say that my basic thought is that Canada is not a nation, it's a remnant of a colonial empire, in that a nation is a group of people who think they are descended usually from some past heroes, and they identify with these heroes and this makes them one. Canada has never been in a position where any of its citizens were heroes in this way on behalf of Canada.

Canada was put together by the British armed forces for the benefit of the Treasury of the British Crown. This was done mostly because at the end of the American Revolution there were a bunch of people who had been loyal to the British Crown living to the north of the United States, and over some period, the British set these up. I'm talking now about the people whose philosophy has dominated the government of particularly Ontario but also to some extent the maritime provinces; in other words, the English parts of Canada. These people were given sway over all of North America that the English had. In other words, I say that they were given sort of the empire franchise for northern North America by the British. Anytime they got into any sort of trouble, like with the Riel Rebellion for example, the British would dispatch some officers to mastermind repressing this rebellion. Then of course I go on to other examples.

For example, when the Ottoman Empire was broken up after the First World War, many nations were grouped together in countries, and in many of these countries one group was set up as the owner of the country, the rulers of the country. Of course, the best example is the Sunni Muslim Iraqis, led by Saddam Hussein, who were set up to be masters of all of what's now Iraq, including the Kurdish people to the north – that's a different nation – and the Shia Muslims to the south, and they have pretty well run the whole country for their own benefit since then. Another example, of course, is Lebanon, which is another country that's had serious troubles because it consists of several nations.

Then you've got, for example, Nigeria, which has something like 70 different tribes who speak 40 different languages. There the way it worked out was that the Hausa from the north, from the desert, were set up as the warrior chiefs, and the Ibos, who were Christians in the southeast, were set up as the civil service. They were able to keep that country together only for a short time before they had a very serious civil war.

Another example is South Africa, which quite visibly has many different groups in it, but of course the British figured that whoever they left the country to would be able to rule it in the same way as they had.

Another one is India, Pakistan, that whole area, and Sri Lanka, where national boundaries were set up without a lot of regard for the different nations that were inside there.

You've also got Greater Colombia, which was left behind by the Spanish when they vacated their American empire. Greater Colombia broke up into four different present-day countries over a period of almost 100 years.

Yugoslavia was left over from the Austro-Hungarian empire, and it now looks as if it's going to break up into national countries.

The ancient Roman Empire broke into two. First there was the east Roman or the Byzantine Empire and then the west Roman empire, and over the centuries many of those nations eventually got their real freedom.

In Australia and New Zealand, of course, you had nothing but British settlers and very few aboriginal people, so these people were able to rule the whole area.

I also go on to describe exactly how a national group is born. You have, for example, the English. They have a long line of heroes going back to King Arthur. The Israeli read about their emotional and perhaps in some cases physical ancestors in the Old Testament. They know that they are the same group of people, and they're going to fight for their turf. In Scandinavia you've got the same thing with the stories of the old Vikings. Of course, I mention again the Americans, who look back upon the people who fought in the revolutionary war.

In this way we can list a lot of different countries, but we can't list Canada because there has never been a war in which Canadians fought only for Canadian survival. Canadians were part of the British army in the First World War, and sure, they were given some recognition. I think they were given their own corps in the Second World War, but basically they fought in an Allied war. They didn't fight for Canadian territory; they fought for somebody else's land.

In Canada, of course, we do have national groups. We have the Quebecers, for example. They have their heroes like Dollard Des Ormeaux and a host of others who fought for French Canada, and they identify with these people. They feel that they are Quebecers, and they would fight for Quebec. Newfoundland, it's little known, is much the same. They are descended from a bunch of pirates and people who snuck away from the British navy and the fishing fleet and eventually had their own nation. In western Canada, of course, we are different from the rest of Canada, but we don't have the national roots yet. I mean, no western Canadian has really fought for western Canada. You can mention Louis Riel, but most of us don't really emotionally identify with Louis Riel. But we have all of the physical requirements for keeping a nation afloat.

2:14

I think what we have to do is make sure that western Canadians can never say that they've been shortchanged in the Constitution or political process. For this we have to be very vocal to defend the west. We have to try to adopt whatever national symbols we can find. Of course, they are several. One is the proposal at the Premiers' Conference in Lloydminster last year that the western Canadian governments get together and collect their income tax rather than letting Ottawa do it. Another one would be the flag of western Canada. There is a flag of western Canada. It's my lapel pin, if you want to see it. I think I have some bumper stickers with it here. This is the flag of western Canada, and it could be utilized just as well as Quebec has utilized its flag. It adopted the flag as a provincial

flag in 1948. If you look back, you'll find that that was really the beginning of the modern nationalistic movement in Quebec.

The other thing I say is that authority has been continually distributed away from the capital of London, first to Ottawa to some extent and then more and more towards the provinces. This is a natural process that will occur as chunks of an empire break up further.

There are many things that we should do. One of them is that we should look for more western control over things like the environment, because this is becoming a very important thing in government, and it is the source of many things that can be done to discriminate from one region to the next. In other words, a central government could sit and use environmental reasons to hold down economic development in one part of the country to the benefit of another.

Anyway, I think that in a nutshell is what I'm trying to tell you.

MS BARRETT: You had a very interesting thesis, and I enjoyed it, although I'm going to make a joke and tell you that I'm a daughter of two Newfies, and I don't think they want to be called pirates.

MR. HERMANSEN: Well, ask them about, for example, Mr. Goodyear. I have lived in Newfoundland for three years, and I know that this is a great source of pride, that these people took on the British navy, they moved to Newfoundland, and they founded the nation there.

MS BARRETT: It's true. You're right about one thing; Newfoundland did have its concept of nationhood.

My question is totally unrelated, I think, to the substance of your presentation except for the last part. What is this, please? What is this west Canada? Is this a movement, a party, what?

MR. HERMANSEN: I can give you this.

MS BARRETT: Thanks, because I don't know about this at all. Am I the only person on the committee that's . . . Okay. Well, I have to read this. I'll spare the audience, but I suppose if anybody wants to look at it, you can come up and look afterwards.

MR. HERMANSEN: Okay. I have a couple of copies here.

MS BARRETT: I didn't mean that in a derogatory sense. I meant that I won't take up the time of the people by reading it. But if anybody wants it, they can come up and look.

MR. HERMANSEN: That's fine. I have looked at the clock too.

MR. CHIVERS: I was just going to say that Pam shouldn't feel too bad. Australians are accused of being descendants of murderers and criminals.

MR. HERMANSEN: That's right, and they're proud of it.

MR. CHIVERS: That's true.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there other comments?

Well, Michael, I'll say thank you for your well-prepared and presented presentation. The Chair always appreciates somebody who can live within the rules.

MR. HERMANSEN: You're very welcome. Well, we engineers are not schooled in debate and writing and so forth, so I'm very happy with what you've told me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Michael.

Our next presenter is Clarence Truckey on behalf of the Westlock constitutional study group. Clarence, welcome.

MR. TRUCKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature. The Westlock constitutional study committee has a number of suggestions for improving the Constitution and thus the governance of Canada. We'd like to emphasize two main points, and I would start out by stating those two. We feel that the greatest problem we have today in Canada is the ability to change the Constitution, the amending process, and we have a suggestion for that process. The second basic premise we have is that the governance of Canada should be once again taken back to the people, and we have a process and a methodology for doing that.

With regard to the amending formula, Mr. Chairman, we don't have a lot of trouble with the present Victoria formula, but it seems to have gotten a bad reputation, and thus we would attempt to come up with something that seems to be more democratic, if you wish. You'll see the outline that we have there. It is basically that we would have a constituent assembly in Canada. It would be an ongoing and annually meeting body made up of 72 members, the constituents of which would be six from each of the 10 provinces, six to represent Yukon and Northwest Territories, and six representing the native people of Canada. From the provinces we would suggest that the makeup would be two from the Legislative Assembly, two from the academic community, and two from the public at large, which we will call outstanding citizens.

As I said, this constituent assembly would meet annually, and following its deliberations and the ideas for change that it might present, there would be then annually a vote, a referendum, on the recommended changes to the Constitution. This process, of course, depends upon modern technology, and we propose that every Canadian be issued a voter card, a computerized voter card. We feel that with modern electronics and computerization this can be effected very easily in our country.

This process that we're recommending we feel has the following benefits. I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that I am not reading the brief but I'm skipping through it. If there are any questions, I hope that you will pose them after I'm finished.

First of all, this kind of constitutional change process removes the process from the sphere of partisan politics and special interest groups. Secondly, we achieve a degree of direct democracy not hitherto available to Canadians since the very earliest of times. Thirdly, we make by this process the Constitution a living document that is easily changed and becomes again the property of the people. Not mentioned here but inherent in this, of course, is that there would be no veto to our Constitution by any province as such.

With regard to the things that we think need attending to, Mr. Chairman, in the process of amending and to be enshrined in the Constitution, we'd suggest the following areas needing special concern. Firstly, in the area of federal/provincial responsibilities we believe that there needs to be a clarification and a simplification of the responsibilities of our two senior levels of government. We think that the basic responsibility of our central government, the federal government, is to set basic standards and that the provinces should be allowed to enhance,

build upon, and make more effective those basic standards for the country.

We have listed here a number of areas. I'll not go into them, but we would see the areas of responsibility in Canada broken into the three traditional ones. That is to say, certain areas of federal responsibility such as trade and defence; there'd be certain areas, such as the organization of local government and the natural resources, as being strictly provincial. Those areas, though, that would be combined and to which I referred as being basically a responsibility of the federal government and to be enhanced by the provincial legislation would include the environment, education, health, transportation, and industry. We have set out some ideas within those which you may want to question me upon later.

As an aside, Mr. Chairman, we think that taxation with the derivation of taxes from within Canada should be the field of the provincial governments exclusively, and the federal government should be required to give reasoning and good logic for accessing whatever amount of taxation is required from the citizens of Canada. Of course, taxation on trade and so on would remain a sphere of the federal government.

2:24

The second area we think needs some tidying up is the area of making government more responsible, and again we'd emphasize that what we would do is move the greater power to the people, via the referendum, and the voter's card would be crucial to this process. We would suggest that many basic issues – and we can think of things like abortion, the GST, and so on – could be referred to the people and could be decided with a referendum to the people. Some other ideas, though, that we think are worthy of consideration in the matter of making government more responsible are, firstly, that the federal government should be subjected to a fixed term of office, probably four years. This of course would eliminate the ability of the Prime Minister to manipulate the electoral process. Second, we think that recall has some value, and not, shall we say, too easily done but by due process. We've outlined a process there for you. That is, 10 percent of the electorate in a given constituency could require a vote that a referendum be held within 30 days following such a petition, and it would require 50 percent of the electors to recall a member.

We think that free votes in Parliament are a good idea and that this could be done, except for declared lack-of-confidence Bills, without upsetting the process of governance. Once again, referenda on basic issues, such as the ones I mentioned earlier, could be referred to the general populace.

We would also, Mr. Chairman, like to support the idea of the triple E Senate, and once again, we think this number 72 has a magic value to it. The numbers would be six per province, six for the Northwest Territories and Yukon, and six for native peoples. We think that perhaps having an election every two years on a rotating basis for the Senate would keep a vital and ever fresh viewpoint coming from the people to the House of sober second thought. Perhaps you read the editorial in the *Journal* today regarding regional senatorial representation. We do not agree that that is a good move. We think that it's better to have the balance by the provinces. Even though P.E.I. has only a hundred thousand people compared with the 10 million of Ontario, we believe that's the real purpose for having the equal Senate and feel that that should be maintained. It does not follow that because P.E.I. has an equal number of votes, they have a veto.

In the matter of bilingualism, Mr. Chairman, we would submit that yes, Canada should be a bilingual country, but not of any one second language. We believe that French is not the only language that should be taught in the schools and that French should not be federally imposed upon the population. We think that the way it has been done recently has been fractious and unnecessary in non-French Canada. We think, though, that English should be the official language of Canada, since English is fast becoming the international language, and if Canada is to take its place in the 21st century, we need to be able to maintain good business and government communications with the English language. As I said before, the provinces, beyond the matter of there being a second language, should be allowed to choose which languages within their boundaries may be developed, and I think it should be wide open and encouraged. For instance, in Thunder Bay it may be Finnish, in Vegreville it can Ukrainian, and in Cape Breton it might be Gaelic. This should be a widely divergent bilingual country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the federal government should get out of the business of bilingualism as it has been done up to this point and allow it to get back to the multicultural groups and allow the provinces and the municipalities to do whatever accommodation, rather than initiation, is done in this area. We base our thinking on this – and multiculturalism I think somewhat follows, but particularly the French fact and the problem of Quebec in Canada – on the basis that western Canadians are not really a part of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham/Quebec Act syndrome, and we feel that this has been foisted upon us and we should be allowed to more readily recognize the many multicultural groups in Canada.

Moving to multiculturalism, then, Mr. Chairman, we would encourage cultural diversity in Canada and enrichment that comes from the heart and not from the government. We feel that it should be financed by the local groups, perhaps by provinces and municipalities to an extent, but the federal government should get out of the business of multiculturalism as it has been done in the past, much like with the bilingual initiation that was mentioned before. School boards should be encouraged also in this area, as in bilingualism, to give the opportunity for a variety of multicultural experiences to students, and this can be done, we think, without taking away the idea of the total mosaic. Even if it is Ukrainian in a given community and Finnish in another, we can still be aware of the total enrichment of Canada by this mosaic. In finality, I would just say that under this area of multiculturalism/bilingualism we feel that yes, Canada should be a multicultural country in a bilingual framework, but the bilingual part can be any second language.

The final area, Mr. Chairman, we would like to comment upon is the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and in this regard, despite the spate of criticism that the Charter has had of late and the number of court cases based upon it, we do feel that this document is the one that raises the possibility of life in our country being at the highest level of democracy. We feel better to err on the side of democratic rights rather than on government repression. The notwithstanding clause we feel should be retained for a time to allow provinces to accommodate special circumstances. We think that the five-year reaffirmation provision does require that governments continually reconsider the override provisions of the Charter.

In summary, then, Mr. Chairman, we believe in Canada as it is presently constituted, and the thought of losing our distinct Canadian culture is abhorrent to us. We believe that all regions of the country must approach the current constitutional crisis with a spirit of understanding and compromise. Above all, it is

our belief that by returning the nation to a more direct democracy in which all people participate, a unifying spirit is promoted.

We'd like to thank you for this opportunity. We feel in our case that just having had to go through this process and the process that is going on and will continue to go in Canada is of benefit because we all get to know a lot more about our country and our Constitution.

I would just then finally refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the list of our committee members on the back page and point out to you that there's one misspelling, I'm sure. That should be, in number 5, Seatter, spelled S-e-a-t-t-e-r. And perhaps some misnomers: we have "retired housewives" down there. I suspect that many housewives would protest that they are never retired.

Thank you.

2:34

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Clarence, for a very well-organized and well-presented brief. There are three members who have indicated a desire to question you. I would remind the members that we have used up our 15 minutes, so I'd ask you all to bear that in mind when asking your questions.

MR. CHIVERS: With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I'll confine myself to the one question, although there are a number I would like to ask.

Clarence, first let me see if I understand your brief. I think you were suggesting that English would become the official language of Quebec and all of Canada. Is that correct?

MR. TRUCKEY: That is correct.

MR. CHIVERS: That there'd be no constitutional recognition of the French language, even within the province of Quebec?

MR. TRUCKEY: Not a special recognition; yes.

MR. CHIVERS: And that it would be constitutionally required for the province of Quebec to adopt the English language. I think yours is the first brief that has gone that far. Most of the people that have been opposed to official bilingualism and the Official Languages Act have at least conceded to Quebec the right to decide its own language within its own boundaries.

MR. TRUCKEY: Well, I think the basis, Mr. Chairman and Barrie, is that we don't think we can function very effectively in the world of business internationally without having a facility in the international language, which is English.

MR. CHIVERS: Well, I understand your position.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Nancy.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Truckey. I agree with you that public consultation and public education are very much part of the same thing. I thank your group for coming together. I'll just pick up on Barrie's point. I think it hinges around division of powers, because what I hear you saying is: to the provinces give local government, natural resources, and language and culture.

MR. TRUCKEY: Yes.

MS BETKOWSKI: Hence, while declaring English as the language, Quebec would be free to develop a program in its own province with respect to, presumably, the French language. Is that a correct interpretation of what you're saying?

MR. TRUCKEY: Yes, that is the way we would see it.

MS BETKOWSKI: Further, then, when you suggest on pages 3 and 4 about the division of powers, you talk about national standards with respect to education and health. Are you suggesting as well that the current jurisdiction over education and health, which rests with the provinces, be transferred to the federal government?

MR. TRUCKEY: I think, Nancy, that what we're saying throughout is that there should be a re-examination of the responsibilities of the two senior levels of government, and the traditional thinking that education is basically only in the sphere of the provinces may need to be re-examined, and that as with others, like health and environment, we have a need to have some national standards. There's no reason why the provinces cannot enhance, improve, et cetera, et cetera, upon those.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sheldon, does that cover your area?

MR. CHUMIR: No. I was interested in Mr. Truckey's discussion of multiculturalism, the view that this should not be funded. There's a section there on education. I would assume from the general tenor of Mr. Truckey's comments that he would not be in favour of funding separate schools for different ethnic groups, with the basis of those schools being to encourage the maintenance of their culture and diversity, that that should be their own responsibility. Is that fair?

MR. TRUCKEY: I guess the honest answer is that we did not get that far into the problem. Our basic premise here throughout is leave the big decisions up to the people, and we'll leave the mundane decision-making up to the politicians. However, I think it's a critical point, and I'll try to address it. That is, I believe that there should be a greater responsibility on the cultural groups to provide education in their cultural area, and if that means a somewhat separate school or a special school, then that responsibility should fall to the cultural group. In general I believe that that would be the position of our committee.

MR. CHUMIR: So if you were asked, for example, as to whether there should be public funding, say, of private schools to that end, to promote retention of culture, language, or religion, you would say that that should be their own responsibility and not a public responsibility?

MR. TRUCKEY: Well, I think we have said that schools should be encouraged to have exposure for students in the area of multiculturalism, and that may be a special emphasis for a given culture. Having said that, I think that it follows that the Department of Education, doing its thing beyond the basic standards of the three Rs, perhaps, would then have to decide what amount, what degree, of funding would be allowed for the ethnic – and I don't mind that term at all – or cultural study that would be allowed by a school board in a given area. I think there should be a lot of diversity, a lot of opportunities for different cultures to be studied.

MR. CHUMIR: But are you saying that this should be within the framework of the existing school system as opposed to separate, private schools for each of these groups whereby they would be on their own with public funding?

MR. TRUCKEY: Yeah. I think that within the province the best position for our Department of Education to take is that we'll provide X number of dollars for cultural study, exposure, et cetera. If a given group wishes to go beyond that, then I believe it should be their responsibility. If they wish to have a completely private school, that is their own business, and they may want to do it.

MR. CHUMIR: But when you're saying X dollars for cultural pursuits – I just want to make this clear, because you've said to withdraw the financing of the cultures. I wanted to make sure it's clear that funding for cultural pursuits is going to the school system and not to these groups, failing which there's, you know, an inconsistency.

MR. TRUCKEY: I think what I've said, Mr. Chairman, is there would be a basic allowance, if you wish, within the total educational budget for this kind of thing. When the magic number is exceeded, it would be the responsibility of a given cultural group to provide other opportunities beyond that, and that would include private schools.

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

MR. TRUCKEY: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next presenter is Betty Becker.

Welcome, Betty.

MS BECKER: Okay. Let me just note that I'm not with any committee or anything; this is just on my own.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On your own.

MS BECKER: Okay. The first and most important, I think, reform to be considered is federal decentralization, so to speak. With more responsibilities being pushed on the provincial and municipal governments, the need for a central government seems less justified. We should seriously look at splitting federal powers into more provincial powers, giving the provinces more powers on how they want steps for deficit reductions, balanced budgets, and overall needs for its people, because each province is different and has different needs. In the Constitution it states that the federal purse is to distribute all moneys, et cetera, evenly to the provinces, and I don't think that's being done, given the state of provinces' purses, you know.

I don't think that we should carry the burden any longer for a federal government who doesn't think solely of its constitutional obligations. I think maybe that without as much third-party involvement we could see a drastic reduction in the overall deficit within three to five years. Also, we should see a better economy and a stronger dollar if we see less of this foolish government spending. I also would like to add that if the above can't be done, then we should look at the possibility of changes within the House. We have to put an end to this party line politics that the government has right now, for a true democracy. All social reforms should not be part of this party line process but it should be up to our elected officials to speak on behalf of

all of us people who have elected people. The only thing that should be party line is money Bill issues, as far as I'm concerned.

2:44

Secondly, we should add to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms the public's right to all information regarding government dealings. There are just too many hidden agendas and government cover-ups, and I think we all know what's going on up there with our heads of governments. We should also reserve the right, since referendums cost too much money, for elected officials to speak for us out of this traditional party line politics. It's we ordinary people who give the government its paycheques, and I think we have the right to be heard on all issues that affect us.

Third on my list of recommendations is the justice and legal system. This is quite long, but I'll just try to make it shorter. First, we should bring back capital punishment for first-degree murderers. Along with this process there should be allowed a one-year appeal until they are on death row. In that time the convicted murderer will be allotted that appeal to prove his innocence. I feel that this would decrease the amount of criminals that we have to feed and clothe with our tax dollars. Maybe the money saved there could be enough to expand on victims' programs. We did not commit these crimes, and I don't think we should have to pay for it every time someone has committed one.

Another issue I'm going to touch is a fairly sensitive issue. It's in regards to mercy killings. I think we should allow for that for terminal or life-support patients who do not want to be in this world anymore for whatever reason, and this would in turn probably help our sagging health care programs. To spend all that money on one patient who doesn't want it or won't be benefited by it seems kind of senseless when there are so many other people out there who could use this system and be saved with simple surgery or whatever with the machines.

We have to look at our extradition law and policies. The system we have now, as far as I'm concerned, just wastes money and continues to make Canada a criminal haven. I suggest that the government kick up their heels on this issue and stop wasting our dollars by allowing foreign criminals to evade justice in their own countries with the help of our extradition laws. Send them back regardless of what penalties they may face. Also, the courts should be given a freer hand in punishments. I really do believe that this insanity plea just allows murderers and whatever to evade the full punishment for their crimes. We all know that anybody who could commit crimes of such seriousness would have to be a little bit insane, but not to the extent where they don't have to pay for it. We also need stiffer penalties, not just slaps on the wrist, for certain crimes.

I'd also like to touch a little bit on the Quebec issue. I really don't have much to say about this, but I think that if this problem is to be rectified, we have to compromise with Quebec. There should be no special powers to Quebec other than the fact that the Constitution should recognize them as a society within a society, giving them the right to their own language, if that's what they want. Other than that I feel they're as equal as the rest of us in every other province, and they shouldn't be given any special powers or vetoes or whatever.

Another issue I'd like to bring up is aboriginal rights. If anyone deserves these rights, it's these people. A long time ago their leaders gave up their freedom of the land and they gave up their language, and today it seems to me that they're still paying for that. They've stripped these proud and brave people long enough. We have to give them something, because I believe

that they are the true Canadians. They still have their own visions of justice and beliefs. It's been that way for them for hundreds of years, and I don't think they're going to be changing in the future. In the Constitution it states that aboriginal peoples have to be consulted on further constitutional amendments, and I sure hope the government sticks to that. These people should be given a section in the Constitution that allows them freedom of their aboriginal justice and to live free within their own treaty rights and personal beliefs. In regard to Oka last summer, they were fighting for a piece of land which they said was a burial ground. Now, if they have their own people buried there, it's obvious that that was their land at one time and there should be some kind of concession stating that they should get that back. I think we can learn a lot from these people because they do live off the land. They should be consulted for environmental causes and stuff like that.

Finally, I think we should have a serious look at our immigration laws. If we don't put a cap on this situation right now, we're only going to be inviting more problems in the future for Canada. It is already happening. Some people might say that they take our jobs, and gangs come along and they hurt our people. They come here and they live by their beliefs without any regard to Canadian ways. Examples of this might be the Pakistanis joining the RCMP and crying rights when they can't wear their turbans instead of the traditional RCMP garments. Second would be the Sikhs insisting on wearing their daggers, and they cry religion. You know, every time these immigrants don't get what they want, they call human rights. When they come here, they should understand that this is Canada and we don't have to adjust our ways of life for these people that come here.

I think we should seriously look at cutting the amount of immigration that we allow into Canada. It's obvious by the state of immigration that they can't keep up with the flow of immigration that we have already. You know, there's too much to handle. I believe that in allowing so many entries from hostile countries, we're inviting increasing terrorism, gang wars like we have here in Edmonton: the Vietnamese fighting each other with guns and knives. I think we have the right to first be charitable to our own people and then look at immigration. After all, charity begins at home. In regards to the immigrants who are already here, they should be expected to improvise. What they do in the privacy of their own homes is their business, but what they do outside is the public's business. If they can't accept that upon entry here, then maybe they shouldn't be here. I believe that our government is too soft regarding immigration laws and makes it too easy to come here. Something has to change within the immigration laws.

Just a couple of little pointers that I'd like to add are in regards to duties on Canadian borders. Why can't we have duty-free borders in Canada? After all, we pay it into one pocket anyway. What sense does it make to charge Canadians for Canadian goods manufactured in Canada?

I also believe that before this new Constitution or a new Canada is formed, we should have a federal election and let the people decide who they want to represent them in this new Canada.

In conclusion, I'd just like to add on a personal note that if the government we have now would really like a chance at gaining our trust back, they take these meetings that we're having here very seriously and give us what we want in a new Canada, or I don't think there will be any hope for Canada really being united. Throughout history Canada has been the envy of the world. We have all the necessary resources, and we

have a lower crime rate per capita in the world. It would be just sad to see Canada in such political unrest, and I don't think it can get any better unless something is done with these meetings. I believe that if something doesn't happen, we could see a downfall in this country like we've never seen before. Separation could become reality really fast in all the provinces. I believe that if things are this bad today, what are we going to leave for our children? Are we going to leave them high inflation, ballooning deficits, and higher unemployment? I'm here to help with suggestions today to maybe help out our children tomorrow. We can't go on leaving these problems for our children to handle. I mean, our parents left it for us, and now we're going to leave it for our children. We have to get a grip on our country today, before it slips away from us.

Thank you.

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

MS BECKER: There will be a copy of this. It's in full. I've just pointed out certain things, so I'll just send you copies as to this speech of mine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you'd like to leave that copy with John, he will reproduce it for us.

MS BECKER: Okay, great. Thank you. That's in its entirety. I just stepped on my pointers, but it goes into detail.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Betty. I guess on behalf of the committee we'd like to thank you for the time and effort that you made in delivering a very clearly expressed presentation.

2:54

MS BECKER: Well, this is just on personal views, and I believe that something has to be done, especially with immigration and our legal system, and something done within the House of Commons.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next presenter is Barry Breadner. Welcome, Barry.

MR. BREADNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MS BETKOWSKI: Have we got it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes; we have copies. They were sent out this morning. It looks like this.

MR. BREADNER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just had three pages. May I proceed?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Please proceed.

MR. BREADNER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, may I first of all say how grateful I am to have this opportunity to speak to you and that you are all taking the time to do this as part of your Alberta responsibility.

You'll notice that I start my brief submission saying that I am a citizen of Canada resident in Alberta. I still consider myself first of all a Canadian citizen, although as a prairie boy I would have to say that my Canadian feeling has been eroded over the years somewhat. I want to focus on just two things, because I

want to put forward some constructive suggestions today. I think we need those so badly in this country at this time.

The first thing that I address in my report is the need for national institutions and symbols, and I have racked my mind as to how we can try to improve those things in our country so that people can find things that everyone identifies with and that we can look to as a Canadian symbol or institution. I've picked out of this the monarchy.

I am a monarchist, but I quite frankly don't think our monarchy is working very well for us anymore. I think there are probably a number of reasons for that. I think the French-speaking people in Quebec see our Queen as the Queen of England rather than the Queen of Canada, and I also point out in my report that I think the appointment of politicians to the position of Governor General and Lieutenant Governor – this goes on repeatedly nowadays – gives these offices a distinct political appearance. If you would look back at the last three Governors General, we have now a former Conservative, Mme Sauvé was a former Liberal, and Mr. Schreyer was a former ND, and they all came out of a political office within months or years of being appointed to this position. I think that unfortunately gives the office a colour. Not that those people haven't served their country well or aren't good people, but it's just that it brings that aura to the office. The monarchy's greatness, I think, is that it can be above the political realm, and I think we're failing to do that in the way that we have been using this office for the past few years.

In my report I say that we should create a Canadian monarchy. I didn't say to you what ideas one might have there. I try one on people, which gets some interesting reactions, to say the least. They seldom come back with anything; they say, "Well, that's a good idea, yes; but I don't know." The idea is this: I think our leaders should go to the Queen in London, and they should say, "Ma'am, this isn't working for us, you know, you being Queen of Canada; it's not really working out for us anymore, and we want to change this institution. What we want to do is we want to ask Edward to come and be King of Canada, but the condition is that he must marry a bright, articulate, and personable young French-Canadian woman." [laughter] I got the reaction that I usually get.

There are lots of monarchies around in the world today that were started with different approaches than that, and they work very successfully. I personally favour a rather low-key monarchy, something like what the Netherlands or Scandinavia has. If you look at these – for example, the Norwegian monarchy was founded by a Danish prince and a British princess; that was the beginning of that monarchy in this century. You can look at Spain, where I think the King of Spain probably saved democracy for Spain in recent years. Belgium has a monarchy that holds it together. I don't think we should dismiss this idea out of hand. There may be some better ones, but I think what I'm saying to you today is that the institution needs rejuvenation.

If we can't rejuvenate the institution, then I think we should consider discarding it, because I think it's more a source of division now between English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians than it is a source of national pride or institution.

My second point, ladies and gentlemen, is on the charter of responsibilities. I've listened with great interest to how people have responded to our Charter of Rights and how they see things happening since the Charter of Rights has been invoked. I also have some personal feelings on the way the legal system is taking us with this Charter of Rights. I think there's a need for a charter of responsibilities to be incorporated into this so that people don't just say, "Give me my rights," or "I expect my

rights." People should also be thinking in terms of "What responsibilities do I have to society and to this country?" so that there's some balance in this document rather than the kind of one-sided direction that I think is currently in it. I also suggest this would take us back to more of the spirit of the BNA Act, which said we would have "peace, order and good government," and not the emphasis on the individual and freedoms that were in the American charter created 200 years ago.

I think these are very important things for us to do because we are in a very international world. We are in a northern hemispheric climate where we have tremendous pulls and pressures upon us. Unless we're able to create some of these institutions and make them work for us to differentiate us from our neighbours, I think that we will simply fall into the orbit. I've had the good fortune of living away from Canada now for some years and returned just a year ago, and it's quite remarkable to see the change in Canadian society, even in five years, how we have become, I would say, more Americanized in our speech, in our attitudes, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, that's all I have to say. I'd welcome any questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Barry. As a member of the Monarchist League of Canada for over 20 years, I'm quite interested in your comments with regard to the monarchy. I think I'd want to keep fighting for the institution quite a while before saying that we should discard it, but I am very interested in your suggestions of how to make it a more Canadian institution.

MR. BREADNER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very strongly monarchist in my personal feelings. I think there's a great deal of history and things to be proud of in that, but I have to, as a Canadian, say that I just don't think it's working for us anymore.

3:04

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any further . . . Pam.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. In the hot tub and razors department, I'd like to ask about this unitary state you propose if we can't succeed in either regaining national symbolism to pull us together or getting our Charter to include responsibilities. When you talk about the unitary state within the North American context, do you envision this would happen in the event of Quebec's separation, if it did, or/and is this something you envision being strictly Alberta or western Canada, or is this, like, a last resort, and hot bathtub and razors?

MR. BREADNER: I'm not sure I understand your hot bathtub and razors.

MS BARRETT: Suicidal.

MR. BREADNER: What I'm saying is that I think we're looking at a North American unitary state. If we can't find things that we can be proud of as Canadians, that we identify as Canadians, and institutions that differentiate us from our neighbours in a meaningful way, then I think we will simply drift into the orbit. I think we should take the initiative and do it.

MS BARRETT: Yeah; okay. Sorry. I wanted to ask the Quebec part first.

MR. BREADNER: Okay. I think if Quebec leaves us, it would hasten the problem.

MS BARRETT: Do you think it's inevitable? That's what I'm asking.

MR. BREADNER: Well, I'm not sure it's inevitable. I'm not sure anything is inevitable. But I think it would make it much more difficult to retain our identity as Canada. I sort of made my first suggestion a bit tongue in cheek, but I'm serious too. I think if French Canada were a part of our monarchy – you know, they could identify that it's part of them – that would be one of the few things we've got that everybody could look to and say it's ours.

MS BARRETT: Of course, you can see the difficulty.

MR. BREADNER: Well, madam, I've been living in a society for some years where arranged marriages are the custom. I might say they work very well.

MS BARRETT: Not a choice I'm likely to make. Thanks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Barry. I appreciate your participation and your presentation.

The next presenter will be Winston Gereluk of the Alberta Federation of Labour. Welcome, Winston.

MR. GERELUK: Thank you. I taught school for a while, Mr. Chairman, and I learned in the school system not to hand out material when you wish to talk because the students will be busy flipping through the material when they should be listening. This is a 17-page document.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Naturally you're going to highlight it then.

MR. GERELUK: That's right. That was completed only because I got quite rude to some people.

I've just returned, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, from the 35th annual convention of the Alberta Federation of Labour. At that convention, which came under the slogan of reclaiming Canada, a lot of the matters you're discussing or you're hearing being discussed today came to be discussed. The paper that was put together was put together in the last four days, based upon the kinds of discussions and resolutions that emerged. So I will do my best to highlight some of them.

First, I just want to apologize that Don Aitken isn't here. He was supposed to be here, but it's the nature of leadership of the labour movement that you go where the crisis is the deepest. It's the nature of working for the labour movement that you don't bother to complain, when asked, that it's a nice June day. Of course, I'm complaining to the wrong people.

The paper you have before you addresses many of the constitutional questions that we've heard discussed and that we discussed over the last four days. On the matter of Quebec, for instance, we go to some length to talk about some of the constitutional basis, some of the historical basis for the constitutional guarantees we feel the people of Quebec have the right to expect. We express surprise that we have amongst us people who would go about tearing up historical guarantees and contracts as if they meant nothing, be they for the people of Quebec, the aboriginal people, or any other group of people.

We don't think that's the way society should operate.

On the question of western alienation, we go at some length to talk about the roots of western alienation, and the roots are very deep. I suppose the major point we make there, one thing that should not happen, is that western alienation should not be exploited as a basis for tearing Canada apart further, but rather we should be looking for ways to overcome some of the good historical reasons people have for feeling we've gotten the short end of the stick in the west and steps taken to correct those.

What we spend a long time talking about at Federation of Labour conventions and elsewhere are some of the basic economic relationships that rule people's lives. I suppose the basic question to be asked here is what type of economic philosophy should form the basis of our Constitution; whether or not the people drafting our Constitution, the new Constitution that's sure to emerge, should be following the dictates of an economic philosophy that is devoted to a totally free market. We claim that if that's the case, there's not very much chance for Canada at all. By the measure of this economic philosophy, Canada has little reason to exist.

It's clear to many of us that from the beginning Canada was nothing if it wasn't an artificial contrivance, that if we were to follow things people are fond of referring to by the metaphors of natural lines, free market, things like that, Canada would not have existed. The cross-border shopping: we think there's a certain awful truth in the cross-border shopping that's taking place. We think there's deep economic truth in that, and if you look hard enough in the long lines of cars of shoppers, you can see the end of Canada. The will of the people or at least some people originally and throughout the decades, as expressed in government, evidently asked that there be a Canada; otherwise, we would not have had one. If the guarantees for the continued existence of this country are not to be embedded in the Constitution, then where shall they exist? We think the Constitution is the obvious place.

We're facing two economic crises. The first is the economic crisis that is created or at least exacerbated by a national government that is addicted to this free enterprise economic philosophy that I think and we think spells the end of Canada. If they are addicted to the very thing our forefathers spent a lot of time either trying to counteract or enhance when they created Canada, then they're addicted to the end of Canada.

There is little mistake, it seems, that there are at least two areas of federal government that have held this country together, and both areas were very carefully constructed. The first is the area of government programs, the kinds of programs that at least to some measure intended that there should be equality of conditions across Canada from coast to coast, that people should enjoy some equality-of-life opportunities no matter where they live. When we talk about this area that's held this country together, the federal government has been ensuring some degree of social programs, some subsidiary programs such as economic stabilization and regional development programs that have ensured some equality of economic activity across Canada, some control of financial activity, and some preservation of culture. Those are the areas I refer to as basic government programs.

The other area of federal government that has been basic to, first of all, the creation and then the continued existence of Canada is that area that speaks to the ownership or regulation of key institutions that provide the infrastructure for the Canadian way of life. Here it's quite clear that without the expressed will of the government, we would not have had our transportation systems and we would not have had our communication systems such as the post office. We would not have

had some of the institutions that ensure that at least there is some expression of culture across Canada that if not uniform at least can be identified as Canadian; for instance, we might talk about the CBC under that one. It seems to us that all these basic government responsibilities and areas are being dismantled. We're hard pressed to find one area of life supposedly to be guaranteed by the federal government that hasn't been turned topsy-turvy in the last while, all in the name of such things as free trade or the federal debt or whatever bogeyman is used to convince us that we should happily give up an aspect of our way of life.

I think and we think that the second economic crisis arises from even more basic economic relations governing people's lives. We think in the last while there has been a dismantling of public policy, guarantees, and programs that have protected Canadian people from at least the most fundamentally predatory and inhumane aspects of an economic system that if allowed to run wild would, you know, place everybody in essentially an economic jungle.

3:14

We have lived in Canada and worked in Canada in a framework of shelters and guarantees that has made Canada a significantly superior place to live and work than the United States, for instance, or at least parts of the United States. We think that what has happened in the last while – and we can speak to any area here – is that these guarantees and shelters have been torn away systematically, exposing us totally. For instance, where are the guarantees to quality health care or quality education if we continue to go in the direction that apparently has been laid out in the last few federal budgets? There are no guarantees eventually, and in fact more and more as we go in that direction, we get statements from high-ranking Canadians that that indeed is the way we should go.

Where are the protections and the guarantees of at least minimally decent work that have typified the Canadian way of life and distinguished it from the American when, for instance, free trade, especially the type of free trade agreement we are now negotiating relative to Mexico, exposes us to the misery of working life in Alabama or in Mexico? Surely nobody needs – or if they do, I'd be happy to provide them with documentation backed up with pictures on the nature of working life in parts of Alabama and parts of the Maquiladoras along the Mexican border. We do not need to experiment to find the answer to the question of whether simple, unbridled competition yields humane and minimally decent working conditions. That experiment has been run many times around the world and throughout history. We only have to read books on the early industrial revolution in Canada to find out what happens when society and government do not make the express move to protect working people from that sort of thing.

We believe the relationship between employer and employee is the basic relationship in society. Really, the type of work you do largely determines who you will turn out to be or what you will be like as an individual. It also determines to a large degree the type of society you will live in. So anything that presses for lower wages, and we're fond, of course . . . If I were an employer, I suppose I would look for ways to pay lower wages. Lower benefits: for instance, when you contract out work instead of holding on to permanent work, your benefit costs are much lower or nonexistent. Anything that sort of suggests that cheap consumer commodities is in itself the desirable direction we should be going we think is wrong-headed. You're not talking about lower wages, lower benefits, cheap clothing, and

other commodities. In the final analysis, you're talking about the type of society you want to live in. If employment is that basic to the type of society, we should expect to see guarantees in the Constitution of Canada that provide for what I like to call minimally decent standards of working life.

But in fact there is no statement of workers' rights in the Constitution. There is a fundamental freedom of association provided for, but Supreme Court decisions have told us that that's largely a hollow right. You have the right to association, for instance, but neither the object nor the means by which you achieve that right are apparently guaranteed in the Constitution, and certainly the rights for unorganized workers we don't see articulated anywhere in the Constitution. So we feel the first answer to that is a statement of workers' rights, which is also spoken to in the paper I've handed to you.

The second thing that we think should be required in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and in the Constitution is that anytime an international trade agreement is negotiated, something akin to the European Social Charter should be provided for in it. You cannot have a situation . . . Well, yes, you most certainly can, and there are situations. Let me reword that. It's not desirable to have a situation in which remaining competitive depends upon simply bidding down the price of labour and the quality of life. In Europe they may not be successful in implementing it, but at least they've stated the intention that that should not happen. States within the European Economic Community cannot simply attract investment in a holus-bolus way, allowing a bidding down of the price of labour and the quality of life in that society. We think that's the desirable direction to go.

There are other recommendations we make in the paper. Probably the only other one I want to mention is that we shouldn't allow the final report issued by the Liberal commission in Quebec . . . The name of that commission escapes me.

MS BETKOWSKI: Allaire.

MR. GERELUK: That's right. . . . to form the starting point of our deliberation. We think that's fundamentally the wrong starting point. Of course, it's jumped on by provincial governments all over, because that's the starting point many of them had expressed as desirable for themselves. We think the correct starting point is that we should desire to keep this country together and keep it uniformly together as much as possible.

That really is the sum total of my presentation. I thought I only had 15 minutes and thought I had exceeded by about 5. Okay?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You used 15 minutes exactly, Winston. Nevertheless, Barrie wants to ask a short question.

MR. CHIVERS: The Chair is going to indulge me here, because we really are under time constraints.

I think you made a very good point at the start – and this is the one area I'll address – with respect to historical contracts. I think that's a proper context to put it in, in terms of language rights and in terms of treaty rights for aboriginal peoples, and I wonder if you could just clarify that thought, expand on it a bit.

MR. GERELUK: Well, I could best clarify it by reading what I have written here, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: No. If you've covered it in detail in your brief, don't bother then.

MR. GERELUK: That's right. You know, I taught school for a few years until I ran out of money. It seems students are not taught about the Quebec Act, the Constitution Act, the various Acts which for whatever reason existed politically at that time. The people of Quebec were guaranteed a certain identity, a certain basis for the types of rights they're claiming these days. However, in presentation after presentation – I've listened to a few – these are referred to as somehow special rights that are being requested. In fact, they are historical guarantees that should not be discarded that easily.

The Alberta Federation of Labour has talked to the three sides of the Quebec labour movement – the CNTU, the QFL, and the teachers – and we'll be organizing a major conference this fall where we're bringing leaders of the three labour movements together in Alberta to talk about how we might resolve some of the differences that have arisen to provide a basis for Canadian life.

MR. CHIVERS: Thank you very much.

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

MR. GERELUK: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next presenter will be Adil Shiuji. Welcome. Excuse the pronunciation.

MR. SHIUJI: It's okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair is always subject to correction.

MR. SHIUJI: Mr. Chairman, this is my first time, so I hope you don't mind. I'm very nervous.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't be nervous. We won't bite.

MR. SHIUJI: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure being here this afternoon. I am delighted that the government decided to call the public hearings. I was disappointed that the government chose not to do so in 1987. Last year our Prime Minister rolled the dice at the eleventh hour. We all know what was the end result. The other party that must share part of the blame is the CBC. In my opinion, the CBC used scaremongering tactics and chose to report only the pro-Meech side.

3:24

Mr. Chairman, the future of this great country is at stake. In the upcoming months and weeks we as Canadians must decide what kind of Canada we want. Do we want a Canada that is made up of 10 Canadas and two provinces? My answer is no. I believe most Canadians want a strong and united Canada. I believe in a strong central government, that the federal government must retain its powers in difficult times; for example, that you take it from the rich and give it to the poor. For a province like Newfoundland, which has the highest unemployment, the federal government should take from the rich and give it to Newfoundland. When in a few years the economy of Newfoundland is booming because of Hibernia and if Alberta became poor, the federal government must have the powers to take it from Newfoundland and give it to the have-nots.

Mr. Chairman, I have concerns in five areas. My first is the opting out in Meech Lake. No provincial government should be

allowed to opt out of national programs, but if the provinces choose to do so, the federal government must not compensate. If the feds do compensate, we will be faced with the same problems as we are faced with the lottery revenues, which are being used by the provinces as a slush fund.

My second problem is when Don Getty talks about the triple E Senate. Our system is based on a parliamentary system, not a presidential system. The Prime Minister must appoint Senators, just as the House of Lords in London.

Third, the distinct society. We all have different meanings of "distinct society." To the separatists in Quebec it would mean it is their God-given right to tear this country apart. I urge the government to tell the federal government that no one objects that Quebec is distinct, but it must very clearly tell Quebec that because of its language and culture, et cetera – or the federal government should ask the Supreme Court of Canada to define "distinct society."

Fourth, under Meech Lake the Prime Minister said that the provinces should submit names of a person or persons whenever there's a vacancy in a province. The provinces should not be allowed to submit names of persons to sit on the Supreme Court. The provinces will only submit a list of party hacks. The PM must appoint the best qualified persons with or without party loyalty.

The fifth point is immigration. It is regrettable that the federal government has already signed to give immigration powers to Quebec. It is now preparing to do the same with the other provinces. It is with regret that the federal government will no longer be involved in providing integration services re language and culture. But Quebec will handle these services and will receive reasonable compensation for doing so. In regards to the expansion of unanimity, I think it should require approval by the federal government and by seven provinces representing 50 percent of Canada's population.

Finally, there are those who say, "Let Quebec go." I say to them that most Canadians understand that the departure of that country is a crime against humanity.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Adil, you did very well expressing your point of view, and we appreciate that. You came out very much against a triple E Senate. I can be blamed for the proposal since I chaired the committee that recommended it to the Alberta Legislature. If you don't believe in that or the provinces' involvement, would it be fair to say that you don't agree with the original purpose of the Senate as set up, which was to represent the provinces in the federal decision-making process, remembering that Canada was establishing a federation as opposed to a unitary state like Britain? Would that be fair, that you don't think there's a need for that upper House to balance the population control of the House of Commons?

MR. SHIUI: I've heard that with two from each province – say, in Alberta, you elect from Edmonton east and Edmonton south. If you go to Ontario, there's a population of 5 million. If you go to Quebec, there's a population of 6 million. So who's going to represent the other people?

MR. ANDERSON: Just for your information, the proposal in Alberta was that six Senators be elected from each province at

large. Each province would select the same number regardless of the population.

MR. SHIUI: I think I like the way it is now.

MR. ANDERSON: You like the appointment.

MR. SHIUI: You've got to have it by population.

MR. ANDERSON: So you don't feel there's any need for regional input?

MR. SHIUI: No.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to come back to one of your starting points. I think you made a very good point that sometimes gets lost sight of, and that is in terms of the federal government's equalization functions with respect to regional disparities. You pointed out that there are shifts – for example, offshore oil in Newfoundland – and that eventually the balance could change and maybe Alberta wouldn't be a contributing province; it might be on the receiving end. I want to thank you for bringing us back to that point.

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

MR. SHIUI: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Our next presenter is Warner Gretz.

Welcome, Warner.

3:34

MR. GRETZ: Thank you very much. I have just a few short notes here, and for simplicity's sake I think I'll just read them off.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, that's fine.

MR. GRETZ: My name is Warner Gretz. My wife and I live near Clyde, Alberta. We make our livelihood by doing janitorial work, building management, and maintenance.

Now, I addressed myself to the questions as they were written up in the paper. The first one was: what kind of Canada would you like to see in the future? I would like to see a more united Canada. In order to achieve that, I believe we must place more emphasis on our nationhood being Canadian, not on being descendants of one ethnic community or another. Most nations have been built from a diversity of ethnic groups, but only those that will reach full nationhood in a political and economic context, as opposed to a cultural and ethnic or religious one, will prosper and, in the end, survive. Our federal government must emphasize their role as an agent and promoter of a national government. We must cease catering to ethnic communities as a means of promoting Canada. It doesn't work. It has never worked in the past.

The Constitution of Canada should only address itself to Canada and Canadians, not hyphenates. Differences that exist must be addressed and equalized on an economic basis, not on an ethnic one. Native peoples' land claims should be settled and

compensation paid on a reasonable basis without conferring autonomy or rights of nationhood.

The Constitution of Canada must reflect unity of purpose. If powers are to be divided, they must be divided evenly, with every jurisdiction at the same level, having the same authority in the same field. Standards for service must be the same across the country, which means that the federal government must be in a position to enforce the rules by fiscal contribution; in effect, transfer of payment. I would like particularly to refer to the extra billing furore here a few years ago when the federal minister of health threatened to withhold transfer payments to Alberta if extra billing was legalized. Everybody must be the same across the country. You know, it's unfortunate that the federal government did not show the same steadfastness when the province of Quebec announced its language policies.

Now, the second question was: what kind of changes would you make? Well, I would like to see the reorganization of our federal government by way of a triple E Senate in which all provinces are represented equally. This Senate would take the place of our current federal/provincial bureaucracies and save public money. I would like to see provincial status conferred on the territories. We really don't need colonies. Let the native peoples run the department of Indian affairs with the understanding that it will be phased out within a specified period of time and that by that time they must have put into place programs that will integrate natives politically and economically into Canadian society. From the beginning the understanding must be that the only sovereign government in Canada is the Canadian government. At all levels of government ways must be found to reduce the size of administration by reducing the number of departments and personnel so that we can afford them.

The Bank of Canada must be made to be more receptive to political input so that monetary policy can be set to accommodate the economic needs of Canadians and not just the perceptions of one man, the governor of the Bank of Canada.

Universality should be maintained in social services. I believe that the bureaucracy required to check and maintain selectivity would cost more than universality. However, that is just my perception. Welfare payments, particularly amongst younger recipients, should be dependent upon those individuals' taking and passing upgrading courses in economically viable fields.

Political and economic goals should be set to reflect the needs and wants of the majority of Canadians, not the perceptions or the desires of a specific minority. Here I would like to get particularly into the cost of bilingualism and biculturalism. It never worked and it was never designed to work, since provincial politicians in Quebec opted out of it with the language and sign laws. That soured the mood of the rest of Canada and deepened the divisions between ethnic groups. I would like to point out the cost of bilingualism and biculturalism. It costs us \$500 million a year. Now, the lifetime earnings of a nurse or a medical technician are about \$1 million over a 30-year career. Over 20 years bilingualism and biculturalism have cost us \$10 billion. That would have bought us the lifetime services of 10,000 nurses or medical technicians and would have prevented the closing down of hospital beds and operating room facilities. I suggest that future policies be set to accommodate the reasonable demands of a majority of Canadians, giving consideration to proven and well-thought-out ways to improve the lives and conditions of Canadians.

Thank you.

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

MR. CHIVERS: I'm going to refrain, Mr. Chairman, given the time constraints.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very, very much for your presentation.

MR. GRETZ: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next presenter will be Charles Pei, is it? There's some question whether we've got the name right. Is it P-e-i?

MR. PEI: I thought you were bilingual. You've got both.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Welcome, Charles.

Well, in one document there there was a p-e-c added on to it.

MR. PEI: Six letters rather than three, so I thought that's bilingual.

MS BETKOWSKI: It's Prince Edward Island.

MR. PEI: Yes. That happened twice.

I'm here just as an ordinary citizen. I don't talk about this high-powered business; I just talk about some common sense. First of all, I'd just explain a little bit. I was born in China. I came over for my graduate studies, and that was the time that I watched, just like many other people, the centennial celebration of this country. At that time I shared the happiness and the mood of the country. Everybody was so happy. They were proud that such a young country made it on its own, and everybody accepted everybody else. That must have been one of the best times for this country. I was so impressed. At that time I had problems back home because China had some messy, messy politics, just like we have now, today, and I thought I might as well stay. So I'm here, but I did my share as a citizen anyway, and I'm proud of that. I can say that I'm just like many of us who joined Canada at Confederation, which were many, including Alberta - I believe Alberta at that time was part of Hudson's Bay, as company land. We all liked the country we saw, and we joined it. We don't take it for granted, whatever that means.

Now we are panicked. It looks like the country is tearing apart, and I can see why. Once we did have a good opportunity: there was Meech Lake; there was some agreement. We worked it out two years before that particularly taxing business, and I still don't understand why we are always looking for a perfect Constitution. Why can we not accept what we agreed on at that point in time and understand that after two years of the original agreement, the country changed a lot? We need some amendments. I still can't figure out what's wrong with amendments to something we did two years ago before that closed-door manipulation, the worst part of politics on record. I think that's history anyway.

3:44

Here I only have two things to say. From the way I read the newspapers, I feel that maybe our own provincial government has a little bit different ideas. One is that - I try to echo the Alberta Federation of Labour - at the beginning, when we had this federation, we did have a social contract, and it's nothing new. But most of us didn't know about it, and now we listen to the politicians playing around, trying to play the power game. Eventually everybody gets mad at everyone else - particularly

everybody gets mad at Quebec – so we mess up the whole thing. Now we are here. Today I'm talking about a new Canada including Quebec. If I want to talk about a new Canada without Quebec, I can wait until that day happens. I will be here again talking, but today I'm talking about Canada including Quebec. I don't see how I can have a country without Quebec. I don't understand that. Maybe I'm naive because I'm new, but anyway that's the way I like the country.

Now, I want to talk about two things. One is this language business. We've got the language issue into a political football. Actually, there's nothing wrong with bilingualism. There are many countries around this world who have more than two languages officially used for communication purposes, nothing more than that. But we play this language as if it is a political football. In particular, the federal government has spent billions of dollars, wasting all the bloody money, which only upset everyone else. That's really a messy program. I'm not going to say what I saw was wrong with the bilingual program itself, but, after all, it is a language issue. It is a necessity for such a big country with our historical foundation to have more than one language to communicate.

Now, just for example, suppose we choose either French or English as the only official language. What kind of Canada are we going to have? What kind of immigration are we going to have? There are many people around this world that only speak English or only speak French as a country. Are we going to cut half of the world out of Canada if we decide to have a special type of Canada, as a new type of country? I don't know. I don't see anything wrong with two official languages, particularly if these two happen to be the most frequently used by a number of countries. I'd feel comfortable. I never asked you to use Chinese as an official language for Canada, even if they have 1 billion population. That's a reality. Okay; there's the first beef, because it sounds like our provincial government hesitates to talk about bilingualism. I share the comment of the gentleman before me that the program was operating in such a messy way that it was wrong. But bilingualism itself: there's nothing wrong.

Now, the second thing is about education. When the federal government talks about educational standards, our own provincial government immediately jumps. I would think that one of the problems we have – the Federation of Labour pointed out that one – is that we don't really know enough about our own country. After 12 years of education we only know half of whatever the provinces want to tell us. Quebec may know a completely different story about Canada as compared to some other provinces. If we don't have a common set of basic information about this country, then how can we communicate with each other? We want to be one country anyway. There's no reason. I think the federal government should have some mandate within education. They should set the basic requirements for some things. The provincial government can go to as high a standard as you want if you've got the money, but we must learn a basic set so everybody knows what this country is. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Charles Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: I'd like to get Mr. Pei's views on multiculturalism. We've had some very strong opinions expressed during the past week that the current policies of multiculturalism are not working in the sense that by funding different groups, we're tending to divide rather than bring people together, and we

should be focusing more on the actual bringing of people together: the understanding, education, making sure we know about each other, equality of rights, and so on. Do you have a view on that?

MR. PEI: Yes, I do have my opinion on that. Unfortunately multiculturalism, like bilingualism, becomes like a football, a political football. That's very bad. Multiculturalism to me is just at a community level the foundation of this country, because since the day of federation all the rest came over to join this country. They came from various ethnic backgrounds, and that's why it makes Canada so strong and so acceptable around the world as a peacemaker, not because we are very powerful or very rich or whatnot, but just because they know we relate to each other in a much better, open way.

Now, when we play to the ethnic vote, that becomes pretty messy. If everybody tried to get a vote from the Spanish community, the Chinese community, blah, blah, blah, then we've got a whole bunch of hyphenated groups who ask for grants. Further, the political parties try to give grants in order to get votes, and that's what is wrong. Otherwise, multiculturalism goes back to the community level. That is our foundation of this country.

MR. CHUMIR: Are you saying that that should be the personal responsibility of the groups? We should be supportive of it as a philosophy, but the government should keep their hands off and create a climate where people can do what they want, and let's leave it to the groups? Or are you saying there should be funding?

MR. PEI: No. The government must provide the guidance, must set the policy, but the government, any party that is in power, shouldn't play politics with the funding. There are so many wrong programs. Talking about this umbrella group idea, which means that you have one small country within the country that call themselves the Spanish congress, another group that call themselves the Italian congress, then the party tries to relate to them in order to get the votes, and that is very, very wrong. We have to go back, that multiculturalism is a community foundation. It is nothing political.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, my question was covered.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pam.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I'm going to admit a bit of bias here. I like anybody who says that we want common sense. Okay? That really appeals to me. You said: well, why can't we just agree upon what we agree on instead of getting everything perfect, and come back in two years and see if we should amend? Were you talking about that as a sort of permanent process?

MR. PEI: If you look around, just looking down south, America is not operating on the original piece of paper. They amend it when it's necessary, when it becomes so critical. I'm referring to Meech Lake, that particular incident. At the time when the meeting was called, it was based on two years ago. The majority agreed on that package, but after two years things changed, and we all knew there were some things missed out. My question

was: why at that particular moment could we not agree on some amendments? But our Prime Minister, unfortunately, said: no, you have to take these; I'm not talking. Well, you can't do that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was the seamless web theory that you're objecting to, Mr. Mulroney's seamless web theory.

MS BARRETT: If you pull it, it'll unravel. Yeah.

MR. PEI: Because he was so way out to lunch. It was all in the *Edmonton Journal*. He said that no one should listen to public opinion when you still have two years in office. Now, what kind of government is that?

MS BARRETT: Okay. Can I just return though? It's obvious that what's happened is that because we haven't had the amendments, we're actually, in either real or perceived terms, at a crisis stage right now. Right? Let's say you get everybody to agree on certain items. Would you be recommending that you sign those off, call that your constitutional amendment, and then every two years review it?

3:54

MR. PEI: No, no.

MS BARRETT: No? Okay. You just wait until the problem develops.

MR. PEI: You don't try to fix some things just by saying: "Okay, now there is the book. You go by the book." I'm saying that province by province or region by region, try to talk like we are doing now. I wonder: what's the next step? If we end up with one position for Alberta, then we still end up with trying to negotiate or bargain or whatever. Now, I understand that part of it is a balance of power, but balance of power doesn't mean fighting for power. They are two different things. So I was just wondering, after this go-round, how we are going to sit down again and how we go from there. If we still get mad at each other, still try to say, "Look, they were wrong; we are right," then we are not going anywhere.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nancy.

MS BETKOWSKI: I want to pick up on the question of power sharing as well and ask you if it's fair to say with respect to your support for universality, which I happen to agree with, that you think the medicare model is working. Because there we have national standards under the Canada Health Act, we have provincial jurisdiction to run the program, and then trustees to run the local hospital boards. Is that a model that you see as (a) working and (b) one that we might contemplate for other areas of social policy?

MR. PEI: I'm not really prepared to give a good answer because I didn't spend time thinking about these kinds of things. This program-sharing business: in a country like ours it has to be, I think, in some way. I don't believe we can cut it dry and say, "Okay; now, this is the federal government's work and this is ours." We just don't do it that way because the whole system of collecting income tax and all these things is so complicated. That's why I don't pretend that I understand enough to give any better opinion. But whichever model, I do believe that we can

argue on the model as a model. We should be prepared to say, "Look, if you see anything we can do to improve this, let us do it." As long as we are prepared to talk about the purpose of the program, we're in business. If we try to talk in order to say, "Look, I want this; you stay out," then we're in trouble.

MS BETKOWSKI: In other words, it's not an issue of absolutes as much as it is an issue of consultation.

MR. PEI: Yes; it is relative. It is relative. It depends on the pocket money that the region or the federal government or this government has, because we cannot ask for the same sort of cost sharing in Alberta as in Newfoundland. I don't know who joined first. Maybe Newfoundland is still the last one. I forget, okay? But we are asked to pay anyway. They were still a province at that time. So I don't know. All I'm saying is that cost sharing cannot go by one formula.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Charles, for a good presentation.

Our final scheduled presenters are Alyson Lavers and Michael Phair on behalf of the Edmonton Social Planning Council.

Welcome, Alyson, Michael.

MS LAVERS: We'd like to thank you very much for the opportunity to meet with you this afternoon. I think probably most of you know that the Edmonton Social Planning Council is a nonprofit organization that's been operating in Edmonton for 50 years and primarily analyzes policy and comments on it. We're very happy to be able to make some comments on the constitutional process. We have some documents that we wanted to share with you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: John will take them and distribute them.

MS LAVERS: We feel, as you can see, very strongly that the Constitution is a very critical piece of concern for everyone, and we want to just reference the general principles that we've highlighted as a council. We recognize and support the English-speaking, French-speaking, and aboriginal peoples in their role as founders of this country, while we also cherish the presence and contributions of those of many diverse origins. We have some specific recommendations that we wanted to cover with you. I should say – I forgot to mention at the beginning – that I'm currently the president of the Social Planning Council and Michael is the past president, so we'll be sharing the presentation.

We talk specifically about the need for a strong federal government and, as previous presenters have alluded to, the maintenance of national standards and social programs. We feel that those are absolutely critical in ensuring the survival of this country and that we need to provide minimum standards as the baseline from which we can build services for people. If we fail to do that, the council feels that we may place a potential, an artificial burden on citizens because of geography.

The second point we want to make is that we feel that a strong federal government should ensure reduction of economic disparity between regions. Now, we know that there's been a lot of discussion about this as a particular aspect of service. Section 36 of the Constitution Act commits Canada to promoting equal opportunities, so, for example, when someone in Edmonton is

without adequate housing or food, that's a concern. Social policies affect all of us; that's why we're here from the Social Planning Council. When a region of people suffer because of economic factors, I think there's a role for the country in providing support to them.

Michael.

MR. PHAIR: I think a strong federal government also, from our perspective, would be one that ensures an achievement of national immigration goals. Currently under the Constitution there is a role for both the province and the federal government, but again we see that there is a role in expressing what those national goals would be. We feel that it's particularly important to build a national consensus which ensures open and equitable immigration which will strengthen the country and will suit the national goals that we identify as a people.

MS LAVERS: Our next major point relates to the process of constitutional change, and we feel that the process has disenfranchised many Canadians. We would support the process being revised and broadened. The decision to repatriate the Constitution was done in the middle of the night without Quebec. Meech Lake was an artificial crisis forced under arbitrary time lines, and its architects failed to recognize the need for broad consultation with the citizens of Canada. While we appreciate the opportunity to speak at these hearings, we're under no illusions – nor, I hope, are you – that this constitutes significant participation in the process. We hope that there will be a commitment to long-range, nonpartisan structural change.

MR. PHAIR: Our next major point deals with aboriginal rights. We support the aboriginal people of Canada in their demand to be included at all stages of the constitutional process. Further, the rights of aboriginal people under section 35 of the Constitution Act, which have not been fully defined, should be addressed as a national priority. Section 35 recognizes the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of aboriginal peoples, but we have difficulty in understanding which rights have been affirmed because they have not, in fact, been spelled out at this point in time. We are wondering about the role of aboriginal people, and we are concerned that until the role is identified and clarified, the constitutional process itself is likely to bog down and not get anywhere. As a council we see that the status of aboriginal people and how they are dealt with under this process is probably going to be similar to how other people and other groups in this country are identified and dealt with. We're quite concerned that there has been very little movement since the repatriation in this area and feel that it's an absolutely essential area that must be dealt with as quickly and as broadly as possible.

4:04

MS LAVERS: With regard to the notwithstanding clause, we would support the availability of human rights across the country. Section 33 allows the government to abrogate those basic rights and freedoms, and we feel it should be removed.

Government by democracy presumes that citizens will be included in decisions. I wonder if we're planning to say that in an arbitrary and unplanned fashion political decisions can remove rights from citizens because of specific criteria like cultural origin or language. If we refer to the Constitution, at the beginning of the Act is a Guarantee of Rights and Freedoms: Fundamental Freedoms, Democratic Rights, Mobility Rights, and Legal Rights. I'm wondering which ones of those

we might feel it was necessary to abrogate and which ones of those you might agree would be limited for you or for us. So I think in terms of the notwithstanding clause, we need to think very carefully about the rationale for keeping it in.

MR. PHAIR: Our final point that we would like to bring to your attention is the equality provisions. We believe that section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the equality clause, should be broadened to provide for the inclusion of sexual orientation as a prohibited ground for discrimination. We strongly support the Charter, and as an organization we have over the past number of years. We do think it can be improved upon. From our perspective, in fact, the Charter is a compact between the citizens of Canada and their government. This must be retained and strengthened and is absolutely vital because it does go about trying to describe us as a people.

The Edmonton Social Planning Council isn't alone in this. As we look across the country, a number of provinces, other municipalities as have lately been in the news again have all looked at how the provisions and how we deal with minority groups within our population can be handled. The all-party committee of the House of Commons that looked at equality rights in 1987 supported the inclusion of sexual orientation, and we would ask that that commitment be honoured.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The first responder is Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Thank you for a very interesting presentation. You've recommended the removal of the notwithstanding clause, and I'm sure you're aware of the background and that that was a political compromise involving not just Quebec but also other provinces. One of the suggestions that has been made that might stop short of that – actually there's been a couple of them, but one I'd like to ask for your views on is the possibility that rather than removing it in its entirety, perhaps we could have a check and balance on its application and operation by requiring that if a government exercises the notwithstanding clause and enacts legislation, before it becomes effective it could be subject to a referendum in that jurisdiction. Now, that would at least allow for the test of popular will. I'm wondering if that sort of a formula is something that you would support as a measure stopping short of removal of the notwithstanding clause.

MS LAVERS: Well, Canada is supposed to be the country of compromise. I think probably it's worth looking at a number of options. I think our position would be that all things being equal, we'd still like to see it removed. There may not, for very pragmatic reasons, be enough of a consensus to do that, but I think our position would be that we'd like to see it. If there's any way that people can achieve consensus around removing it, that would be our preference.

MR. CHIVERS: That brings me to the second matter, which is: you also discussed the possibility of an expanded process, but you didn't mention models. We've had a good many models suggested. One of them, in terms of the way it's referred to, is the constituent assembly, and I don't want to go into the details of how you would establish it. Some of our presenters have thought the politicians shouldn't be involved in that process. However, I'm wondering if you have any thoughts as to what type of a forum, at least, should be established to expand the constitutional reform debate.

MS LAVERS: We talked at length about this issue at the council, and the reason that you've got general principles is because we couldn't agree.

MR. PHAIR: I think in some ways it perhaps is easier to describe the kinds of things that we think have been wrong with the system and that we would like to see avoided. I think among them is the fact that it has appeared to far too many people that it's been primarily a political process that politicians alone have been involved in. That that is not acceptable in this country I think is certainly the kind of thing that we're saying; that not only must people be involved in the process, but they also must have some way of looking at what some of those results begin to look like and in one way or the other bring that forward in some kind of referendum, some way of public participation in that. I think we're particularly concerned that there have been, as you are well aware, a number of committees around the country with a variety of names looking at constitutional reform, and we would suggest from the council's perspective that in fact it's questionable that any of them have any impact on constitutional change, that that process hasn't really begun. It's still people talking. Our concern is that we'll have people getting this information and going back, and then we'll have a group of perhaps 10 or 11 politicians again making the decisions that really impact on the constitutional change. We're really concerned that that not occur.

MR. CHIVERS: Well, I think you're really hitting a chord, that pretty well everybody agrees that not only the process of Meech Lake was flawed but the product, and that the process has to change this time around.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question really was the same as Barrie's, so I'll try and push you a little further, even though I realize you haven't reached a full consensus in your own organization. One of those issues that I think is toughest for us to deal with is talking about only politicians or primarily politicians being involved. However you do it, those people you elect are politicians. To a minor degree I suppose even the president of the council in the city - there's some degree of politics involved. So I'd really encourage you to discuss some more how that process could work. Meech Lake has been, rightly to some degree, accused of not having public involvement, and yet it really followed a process similar to previous constitutional changes. It shows an evolution of our society, a need for change which we haven't got a prototype for. We've heard a number of suggestions, but I'm not sure that we've yet heard the one that will give us that solution and change forever the kind of perception that's there today that politicians alone are making decisions that more people, if not all, should be involved with.

MS LAVERS: I think one of the things that would be helpful for citizens is a sense that their elected representatives are representing them as opposed to a political party. I realize that it causes politicians a lot of difficulty because you've aligned yourself with a particular political party and particular political platform. On the other hand, you're elected by the people you represent; you're not elected by the party. In issues such as constitutional reform, I think the consideration of the con-

stituents' views and values should take precedence over those of the party.

MR. PHAIR: I don't think we want to leave the impression that we were saying that politicians should be entirely excluded. It's much more the position that it needs to be much broader than that. I don't think the council wants to be seen as saying that we don't think politicians have any role in this at all. That isn't our position.

MR. ANDERSON: And I don't think the committee members feel defensive on the issue of politicians. It's only a matter of how you get by defining somebody as that and where there is equitable involvement. Some models have been suggested for the constituent assembly that Barrie talked about. Most of those, frankly, require judgments on who should be involved in the process, again with probably less public involvement, at least to some degree, because at least people cast ballots for us in a total sense. So we're still trying to find that, and I guess not just with the Constitution. It seems in an ongoing way that people now have the education, have the knowledge, and want to be involved in the decisions that are being made, and I for one don't think we as government have figured out how to do that yet.

4:14

MR. PHAIR: I think we also had the communication and transportation systems that perhaps impeded some kinds of involvement in the past. I mean, mass communication is absolutely amazing when you think about it from that perspective.

MR. ANDERSON: True.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The Chair wants to congratulate all the presenters and the committee because we really have done very well this afternoon. We've gone over 10 minutes, and there have been 12 presenters, so everybody has co-operated.

Now we go into the unscheduled presentations. The committee has notice of six presentations. It is now 4:15. The original time of adjournment was set at 5 o'clock. We won't insist on dropping the hammer at 5, but the committee would urge all presenters to try to make their presentation within a period of eight to 10 minutes, if possible. We'll be encouraging you to do it within that period of time.

The first presentation will be by John Morris Hawrelak. Welcome, John.

MR. HAWRELAK: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

MR. HAWRELAK: Thank you. My submission is actually impromptu. I didn't get on to it until it was kind of too late, so you'll have to excuse me if there are some errors or questions that have to be answered.

First of all, I'd like to read you an abstract of Canada Day and God's love to all kind.

Three oceans form the arch of Canada:
Wisdom, beauty, and everlasting peace.
Her love belongs to no race or custom;
God's crown embracing is universal.
To love one another in God's highway,

With love do we seal her peace and honour.
 Before that honour comes humility.
 That is the meaning of Canada Day.
 Love is her language in all languages:
 Ancient wisdom which God's messengers bring,
 Reality beyond all form and creeds
 At the feet of the supreme Lord's regent.
 Royal master, teach we Canadians a star is born.
 Her name should be Canada.

I would like to speak on democracy. Firstly, there are many detailed short premises that we could have exercised, but I'd like to speak on democracy and why I feel that we are so sadly lacking in that department, that actually we're relatively primitive. We believe and others profess that good government is built on the consent of the governed. The governed cannot consent fully to any course of action unless they know what it is, and too often we find that. Free trade was a good example, my friend, of the people lacking the understanding of this purpose and being pushed, talked into the fact that hey, any professor of any university will tell you first and foremost that free trade is a great thing if it would work. But the very thing is: don't expect an honest deal with a bunch of crooked partners. There is no way in the world that that free trade wouldn't be manipulated. Unless you have heaven on earth, my friends, you will not be able to exercise it. The public themselves will defy that. There are too many opportunities for wrongs to go ahead.

However, my point is with democracy. It is, therefore, the duty of every good government to tell them what is being done for them and in their name. They may refuse their consent because they do not understand it. If so, the government will explain more fully and simply. They may withhold consent because they do not approve. This so often happens. Time and time again when we ask about something that you people are discussing at the Legislature grounds or in the Parliament in Ottawa, the public only gets the feedback really of what the news media want them to think. I do not condemn anybody. My submission to you people is a coalitionary one. This is why I am picking on democracy, because the very fact is that the people are not oriented. Your jobs in the Legislature, in the Parliament are to teach so they would know, so they would care. We don't have any of that. We're saying Canada is falling apart. Certainly it is falling apart, for the lack of knowledge. The worst judge of ignorance is ignorance itself. We brought this on ourselves. I happen to have four grandchildren, and I love them, and I don't have any intention, even at the age of 64, to allow this country to disintegrate.

Where we should be a nation amongst nations, we're not. The propaganda for you people to make a few people back you up on something – my friend, maybe you even have to tell a lie, an honest lie. But the very fact is that we shouldn't have to tell lies, especially in the portfolios of excellency which you people hold. It is in your power to be able to ask. Maybe we need a subcommittee before the Legislature, and maybe we need the Governor General to be elected as the President of the United States is elected. Likewise, maybe our Senate should be elected, so that the governed have full knowledge of what is going on. This is lacking, ladies and gentlemen.

I know that you're not here just to beautify the place. I will always say that the greatest invention the good Lord made was when he invented the woman, and I think you gentlemen will agree with me. There is really not too much wrong with that, as far as I'm concerned. I couldn't see any improvements if I wanted to make them myself.

Anyways, in a nutshell, my first complaint is that we do not exercise democratic rights. First and foremost, we are the blind leading the blind, and as long as we differ in opinion – my friends, fools always disagree. It is wise men that never argue; they always agree. The fact is we're lacking these things, gentlemen. When I go to talk to my grandchildren now – you know, I play the games they play. I'll tell you something: I try my very best, but I cannot compete with them. They are just young toddlers yet, but I'll tell you something: they're inquisitive; they want to know about our country. What are we teaching in our schools about the country? Cultural movements are great. The fact is, if we need a dozen languages to keep this country together, that is the finest investment that we can make. There is no greater investment than Canada itself. There should be no division, my friends. As I said, in division only fools disagree; wise men should never differ.

At that, ladies and gentlemen, I leave the rest to you to do well. I wish you the very best. I know it's a hard, trying day, but you're here to gather good information, and I have the confidence that you'll just do that.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Hawrelak.

The next presenters are Jo-Ann Daniels and Jessica Daniels of the Women of the Métis Nation. Jo-Ann and Jessica, please come forward. Welcome.

MS JO-ANN DANIELS: Thank you. First we'd like to thank Corinne, the receptionist, for all the help that she gave us. She was fantastic, and she should get a raise. I'd like to thank the committee for giving us this opportunity. The Women of the Métis Nation tried very hard since we received the letter to get a special spot, but it just simply wasn't possible. We called too late.

I am Jo-Ann Daniels. I've been involved with the Women of the Métis Nation since its inception. This is my daughter Jessica Daniels. She is a director. I think what I'd like to do is thank all the people who have come up here who have supported aboriginal rights, and then I would like to define Metis. I'm not going to speak specifically about the paper. I will highlight it for you. There are some additional comments that we wanted to make, and since you'll be reading the paper, we're going to take this opportunity to add some things.

4:24

I'd like to define Metis. As put in the Canadian Constitution, there are three aboriginal groups: the Inuit, the Indian, and the Metis. At the Constitution table the Metis people were requested to define ourselves, so we came up with a definition. We said that you are Metis if you identify yourself as Metis. You are Metis if the Metis community accepts you. You are Metis if you can legally prove or historically prove that you are Metis, legally in that you sign an affidavit saying you are Metis, historically in that your families can be traced back to the Red River. It is no longer based on blood quantum. I'm not Metis because I have so much Indian blood in me. I'm not Metis because I have so much white blood in me. We are a nation unto ourselves, distinct from that of Indian and Inuit. It is from that that we speak.

Next, I'd like to mention that provincially Grant Notley went door to door to every single Metis household in every single community. He never forgot the Metis people, and the Metis people gave him strong support. When Peter Lougheed wanted

to become Premier of Alberta, he approached the president of the Metis Association and he announced himself: I am a Metis and I want the support of my people. I'll tell you, never since then have the Metis people received that much attention.

I also want to say that there used to be a time when the ministers and the Premier himself used to travel to Metis communities. I have pictures showing Neil Crawford, Jim Horsman, Al Adair, and the Premier himself sitting at a meeting of Slave Lake Metis people, discussing their issues. At that time the Premier also asked the association if we would meet with his ministers. Now we have ministers sending us their staff to deal with us. We have not progressed; we've taken a hundred steps backwards.

Some of the highlights of the paper are the history of Women of the Métis Nation. It was by mere accident that in 1985 a Metis woman was sent to the Constitution table, and it was not a happy accident. It was a very unfortunate one, because the way in which Metis women got to the table was that when the issue of equality came up, one of the members of the Metis National Council turned around and said, "I don't want to speak of this; Jo-Ann, you take the chair." That's how Metis women got to the Constitution table, and it hit us like a lightning bolt: these people don't care about what happens to Metis women. We are not being represented. Simultaneously, a number of Metis women also realized that very same fact, that Metis women just simply were not being represented. We were not partners. We had always believed that we were partners in the constitutional process, and we found out very sadly that in fact we were not.

One of the constitutional issues we address in this paper is self-government. There simply cannot be any further discussions on self-government if Metis women are not involved. We have a responsibility to uphold that partnership, and we demand equality in that partnership to speak about self-government. No aboriginal group has a right to sit at the Constitution table if we are merely going to pattern ourselves on what already exists. This system has already failed us. Metis people have their own visions of what self-government is. The Women of the Métis Nation uphold a third-level government. We see that as the only source from which Metis people can truly govern themselves. We want to belong within Confederation; we do not speak sovereignty. But our highest position of self-government is that of a third-level government, something akin to provincial government powers.

A land base. There are already areas that are set out for Metis people. Provincial legislation does not guarantee that land. Metis people as a nation have a right to address this land base question uniformly, and provincial legislation cannot guarantee that we will maintain that land base. It can only be guaranteed within the Constitution. The Women of the Métis Nation have been against resolution 18 and the kind of negotiations that are going on with the Metis settlements, but nobody has come to ask us. We have had to demand that kind of voice, to have that kind of involvement. Nobody wants us there. Why not? Of course we should be there. Of course we have a place. Of course we have a role. If our own organizations can't see that, then surely there must be some other alternative that Metis women can take to ensure that we have that kind of partnership with Metis men in developing that land base. When a husband or a common-law husband leaves a Metis woman in the community, she has absolutely no compensation. She has to leave that community because there are no economic opportunities that exist for her in her own community. If you're not willing to become a farmer, if you're not willing to become a rancher,

there's absolutely nothing else for a Metis woman to look forward to. It is absolutely essential that Metis women become partners in that development and in that kind of talk.

Unfortunately, because of some of the treatment that we have received, Metis women come to any kind of discussion table very bitter and very angry. Our experiences have not been very good. We've had the provincial government try to dictate to us not to use the word "Constitution," not to go to the Constitution table. We have a right to be there. This government or the federal government has absolutely no right to tell us that we have no place there. Of course we do. We are not Metis Albertans; we are Metis Canadians.

Some of the treatment that we've received from native affairs under Milt Pahl – we've had some of their technicians come up to us and say at a technicians' conference to the First Ministers' Conference: I prefer the term "mixed blood." Who is that person to dictate to us, a nation, what we should be called, he with the provincial powers to say to us: you should call yourselves "mixed blood," not Metis. It shows no understanding. It shows arrogance. It shows a disruption of the whole process. We have a right to be there. We are a nation. We don't need government staff coming up to us and telling us don't bite the hand that feeds you. What kind of talk is that? We're supposed to sell our souls for \$250,000 a year? No. We can't have that. We must have government officials give some discipline to their staff when they're dealing with aboriginal people. There must be some kind of respect shown, that we are doing our best with very limited resources.

We also want to talk within that, in that we know that the provincial government has taken jurisdiction over the Metis people. We know the kind of efforts the provincial government has made to address the areas of land base and that they have said many times that they want to help in the areas of self-government. In that we don't want the provincial governments to say that they exclusively hold the jurisdiction over Metis people. We want to see them encourage and help us and force the federal government to have that same responsibility. We do not want to be seen as pockets of Metis people, individually scattered from province to province across Canada. We are a nation, and we deserve to be treated like one.

Also, on education, we've found that our children do not learn, that Metis people do not have a big history in the part of Canada through the curriculum. My daughter is here today because of what she learned through her own organization. She feels that what is taught in schools has nothing to do with the Metis reality. That curriculum has to be looked at.

Government people. We are very happy that people like Pearl and Mike and Willie are sitting in levels of government, but party policy dictates that they cannot represent their own people. We need some guarantees that Metis people are going to be represented within all levels of government. We cannot see that party policy will override those rights of a nation. We also want to say about the Senate that Women of the Métis Nation does not approve and does not support any kind of Senate. We believe that a constitutional process can answer those questions. We see the Senate as being part of a political tool and a very ineffective one, that it's merely a football. The Senate doesn't make any sense to us.

Finally, I know that our paper delves into these issues much more deeply than I can, and once again that is also just a brief paper of a much larger one of a lot of information. For the very first time, in 1986, Metis women were able to meet and discuss their political and constitutional issues. The Metis Association of Alberta was formed in 1929, and it was only in 1986 that

Metis women were able to meet and gather and talk about politics. It is only this year that the Secretary of State of the federal government recognized the special needs of Metis women and decided to fund us, to make us a priority for funding. We would like the same kind of recognition from the provincial government. One Metis leader said back in the days of Peter Lougheed: this government is the richest and most powerful government. We must first get through the province of Alberta that this province has no compassion but that the Metis will give it some heart.

Thank you.

4:34

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Jo-Ann and Jessica.

The next presenter is Claire Arseneau. If Claire could come forward, please. Welcome, Claire.

MS ARSENEAU: Good afternoon.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MS ARSENEAU: My name is Claire Arseneau. I've been a teacher for 35 years, and I'd like to indicate that I've earned every gray hair I have. Anyway, there are many, many problems facing Canada, and I would like to be able to say something on all of them, but I can't, so I sort of stuck to education, since I feel I know a little bit more about that than anything else.

The population of Canada always has been ethnically disparate, but I believe we knew that we were Canadians. It is more ethnically disparate now. It's different by regions economically and always has been. It's different by age, values, philosophies, and religions. To address the problems created by different values, philosophies, religions, and beliefs within one country and, therefore, one overall, large society, I would like to indicate how I think the school system could help resolve some of these problems.

Values and attitudes are some of the more spontaneous motives which cause people to act and interact in certain ways. Many lasting values and attitudes are learned when we are very young. Children do not have too much trouble playing together, regardless of their race, religion, et cetera. Because this is presently addressing youth, I believe the school system could be better utilized to produce Canadians with Canadian values and attitudes. A person is a citizen of a country, not of a province or a region, nor of an ethnic culture or an ethnic past. At present we do have an historical Canadian culture, but it has not been well analyzed, depicted, or presented to Canadians and is in the process of being totally ignored while we appear to be blindly stumbling toward what appears to be evolving chaos. We are paying the price of Americanism and complacency.

After 35 years of teaching I would strongly recommend strong federal control of the educational system within Canada, not in the sense of rigidity but in the sense that every student receive the same basic minimums, producing some coherent equality in education. I'm not suggesting that they just learn minimum essentials but that all Canadian children be exposed to whatever is basic to being a Canadian.

That the social studies programs teach basic Canadian values, Canadianism from the early settlers to today and also with regard to the aboriginal people. Study of the cultures, practices, religions of all the ethnic groups making up Canada today. Canada-wide attainment of literacy skills, Canada-wide attainment of skills for present and future technologies – I sound like

The Ad Agency – Canada-wide attainment of knowledge of the democratic system so that future citizens can be informed and participate. Attaining knowledge of Canadian law, attaining knowledge of business, attaining knowledge of viable health programs, preventative and maintenance. That would perhaps help the medicare problem.

That every schoolchild emerge completely bilingual in French and English. Now, the reason I say that is not because I am of French extraction myself. It just happens that I am, but I don't speak French. My grandparents came from Hull, Quebec, went to British Columbia and learned to speak and write English on their own; that was in the early 1900s. I had some French in school in British Columbia, but I never learned how to speak it, and I didn't learn how to speak it at home, either. But I believe we have to honour historical commitments before we move on to other commitments. Children catch on to languages very easily, and the school system is a natural way for them, I think, to learn languages. They don't have to learn just French and English. We can throw in any number we want or can afford. If, in order to keep Quebec happy, we have to, you know, be bilingual or whatever, then the school system would be a good place to learn that. The provinces could always add to these programs. Children could always learn more than two languages. They can always have enriching experiences.

I believe that there is enough money allocated to education, but I do not believe that it is being well spent. It is time that the required programs were completely reanalyzed and revamped and brought up to date.

Canada must remain a whole country. Go back in our history and clear up any injustices to the aboriginal people, any other ethnic groups, and then involve new immigrants inasmuch as they can be absorbed justly into our society; that is, without infringing on the rights of people already here. We may need to clear up our own chaos before involving more people in it at such a rate that they may not be able to be absorbed properly. If Canada had an unlimited supply of wealth, we could support everybody in the way everyone wanted, have all the programs everybody desired. Such is not the case. We are in a deficit that is absolutely unacceptable and probably unnecessary to a certain extent.

People who are immigrating to Canada as adults need to be helped to become Canadians. They do not need to be funded to maintain their differences; those already exist. If we are going to spend money on adults, it should be spent on programs that help them to become Canadianized. They will keep their culture all by themselves without cost to anyone, and there's nothing wrong with that. The school system already exists. It is already being funded and has to be funded. It is not, in my opinion, being utilized as fully or effectively as it can be in helping people to become effective Canadians.

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

The next presenter is Elizabeth Hall. Welcome, Elizabeth.

MISS HALL: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MISS HALL: Thank you. These are jottings and thoughts that came to my head quickly this afternoon as I listened to the different speakers, and they are based on what I understand and also what I've learned in the way of studies. I am also going to refer to the environment in a sense, but I'll keep it within the context of the Constitution. I may not go overboard as an

environmentalist might. I mean, I'd be tempted to, but I think we restrain ourselves pretty well, or we're working on it pretty good, anyway.

What I want to get at quickly is the basis of the country. When we were growing up and going to school, we learned that Canada is a democracy, which we understand is government of the people, for the people, and by the people. I think this is a good basis on which to work for our presentations. Also, as a civil servant I worked for 23 and a half years with the Unemployment Insurance Commission here in the city of Edmonton. On the outside of the UIC building the Canadian coat of arms had in Latin, which was taken from one of the psalms: dominion from the sea to the ocean. That's what we understand Canada as geographically and also in how it is administered.

4:44

To go on from there, Canada is a multicultural country. That's what we have come to understand it as lately. It slowly but surely has been in the process of becoming that way from year one, beginning with the aboriginal peoples, which are the natives as we know them across the country in general and the Eskimos in the north. We find aboriginals peculiar to different parts of the world – over in Australia the black men, and peoples of the rain forest – and I think we'd get a better understanding of our own peoples in this regard if we studied the aboriginals of other nations and how they have coped and, in some cases, even been wiped out. This is where it's taken me in my studies on the environment. People were placed in an environment, and they depend on it also.

With reference to the peoples of the rain forest, in some cases they have been wiped out because their cultural mosaic had been the complete dependence of an indigenous people on the land in regard to food, clothing, building materials for their habitation, medicines, et cetera. When the rain forests where they lived in some instances had been wiped out, it tended toward deterioration which caused what we'd call their annihilation.

Going back for a minute to the civil service. This is all done in a hodgepodge, but I'll quickly get it all out anyway. Having worked as a civil servant, I feel I have an obligation to my country to contribute whatever else I can to it. I'm wearing today a brooch which says "Bravo" on it, which I picked up at a display showing the work of different individuals who had been awarded the Order of Canada. In their love to attain goals for the betterment of society in Canada and, incidentally, the world, they gave great dedication and sacrifice in order that this might be achieved. What better way to show one's love for one's country?

Indigenous peoples by nature have always been dependent on living off the land, like hunting and fishing. They are good environmentalists because they partake of the fruits of the land without depriving the land.

As for multiculturalism, I think each person should be established multiculturally with their own group if they wish. They should be helped to work out their problems amongst themselves and, as a group and groups, show proper responsibility to the rest of the country and the government of the country, because we are all living in the country together and should live in harmony. There should be good communication between the government and the people. At the bottommost part of the heap, as we refer to it slangwise, there are people who are suffering distress. If this is being alleviated, it is only temporary and the problem is ongoing. The moneys we as people submit in trust to the government to spend fairly – this is not always being done. Here, people suffer who are unable

to help themselves and are not enabled to help themselves as much as they should be.

Going back to the environment, lands we own as owners and also that which belongs to the state – we are all caretakers of this land. We have been put in charge of the land as caretakers on this Earth by the Creator, and we must be responsible for the proper management of resources thereof. For instance, renewability of the forests and the soil. A forest should be managed so it can regenerate itself; you take out the mature trees when they're ready for timber or pulp or whatever and leave other trees coming up to grow in their places. This can be done by those buncher feller machines that have been invented. This saves a lot of trouble, like money and that, in trying to reforest an area. If clear-cutting destroys an area, it causes landslides, and the water that would ordinarily be held in the soil by the tree roots and filtered down later slowly but surely into springs and then into the rivers and that – when the trees aren't there to hold it in the soil with their roots, then we get floods and landslides, especially on mountain slopes like in B.C.

I'll just hurry along quickly here and . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have almost reached 10 minutes now.

MISS HALL: Yeah, that's right. Well, I'll just finish quickly.

That causes flooding and also silting of reservoirs and so on. I won't go into it all.

What we want to do is have sustainable, renewable resources regarding the land, which the people live on and fight over, so that future generations may have something as their inheritance.

I think that's all I need to say. Thank you.

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

The next presenter is Lorne Hurst. Come forward, please. Welcome, Lorne.

MR. HURST: Thank you, and thank you very much for giving me the opportunity. And the end is nigh.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For today.

MR. HURST: I'm the last one. You people must be very tired listening to all of us, although it's been a very engrossing subject. I'm sure that . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have one more presenter after you.

MR. HURST: Is that right?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HURST: Okay.

I understand that you've been given copies of my presentation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

4:54

MR. HURST: By the way, it was put together today rather quickly. You'll find a few typos or mistakes in it.

What kind of a Canada do I see? I would like to see Canada as a federation, a true federal country. A federal country, in my definition, is equality of a number of people or a number of provinces or states. Each is equal, perhaps not in population,

perhaps not in resources, but equal before the law and within the Constitution. Now, what they'll do in federating is give up some of their sovereignty – some of it; maybe not all of it. Certainly, according to the terms of the federation, they'll give up some of it with the idea that the federal power becomes the repository of the sovereignty they've given up. I think it's essential that a federation – and it can be anywhere in the world – has to balance between population on the one hand and territory on the other. These federal sovereign states have to be equal to have tranquillity amongst them and to have equality amongst their citizenry and fairness between the different provinces. The parliamentary system must be constructed in such a way that there's representation by population, which is the democratic principle, and representation by provinces or states, which is the federal principle. So you have these double equalities that must be in a federal state. This is the kind of Canada I want to see.

I mention in my paper that the territories would also be represented equally in the Senate, which would be the upper House of this Parliament. You might well ask: why would the territories have equal representation in the Senate? Well, in the lower House they have representation by population the same as the provinces have, which gives them a voice equal to any other Canadian citizen, and I say that in the upper House they have to have the same equality in the way of a voice because they represent territory, a region of Canada. Of course, that doesn't mean they're provinces, because maybe economically, financially, infrastructurewise, and in many other ways they're not able to assume the government responsibilities of being a province. Therefore, politically, so to speak, they could still be a territory and the rest of Canada would have to look after them a little bit and help them, that sort of thing. So I say that territorial governments may not be provincial, but they should be equal from the point of view of territory in the Senate.

As I see it, this Senate would be triple E, essentially triple E anyway. I've talked about the equality, that sort of thing. But I see an equal number of Senators elected by provincial voters. There could be any quantity: two, six, 10. I wouldn't want it to get too large, but whatever and equal. Each province could decide within itself, for its own provincial requirements, what kind of representatives they would put in. Would they have them by divisions? Let's say Alberta had six, mindful of your report, Dennis; then I say they should be in six territorial divisions of Alberta. This is what I would recommend for Alberta. But that's up to a province. Ontario might decide on something different, or Prince Edward Island might decide on something different. The province, being a sovereign part of the federal thing, can make its own decision on that.

Effective? Well, yes. The current Senate would be effective if it had any credibility and was able to stand the gaff without having more Senators rushed in to change the picture. The big thing is that I think the Senate should never defeat a government. The government is in the Commons, and I don't think the job of the Senate is to defeat the government of the country. The job of the Senate is to act as a policeman for fairness across the regions, across the provinces. Therefore, I think they could defeat a government Bill with impunity – just wipe it out, defeat it – but the government shouldn't fall. The government should have to do its homework and come back with something that could pass. Also, I could see a number of cases where maybe the Senate would not defeat a government Bill; they would see a lot of changes for it but really wouldn't want to defeat it because they would agree on the principle of the Bill. In that case, there could be an arrangement where the Speaker of the

Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons could get together and form a committee to work out a compromise to try and get it through the Senate and perhaps changes in the Commons. Those are mechanics that could be talked about.

How do we get our new Constitution? I say through constituent assemblies. I believe it was discussed earlier here today, judging from some of the questions that were brought. Each province would have its constituent assembly. How would we form a constituent assembly? I think the simplest way would be to follow provincial constituency lines, not federal, because this is a provincial constituent assembly, not federal. Then how do we get away from politics in this constituent assembly? Well, I think plurality from the constituencies. I would suggest not one member from a constituency, as we currently choose our MLA – it's the first past the post – but maybe three. This allows the voters of the constituency to kind of spread it around a little bit, maybe have a PC and an NDP'er in there. Horrors of horrors; I don't know how they could get together. Well, you people get along very well here; that's right too. I'm sorry, my apologies to this forum. Anyway, I see the voters having a little bit of a choice if they could have plurality representation in this constituent assembly.

This constituent assembly is just the precursor, the forerunner to a national constituent assembly. This national constituent assembly would be a much bigger body, so I would say no more than 20 people from each province, maybe much less, maybe only 10. Let's say there were 10 from each province and territory. That would be possibly 280 for Canada. I don't know; that's pretty large. But there are about 280 people in the House of Commons right now and they make a pretty good noise. So maybe we could have a national constituent assembly of 280, even if we sent 10 from each of the territories. They should have a time limit to get their work done. It really doesn't matter what it is so long as it is a fixed time. I say 30 days in my paper. It could be 90 days or a year. I don't think they would do as good a job if they had a year; they'd do a poorer job. Put the pressure on; give them a deadline. I work on deadlines, and I think I work better on deadlines. The constituent assembly could elect their own officers. I don't think they should be overlooked by the Parliament, either the Commons or the Senate, or overlooked by the Premiers or the first ministers. They should set their own officers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm going to have to ask you to speed it up a little bit.

MR. HURST: Okay.

Multiculturalism. I believe that we are a multicultural country right now, that there should be no hyphenated Canadians at all, and that multiculturalism is excellent. It should be conducted by the groups themselves, a family or group affair, and the federal government should get out of it.

Immigration. I believe immigration is like adoption. When I come as an immigrant, I should be adopted into my country. I view immigration as adoption; therefore, I will accept the tenets of the country I'm coming to. If I run away from something that I don't want where I've left, I shouldn't be allowed to bring it in, import it here.

5:04

Quickly, then, fixed electoral terms. I think I'll just leave fixed electoral terms at that.

The bill of rights versus the common law. I'm very disappointed with the bill of rights. I feel there's something about it

that is very much amiss and that the old common law was something that worked out over the years. Even the French Civil Code they have in Quebec: they're unhappy with the bill of rights superseding that. So we're unhappy, or at least I am, with superseding the common law. Everywhere the common law conflicts with the bill of rights, some judge has to decide that there is a conflict between the two. He must find in favour of the bill of rights, and this I don't agree with.

Property rights. This is not mentioned in the paper, but I thought of it afterwards. I think property rights should be put into the Constitution.

Regional equality within our province: can I be permitted to talk about that? Horrors. I wouldn't like to think that we have inequality now. We don't, but things are changing. We have two huge metropolitan areas, Calgary and Edmonton particularly, that may come to dominate the politics of the province of Alberta. Now, we have the same situation in Canada, across the country. We keep saying that with Ontario and Quebec being the population centres and the power base and the powerhouse, we as the outsiders want to have more say on a regional basis. I see the same problem coming up in Canada, but horrors of horrors, the suggestion of adding another level of government of course would send everybody into delirium. But I do see something. We need to think about something that can be the equivalent of an Alberta Senate to represent the districts around Alberta as a second guess on the MLAs, whether they be rural or whether they be urban.

Now I conclude. Thank you very, very much for hearing me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Lorne, thank you very much for your well organized and presented presentation, which was on such short notice. Thank you.

I should also say, though, to the members of the audience, that if any of you are moved to make presentations as a result of what you've heard or seen about our proceedings this past week, please contact the telephone number or the address on the booklet Alberta in a New Canada, which is available at the door, and let them know what you want, because the full committee will be meeting next Thursday to talk about our future course. Between now and next Thursday, it would be well worth your while, if you feel there should be further participation on the part of Albertans, to do that.

The last presenter today and of this round and, depending on what happens, of this process will be Holdina Staszkiwicz. Holdina, come forward, please.

MRS. STASZKIEWICZ: I congratulate you on your pronunciation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I come from Drumheller, and it's sort of a multicultural area in Drumheller.

MRS. STASZKIEWICZ: My husband always teases people who stumble over it. He says it's a good Irish name.

I also congratulate you on being able to sit still so long, and I know you'll be happy to hear that I have a two-minute presentation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Very good, Holdina. A lovely way to end, wind down.

MRS. STASZKIEWICZ: I do thank you for the privilege of being allowed to make this presentation. My name is Holdina Staszkiwicz, and I have been a resident of Canada since 1925.

I appreciate the fact that you have an awesome task ahead of you to sort out the many recommendations that have been voiced in the course of these hearings. An even weightier responsibility falls upon the people who will endeavour to draft a Constitution that will serve to strengthen our nation as a whole. If it were merely a matter of assembling a new piece of equipment, the constitutional committee could always consult the manufacturer's handbook, or if they were building a house and were faced with a problem, they could go to the architect who drew up the blueprints. But where does one go when assembling a Constitution for a nation as vast and as complex as Canada? Is there someone wise enough to know what constitutes good government?

Good news, ladies and gentlemen: there is someone who laid the ground rules for good government long before Sir John A. Macdonald came on the scene and even before *God Save the King* ever echoed across England. That someone is none other than the ultimate authority Who created the universe and made the rules for keeping everything in that universe in right order and Who also is the final judge. I daresay that most of us have at least one copy of the Creator's handbook, the Holy Bible, in our homes. The tragedy is that we have allowed it to collect dust instead of searching in it to provide the answers to our problems, whether these concern a family, a community, or a nation.

The Creator says, for instance, "Righteousness exalteth a nation." Do we want our nation to be exalted? Then we must abide by the Almighty's rules for bringing about that righteousness. He says, for example: woe to the nation that calls evil good and good evil. God will destroy the people who promote homosexuality as a life-style even as He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. He says further: woe to the nation that sheds innocent blood. Are unborn children innocent? I would say Canada is in trouble.

There is hope for us, however, for God also says: If my people who are called by my name will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, will forgive their sins, and heal their land. Does our land need healing or does our land need healing?

We the citizens of this beloved Canada – and this includes our elected leaders – have a choice. Either we abide by the unchangeable laws established by the Creator of the universe and reap the benefits of health, peace, unity, and harmony, or we act in opposition to Him and suffer the consequences of lawlessness, anarchy, and ultimate destruction of a nation.

As for myself, I choose to abide by the Book. I humble myself under the hand of Almighty God, asking His forgiveness for my greed, my self-centredness, my self-seeking, my murmuring, my complaining, and my criticism of those in government. God says: pray for all men, for kings and all who are in positions of authority. This is the responsibility of each and every citizen. This I will do, so help me God.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Holdina.

MRS. STASZKIEWICZ: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Also, on behalf of the committee, thank you to everyone who participated and everyone who expressed their interest in what is going on in our country at the present time by their presence here today, and again thank you to members of the committee for working so well with our participants. Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good job.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 5:13 p.m.]