

6:01 p.m.

Thursday, June 6, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would it be all right if we started the meeting?

The first item on the agenda, then, is the approval of the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, May 22. Have you read through those, and are there any errors or omissions?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I move that they be adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Schumacher that the minutes of May 22 be adopted. Are we in agreement?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next item on our agenda, then, is Review of the Public Hearing Process and the transcripts. Garry, would you like to just explain what we're doing relative to the transcripts and so on?

MR. POCOCK: On the transcripts, we've made 50 copies of the *Hansards* that we have received to date and distributed them to committee members as soon they became available. *Hansard*, because the House is in session, will be somewhat backlogged in getting all the *Hansards* out, depending on the activities in the House. So it may take three or four weeks to complete all of the *Hansards* for the public hearing process.

One issue is how many transcripts are made and distributed by the committee. The cost for photocopying is approximately \$25 per *Hansard* set, because we're looking at approximately 800 pages or more of transcript. We can reduce the price somewhat if we go to printing more copies. Two hundred copies would be about \$5,000. Six hundred copies would be almost \$9,000. We will probably make sufficient copies so that all members of the Assembly have copies. We would print 200, and that would leave us with approximately 100 to distribute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My suggestion was that we go for 200 because I thought that each member of the Legislature, in addition to the members of the committee, should have copies of the transcript and the library, of course, and so on. That would take probably 100 copies, and then we could have 100 copies available for people who might want to receive them.

Yes, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Jim, is it anticipated that that 100 copies would cost anybody who wanted it \$25?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't want to start charging people for them. My thought is that we would distribute them upon request, a legitimate request, for nothing. We might want to revisit that if it appeared that there was demand beyond that, where it would start running up into substantial amounts of money.

Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: You might place copies in some of the major libraries in the province and tell people that they'll be available there.

MR. CHIVERS: I think you may find that there is quite a demand, particularly amongst educational institutions.

MR. POCOCK: We have received requests for copies from some members of the media, and some of the presenters have requested copies of the transcripts as well, but the demand from the presenters has been fairly small to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the entire set or for their own?

MR. POCOCK: Well, some are asking for certain dates.

MR. CHIVERS: I'm just concerned that if we're printing it, we probably should allow for some unexpected demand for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what does the budget situation look like? Two hundred copies will cost \$5,000; 600 copies will cost \$8,500. So for an extra 400 we might want to go for the 600.

MR. ANDERSON: I agree.

MS CALAHASEN: I think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; would somebody make a motion to that effect then.

MR. CHIVERS: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, Barrie. Is everyone in agreement that we'll go for 600?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

I think maybe we could have a general discussion about the process. Obviously we heard everything under the sun. Maybe not, but a wide variety of expression of opinion was found by panel A. Perhaps I could just describe how I saw it as chairman and then other members of the panel may wish to do so quickly.

I think people were generally happy to have had the opportunity of coming forward. There was that wide variety of opinion, everything ranging from the fellow who said that the provinces should be eliminated and we have a unitary state, on one hand, to the representations by the separatists, if you will, that the country should be fragmented into smaller countries. Between those two points of view there was a wide range of opinion.

I thought that clearly the issues which surfaced almost all the time were issues of bilingualism, biculturalism, aboriginal rights, the division of responsibilities obviously. The nature of the structure of government itself came up for a lot of comment. We did get, I think, some very useful suggestions. Clearly at this stage, however, I want to read over what panel B heard, and I would hope that the members of panel B would want to read what panel A heard so that we can be well informed.

Of course, at this stage of the game – and we'll have to talk about this later. Have you all got a copy of this document called Public Responses? Okay. That outlined the fact that we did have 419 presenters. There are waiting lists in Edmonton and Calgary and additional requests from regional centres. Then we have a list by name of all the individual presentations that were made. I think that I've still got some impressions in my mind of some of the presentations that do stand out. Some of the more bizarre ones, I guess, come to mind immediately: the fellow who suggested that the solution to all the problems was to combine the English and French languages into one was un bon idea.

MRS. GAGNON: What about the guy that said he could always assassinate us if he couldn't recall us. That was interesting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that came to mind as well.

MR. CHIVERS: You don't have a monopoly. We had monetary genocide.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, then there was marrying Prince Andrew to a Quebecker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, obviously some of the more extreme statements stand out in your mind. At the same time, I thought there were some very thoughtful, carefully prepared, and well-considered presentations. I was very pleased with the process.

A few criticisms, obviously, were directed our way about the nature of the meeting halls, some because of access problems, and we have to be very careful if we go again to make sure that we don't run into that problem. Secondly, I think we might try and find less intimidating facilities, such as the concern about the ordinary people of this province not feeling comfortable about going to the major downtown hotel ballroom type of venue. But those, I think, were relatively minor criticisms.

6:11

I thought that there was restrained partisanship on the part of everyone, although a couple of times it did come to the fore, but generally speaking I thought members of panel A co-operated very well despite the all-party makeup of the committee. I think that's a good sign for our future discussions.

That's my general overview. I don't know if anybody from panel A would like to add any thoughts on that.

MRS. GAGNON: I would just like to add that I thought the communication vehicle was excellent. We did hear from a lot of people and a lot of groups, and I think it was a wonderful thing to do.

You got a package of materials from the Official Languages Commissioner. I wanted to mention that I'm the guilty party that's added to the paper storm. I really felt that there were so many myths and so many misunderstandings, so I asked that this be sent to us. When you have time to get around to it, on page 4 of the covering letter the commissioner mentions, for instance, such things as 3.1 percent of the federal civil servant jobs in Alberta being designated bilingual. People probably think it's 50 percent. A whole lot of myths are corrected through this documentation, so I'd invite you to read it, please.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I was curious to have a little follow-up from yourself on the comment you made in response to the Hon. Helen Hunley's suggestion that we turn ourselves into a committee of the whole when we come back into the Legislature with our report. You mentioned that the commitment had been made publicly, and it was the first time that I had heard of that. I wondered if you could expand just a bit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the task force was originally announced, I indicated then that the report would be submitted to the Legislature and I would recommend that the Public Affairs Committee of the Legislature be called for the purpose of holding public hearings. That seemed to have been missed somewhere in the communication. Of course the Public Affairs Committee is every member of the Legislature. I feel quite strongly that that suggestion that was made by Miss Hunley would be a followup to the commitment that I had made at the

outset. I think it really has merit, once we have filed our report, in order for one more opportunity for the public to come and give us their views.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that subject, while we're at it, CKUA have given us some ideas about some further electronic opportunities for such things as electronic town hall meetings and so on, which I just received and which I want to share with the rest of the committee. The point was made that if we do reconvene as a committee of the whole Legislature, we could then give consideration to televising the proceedings including an electronic telephone linkup that Albertans could access throughout the province. So these are some ideas. I think they're certainly worth looking at when we get to that particular time.

Okay, that's my perspective. Would anybody else from panel A want to add anything?

Yes, Stan.

MR. SCHUMACHER: On behalf of panel B I think we can all concur in the technicolour-type of hearings we had as well. They covered the whole spectrum. You may have just missed it, but we also heard a lot of negative comments about multiculturalism as well. There didn't seem to be very much support for that.

I think we all got along pretty well together. Sheldon's sort of stock question about national standards became something we all got used to.

MR. CHUMIR: A standing joke.

MR. SCHUMACHER: I think I was a little surprised at one thing. You talked about nonpartisanship, Mr. Chairman. When we went to Grande Prairie, John McInnis and Sheldon and I went to a classroom to meet with about 20 or 25 students, and I was quite surprised that Sheldon had Liberal material that he was passing out to the students. He also passed out that same material at several of our other sessions. For the person or the party that seemed to be making the most of nonpartisanship in these things, I didn't think any grass was growing under his feet with regard to promoting the Liberal point of view on constitutional matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As chairmen I think we've got to be careful about not introducing party print material. Obviously, we have our own approaches, but any print material which bears the party position, I think, should not be handed out during the course of these hearings. I think that would really create some problems if that were to continue. I don't know how widespread it was.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I handed it out to a class that we went to, which I thought was entitled to know what the Liberal position was, a copy of our discussion paper in the form of a constituency newsletter that went to each of my constituents. I thought it was quite proper, still think it's quite proper, and will always think it's quite proper. I think the students are entitled to know that there are differences of philosophical perspective, even as we go listen to Albertans and hopefully maintain some open-mindedness. These weren't being passed out at large at the hearings per se.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, obviously your classroom activities are not part of the public hearing process. If it was just at the

public hearings, I wouldn't think that we would want to pass out party material, any party. Hopefully, we would avoid that.

Yes?

MR. DAY: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point. I was prepared just to let it drop with having had it brought out. I thought we would hear from Sheldon that he would refrain from that. This is a select committee of the Legislature, and nonpartisanship is key to the success of these types of committees. Now I'm a little bit alarmed when I hear him say that not only did he think it was proper at the time, but after having had the chairman raise it now, he still feels it's proper.

I think that we as a committee need to come up with some kind of guideline if we are going to be having future hearings. I daresay that if somebody had handed out a Progressive Conservative document, if one of the committee members had done that, we'd be hearing about it from one end of the province to the other on every radio and television and in newspapers. Now we have the member saying that he still feels that's proper. I think that's a severe contradiction in terms of the mandate of a select committee. I'd like the members of this committee to address that. If there's a consensus that that's proper, then I think we're going to have balloons and banners and a show at every hearing. I think we should address that. I'm somewhat alarmed by his . . .

621

MR. CHUMIR: Take a valium.

MR. DAY: I was alarmed when I saw him at a public meeting follow-up. Someone had made a presentation and run up and given the brochure at the meeting. This wasn't in a school setting.

So I think this is serious, and we should resolve it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm a bit surprised if our discussion veers off on this back road. We're reviewing what occurred during our public hearings. I think one could probably make the same argument that the document Alberta in a New Canada was prepared as a discussion paper by an all-government committee; therefore, there is some partisanship to that too. So if the member wants to distribute some material that was acceptable as a constituency handout under his name, I don't see any problem with that any more than if we as a committee are going to use a discussion paper prepared by the government members. One could make exactly the same argument. So I don't think we need to spend a lot more time discussing it. If people have let their frustrations be known, so be it. I suggest there are other items in the time we've got left to us that probably are more deserving of our attention, and I hope we get back on the main road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I think we'll have a couple more brief comments and then . . .

MR. ADY: Just an observation. I'd really not like to see our committee get into that, where everyone is doing that. It would really turn into a circus and take the dignity away from our committee. Hopefully it's not going to get to that point. As far as the discussion paper, I don't know if I've heard a comment that it is partisan. Quite the contrary; we've received nothing

but compliments that it isn't. So I don't think in fairness that that's valid, Bob.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I tend to agree with Bob, that we could spend our time on more important issues, although I too would be disturbed if we had general partisan material given out.

I can't resist saying that this is the ultimate irony, however: that the Liberals would be handing out positions when they originally were reluctant to join the committee because they believed the position was there on the part of the government as opposed to the Liberal Party.

Nonetheless, I think we should all use our good, discreet judgment in what we're handing out. I would think the committee might want to drop it at that but leave the possibility of revisiting it if we found some further difficulty with the issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that's good advice.

MR. McINNIS: Before we leave the question of partisanship altogether, there was just one note in the questioning that bothered me. With some witnesses, there seemed to be a desire on the part of some members to get every person who showed up to admit that somehow Alberta's political standards of this, that, or the other thing were that much better than the rest of the world. Now, I do appreciate that there are those around this table who have that view, but I'm not certain it's necessary that every witness be forced to confront that and internalize it and somehow respond to it. This particularly arose anytime anybody suggested there should be a national standard for anything. I think the difficulty is that if you do that, you invite somebody else to present the alternative point of view, and we're going to be badgering these poor witnesses and confusing them as to responding to whether Alberta is better or worse than other provinces. That really isn't our mission. I think it's to determine what they want to tell us and try to understand those things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there are going to be questions which probe strong positions presented by people. Obviously, we can't just sit there and be a sponge entirely. There's got to be some opportunity. My advice is that there were some quite intensive discussions with people about this issue of national standards on the other panel . . .

MR. McINNIS: Every time it came up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . from Sheldon. So I've heard that too. Let's be reasonable. I don't think anything's gotten out of hand, and I think we'll just be a little cautious about this.

Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: I would just like to say that I suppose we're all guilty sometimes of flogging our own particular bent, whatever it might be. I noticed certain people asking the same question all the time. If it hadn't even been mentioned, it was still asked, just to increase the statistics, I guess. I don't know.

But I want to leave that aside and talk a little bit about the response we got to multiculturalism. I think again we needed more information as to the Bills, the laws, the way they're interpreted, the budgets of both the federal and provincial governments in this regard. I would not want to see this committee make decisions on the multicultural policy and practice that we have in this province and as a country without

more information. I would hope we could have all the kinds of background we need before we discuss that with some intelligence and understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clearly, we have to be well informed by not just what we hear from the public who come before us but what we also must learn from material such as this.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, thank you all very much. We'll move along, I think, to the research update.

John, do you want to bring us up to date on where we are?

MR. McDONOUGH: I have a handout available on preliminary data from the first 444 written submissions we've received. This is a preliminary look at those numbers. The one thing you will notice: although we had 444 people write in, often the responses were down in the 20s or 30s in terms of the number of people who responded on any one issue. It's important to realize that these are not statistically valid in any sense, and the fact that 10 people agreed on an issue and 20 people held a contrary opinion - it's difficult to generalize any of that to any broader population statistics. I'm quite happy to have this done, and we're continuing to work on these numbers.

We are at the moment coding the written presentations to the hearings. We have about 250 of those. We will then correlate those with the *Hansard* presentations. It will take us about a month, I think, to get through last week's activities, maybe not quite that long. As soon as we have that finished, we'll throw all those numbers into the hopper again and will then be used to working with the statistical package we have at hand. Well, it's not a statistical package; it's really a nose count. If there are any questions people have about the numbers that are generated, please feel free to let me know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any questions of John then?

Yes, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Just a couple of comments first. From an initial look at this, I think it's excellent work on the part of the staff in a short period of time. I'm wondering if it's possible, on the program we have for this, to break out the groups and organizations that write in or present versus the individuals. We might want to look at them differently.

MR. McDONOUGH: Yes. The answer to that is yes.

MR. ANDERSON: Great.

The other thing, that I probably should have mentioned in the last topic, is that I agree completely with the statement that we've got to be careful about making our decisions on the basis of any one particular set of data and public hearings. I guess I'll state for the record: have a limitation, allowing all Albertans to become involved who want to but only attracting those who are comfortable in that sort of process. I think whatever decisions we make in the end we have to base on wider input, and you, Mr. Chairman, have already indicated what some of that might be. I think this was helpful in the short term. Certainly the breakdowns are very helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Barrie, and then John.

MR. CHIVERS: I just want to endorse what Dennis said with respect to this statistical analysis. It's excellent, and it's very useful.

MR. McDONOUGH: Thank you.

MR. McINNIS: The question we have to address is how the inference might be made from these ideas to the general population. I think that is a question the committee has to wrestle with. We hear from people who have strong views and word processors and an ability to get in there quickly with their points of view. I'd see this as a kind of fishing expedition for ideas, and I think we should take some of these ideas directly from the people and put them in our survey and other instruments to try and find out how the rest of the world feels. We know how a vocal minority feels on some things, but I think this is a good source document in terms of the public opinion research we're planning to do.

6:31

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Okay, you will continue with your endeavour to get everything into these categories.

On the public opinion testing issue, which is part of the research, could you bring us up to date, Garry, on what is transpiring in that respect?

MR. POCOCK: I've contacted four polling firms that we have requested, with the exception of the Population Research Laboratory. The director is on a conference and isn't returning until Monday. I've had some preliminary discussions with the Angus Reid group and Marktrend marketing and Strategic research. I had a meeting today to go over some of the various alternatives in terms of polling to give some indication of what the committee may desire in terms of polling, and we expect to have proposals complete by the end of next week. Then we can bring that forward to the committee for their consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any questions about that?

Yes, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: I was just wondering: are we going to be able to get a copy of the Angus Reid data in terms of the questionnaire?

MR. POCOCK: I think it would probably form part of their proposal with respect to this committee. Part of the costs for conducting the poll with the Angus Reid group would include access to their constitutional polling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which has been published in Southam, right? That's the one you're referring to?

MR. CHIVERS: Yes. That's the one I'm referring to. I was interested in the questions. I think it would be very useful for us in terms of forming our questions.

MR. McINNIS: I think that's a very big consideration, because Angus Reid has done a lot of work on the Southam unity project and they've developed some psychographics that I think are quite interesting. What I saw published didn't have a lot of Alberta detail to it. We tend to get lumped with the prairie provinces or, worse yet, English Canada. If there were a way to tap into that resource, it would be a bonus. Which makes me

wonder: how do we assess these proposals? I assume that the low bidder is not necessarily the winner automatically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We would have to see the nature of their proposals, as to how much depth they propose and so on. But we don't have the information yet. I just wanted you to be updated as to where we are, and we do have to hear from this organization. Because the director apparently is away until Monday, Garry hasn't had a chance to discuss it with him.

Yes?

MR. McINNIS: What was the third company you mentioned? There was Angus Reid, Marktrend . . .

MR. POCOCK: Strategic research.

MR. McINNIS: Is that the one where the director is . . .

MR. POCOCK: No. That's the Population Research Laboratory. That's associated with the University of Alberta.

MR. McINNIS: From which one was the director absent?

MR. POCOCK: That's at the Population Research Laboratory.

MR. McINNIS: Oh, okay.

MR. POCOCK: That was the one Ms Barrett recommended.

MR. CHIVERS: Is it in order to discuss timing of the polling at this point in time, or is that premature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that will be part of the proposals. I think when we get that back we'll have to . . .

MR. CHIVERS: Just in general terms. Is your inclination to go for polling before the continuation of the hearing process or after?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My inclination would be to get at it so we could have some of that information available to us before another round of hearings took place. But I'm open on that. I really would like to have a discussion when we sort of see the proposals, get a better feel for it than I have. I just don't have a feel for it at all right now.

MR. CHIVERS: I'm content with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

All right. Under Other we have to talk about the necessity of further public hearings. It's my view that since there are a number of requests still, some from substantial organizations in both Edmonton and Calgary and the other regional centres that have made requests, I would like to recommend that we agree that we would conduct another series of public hearings to make sure we accommodate those people who still wish to give us their views. Does anybody have any objection to that?

John.

MR. McINNIS: I wouldn't describe this as an objection. Just in terms of how we structure it, one comment I heard from some groups was that they didn't have enough time to work out their thoughts, given the new situation we're all in, and some of the organizations don't have a constitutional position they can pull

off the shelf and present. So I think we should give some lead time prior to the hearings, perhaps a little more than we did last time, to prepare.

The other thought I had was that we might want to consider whether there are any preliminary ideas we'd like to put forward for the second round to stimulate discussion. I think there are some people who would like to participate on the same rules as last time, but perhaps we might get a more useful response if we put something forward. Now, I appreciate that has some difficulties in itself, but I think it's an idea worth discussing, having a slightly different format for that second round.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let me just give you my thoughts as I've developed them in my mind. If we made an announcement following this meeting that we're going to have further public hearings, it would be useful to suggest that perhaps until the end of July people could indicate to us that they would like to give further advice, and then schedule meetings in the month of September so people will have the summer. We as a committee would also have the summer, and obviously we're going to have a lot of reading to do. Then in September - and I'm not certain when - if we're going to rural Alberta, we'd have to keep in mind the harvest situation and so on. We would certainly try and conclude the next round of our hearings by the end of September.

That's a rough outline, and I'm certainly open to suggestions. Yes, Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I'm a bit concerned about the fact that if we take too long, we're going to perhaps render ourselves a bit irrelevant in respect of the federal government process that is being set in motion. If we don't have hearings until September, finish at the end of September, then we have our deliberations. Then we have the Legislature come in, we present our report and there are discussions, and there are the Public Affairs Committee hearings. I mean, we're into the end of December for sure, maybe in January, before there's a report. There's been a suggestion to date that Mr. Clark expects to report by February. Now, we don't know for sure, but it seems to me that we have to throw that around a little bit and find out whether or not there isn't a bit more of a sense of urgency, at least to get some preliminary matters determined. I'm wondering whether perhaps we shouldn't be holding some hearings during the summer. I know it's not optimum, but the fact is we've had a very thorough hearing process so far. It's pretty well people in areas we've missed that are an issue, and we shouldn't be trying to gear to get some position completed by the end of October. In other words, I guess the bottom line is: is there any relevance from our point of view to meeting a time frame in light of reality and what's going on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we don't know yet what the federal government is actually going to do. Going on the basis of a news report which came out yesterday, it indicated there would be an announcement yesterday of the structure of the federal government's committee and its timetable, suggesting that it would commence its process in September and report by February. When I read that, I immediately contacted our Ottawa office. They checked, and there's no substance, apparently, to that report. So we don't know what the federal government's process is. In any event, I don't think it's necessary nor perhaps even desirable to be ahead of the federal government's process.

Yes.

641

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, I see this process as an attempt to search for a constitutional consensus amongst all of Canada, including Alberta, and I think it would be a mistake to prematurely sketch out a path. It seems to me that the time frame you were suggesting is realistic. I don't like the idea of an interim report. Sheldon mentioned this to me earlier today, so I had an opportunity to think about it somewhat. I think the difficulty with an interim report or that sort of a process is that we would do just precisely that. We would commit ourselves to a general direction at least, and I think that would be unwise and counter-productive in the search for a constitutional consensus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just speaking for myself, I couldn't imagine how I could sit down and try and write an interim report at this stage. I would find that an impossible exercise to do. So I think I have to concur with you on that one, Barrie, from my perspective. Anybody else want to comment on that?

Well, that's a rough outline, and Bob Hawkesworth had some ideas that he passed by me yesterday which I thought really had some excellent merit. Perhaps you'd like to bring those forward now.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess what sort of stimulated some of my thinking was that I believe Dennis had issued an invitation to Mr. Parizeau. I'd seen something in the paper – and I haven't been able to confirm it for sure – that he would be interested in coming back to Alberta and appearing before the committee. That was sort of one thought, that if that is in fact correct, we'll probably want to schedule a meeting sometime.

I guess that's one voice of opinion in Quebec. There's also the voice of the government in Quebec that would seem to me to be valid and important, actually, for us to meet with as well. So I was wondering about the possibility of scheduling a meeting perhaps with Mr. Rémillard, the federal and intergovernmental affairs minister for Quebec, as perhaps another person from that province that we should be listening to. Of course, Mr. Clark himself is likely to be in Alberta at some point to meet with cabinet members, and at the time that he's here . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: He stood us up in Calgary.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: . . . perhaps we could invite him to join us as well. It just seems to me that there are a number of other people and committees and governments that are engaged in exactly the same process we're engaged in, and as Barrie has just mentioned, we're all searching for the constitutional consensus that will help us merge on the other side successfully. It seems to me the more we can be in communication with one another about these matters and the more we can be talking about these issues, the easier it'll be to achieve some degree of consensus.

That's why I sort of approached you with the idea of us issuing some invitations, perhaps, to some of these people. If we are in the process here of maybe throwing out all of the brainstorming ideas, there was a suggestion from the task force on Canadian unity, the three people from Quebec that appeared in Calgary before panel A, an intriguing proposal. They felt a big part of the job of English Canada is to win the hearts of Quebec. Some gestures they felt could be very significant and important, including some members from English Canada and members of our committee perhaps going to Quebec to meet with politicians and others in that province. I know at a

previous committee meeting it was a suggestion you made as well, Mr. Chairman, that you had received from some of the other provincial committees that they would welcome some joint meetings or joint consultations as well. So it seems to me there could be some process of consultation across the country, at least for perhaps a few representatives of the committee, to help with the communication and idea sharing, perhaps before our committee has public hearings in September.

Those are all just ideas and thoughts for your consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. I've got two or three people who want to get in, but I do want to repeat what I said earlier. In my meeting with the representatives, all three parties on the Ontario select committee including the chairman, Tony Silipo, made a very strong case for getting together with us sometime before we finalized our respective reports. Likewise, Wally Fox-Decent, who's the chairman of the Manitoba committee, had written to us requesting this opportunity and suggesting that they will organize in Manitoba a collective provincial committee discussion. He had suggested that for the week during which we were holding our public hearings, so obviously we weren't ready to proceed on that basis. So those are certainly ideas that we need to discuss.

Stock, Pearl, and Dennis.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of things on Bob's suggestion. First, if there is some traveling – Bob mentioned to Quebec – it would be a very limited group, definitely not many members of the committee, and I don't think we should single out Quebec for that kind of communication, nor just Mr. Parizeau. Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia all have equally valid concerns, and I wouldn't want to give the impression that we somehow think Quebec's is more paramount in our minds than any other province's. That, then, gets back to this thought of traveling, and you've allayed some of the concern. I think it would be best served if some representatives of this committee were to meet with members of all the other committees at one central place, again to share information, not to try and draw up guidelines or things like that ourselves but just to share information among ourselves of what our citizens are saying. We don't want it to be a larger Meech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I don't think that was your intention, was it Bob?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Oh, no, by no means. I've not worked out in my mind to put forward a specific proposal, but simply that other provinces have set up similar committees such as ours here, and I don't know what the mechanism is for the communication for us to set up with them, but I do believe it's important that there be some mechanism, however that might be determined by this committee. It's not meant to single out any particular province either, and that's an important point to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Pearl, Dennis, Barrie.

MS CALAHASEN: I just wanted to ask – actually Stock sort of alluded to it. I wanted to know: why would we want to do that particular thing? Why would we want to meet outside people? Why would we want to meet Parizeau? Why would we want to do that in these initial stages, particularly when we're going out to get Albertans' views? Is it for maybe at some point in time after we get the views of Albertans? Is that what you're

talking about, or are you talking about presently, in between while we're still waiting to hear from everyone?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, there's I guess lots of communication that can take place through the media. I gather an invitation had already been issued to Mr. Parizeau. I don't know whether that was accepted or not. I think things are moving. There's a lot of fluidity in Quebec at the moment. I think it's important for us to speak face to face with some of those people who are involved in that province.

6:51

MS CALAHASEN: But for what purpose? I'm trying to find out: what is our purpose for doing that?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, what's the purpose for our committee, period? It seems to me that at the moment the country is facing another round of constitutional negotiations, and how we're going to resolve those differences and be successful in concluding those negotiations, I don't know at the moment. But it seems to me that the first step is to make sure we're in communication with one another and be as clear as we can about what we're . . .

MS CALAHASEN: What we're hearing or what the process is?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Sure, yeah.

MS CALAHASEN: Or just to get information so that we can make sure that our particular forums are more enhanced or enriched in that sense? Or just give us some view in terms of what the feeling is throughout Canada?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: All of the above.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to support generally Bob's suggestion and verify that Mr. Parizeau has expressed an interest in meeting with the committee. When we were in Calgary, I had to attend a chamber of commerce panel where he was speaking, and committee B suggested that I issue such an invitation at least to the committee, and I did that. He said he would be happy to try and arrange a mutually convenient time if the committee wanted to do that. I indicated that the Chairman would be likely to get back to him in that respect at some time in the future.

I agree with Bob, too, that it's important that if we're going to have Mr. Parizeau, we invite the other perspective in Quebec. I'm also sympathetic to the point of view that we should be hearing from all of our fellow Canadians who are involved heavily in the issue and either chairing committees or leaders in the area. I'm not sure how that would go in a process sense, whether we would issue invitations to each - I personally don't think that's that bad an idea - to the chairmen of committees at least elsewhere and a leader who particularly wanted to come and speak to us. I'd think it'd be helpful to get as much as we could.

I would also endorse the idea of a central meeting of all of the committees. I think Canadians are getting confused with the myriad of committees that are there, and I think we need to know what we're talking about in Canada amongst all Canadians. I would support, Mr. Chairman, you talking perhaps more firmly about a date with Manitoba, if they wanted to organize such a thing, and maybe trying to organize it so we could put it

in our schedule and others in the country could far enough in advance to make it a reality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks, Dennis. Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, just responding to both yourself and to Pearl, it seems to me that whatever our personal views on the matter are, the reality of finding a constitutional consensus hinges in a large measure on what happens with Quebec. Some of the most difficult and thorny problems that we're going to have to deal with - such as language, notwithstanding clauses, division of powers, amending formula, you name it; it goes down through the whole list of them - are issues that I think and feel strongly that we need better understanding and appreciation of from the horse's mouth, so to speak, from people that come from Quebec. Some of our people can go to Quebec so that they have a better understanding of just how complex they are, and they have a better appreciation of what the views of Albertans are, as we've heard them.

MS CALAHASEN: But, Mr. Chairman, that's the problem. I mean, you know, like we haven't heard from all Albertans. I don't think we have any idea as to what Albertans are thinking. So here we are getting other people to come and talk to us when we haven't even heard all Albertans. I guess the concern I'm trying to bring out is when do we do it? I don't disagree with that, but I think the timing is very important, and that's the point I want to bring up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think you've made your point quite clearly.

MR. CHIVERS: I just wanted to deal with my second point, Mr. Chairman, which is with respect to the discussion you had with Ontario and Manitoba. I quite agree that that would be a useful process, and if Manitoba is prepared to host it, it seems to me eminent good sense that we would participate in that sort of a meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yolande, John McInnis, and Sheldon.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. I have three points. First of all, the Task Force on Canadian Federalism that Bob Hawkesworth referred to, the three presenters from Quebec to group A and the invitation. My recollection is that they did say, "After your report is complete, please come and woo us," and "All Quebecois are waiting to be wooed; they want to know you care," and that kind of stuff, but they mentioned, "After your report is complete."

My second point would be in regard to a second round of hearings. Are we going to solicit input through advertising again? Are we going to go through almost a repetition of round one? Because when I look at the data so far, I see there are 41 who wish to speak in Calgary, some who have already spoken. When I look at the names like Roy Farran and so on, we've heard from them, and I guess we're giving them a second opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I think there may have been an overlap there, and I asked somebody to check because I wasn't at that meeting, but I heard that he had spoken. So that should just be struck.

MRS. GAGNON: So we won't allow people to come back twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MRS. GAGNON: So that number there would be a little smaller, then, in Calgary, maybe 35 or so, 12 in Edmonton, and then just a total, really, of four from other areas. I guess I'm suggesting that a full-blown round of hearings might not be necessary. We don't know. Maybe we will know if we advertise, but advertising creates expectations, so what is our purpose for the next round, and what is our goal? Then I was going to mention those who've already presented, but you've indicated that that would not be possible. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it would take a rare, exceptional circumstance, and I don't think that was intended.

Okay, let me see. John, and then Sheldon.

MR. McINNIS: After addressing the two parts to Bob Hawkesworth's proposal, the first, liaising with other people who are doing the same work, seems to be well in hand. The other one, though, I think has another dimension. We heard from a couple of national organizations, in one case an international organization, that suggested there is some difference between the way people in Quebec feel about the future of our country compared with the posturing of governments and politicians. Now, that suggestion intrigues me quite a lot. I know it's difficult sometimes to make those assessments, but it seems to me part of the purpose in going there is not just because Quebec isn't a province like the others but because the time frame and the referendum, the two reports that we've all been briefed on, Allaire and Bélanger-Campeau, are in a sense driving the process. So we'd be better off to have some idea of our own of what's really happening in that province, how quickly it's going to happen, and how it may affect Albertans, because that's one of the dimensions we have to look at. You can posture all you like and say this is the Canada round and Quebec isn't the issue here, but there are certain facts that remain, not the least of which is the 1992 referendum deadline, which is certainly a factor that we have to look at before we prepare our final report, I'd submit. So I'm thinking that that's a very timely suggestion coming from the hon. member.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, in terms of the referendum deadline, again if that Bill goes ahead, the referendum's in October, and any decisions, I understand, have to be made in Quebec during the summer. There has to be some lead time, so if we are geared towards Quebec's agenda, then we have to have something on the table in the spring, as the rest of the country has to have something on the table. Now, I think this is something, Jim, that if you and your people can find out where we're going in terms of the whole process, I think that's key.

Moving on to Bob's suggestion. What Pearl I think is saying is that we should really find out what Albertans are saying first and have that in mind, have a much better focus on what we're thinking and what we want to do, what questions we have in mind, before we meet with representatives from Quebec, Parizeau and Rémillard. I'm inclined to still be of the view that we move with all dispatch to get what we can from Albertans and not take a nice leisurely summer while the country is in crisis. I'd like to see us move much more rapidly with respect to dealing with Albertans, focusing on factual things, and then very quickly meet with people from the rest of the country, with

Parizeau, Rémillard, and other committees, a delegation to Quebec, and so on. I tend to agree with Pearl, if I understood her correctly.

7:01

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I think we had a pretty good discussion. Stan wants to comment, but I do think we need to get some motions on the floor here relative to the proposals. We've had a good discussion. I do think, though, we have to decide about further hearings. We have to decide about meetings with other people. We don't have to be specific about the individuals, but I would think we have to frame a motion which would deal with the suggestions Bob has brought forward.

But, Stan, do you want to comment first?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah. Just with regard first of all to what Sheldon had to say, I think I heard a few times at subcommittee B that this process - while it may not have seem rushed to us, the public thought it was rushed a little bit. Therefore, I don't think we can go as quickly as Sheldon is asking us to. But in order to bring us to some type of conclusion, I'd like to move that the committee agree to hold further public hearings, that as soon as possible after today, if we make that decision, the public be advised that they have until July 31 to say they want to participate in those hearings, and that the hearings themselves will be held sometime during the month of September this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's in the form of a motion. We've had some general discussion in advance, so do we need any further discussion on that specific motion?

MRS. GAGNON: For clarification, please, Stan, what do you mean by "be advised?" That we advertise, that we solicit - please get involved - like we did last time, or that we just notify?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I don't think there has to be a plea to get involved but that there will be a further chance for Albertans to express themselves and, for those who wish to do so, let the organization know by July 31 so that we can plan to accommodate them.

MR. McINNIS: The thought about the hearings was to try to get them beyond harvest, after the harvest?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Harvest is a very elastic season in our province.

MR. McINNIS: That's true. You were thinking later September, though, not like September 1.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, I would say that for sure harvest begins by the middle of September. It might have to be earlier in September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it depends on where you are. In the south it can begin in mid-August, you know. We'll have to be cognizant of that.

MR. ANDERSON: On behalf of Calgary, our harvest is wide open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're harvesting from the rest of the province all the time. I shouldn't say things like that.

Anyway, any further discussion on that?
Yes, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: I was going to say that I am prepared to second that motion, Mr. Chairman. But I would also like us to try to firm up those dates if possible. There are some personal considerations for me, as I'm sure there are for other members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have to check very carefully with members as to their fall schedules. But in general is there any further issue? You don't have to second a motion in this committee, I think, by the way.

Are we agreed, then, with the proposal?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. GAGNON: I would like it recorded that I don't agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't agree?

MR. CHUMIR: Twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon doesn't agree either. Everybody else does. Okay.

All right; Bob, would you like to frame a motion to incorporate some of your suggestions?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Okay. I'm thinking along two lines, Mr. Chairman, and sort of in the form of two motions. One would be something along the lines of asking you, or empowering you on our behalf,

to invite representatives of the Quebec government and opposition to meet with the Alberta select committee at times that are mutually convenient.

It's fairly broad, I guess. Leaving it fairly broad is my intention for the first motion.

Then I think it's a different question, and I'd frame it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps we should just deal with that one separately. Is there any further discussion on that motion?

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, on that one, and if I can just anticipate, Bob, what your second one's going to be. Our resolution that formed this committee - I'm just asking this as a question. Are we going to be affected here? Are we going to have to make some changes? It reads that this committee was established to consider the current state of the . . . federation and consult with the people of the province of Alberta to determine their views.

It stops there. It says "people of . . . Alberta."

Then:

shall report back . . . on the views expressed by Albertans.

Further down - and, Bob, I'm just anticipating the second one; I could be wrong - point 4 was:

In carrying out its duties, the committee may travel throughout Alberta and undertake an extensive process of consultation with all interested Albertans.

So just a question on process. Are we going to be offside with the existing motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the intention was to invite them to come here to Alberta, was it not? I think you're probably quite right that any travel outside Alberta would have to be authorized by the Legislature. I think that's fair to say. But the

intention was to invite them to come here and discuss the matter with us.

On that, could I just throw this in as information, though. Gil Rémillard has indicated to me that he wants to come to Alberta for some discussions. But when he did so, we didn't have the select committee in place, and he didn't say "to meet with your select committee," as apparently Mr. Parizeau said. So the motion which would authorize me to contact them, then, and invite them to come here is what I think we should be considering.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I just had one other point I wanted to add. I don't know if it needs to be amended now or if I can just ask Bob if he wants to expand it. I'm just a bit sensitive to the fact that we are naming representatives from a province. I'd like to see it amended so that it could include other provinces.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, you're anticipating my second motion, and maybe I could just take a moment to explain how I intended to phrase it. It was simply again to empower the chairman, on our behalf,

to consult with the Chairs of the other provincial legislative committees in Canada regarding a mechanism and a process for ongoing communications.

It doesn't define anything yet; it just asks our chairman to open up those lines of communication and discuss and then report back on what might be concluded from those.

MR. DAY: Couldn't we just roll it into one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You could perhaps roll it into one.

MR. DAY: Yeah. . . . and say "other persons as the committee should see fit." With what we heard, going around the province, about people's sensitivity about the focus on Quebec, I'm reluctant that we should just focus on them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think that intent can be rolled into one, can't it, Bob?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Sure, sure. I think it's just understood that you will be reporting back at your earliest possible . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are there any further questions? Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any dissenters?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: There's just a third item, and I didn't mean to include it. I'm just wondering what the committee's thoughts are about an invitation to Joe Clark in terms of the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I think Mr. Clark is seeking from us opportunities for some dialogue, and I want to just give you a quick report on that. We tried to get him here this week. We had problems. We failed again in getting him here next week. He wants to see the Premier because he's meeting with all the Premiers across the country. In my discussions with him he said he would like to have some dialogue with the committee, so I think that will happen sometime without the necessity of a

formal motion. It's getting to be a bit of a challenge getting everybody together.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I'm encouraged by being on a roll here. I've never had a motion so warmly endorsed by the committee. Maybe I shouldn't push my luck.

There was another suggestion made at our panel in Calgary last weekend from Chief Roy Whitney, who opened up the possibility of an ongoing working committee or working group between our staff and the staff of either the Indian Association or the Alberta chiefs. Maybe it doesn't need a motion, but I'm wondering if we couldn't also ask if the committee couldn't also direct either you, Mr. Chairman, or our staff to approach the Metis nation of Alberta and the Indian Association of Alberta and perhaps follow up with Chief Whitney or the Alberta chiefs to pursue that suggestion, just to sort of indicate that we're interested in that proposal, and perhaps do some preliminary meetings to see if such a working group could be set.

7:11

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; Yolande and Jack Ady.

MRS. GAGNON: I think Jack will make my point. We didn't hear what Bob heard.

MR. ADY: I would suggest we review his presentation and then bring it back to the table. Bob, would you be agreeable to that? That's not exactly what I heard him saying, and I think we need to fit it to that.

MRS. GAGNON: I thought he said the chiefs and a body of government MLAs should begin to meet. That's what I heard. But we have to review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a good point. My recollection of what he said is a little vague too, right at the moment.

Dennis, do you want to comment?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, that's fine if it's coming back. I was only going to speak to the potential for that causing us to make a lot of other decisions. In subcommittee B, for example, we had a presentation from some of the Metis women, who felt they were being interfered with by the Metis organization; they weren't being represented. So if we formally entered into something, we could have a series of other groups or organizations who'd want to speak, though I would be quite pleased to have any assistance in trying to resolve the native part.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the spot, but I did want to also follow up on Stock's point. He raised a concern about traveling out of the province. Given the schedule of the Legislature now, I'm hoping that we haven't precluded ourselves from participating in a Winnipeg meeting or something of that sort. If we have, then I don't know if we'd want to consider an amendment before this sitting is out of the way. I think Stock raised a point that I hadn't thought of before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that is a concern.

You wanted to get in, Pearl, on the other issue first, the subject of Chief Whitney's comments?

MS CALAHASEN: Oh, I just wanted to know what it was because I wasn't privy to that particular information, so it's going to be interesting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we're going to review it, so that will be satisfactory.

Okay, on this other point, this very interesting one, Dennis. We have no authorization by the Legislature to travel outside of the province, and if a meeting were to be organized in Winnipeg, for example, the amendment would have to come forward. Let me pursue that, though, and get back to you for the next meeting, which I think will be before the end of the session.

MR. ADY: Mr. Chairman, is it the consensus of the committee that perhaps you should get the amendment? Don't we need a little more elbowroom?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if you want to make a motion to that effect, then we would have to take the motion forward.

MR. ADY: Well, I would be prepared to make the motion that the legislation be amended to allow us to extend our travels outside the perimeters of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we would request the Legislature to give consideration to that request. Any further questions or comments on that suggestion? Are we in favour of that motion? Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any opposed?

Okay, I think that brings us along to the question of the date for the next meeting. I will be away all of next week and will return the week of the 17th. In between sessions on Tuesday night, the 18th, or on Thursday night, the 20th?

MR. McINNIS: Tuesday there's a Cancer Board dinner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, is there?

MS CALAHASEN: Thursday is probably best.

MR. ADY: Tuesday is better.

MRS. GAGNON: Monday, the 17th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've got a function that night. It's in my book.

MR. BRADLEY: How about Wednesday, the 19th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's an MLA lawn bowling party.

MR. BRADLEY: That's why I suggested it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was the 18th?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: The Cancer Board has a dinner at the Macdonald. What was wrong with Monday, the 17th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a function that I've committed to.

MR. CHIVERS: And the 20th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have nothing. I'm okay on Thursday, the 20th.

MRS. GAGNON: Let's try a show of hands for the 20th and see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the 20th? Okay, the 20th it is, at 5:45. We'll do the same thing, okay?

MR. McINNIS: And if Mr. Clark were available, we could have an ad hoc meeting without it being formally constituted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. As soon as we know a date, and whoever is available on the committee, and we'll make sure that happens. Okay?

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, this is a little belated, but dealing with the involvement of the aboriginal peoples, one of the suggestions that arose out of discussions during the process of the hearings is that we might want to consider the possibility of taking the hearings to some centres that would facilitate the involvement of aboriginal peoples. I'm wondering if our staff could consider those possibilities and give us some recommendations and advice on that.

MS CALAHASEN: Treaty 8 said they would be willing to host. Then they'd get all the Treaty 8 people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll look into that.

MR. CHIVERS: I think we have to be careful about the political niceties of where we travel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly. But that's a good suggestion.

Under additional approaches, I just got this communication of options suggested delivered to my desk. I haven't really had a chance to go through it, but let me get the communications people to refine this in view of the motion relative to the second round and see if we can come up with some methods of keeping the public aware of and informed of our activities and our next round. So we'll have that before the next meeting, whenever you can get it, and then we'll have it in the committee members' hands before the meeting.

Yes, Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn this evening, I think it would be in order simply to express some appreciation for the work our staff did to shepherd us and keep us so well organized. It must not have been the easiest job that we could have asked them to do, but I appreciated the efforts they made on our behalf and the way the hearings were as well organized as they were. [applause]

MR. CHIVERS: Somebody at our hearing voted Corinne a wage increase. I don't want to leave this meeting without thanking Stan for putting us all on the spot by announcing rather provocatively at the end of one meeting - when they said, "What are you going to do with all this information?", Stan replied, "That's what we get the big bucks for."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Thanks, Stan.

MR. SCHUMACHER: You're welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaking of big bucks, members who wish to submit their accounts to Louise, please do so. As chairman, I'll sign them and get them paid.

Okay? Adjournment?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I move we adjourn.

[The committee adjourned at 7:21 p.m.]

