

6:03 p.m.

Thursday, June 20, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some members still eating, but perhaps we could proceed with the agenda. We'll deal first with the committee minutes of June 6. Is there any concern with respect to errors or omissions?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I move that we accept them.

MR. CHUMIR: Just a detail here with respect to the reference to Stan's surprise at my "distribution of materials that were of a partisan nature to students." That was at a school to which we had been invited. Those were not at the hearings per se.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's correct that.

MR. CHUMIR: Grande Prairie high school.

MR. DAY: This did not take place at any of the hearings?

MR. CHUMIR: No. It was Stockwell that was shocked; it was Stan that was surprised.

MR. DAY: I'm sorry, because I thought I saw you get up from the . . .

MR. CHUMIR: I did hand out two pamphlets to isolated . . . This says that Stan Schumacher "expressed surprise."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CHUMIR: If you want your oar in the water, that's fine.

MR. DAY: Could we just have clarification, though, that that won't be taking place at the future hearings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we agreed that we wouldn't be doing that.

Okay, anything else? May I have a motion to adopt the minutes?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I move they be adopted as amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As amended. All right. Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

You see a revised budget for you. I'll perhaps have Garry explain the changes that have been deemed necessary.

MR. POCKOCK: What we have done here is extend the budget for July through to the end of November. The first column on this paper indicates the original budget was estimated at \$780,347. The second column outlines the anticipated additional cost to carry the committee through to the end of November.

The first part is Manpower, the costs of 11 staff members. The next part is Supplies and Services. The first one with respect to Travel, \$47,000, is an estimation if the committee takes outside travel to the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba. That's the estimated cost for five committee members and three staff, with airfare, meals, and accommodation.

The second figure under Advertising for \$149,000 is our anticipated advertising cost. It's detailed further in the documents we provided for the committee for consideration this evening. *Hansard* Transcripts are \$54,000, which would cover the committee meetings and the public hearings and the printing and distribution of the *Hansards*. We have the Hosting and rental charges there. The other major change is under Research, where we have provided an additional \$25,000 with respect to polling to cover the slightly larger than expected polling costs.

Payments to MLAs is the per diem received for attendance to committees. Fixed Assets is for additional software and equipment for analyzing the written submissions and the public hearings.

A total increase of \$559,142.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments? Could I have a motion, then, to approve the new budget, the additional budget? Dennis Anderson. All those in favour? Are there any opposed? Thank you.

Polling proposals. Garry has sent a memorandum to each of us. I hope you've all had an opportunity of reviewing that. The bottom line is that he recommends that we accept the Angus Reid proposal. It is, I guess, the least expensive, for one thing, and would give us a better analysis because it would permit us to make use of the analysis they had previously undertaken.

Then on page 4, in a general way, the issue areas that have to be looked at:

- division of responsibilities;
- the development of national standards;
- bilingualism/multiculturalism;
- asymmetrical federalism;
- aboriginal issues; and
- process/amending formula

are all issues that we think have developed that need analysis. Yes.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I like the look of the Reid proposal; in fact, I like all three parts of it. Given that we're spending more than \$1.3 million, I think doing the focus group at the end of it makes some sense, so we have a complete sense of research.

The only question I have is how we relate to the consultant once we hire him. It seems to me that this is too big a group to work with consultants, that we should look at maybe a small subcommittee, maybe three or four people, to work on the questionnaire. But I'm supporting the recommendation with the focus groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, on page 4. Might I suggest that there perhaps are two or three other items that we might want to consider including in the polling. The Charter of Rights was certainly an issue with a number of people, you know, in the context of adding, deleting, abolishing it, or maintaining it; the notwithstanding clause, deleting it or modifying its impact; and the general topic of institutional reform was also something that was . . . Senate reform, of course, free votes, fixed terms for elections, that sort of concept. I suppose also another area is the equality amongst regions, but that might be covered in a couple of the other topics above.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you're quite right. Certainly the Charter issues were raised. The other two you mentioned? I'm sorry, the . . .

MR. CHIVERS: Notwithstanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Notwithstanding, yes, and the institutional reform. Yes, very much so.

Yes, Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: I agree with those comments, but perhaps a subhead of institutional reform. I note there were a fair number of comments with respect to freedom of information. There were some opinions. So perhaps that might come under the heading of institutional reform. There are a number of things that I think might be added, but that would probably would be up to the committee.

MR. DAY: I might like to review *Hansard* just on that point. I recall some freedom of information type comments after certain members had tossed out the question, but I think we want to be looking at areas that were genuinely brought out in the first instance by people coming and presenting to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it could be a subset, but in a sense it would be Charter of Rights issues, I think. It would be a subset of a question of whether or not one would want to strengthen the Charter of Rights to include that. Barrie mentioned three points: abolishing, maintaining, and strengthening. So that would come into that subset, I would think.

MR. CHIVERS: Actually, there were four that I mentioned. There's the possibility of deleting too: deleting, maintaining, abolishing, or adding to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yes.  
Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: Again under institutional reform I think we could ask a question, or I would suggest to whoever's on the committee that one question be formulated around the issues of British parliamentary system of government or congressional style of government, because there was so much confusion as to what is it that people want as a form of government, could we mix the styles, and is that what they want? You know, I think that has to be clarified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, definitely that whole topic of institutional reform I think encompasses that issue, and such things as referenda, initiative, recall: all of those things fit into that broad category.

6:13

MRS. GAGNON: But I think people have to focus on what kind of government they want, and then these other things flow from that.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. If nobody else is on your list, there was one point that I neglected to make. At the top of page 4, the second item, "the development of national standards": I wonder if we shouldn't be a bit more focused in terms of what we're speaking of there. I can think of several topics that were repetitive at our hearings: education, health care, the environment. Perhaps we should focus that and give a bit more direction to the people that are preparing the questions.

MR. ANDERSON: I think we have to be fairly comprehensive on that question. Certainly health and education were two that

were mentioned. I think there are at least three possibilities we should be exploring with respect to national standards; that is, federal, provincial, or a collective standard established nationally by the provinces or in concert. We need to explore that area in some depth I think. I wouldn't agree that it would be just sort of education or health care. I think we need to look at environment and a number of others that were raised as well.

MR. CHIVERS: Yeah. I didn't mean to limit it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to have to be cautious, of course, because we can't ask every question under the sun. Each proposal, I think, will suggest 30 questions, so it's going to have to be carefully focused. I don't think we can add everything that we would perhaps like to do.

MR. ANDERSON: On that point then, Mr. Chairman, I think one important area is not just the traditional federal or provincial one but also that collective responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Collective, yeah. There's no doubt about it. We've had people say, on education for example, leave it entirely to the provinces and some people saying that the federal government has to have a much greater role and others saying that it has to be a shared process developed somehow. So I think we have to focus that way.

Okay. If nobody has anything to add, what about the recommendation itself relative to the particular Reid group? I think we should have a motion to accept the recommendation.

MRS. GAGNON: I'd like to hear from Garry, please, as to his rationale for selecting that particular group.

MR. POCOCK: Sure. I attempted to outline it in the memorandum. We were asked to invite four separate polling organizations to submit proposals. The University of Alberta's population lab do not feel that they would be able to undertake the polling at this time, which left us with the three. The first one I guess is Stratix Research. We reviewed their proposal. I also spoke to them by telephone on several occasions. My impression is that Stratix Research is more towards marketing reviews than they are for public opinion polling. They have an alliance with Environics, but I think right now it's in its formative stages. They've only had a very loose association for approximately six months. While Environics would be able to provide them with some assistance, it's not clear that we would have access first to the polling that Environics has done in the constitutional area or their expertise in designing those particular questions.

Then we reviewed between the Angus Reid group and the MarkTrend Research. Based on the discussion that the committee had at the last meeting, on the 6th, there was an indication that the committee would prefer to be able to use a polling organization that had a background in public opinion surveys and also that may be able to provide the committee with detailed information and polling results that they have already undertaken. That, of course, is where the Angus Reid group has the main benefit. The group will be able to provide immediately not only results of their surveys but also the committee can use those surveys to assist them in developing their own questions. So on balance we decided to go with Angus Reid. They were very close in terms of cost with the MarkTrend as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question with respect to the relationship of the budget. If we were to accept the Angus Reid, as I read the budget, the polling and studies would be a total budget now of \$65,000, and I think the Angus Reid proposal adds up to \$80,000 approximately.

MR. POCOCK: Yeah. That's with the focus group. It would be \$80,000, and then we would have put an additional amount in there. If the committee decides to go with that, we can adjust accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see. Okay, then. I'm sorry; I didn't quite understand that myself when I looked at it.  
Okay, John.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we approve parts A and B of the Reid proposal. Part C I think we can hang on to until we get closer to a final report. That's to take the committee's report and to have it tested before it's made public, which I think is a decision we could delay for some time. That's essentially the recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's a useful motion. Any questions or comments on that motion?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I can't hear very well down here. Can you tell us what part we wouldn't be pursuing right now, John?

MR. McINNIS: The focus testing. The proposal is to focus-test the committee's report before it's made public. We don't have a report to focus-test right now, so I suggest we make that decision when we have a report.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MS CALAHASEN: But I think one of the most important parts is to see whether or not we've written or at least are reporting what the people have been saying to us, the focus groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can come back to that as a decision. Any questions or comments on the motion then? Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I think we've had enough advice relative to the matter on page 4.

Now, the suggestion has been made that a subcommittee be established to work with the committee or to regroup in terms of drafting it. Once that subcommittee work has been accomplished, we would then want the whole committee to review the recommendation of the questions. So may I suggest that we have a subcommittee of at least four or five? That would permit roughly one from each opposition party and two or three from the government side to work on this.

MRS. GAGNON: I'm volunteering Sheldon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon has volunteered.

MR. DAY: I'd like to nominate either Pearl, Fred, Ken, Stan, Nancy, or Gary.

MS BARRETT: I'd like to nominate John.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. Well, listen; let's leave it. We don't have to establish the membership . . .

MR. McINNIS: Let's establish the number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The number. I would think that . . .

MR. SEVERTSON: Do you want a motion just for five?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Okay.

MR. SEVERTSON: I'll move that we have a committee of five.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody agreeable to that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And each party can nominate their own membership after appropriate consultation amongst their own members on the committee.

MRS. GAGNON: Is it understood that it's three Tories, one ND, one Liberal?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

Okay. Anything else on the polling proposals? We'll have to go to work on that pretty quickly, I would think, and the subcommittee will have to be established. We'll get that committee working.

Public hearings. We're now advised that there are 50 on the waiting list for Calgary, and my advice from Garry, and I think that's been our experience, is that that will require at least two and a half to three days.

MR. McINNIS: That's before we even announce it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's before we advertise any more.

Twenty-two people in Edmonton on the list, and that might be accommodated in one day. Of course, since we have a double committee, we can . . . That's four days there now. We have had the requests for the four additional communities: Wainwright, Peace River, Hanna, and Rocky Mountain House. I would think at this stage we wouldn't want to entertain any more locations, unless somebody has heard of any more than that, and I have not as chairman.

623

MS BARRETT: I'd agree to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we agree, then, that we would do Calgary, Edmonton, and those four other communities? They're fairly geographically distributed too, not bad: the north, central, east-southeastern, west.

MR. SEVERTSON: Rocky's a little on the west side.

MR. McINNIS: Rocky's on the list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: Where is the list?

MR. POCOCK: That's on the communications list.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, we had spoken last time about the possibility of working out some special accommodation for aboriginal peoples. I take it that by agreeing to those locations, we wouldn't be restricting the possibility of doing something like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have another item on the agenda, which has been circulated, relative to how they were dealt with. I'm going to come to that, I believe. We just received that, the treatment of aboriginal issues by other constitutional committees. I will come to that as a separate item.

Okay. Can we have a motion to the effect that we will do those communities?

MS BARRETT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam Barrett.

Any questions or comments? Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Now, dates. We've agreed on September.

MR. McINNIS: Later in September.

MR. SCHUMACHER: How about early September?

MR. ANDERSON: How about the middle of September, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Which September was that?

MS BARRETT: How about October?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me get just a general feeling. Would you be comfortable with the process as we did it before, where we took a solid week and did it that way, rather than one where we took a couple of days a week?

MS BARRETT: The former.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you prefer the former? So we should try and find one solid week in which to accommodate these additional hearings.

MS BARRETT: Yep.

MR. McINNIS: An eight-day week.

MS CALAHASEN: Nine.

MRS. GAGNON: On the 20th to the 28th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, something as we did before, but rather than just trying to chop it up into smaller segments. Okay? That I don't think needs a motion, but we've got consensus on that.

Now, the timetable.

MR. DAY: The week of the 9th . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: That makes it difficult for your vice-chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The week of the 23rd, it seems to me. Okay; I guess we could have . . .

MS BARRETT: We could have two separate committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could have 16 different opinions. Okay, Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I suppose this is getting somewhat academic. If we're going into September, perhaps it doesn't make much difference, but I'm still having problems figuring out how what we do is going to have any relevance in timing. If we're not going to get through hearings until late September, we're going to have to do a report. There's going to have to be some review of the report, and I understand the Premier has said the Leg. won't look at it until next year. How are we going to fit into what's actually happening? I mean, it seems we're almost on a cloud of our own here. I think maybe we should start to figure out where we need to be to have some impact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, this new mother of all committees that our federal friends are setting up is not proposing to start any of their process until September. So I don't think we need feel in any way that we're rushed to be done before they are, so to speak. In any event . . .

MR. CHUMIR: I kind of disagree with that because I think we should do something so that we can have input into that process. I suspect that process is going to be fundamentally important to the decision-making process. I think they're going to be right at the centre of what's happening across the country. If we're not in the position to provide input, they're going to come out with a report in February. We'll probably just be starting to talk about what our general direction is at the time their report is made public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, no. I think we will intend to not find ourselves in that position.

MR. CHUMIR: What would be the schedule? That's why I'm wanting to kind of get some focus on that. That's why it may make a bit of difference as to whether you do something September 9 instead of the 23rd. It's my view that the Legislature should deal with this in the fall for sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we're trying to find the most convenient times for members.

MR. McINNIS: Can I make a suggestion? I think what Sheldon's talking about is the timing of our final report, whereas the agenda item is actually the timing of the hearings. Can we deal with the hearings before we deal with . . .

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I'm throwing that in though, John, that it all backs up. There's an issue as to whether we intend to get this before the Legislature during the fall to have something to say before Christmas, because quite frankly, if you don't have anything to say before Christmas, we may very well be totally irrelevant. If you move a couple of weeks forward in September, it may make all the difference as to whether you can do something in the Legislature somewhat later in the fall. I personally don't care what time we do it in September.

MR. McINNIS: It's an interesting discussion. A lot of those things are beyond our control as a committee in that we don't

know when the Legislature will sit, but we do know that we have some hearings to schedule. I think that's what I'd like to do before we have that discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think it comes down to the week of the 9th or the 23rd. Now, in terms of your own individual preference or ability – we'll take a straw vote on this – how many people would prefer the earlier week, the 9th? Okay. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven . . . Pam, is your hand up for that?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eleven. How about the later? Okay, well, clearly the earlier week has the preference.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Both weeks are fine, so I voted twice.

MR. McINNIS: Is there a reason the in-between week is out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there is for our party. There's a major caucus session in there, so that would be very difficult to do.

MR. SCHUMACHER: We couldn't start like we did before, on the Friday and Saturday of the previous weekend?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the 6th and 7th? I can't.

MS BETKOWSKI: That's early for people with kids in school.

MRS. GAGNON: That's right after the long weekend. It's too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we can probably accomplish it in the week of the 9th to the 14th. I would guess that we could probably do that.

Okay. Yes, Pam.

MS BARRETT: Thanks. I don't want to leave the subject quite yet. Is there a possibility that if we were split approximately equal in numbers, one team could conduct hearings in the week of the 9th and the other team could conduct their hearings the week of the 23rd? Now, I know, for example, that one of my hon. colleagues, who probably wouldn't want to be named on record, said he voted twice because he didn't care. For example, that would bring the number of people indicating a preference to the second week in September . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not an unreasonable suggestion, to do that, providing we could get the proper mix of membership. I'm not so sure that we could do that.

MRS. GAGNON: Wouldn't it be terribly difficult for the staff to stretch it out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think it would make much difference to the staff. They have to be there one way or another.

MR. CHIVERS: Well, why don't we just ask again for who can do it the week of the 23rd?

6:33

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who could do it during the week of the 25th? Who could? I could. Nine. Okay, it's a doable proposition.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Anybody interested in committee B in the last week of August?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last week of August?

MR. SCHUMACHER: They don't like the long weekend.

MR. CHIVERS: We'd better check the 9th now then. Just make sure that that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We may have to shift our membership a little bit from the previous panel. Would you each give me the dates you can be available. Okay? We'll try and accommodate that that way.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. That's great.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Now, if we could only write the Constitution as easily as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we could take a look at the next item, which is Communications. It's being proposed that we not utilize television advertising and that we . . . Who will take me through this?

MS PARR: I'll take you through this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thanks. Speak up in a good, loud, clear voice.

MS PARR: Essentially television advertising hasn't been advocated, as the chairman has said. It was felt that the additional cost for television wouldn't generate a significant number of additional responses. I think it was very useful that the committee did two weeks of television advertising for the first round, and it really did assist in heightening awareness. But the awareness is there, and this is a proposal that would build on what already exists.

The recommendations are for a combination of public relations activities as well as paid advertising, with perhaps more emphasis in some ways on public relations than paid advertising. The advertising plan, if I could just look at that first, is to do an initial round of print and radio advertising to let people know about the deadline for registering for hearings. I think that's the most important message the public will want to know: that they have to decide by July 31, the date we've used here, if indeed they want to appear before the committee. Then the second round of advertising would be in the period just before the hearings to remind people that the hearings are taking place, that they can attend them, and just to raise awareness of the committee's work. If we go for two weeks, it will affect some of the way the media is bought at that point.

In terms of the public relations activities, what's being recommended is some fairly intensive work on behalf of yourselves in terms of publicizing the hearings through your offices and any mailings Members of the Legislative Assembly might be doing, in columns that appear in local newspapers, and just generally getting the word out over the summer months and particularly leading up to July 31. Posters: again we're advocating that they be printed and distributed widely.

Third, and perhaps most important, is another round of mailings of letters to organizations and groups and individuals that are on our mailing lists to let them know about the hearings. We found that when those letters were received by

groups, there was a corresponding increase in calls and registrations for the hearings. So we feel that's really quite an effective method for the committee to use to get their message out and invite people. There is a rather detailed media buy, and if anyone has any questions, I can certainly answer those.

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

MS BARRETT: Well, what I'm a little worried about is that if we go on a massive campaign again even without going TV, what are we going to do, folks, if we generate another level of excitement to the point where we can't accommodate everybody? Not that I don't want to accommodate everybody; I do. It's just that I wonder if the proposal is compatible with the numbers we're anticipating for capacity. That's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me just throw something in the air. I think this time we would have to emphasize the deadline . . .

MS BARRETT: For registering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . and that you can't expect to be heard if you don't let us know.

MS BARRETT: That allays some of my concerns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that will help considerably.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Okay.

MR. CHIVERS: The other thing that would help is that perhaps this time we could give people an incentive to register and provide us with briefs by saying that only in the event that there is any time left will there be any unscheduled presentations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think if we emphasize the deadline and say, "We're doing it again, but you've got to let us know by the end of July," and then they've got two months to prepare. We had some concerns about people not having enough time to prepare and so on. I think that's how we should key our advertising. That's my suggestion.

Now, there were some other speakers. I'm sorry. Dennis, then Barrie.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, along those lines, I would hope that in our first advertising barrage - and I'd be interested in hearing what that would include; if it's not television, does that mean radio and newspaper? - we not advertise times. I think one thing we could have organized maybe a bit more efficiently last time was that we advertised the times, so we had to be there for the times. There were places like Hinton where we could have in fact done two communities in that day if we'd known before what it was. I'd say we advertise the town or the city and that we're going to be there but not set the times until after we've received all of that and know what's happening.

MR. CHIVERS: My point is somewhat the same, because Judith had indicated the first message would be the July 31 deadline. I assume that would also include the dates of the hearings and the locations of the hearings but, as Dennis says, not the times.

MS PARR: That's right. And in fact the dates of the hearings only in the weeks the committee would be holding hearings and not Edmonton on such and such a date, so quite generic in that sense.

MS BARRETT: Ah, but would we do two sets of hearings? You're going to need to keep that in mind. If we have two separate committees, one the week of the 9th and one the 23rd, we have to tailor the advertising on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have the choice, if you want to be heard in the week of the 9th or in the week of the 23rd.

MR. ANDERSON: That, Mr. Chairman, could get complicated for the small centres. It would be fine for Edmonton and Calgary.

MS BARRETT: By the time we go the media, though, we should have it organized.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. I'm just saying: do we want to spend two days in Peace River?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. ANDERSON: So we wouldn't want to advertise both weeks for Peace River.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're quite right, Dennis, but we'll let the staff work that out. We would say, for example, that committee A will be the one that goes to Rocky Mountain House, and it will be on September 9. Committee B would be the one that goes to Peace River, and that will be on September 23. I think we can work that out. Okay?

MR. CHIVERS: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we'll have more flexibility in dealing with the Edmonton/Calgary situation. But that's a technical thing the staff can work on.

MR. CHUMIR: I have no problems with the proposed media approach, but I guess I have a question with respect to an item of production costs of \$25,000 for newspaper and radio spots. What would that encompass?

MR. PARR: That would be preparing all the copy and the artwork to be sent and couriered to all the papers. Some of the costs on the print side that might seem high are because there are so many weekly papers in so many different locations. Then, secondly, there are two separate radio advertisements being proposed. Both of those would require going into the studio, getting all the tapes made, and all of that.

6-43

MR. CHUMIR: I've been in concert promotion. I can't imagine \$25,000 in costs. [interjections] I'm just blown away by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's make sure we don't have to spend more than we have to, but if that's what we have to spend, I guess we have to. Okay? Let's go on that basis then.

Under Other I have three items. One is the issue regarding the motion for travel outside the province. I have prepared that.

I have it on notice, so that will have to be dealt with before the Assembly adjourns. That motion was discussed. It was felt by our caucus that we should not travel outside the province until we have heard from Albertans, until we've concluded that process. That will, I think, probably be the best. I think we'd be in a difficult position to do it otherwise. It's on notice now. I signed it today. Okay?

The other item I had was the subject of the analysis, and then finally I'd like to come to the aboriginal issues.

In the analysis, I'd like John to bring us up to date on where we are in his enjoyable task of figuring out what we're being told.

MR. McDONOUGH: The cards and letters are continuing to come in. At last count we had about 850 all told. That includes the first 440—some that we coded before we went away. While we were away, another 100 came in. Approximately 250 briefs from the hearings, though that does not include the people who spoke without briefs. So I don't in fact quite know how many additional people I have in that category, because we don't have all the *Hansards* and I haven't added them all up.

Since that we've had another 100 or so documents come in. So the process continues. We are coding the briefs, and as we have an opportunity, I'm taking the brief and matching it with the *Hansard* transcripts and adding that information. We're trying to handle it by individual. So if an individual sends a brief, makes a submission, has a phone call, it all is coded under one individual. We are trying to do this by counting individuals, not counting individual pieces of paper. Some people love to write, and one of the problems of knowing how many submissions we have duplicates of . . . We have additional submissions by our favourite presenters. We are trying to keep the matching process going. We are making progress. I am not going to do — unless instructed — another turnout of information until we have most of the hearings codified, and then we'll dump another several hundred people into the process and do another quick analysis. The analysis you've got so far is a brief analysis. There would be more complex analyses of that data coming in the future.

MR. CHIVERS: When might we expect that codification information to be available, John?

MR. McDONOUGH: I'm now beginning to look at about the second week in July. I was hoping for the end of this month, and that's no longer possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fairly reasonable, I would think, in view of the volume.

Any questions for John then?

MRS. GAGNON: Just to clarify. How many briefs in total do you think by now?

MR. McDONOUGH: Approximately 850 briefs. Now, that includes just single-page letters. Some of those are really brief briefs. Others are some of the documentation you've already seen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions for John?

All right. The next item is this issue of treatment of aboriginal issues, a document which you have received. You will note the last page of that document indicates the presentations we have received to date. You'll see that we've had five associa-

tions and six individuals who came forward as people who wanted to make specific representation relative to aboriginal issues. So that's actually pretty good. I'm quite pleased with that.

There's also a summary of how the issue has been dealt with by the other provinces. British Columbia has done, as you see, very little work on the overall issue to date, but they're going to issue a discussion paper as one of 25 papers which they are reviewing.

In Manitoba they just dealt with aboriginal issues in the same way as others, but they did have a round table discussion where they met with Ovide Mercredi — he, of course, has subsequently become the chief of the Assembly of First Nations — and then, of course, were addressed by a number of presenters, as we have had to date. They did have a meeting in a native community centre in Winnipeg. They didn't think it was necessary to adopt a special process.

Ontario: they did not have a special process but during the course of the hearings had a number of presentations, as we have had.

Quebec: I see that neither the Bélanger-Campeau commission nor the Allaire committee made special arrangements to handle aboriginal issues. I don't know what Allaire did, period, in terms of formulating their policy, because it was done without any public participation whatsoever that I'm aware of. It was strictly an internal party committee, and they had no public participation in that at all.

New Brunswick, on the other hand, has done quite a lot, with a special two-day full committee hearing, a full day of presentations from aboriginal groups, and a series of questions. The final report will have a section devoted to aboriginal issues.

Prince Edward Island: no special arrangements.

Nova Scotia: the process is not yet under way, but the native community's been asked to nominate one member to the committee.

I found it interesting, if I may just digress a bit, that the Nova Scotia government would have called on Eric Kierans to act as the chairman of their committee reviewing . . .

MR. BRADLEY: He lives in Halifax now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does he live in Halifax now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Still, I found it interesting considering his background and that of the government.

MR. SCHUMACHER: He's a good Liberal.

MRS. GAGNON: A very bright Liberal.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: An oxymoron. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MS CALAHASEN: That's good; an oxymoron.

MR. McINNIS: You mean like Progressive Conservative?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. We just left the House. We had enough of that earlier today.

The federal government is going to do something and may constitute a special subcommittee of the recently announced

joint parliamentary committee on the Constitution. Now, they may do that. So, I guess the question is: do we wish to do something in the nature of the New Brunswick approach, which was fairly comprehensive, or should we do what Ontario and Manitoba have done and what we have so far heard to date in terms of individual or group presentations just coming forward on that?

Pam.

MS BARRETT: I have a question. Did we do a massive mail-out to the bands and the Metis settlement associations? Okay.

6:53

MR. CHAIRMAN: The answer to that was a nod of the head, but for the *Hansard* record, it should indicate yes. You see, I've been in the courtrooms, and I know how to make sure it gets on the record. Right, Sheldon?

MR. CHUMIR: You betcha.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Well, maybe what we could do is target again for another mail-out, especially to all the bands and the locals and their political offices as well – their political offices tend to be concentrated, I think, in Edmonton and Calgary – and just see what the response is before we decide anything additional.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I guess we need to define what we're trying to achieve in this respect. Is it to give access to those who have concerns on this issue, or is it for us to gain a better understanding? Personally, I would like to have something for the latter purpose, and my own bias would be for another kind of round table session of the sort we had before this committee was structured where we have a number of leaders we can explore the issues with in some depth. I guess that depends on which we're trying to achieve there. If we're achieving access to the committee and all the opinions that want to come through the hearing process, as we are with everybody else, then we might want to consider that kind of round table meeting on one afternoon or one day.

MR. CHIVERS: I'd envisaged this as being somewhat wider than simply focusing on the leadership. It seems to me that we should be having an advertising message going out directly focused on the aboriginal community and using some of their communication devices so that we get input from a broader community rather than just leadership. We have already gone to the leadership of communities. That wouldn't exclude them from participating further in certain areas. It seems to me we should be trying to do the same thing we're doing with the rest of the province, which is to bring in ordinary people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Pearl, and then Bob Hawkesworth.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to speak on some of the process. I tend to agree with what Dennis is bringing out regarding the information and our purpose as to what it is that we're trying to do. Speaking as an aboriginal person, I find that in most cases we'll get very few people who will come out to the kinds of forums we have because of the feedback I've been getting on the kinds of gruelling questions that come from individuals within our area, even though we're trying to find out some more information about aboriginal feelings. The one thing I've been getting a lot of is that if we

are truly interested in finding out what the aboriginal position is on a number of issues, we should become more knowledgeable of the issues that are plaguing the native people. I think Dennis's recommendation there would be a really good one for us to follow, where we become better informed of the issues which I think impact everything in terms of the Constitution and the aboriginal people.

The other one is access. As I said, most of the people were saying that they would not come forward and present their cases because presently they're really not that prepared to make the kind of presentations that this group seems to say we have to have. What I think they would like, from the feedback I've been getting, is maybe having us attend either what they call their Treaty 8 or Treaty 7 or Treaty 6 or even for us to write a special kind of letter to the people asking them if they would be willing to host us or a group of us and be able to go out and talk to the people on a second round basis.

MR. DAY: In just one location you're saying?

MS CALAHASEN: Maybe even a north and a south, in that fashion. I've just been hearing from the northern part of the province. I haven't heard anything from the south. There might be some sort of a different thrust from the south.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Bob Hawkesworth.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the comments that Pearl and Dennis have been making here, that we should give some thought to maybe a separate or a different kind of process than us sitting at a table and people coming forward and making briefs one after another. I appreciated also having Chief Whitney's suggestion circulated again. I don't know whether there's been any chance to clarify this question with him or not of whether he was speaking on behalf of the treaty chiefs in the province when he suggested that they establish amongst themselves a committee that would then, in a way, act almost like an ongoing committee that could discuss these questions and present it perhaps even to the point of being able to arrive at a common position between the chiefs and this committee. I recognize that that's not the only aboriginal group or organization or peoples that we have to concern ourselves with. I was just wondering if there had been any opportunity to clarify that and if there might be an opportunity there as well to establish something a little bit different in the process of consultation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. There hasn't been any follow-up in the committee, but there's certainly a possibility that we could. I think it would require almost a letter from me as chairman, perhaps, to the leadership organization here within the province to see whether or not that suggestion had their support. He did make some interesting suggestions. And then perhaps say: is there a way we can, during the two-week period we're talking about, find a mechanism where we can get some targeted input from aboriginal groups? I'd be prepared to do that. But that doesn't answer the concerns other people have raised about the formidable nature of appearing before eight members of the Legislature, or 16, whatever. If we could do it on a more relaxed and informal basis, I think that's what Pearl is really suggesting.

John.



MR. McINNIS: I would suggest that somebody – maybe it's already been done – talk to the New Brunswick people a bit further about how they went through their various events. I hear a few people talking about a meeting in the north and a meeting in the south which is not necessarily a public hearing in the sense that we've had, and I like that. It seems to me that everybody who's addressed aboriginal questions wanted to do something. Whether it was to clarify the status in the Constitution, resolve land claims, or whatever, there was almost a consensus on that point. I'm suggesting that we try to get some clues from some of these other organizations on how they conducted their meetings and try for a less structured meeting somewhere in the north and one somewhere in the south at some time in that two-week period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, let me follow up on that.

MRS. GAGNON: I hope it's not either/or. I really like Pearl's suggestion that some members of the committee make themselves available at the invitation of a group in the north and the south to go on their turf, on their terms, according to their schedule, whatever. I think that's really good. That doesn't stop anyone from coming forward to our committee if they wish. You know, there's another option. And then maybe having a special day or something set up on our terms that would be exclusive to aboriginal peoples. There may be three alternatives there or even four different ways that we could seek that kind of advice.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Fred.

7:03

MR. BRADLEY: In this idea about meeting north and south we have three treaties that cover the province – Treaty 6, Treaty 7, and Treaty 8 – so we may break it down by treaty, and we may look at meeting with the chiefs of the different treaty organizations. They often get together. That may be an opportunity to discuss that type of an arrangement also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can't forget the Metis settlements groups.

MR. McINNIS: And the non-treaty chiefs as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. There have been some useful suggestions. May I suggest that we work on it, that we try to encourage the identifiable leadership group that is more sophisticated and that, you know, would want to come forward – then they're well prepared with legal counsel and all that sort of stuff to now come forward – but that we also explore the invitational concept that Pearl has raised there, see if they want to invite us or even a smaller subcommittee to just come and discuss in a more informal way some of their issues. There's one option.

MR. CHIVERS: With the larger group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We must be clear that there are three treaties, and we have now established the Metis settlements.

MS CALAHASEN: Right. I was going to say don't forget the Metis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, no. There are really four key aboriginal groups, I think, in Alberta.

I think we also have to keep in mind that our situation in Alberta is vastly different than it is in our neighbouring province of British Columbia, for example, and I know the New Brunswick situation is also very, very different from what we face here. So I think we have to tailor our approach to the Alberta scene. I'll take these suggestions and try and put them into a draft letter to the treaty groups, the Metis Association group and see if we can explore the various ways that they would like to come before us or be in contact with us.

Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Maybe even in advance of a letter from you some of our staff folks could just informally or verbally ask ahead of time some advice or suggestions from some of the organizations around the province, if they have some thoughts they'd like to suggest. Just very informally before you contact them in writing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Yes, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, I still have some concerns in terms of opening up the process in terms of the aboriginal communities. It seems to me that it would be useful to focus some of the advertising specifically on attempting to involve other people other than just focusing on advertising to the leadership. It seems to me that that was a point that was made by a couple of individuals during our hearings. I think it's an important point to bear in mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, are we using the native news media papers and so on? I hope we are advertising in them.

MR. CHIVERS: But what I'm saying is that I hope our message is that it's not just going to be a leadership sort of a situation, that if other people wish to come in, they should be involved through a specific invitation directed at them, not just at the leadership.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we can look at that suggestion, too, very easily. Well, that's been a very useful discussion, and I appreciate your advice on that.

The next thing I have on the agenda is a date for the next meeting. Unless there's something unusual or remarkable, I think what we have to do is have the subcommittee deal with the issue of polling. Then once that's been dealt with, we would bring the group together again for final approval, and maybe that could be done at the call of the Chair in consultation with the various caucuses. Would that be suitable?

MR. ANDERSON: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It may not be possible to get everybody together during the months of July and August, although if we're still in session in mid-July, by then we could have another meeting.

MR. CHIVERS: We could set a date just so we have a target to aim at, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAY: August 10.

MS CALAHASEN: Yeah, that's a good day to finish.

MRS. GAGNON: For the polling group you mean? The subgroup?

MR. McINNIS: For the end of session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, let's leave it the way I suggested, though. We'll get the subcommittee structured, we will then have a meeting on that, and then we'll get the group together at the call of the Chair.

Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: Can we designate somebody to Chair the subcommittee so we have an organizing person? One of yours?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it will be, and whether or not I do it is something I want to discuss with my caucus colleagues.

MR. McINNIS: But you'll delegate somebody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There will be, yeah.

Can I have a motion to adjourn? Stock Day. Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The committee adjourned at 7:09 p.m.]