

1:39 p.m.

Monday, July 15, 1991

[Deputy Chairman: Mr. Schumacher]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the committee would come to order, our 1:30 meeting will commence. Stock has mentioned he has to leave a little bit before 3 to go to the dentist, so if we could try to aim for . . . I don't know how long your presentation is.

MR. CAMERON: Well, there's enough data here to go on all day, but I'll try to breeze through it.

MR. DAY: Sheldon will stick around for it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In any event, as I understand the situation, we've got Bruce Cameron from Angus Reid Group to give us a little background on work they've already done, which I believe is one of the reasons your proposal was accepted, because you have done a lot of this work already. I believe I'm speaking fairly on behalf of the committee when I say that we want to test out some of the things we heard in our hearings to see whether in fact we had an accurate representation of Albertans' points of view in our hearings. I don't think we did, but that's only my personal opinion. I think we all agree we would like to have that done, and therefore I guess we would like to give you a sense of what we're interested in in preparing a set of questions for the population of Alberta a month or so from now. It may be six weeks or two months.

MR. CAMERON: Sure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that's the background on which we'll start.

MR. McINNIS: Well, I think it's accurate to say we heard many conflicting views at the hearings. It might be a matter of sorting out which ones have what degree of support.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So with that, I guess the area that is most in people's minds around here is this business of centralization or decentralization, or the division of powers: whether there should be a change in the division; whether Albertans feel there should be some change or whether the status quo should . . .

MR. CAMERON: Well, it's similar to committee meetings. Depending upon how you ask the question, you get many conflicting responses on an issue. We approached it from a number of different angles. I'll try to show you the breadth of the information we collected and highlight some of the key dimensions so that the committee can decide where it makes sense to replicate those and pose questions in the Alberta context and where you might want to customize the questions or change them in a certain direction. So what I'm going to do is first of all go through . . . This is the outline of the presentation.

The Overview of Study Objectives. I think everybody here knows what the study objectives are. The mandate of the committee obviously is to consider the state of the Canadian federation and consult with the people of Alberta on constitutional options and issues. The actual research task we set out in the research proposal: that it will accurately and objectively

record the opinions of all Albertans toward various ideas on constitutional reform. Now, that will involve asking questions about the division of powers, the importance of national standards in areas of provincial jurisdiction, as well as how Albertans' attitudes differ from other Canadians' on key issues such as aboriginal participation in the process, language rights, the amending process, and fiscal and institutional reforms. So there are a number of areas to cover. What I'm going to do is walk quickly through the process by which we intend to conduct this study and then review the national unity study and the western Canada study. I'll describe both those studies when we go into some of the details on financing we had on those studies.

I'll talk briefly about some implications we see for Alberta as it relates to the committee's tasks, and then I have some suggested question areas. I've got copies of the questionnaire. I believe they were included in the documents you received, with the exception of the western Canada study. I think that questionnaire was separate. So we'll go through that quickly and just highlight some of the questions I think it would be useful to ask again so you get some kind of national benchmark to compare it with.

MR. ANDERSON: Bruce, are you saying that in addition to these books we have questions, or are you talking about the questions in these?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. I believe the questionnaire is appended to the national unity study there. But it's not in the document which has the options for western Canada; the questionnaire for that was bound separately. So you have one questionnaire there, but the other questionnaire which will form part of the core isn't there. I can supply that to the committee. I have copies here.

MR. CHUMIR: Yes, please.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

So the process we suggested was to review public opinion data on constitutional issues and attitudes in Canada, focusing on the difference between Albertans and other Canadians - and we'll try to do that today - and then draft a survey 20 minutes in length. That allows for approximately 60 question items. It's going to be a considerable task to get to that point. For instance, the national unity study was a 35-minute questionnaire; the western Canada study was a 25-minute questionnaire. If we combine some of those questions and add some of your own questions, we're looking at a fairly lengthy survey instrument. So keep in mind that we have to keep it to 20 minutes but still have to incorporate some of the specific concerns of the committee.

MR. McINNIS: Just on that point, would it be possible to split the sample in some circumstances so we could get more than 60 questions out of a 20-minute instrument?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, that is possible, especially with the sample size of 1,200. You could split the sample and still get an accurate cross section.

Let's look first of all at the national unity study. The methodology, quite briefly, is that we conducted 2,512 surveys on the telephone. It was done the first two weeks of May this year and the very last part of April, and the sample was distributed across all regions of the country. We made sure we had enough sample from each region to look at that region. When we talk about the national data, we weighted it back so that it's the national

proportion. For instance, the Alberta data got weighted back to 218 even though there were 301 actual surveys completed. The margins of error are there. They are quite low because the sample size is quite large.

The research inquiry on the national unity study covered a lot of different issues. First of all, we talked about attachment to the country, the mood of the country, and how people felt on a very emotional and personal level about the country. Then we talked about getting to the table and the context and process issues involved. We also went into the various components of negotiating a constitutional deal, talked about the Quebec independence scenario in Quebec specifically and how other Canadians outside of Quebec felt about that, and issues that arise out of negotiating Quebec's independence and what would be included, what wouldn't, and what the implications would be.

Finally, we did a psychographic segmentation of English-speaking Canada and Quebec. Now, this really became the core of a lot of the results we talked about, because using that approach we can segment people according to shared attitudes. Then when you look at issues such as deal-making or constitutional arrangements, you can see why some people are much more hard line in certain areas than others, because they're motivated by a different set of values and attitudes. We did recommend that for this study because of the time limit, although we can incorporate some attitudinal dimensions, and I'll suggest that at the end of this presentation.

First of all, the mood of the country. One of the traditional questions we typically asked, and I don't think we'll get all of it on this here, is sort of the public opinion agenda. This shows a lot of different issues. I won't go into a lot of detail on it, but basically the main point here is that concerns about national unity from February '88 all the way through to May - that says actually 46 percent - have risen quite dramatically in the last, say, six months. Other issues have gone up and down. You can see concerns about free trade and then they dissolve away and there's not much mention, although they're appearing slightly stronger now because the concern is about international free trade, the tripartite agreement. The issues jump up here in September 1990. But the main issue is that the concern that was expressed previously about Meech Lake in and around July 1990 is now surfacing as a more general national unity problem. These are unprompted answers that people give us. We asked what the major issues of the day are, and these are the kinds of things people say. Now, we would recommend that that question be included because it gives you a signpost to say that the Constitution is on the top of people's minds, or national unity or however people are phrasing the debate.

1:49

One of the things that shows the mood of the country: we've compared with some data back to 1980 when we asked a few different questions, and this was in Quebec, Quebec public opinion on some key aspects of the national unity debate. We asked: how much do you agree or disagree with the statement, "I feel profoundly attached to Quebec"? Now, you don't see much movement between 1980 and 1991. Basically two-thirds of Quebecers believe strongly that they are profoundly attached to Quebec. What you do see, though, is a decline in the percentage of people who say they feel profoundly attached to Canada, from 56 percent saying they strongly agree in 1980 to 30 percent in 1991. Another statement associated with that is, "I feel more attached to Canada than I do to Quebec." You see that the proportion strongly disagreeing has risen from 26 to 39 percent. In general that reflects the mood of Quebec, although

there are some definite differences within the Quebec electorate on that. We segment the people according to their attitudes, and you'll see later that there are some key federalist groups in Quebec.

Now, there are a lot of statements here. We used these kinds of statements, and I won't go into a lot of detail on them because we don't really have time. We investigated a lot of myths and misconceptions Canadians have. We went down a list of a number of different statements. Two here really illustrate the difference between English Canada, in this column here, and Quebec, in this column here. The Quebec government tramples on the rights of English citizens in that province: well, 76 percent of English Canadians outside of Quebec agree with that; they think the Quebec government does that. Only 28 percent inside Quebec feel that way. On the other side of the coin, 27 percent of English Canadians think Quebecers feel humiliated by Meech Lake, whereas Quebecers themselves, two-thirds, said they feel humiliated by the failure of Meech Lake and what they see as a rejection of Meech Lake. So I think those two dimensions are important.

A lot of the debate is being fueled by images and emotions portrayed through the media, and that doesn't often always reflect what people individually are thinking. We picked that up. A couple of years ago we did a survey - in fact, it was about a year ago - where we asked whether people thought other Quebecers were in favour of independence, and those Quebecers, about 62 percent, said yes, they were. When we asked, "Personally, are you in favour of having independence?" it was only 45 percent. I think that illustrates the fact that some issues are being driven by the media and by the intellectuals in that province and the nationalist agenda.

One of the things we asked about in this national unity study was public opinion on the roots of the difficulties we now face. What this shows is that we asked whether people think the constitutional difficulties we face are the result of systemic flaws, whether they are due to policies of Mulroney's Conservatives, or whether it's just incompatibility between Quebec and English Canada. In Canada as a whole, the majority think it's systemic flaws, and that's true both in English Canada and in Quebec, although it's much more pronounced in Quebec. In Quebec they're much more likely to think that the system itself is wrong or has failed rather than the Conservatives or some kind of incompatibility. I think it's encouraging to note that even in English Canada only 17 percent say the current difficulties are due to some kind of irreconcilable incompatibility between English Canada and Quebec.

In terms of getting to the table, context and the process, we asked people on an unprompted basis to give us what they thought were the constitutional issues for negotiation. This is what came up when you compare English regions to Quebec. In total, some of the issues were Quebec's future, national union in general, provincial equality, native rights, the economy, language concerns. You can really see some of the differences here between English regions and Quebec. When you look at something like native aboriginal issues, 23 percent of English Canadians feel that is one of the constitutional issues that's up for negotiation; only 9 percent of people in Quebec felt that. Similarly, when you look at language concerns, it's much more pronounced in Quebec. Twenty-three percent say that language concerns are on the table or that's part of the negotiations. Only 12 percent in English Canada say that.

So there are some differences in terms of what is actually at stake here, what is going to be negotiated. We asked people for their reaction as well to Quebec's upcoming referendum. This

was prior to Bourassa's statement that seems to make it unclear whether it's actually going to take place or not. We asked whether negotiations should move quickly, whether proposals should be prepared, whether the talks should begin with no deadline or nothing should be done. Most people in Quebec, 60 percent, say move quickly; it has to be done right now and has to be done very quickly. The rest of the country is much more split in terms of a need for moving quickly. Thirty-six percent of English Canadians say: prepare a proposal for negotiations; we don't need to move too quickly on the whole issue. So it is somewhat split in terms of what the timetable is.

I won't go into these issues except to say that in the survey we're about to do, it might be useful to talk about some of the key process issues such as a constituent assembly and a national referendum. We have some information on that. The way we asked about it was whether it was a good idea or a bad idea basically, and that shows English Canada versus the rest of Quebec, broken up by demographics there. I'll summarize some of the data on this chart here.

First of all, on the issue of a constituent assembly, most Canadians, 66 percent, approve. That's true as well in Quebec. It's 57 percent in Quebec, so there's still support for that notion. In terms of a national referendum, 68 percent nationally approve of some kind of national referendum, and again there's majority support in Quebec, although it's lower than it is in the rest of Canada.

On the issue of provincial unanimity, the opinion of total Canadians is that 58 percent say all provinces should have to ratify the Constitution. In Quebec that's more split; it's half and half. So there is some slight difference in Quebec.

You can really see the difference between Quebecers and English Canadians when you're asked this question: "Whose interests should your Premier put first? Should your Premier put Canada's interests first or your province's interests first?" You see almost three-quarters of English Canadians saying it should be Canada's interests first and not their province's interests. In fact, that would suggest that the province's interests could be subordinated to the national interest, such as Peterson attempted to do during the Meech Lake negotiations. In Quebec three-quarters of people say their province should be put first before Canada.

MR. ANDERSON: Is it broken down by region in the English portion of that?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, and it's fairly consistent across the country. Throughout the country it's around that; there are no major differences.

Now we'll talk about some of the negotiations: negotiating the constitutional deal; the support for different constitutional options. Well, in English regions the status quo seems to be more desirable than it is in Quebec. Maintaining the status quo is not an option in Quebec.

Renewed federalism is popular in both the English regions and Quebec, and that's one issue that we thought was positive and created some optimism about the whole issue. I think English Canadians, Canadians in the rest of Canada, are looking at serious changes that have to be made to renew federalism, and they're willing to entertain those rather than just go with the status quo.

MR. McINNIS: Because these don't add to a hundred, I'm curious what the question was. Which of these are viable options? Is that the . . . You can pick more than one obviously.

MR. CAMERON: Well, actually we asked each option and asked the level of support for each option. Basically, a number of different options are being discussed in terms of Canada's future constitutional structure. I'm going to read you a list of these options, and for each one I'd like you to tell me if you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose the option.

1:59

The first option is: "The same system of federalism as we have today," the status quo. They can support or oppose that.

"A renewed federal system with completely new [distribution of] powers" between the federal government and the provinces. That's this renewed federalism here.

"Special constitutional status for Quebec." Of course that's supported in Quebec, not in the rest of Canada.

"Sovereignty association with Quebec as independent country" but economically associated with Canada. So sovereignty association and economic association is favoured in Quebec and is a nonstarter in English-speaking Canada.

"A completely independent Quebec" with no formal ties with Canada. In Quebec that is not a preferred option, nor is it in English regions.

MR. McINNIS: Those would be the totals of strongly and somewhat on either side . . .

MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

Then we ask this contentious question that Sheldon has already raised with me. On public opinion on the division of powers, the question we asked was: suppose we were to hold a special constitutional conference and redraft the Constitution of Canada. Which of the following options would you prefer to see?

A substantial reduction in federal powers with these given to all the provinces.

The same arrangement between the provinces and the federal government that exists today.

A substantial increase in federal powers with these taken from the provinces.

In Canada as a whole you could see that between - we've got February when we asked this question, and we've got May as well. We have a number of signposts on this feedback at the time. About half of Canadians, given that option, would choose to devolve federal powers to the province rather than opt for the status quo or increase federal powers. In English Canada it's not as pronounced as it is in Quebec. You can definitely see that 44 percent of people in English Canada say devolve federal powers to the provinces, 33 percent opt for the status quo, and 17 percent say increase the federal powers. Six percent say they don't know. It's very clear in Quebec that three-quarters of Quebecers would opt for devolution of power. When we segment the study, there are some Canadians who do support that devolution of power to the provinces, but the catch is that that would take place with national standards in place to ensure that there are set standards adhered to throughout the country.

Now, we asked about this issue of public support for the devolution of jurisdictional powers in a number of different areas as well, and this next series of charts show that.

We asked whether the devolution of powers to Quebec for health care has to be in the round of negotiations, whether it has to be included in a new deal, whether there's no way that could be included. "Must be" is the dark purple part; that's basically things people feel have to be there. The aqua shows the proportion who say, "No way; that should not be in there."

So that's the hard line on either side of that issue. What you want to look at is the middle ground here, which says, "Well, we could accept it," or "You could leave it out." That's where the room for negotiation comes in. You can see that on the issue of devolving health care powers to Quebec, in English regions there are a lot more people saying, "No way; that shouldn't be." In fact, that's consistent across. You've got the English region at the top and Quebec on the bottom for all these.

MR. McINNIS: So, Bruce, is the question here whether they should be devolved or whether they should be negotiated?

MR. CAMERON: The issue is whether these powers should be devolved to the province in any new Constitution. We asked, first of all, about health care, if the power were devolved to Quebec only, and then if all provinces had the same power. What we see is really that in English regions there is no great difference between the attitudes about whether Quebec should get that power or whether the rest of the provinces should get that power. There's a fair bit of room for movement on that, but there is a significant proportion, about a third, saying no way, that there's no way that should happen.

Basically, the way to look at this is that this is the issue of health care. You can see that between Quebec and the English regions there is a lot more support for having that in there, for having that power devolve to the provinces. The same thing with language. It's very pronounced with language. If Quebec gets complete power over language issues, it wouldn't sit well with a lot of English Canadians, because a large proportion would say no way. However, Quebecers are also saying that has to be in there.

So that's one of the key flash points, I think, in terms of the negotiation. That's really going to highlight it. There's a great demand for it in Quebec and there's a great resistance to it in the rest of English Canada. If it was to all provinces, there is slightly greater room for movement in the English regions - you can see a little greater hatched area there - but it's still not widely supported.

In terms of natural resources, that's another area which, with the James Bay project on the front burner, could become quite a flash point, because a large proportion - over 50 percent - of English Canadians think there's no way that Quebec should have complete control over natural resources, and in Quebec it's seen to be something that they have to have in a Canadian Constitution. If all provinces got it, you can see that the English Canadians start to become more flexible on the issue. In fact, they're not quite as supportive of it, though not as hard-line on it. I think that in some ways that is the trade-off, and that's one of the areas we tried to explore in this study: where was there a perceived room for movement on these issues and where were the areas that were going to be very contentious because English Canadians didn't want to see Quebec get those powers?

MR. DAY: Bruce, in your previous graph that showed February, I think, it talked about people supporting an increase in federal powers. It was at 21 percent in February, and then it dropped to . . .

MR. CAMERON: Seventeen percent.

MR. DAY: Seventeen. So it dropped to 17 percent of Canadians saying increase federal powers in a general sense. Were there any conclusions drawn by you folks on why that dropped another 4 percent in a fairly short period of time there?

MR. CAMERON: Well, unless we do another survey and find that it's dropped another four percentage points, I wouldn't put a lot of emphasis on that four-point drop. It's directional, but it's not very significant. It is a movement in that direction. If you saw a trend, then we would take a look at it. If it is a trend, I would say it's probably because the debate that's currently going on is whether or not Quebec can have these powers and, therefore, by giving all provinces some of those powers . . . I think that's becoming debated more and more. I think that's why people are maybe talking about it and maybe changing their mind on the issue of decreasing federal powers.

We asked it in a number of other areas too. I'll just go through a couple of them. On the environment: whether it had to be in there or whether it should be excluded, it shouldn't be devolved to Quebec. English Canadians really - I think when you look at that James Bay project, there is going to be some resentment if Quebec flouts the federal environment review. There's a lot of concern that if Quebec gets even more powers over the environment, that won't be a good thing. In Quebec there's not even majority support for having that as something that has to be in the deal.

In terms of communications the same pattern exists on a lot of these areas, and it really shows, with the exception of income supplements here. That's with the social policy, where you see that really you don't have much support in Quebec for having that as a totally provincial responsibility.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That's where the money is.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. There's no money in it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They think there is.

2-09

MR. DAY: Bruce, with the communications question. Is that broken, first of all, into the western region? When that question was being asked, are people saying that in light of language type communications . . .

MR. CAMERON: No. It's control over radio broadcasting and issues of that sort.

MR. McINNIS: That

Quebec would have total control in the area of communications, including the power to determine who would be permitted to operate radio and television stations and in what language.

MR. DAY: That was the question?

MR. McINNIS: So powers that the CRTC currently has.

MR. DAY: What page is that on? I want to see it.

MR. McINNIS: It's on page 8 in the appendix at the back, the questionnaire.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Of the Canada national unity study.

MR. DAY: You can go on there. I just wanted to . . .

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Now, there wasn't much agreement there between English regions and Quebec on what has to be there and what has to be excluded, but when you get to issues like minority language protection, you find that there is support

in both English regions and Quebec for minority language protection. There's also support for a binding Charter of Rights and for a reformed Senate in English regions, but the issue of reforming the Senate is more debatable in Quebec. Aboriginal self-government again is about the same between English regions and Quebec. On the issue of distinct society, that's another stumbling block here. Most Quebecers, two-thirds, think it has to be in there, and about half of Canadians think there's no way that can be in the deal. There may be some room for movement there, however.

This is an interesting one. It's in pretty small type. I'll just go through it and read it to you. Quebecers' reaction to the three possible constitutional demands from English-speaking Canada: we asked whether, if the rest of Canada offered Quebec an acceptable deal in exchange for changing Bill 178 to permit other languages on signs as long as French appears as well, you would be prepared to agree to that, or would you reject the proposal if it required Quebec to agree to that? It's the issue of what connections are Quebecers going to trade off on. On the issue of Bill 178, 61 percent of Quebecers agreed they would be willing to give on that if it involved reaching an agreement with the rest of Canada. On the issue of allowing Quebecers to educate their children in English, 56 percent of Quebecers agreed that would be fine; they could give that up in return for an agreement they felt comfortable with.

Making all of Quebec's laws subordinate to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is a little less clear. Forty-seven percent of Quebecers agreed that they would be willing to do that, and you've got 42 percent who rejected; 11 percent said no. Really, the issue of Bill 178, which expires - what? in 1993 I think - is something which may be an area that a lot of Quebecers would be willing to give up if they saw that there were guarantees for language rights in other areas of the constitutional deal.

Now, it talks directly about the independence. We asked the independence question in Quebec in two different ways. Quebecers' support for a referendum on Quebec independence: basically, we said that if a referendum were held tomorrow, would you vote for or against Quebec becoming a completely independent country with no guarantees of political or economic ties with Canada. Fifty-two percent said they would vote against it if there are no ties, no associations there. We also asked: when did you become in favour of Quebec independence; was it before Meech Lake or after Meech Lake? Seventy-three percent said it was before Meech; only 26 percent said after Meech. So it doesn't seem that that was a very dramatic turning point for a lot of people. A lot of people's minds had already been made up before that. Twenty-six percent is still a sizable chunk of opinion.

The most interesting thing to note here on the issue of voting for or against independence is this: you see by age that the core of people who going to vote against independence are 55 and older. In the segmentation we found that as well, that the younger, growing groups are more in favour of independence. The older groups that are still there are in favour of some kind of arrangement with Canada.

MR. McINNIS: This is not the favourite option though; sovereignty association would be.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

We asked people on an unaided basis to give some perceived benefits of Quebec independence. In English regions most people said they couldn't see any, not surprisingly. In Quebec

only 23 percent said they couldn't see any benefits. Some of the benefits they mentioned were more control over language, more control over the economy, more control over natural resources, maintaining French culture, less dependence on English Canada. The only mention that really came up with any degree was ending the fighting and moving on, finally ending the whole issue rather than endlessly debating it in English Canada. I think there's a bit of fatigue on the whole issue.

MR. McDONOUGH: The vote for independence, which was at 52 percent: how does that break down between Francophone and Anglophone in Quebec?

MR. ANDERSON: That was just Quebec, wasn't it?

MR. CAMERON: That was just Quebec.

MR. McDONOUGH: Okay. But do you break it down between Francophone and Anglophone?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, we do. I don't have it on this page. In fact, one of the segments we came up with is very much an Anglophone segment. They're committed federalists. Obviously, they're very . . .

MR. McDONOUGH: The Francophone segment is quite a bit higher than 52.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

What I'll do now is just move on to views regarding what Canada should do if Quebec votes for sovereignty. We've got measures between February and May '91. We asked people:

Suppose that a referendum in Quebec on sovereignty received majority approval and Quebec declared itself a [sovereign nation].

What should the rest of Canada do?

Should the rest of Canada

begin negotiations to establish an economic union with Quebec and resolve issues such as Quebec's share of the national debt?

Introduce economic sanctions against Quebec including the withholding of equalization payments?

Or, ignore the declaration of [sovereignty] and use . . . force if necessary?

Now, in May of '91 this very small proportion of people - only 5 percent - would advocate the use of force. Most people - 70 percent - say, "Begin negotiations to establish an economic union." Now, that's considerably higher in Quebec; 84 percent said that as soon as that happens negotiations should be started. I think there's some reticence in English Canada on whether or not it's a foregone conclusion that there's going to be some kind of economic association after they decide that they no longer want to be part of Canada.

This here shows the reaction on contentious issues surrounding Quebec independence between English and French in Quebec. Basically, the question on the area of share of defence is worded such as:

If Quebec were voted for independence, do you think Canada and Quebec should have a joint defence department, or should an independent Quebec establish its own military?

This shows that 30 percent of people in English regions think that there should be some kind of shared defence; 59 percent of Quebec think there should be some kind of shared defence. That is a pretty standard pattern across the board, that there's a much higher proportion in Quebec who feel that there should be some kind of sharing of the burden of separation rather than

Quebec accepting, for instance, its 18 percent of the national debt. Sixteen percent of Quebecers said they should take 18 percent of the national debt – that's not surprising – only 25 percent in English Canada.

2:19

On the issue of economic union, however, there is majority support in English regions for some kind of economic union even if they decide to go, but it would have to be negotiated. It's not just a foregone conclusion; it's out of habit.

This is an interesting one, too, because it says: in the anticipated spirit of constitutional negotiation, will the other side be willing to compromise or take a hard line? Well, in English regions most people are anticipating that Quebec is going to take a hard line, and not many people, only 27 percent, say that Quebec is going to be willing to compromise. In Quebec that opinion is split on whether or not the rest of Canada will take a hard line or be willing to compromise. So there's much more hesitancy on the part of English Canadians to be saying, "I think they are going to be taking a hard line; therefore, our side should probably take a hard line." I mean, we've got a split here in English regions between whether English Canada should take a hard line in negotiations or be willing to compromise. In Quebec most people say they would be willing to compromise, probably because they looked for more out of any kind of arrangement after separation.

MR. ANDERSON: In that graph is there a breakdown in the English regions on taking a hard line or not?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

MR. ANDERSON: Is there much difference between them?

MR. CAMERON: I can't recall offhand. I've got the tables, but I can't recall.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. We can find them later.

MR. CAMERON: What we did was segment English Canadians into a number of different segments according to their shared attitudes, and we also did the same with Quebecers to see what different pockets of public opinion there were. I won't go into the English-speaking segments because I think the western Canada study covers them much better; it's much more directly applicable to Alberta.

The Quebec society splits into five segments based on constitutional mind-sets. The first and most obvious are the Committed Nationalists, and they're 23 percent. These people are, as the name would suggest, committed to separation: independence at any cost. It's a cause for them. It's not anything that they deal with on a pragmatic or a practical basis. It's very much a cause. On the other side there are some supporters, Nationalist Supporters, who lean towards independence but are still concerned about the economic arrangements that would be made and are not willing to go for total independence if it means a total break with the rest of Canada and therefore a decline in standard of living as a result.

There's this group here of Perplexed Quebecers who are fairly young; they're mainly Francophone, and this is where the debate is going to be played out in Quebec. This group is really not clear about what English Canada wants and is searching around. They hear a lot of rhetoric from both sides, mainly from the nationalist side, but they also hear what they perceive

as rhetoric from the federalist side about the benefits of federalism. If it affects them economically and directly, then they're going to be swayed one way or another, but in a way they're thinking their hearts are with Quebec and their minds are with Canada. That's why they're so perplexed. Many of them live and work – or at least work – in Montreal or the Ottawa-Hull area, so I think that they are tied to Canada whether their hearts like it or not, and that creates some of their problems with deciding which way to go.

The Federalist Sympathizers here have a fairly high proportion of Francophones. They're 15 percent. They sympathize with the federalist cause but not to any great degree. They don't feel strongly committed to Canada on an emotional, personal level, whereas the Committed Federalists here do. They are made up of a lot of Anglophones and some older Quebecers in some of the outlying areas. They're very committed to federalism, and they would like to see the association, the links with Canada, maintained and strengthened, in fact. One of their big issues is the protection of minority language rights, not surprisingly. They feel, I think, let down and isolated by the fact that the rest of Canada or the federal government hasn't stepped in and done anything about their isolation.

There are a lot of charts on the segmentation. I won't go into those because we'll be here forever, but I will take a look at – this shows very clearly the difference between the segments on support for selected constitutional options in Quebec. These are all Quebecers here. The violet part is the percentage of people who feel that what they would like to see is a reduction in federal powers, the red checked is the proportion of people who say status quo, and the hatched here is more federal powers. You can see that the Nationalists are extremely committed – and so are the Supporters – to a reduction in federal powers. Even the Perplexed Quebecers have a lot of support for reducing the federal government's powers in Quebec. Even the Federalist Sympathizers here, 54 percent, would still support some kind of reduction in federal powers, and I think it's because they're willing to concede that Quebecers want something out of this. They want a change in the situation, and therefore they're willing to give on those issues, whereas the Committed Federalists are pretty split on the whole issue of whether to get more federal powers, maintain the status quo, or reduce federal powers.

You see that right now, on the issue of reducing federal powers, the three segments here make up the majority and that which way the Perplexed Quebecers go on most of these issues determines the way Quebec will go. This also shows Quebec's support for independence, and this is where – remember I had said that there was a majority against independence without any economic ties, without any direct association. Well, where the Perplexed Quebecers go, so public opinion shifts. You can see that 93 percent of Nationalists would vote for independence; 88 percent of Supporters would vote for independence. When you get to the Perplexed Quebecers, well, right now, they're siding against that. They would say no; they wouldn't vote for independence without any ties or economic options. That's where their pragmatism comes in. Obviously, the two federalist groups would vote against it, so I think it's that key group in the middle there that's going to be where the battle is won or lost in Quebec.

Now, I know I'm running – what time is it right now?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Twenty-five past 2.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. There is a lot of information in this. I've breezed through some of it. If you have any other ques-

tions, we can discuss those afterwards, but I'll try to get through a very brief overview of the western Canadian study as it relates to what we've just gone through.

The western Canadian study really was conducted to identify constitutional, economic, and political views of western Canadians. Now, we conducted the study and then sold reports on the study to a number of governments and interested corporations and associations. We wanted to differentiate key segments of western Canadians who share similar beliefs, attitudes, and values. We wanted to profile differences of opinion in western Canada by those segments and by regions, by each of the provinces, so I've got all this data by each of the provinces as well, and that's why in the methodology we did a total of 2,406 telephone interviews with western Canadians. The sample was 800 in B.C., 800 in Alberta, and 800 in Saskatchewan and Manitoba combined. When we looked at the data to describe western Canadians, we weighted it back so that the proportion of people represented the actual proportion that they would be in the population. It's just for the purposes that we can look at each of those regions with some degree of accuracy, which we've got in our computer.

The interviews were done in the last two weeks of April of this year, and the margin of error is down there. It's higher for some segments. It ranges between 2 and a half to 5 percent, plus or minus.

2:29

Whereas before we saw national unity at the top or starting to creep up in the national agenda, the economy was there, but in western Canada right around the same time, the economy and the recession were number one on the agenda for some areas. You've got the economy and the recession being mentioned in total in the west by 25 percent, national unity by 25 percent. Now, that differs quite a bit across the prairies. In Saskatchewan and Manitoba, where the economy was harder hit and isn't recovering as fast, that's more enhanced. But national unity is definitely an issue throughout western Canada, as is politics and leadership, at 39 percent in B.C. There is continuing turmoil in B.C., and that is reflected there.

Now, I'd said that I wouldn't go into the segments in English Canada that we had from the national unity study, and that's because we looked at western Canada and split it into a number of different segments according to people's shared attitudes. I'll start off with that because it's a good way to look at some of this data. Segments that we identified in western Canada - now, this is from combining a number of different attitudes and statements. The first one that I'll talk about is the Radical Westerners here. The Radical Westerners are ideologically the caricature of what a western Canadian tends to be around Stampede time: fairly frontier spirit, that spirit of adventure and of entrepreneurship, I think, as well. They're really very committed to individual support of initiatives rather than government involvement. They're the most pro-western Canadian group of any of these segments, and they're found mainly in urban B.C. and Alberta.

MR. ANDERSON: Mainly in urban, did you say?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, mainly in urban B.C. and Alberta. It may be they grew up somewhere else, but they've moved to the cities because that's where the money is and where everything is happening. They tend to be middle-aged males from a higher than average income bracket, and not surprisingly they tend to be supporters of the Reform Party. I think close to two-thirds

of them support the Reform Party. They're practically minded. They reflect the spirit of frontier, and they have a self-made attitude that influences their approach to economic matters too. They're laissez-faire in their approach.

MR. McINNIS: I take it you didn't use the same segments because they didn't fit in the western Canadian . . .

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, they didn't fit. It's different, unique. Because the English-Canadian segments of the national unity study are so heavily weighted by attitudes from Ontario, it really doesn't have a correlation.

MR. McINNIS: So we are a distinct society after all.

MR. CAMERON: That's it.

These people are more likely to think the west has been treated badly by the rest of Canada. They really feel alienated, and they're most likely to support some kind of western economic union or political union, but even then not a majority of these people support that. There isn't a lot of support for some kind of breakaway western economic union. Politically or economically those people look to Canada first in the west, the province second, and then maybe as a western Canadian. Anyway, they are fairly radical, and they are more likely to be upset by what the federal government is doing these days.

Alienated Pessimists, going around the pie, are the largest of all segments, and they're comprised mainly of rural residents in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. There are some in Alberta, but they're more concentrated in those areas. They tend to be older, with lower educations. As the name would say, they're alienated from a lot of things that are happening. They feel alienated, they don't feel like they've been able to exert any power or influence, and they're fairly pessimistic about the outcome of the economy, national unity - you name it - whether it's going to rain or if it's going to rain too much.

AN HON. MEMBER: What page is that on?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We're on about page 16.

MR. CAMERON: They can get motivated by some of the Radical Westerners, but generally they tend not to get that involved because they feel left out of a lot of the happenings politically and economically.

The Frustrated Federalists are about 13 percent. There's about one in eight in western Canada. They are found across all regions, all genders, incomes, but the thing that distinguishes them is that they are fairly community oriented. They like to get involved in a lot of things. They stay on top of current affairs. They're fairly optimistic, and they share a sense of alienation about being treated badly by the rest of Canada, but that feeling is tempered by a real strong attachment to Canada as a nation. So their heart is with Canada even though they feel that the west has been hard done by by the rest of Canada.

The Apathetic Traditionalists are found mainly in rural B.C., and they're the oldest of all groups. They are very apathetic about most issues, and they tend toward favouring tradition and the status quo. On the constitutional issue these people are not likely to get very involved because, first of all, they're apathetic about politics and they're cynical about politicians and the political process. Even if they did get involved, they'd probably be saying, "Keep it the way it is; it's been fine for the last hundred and however many years."

The Ambitious Pragmatists, on the other hand, are people who are fairly self-oriented. They're ambitious about what they're going to do and how things are going to affect them personally. I think in a lot of cases about national unity, they see a benefit in federalism. They see benefit to the west in federalism, and they're fairly pragmatic about that. They want to get ahead, and therefore they support a lot of federal initiatives and they even support some reaching out to Quebec. Because they are fairly pragmatic, they realize there has to be some ground given.

The Dynamic Federalists, 14 percent there, are people who are mainly found in urban areas. They're young; they're highly educated; they tend to be women. In fact, there's a good contrast between this group and this group. The Dynamic Federalists are about two-thirds women, and the Radical Westerners are about two-thirds men, and they have fairly diametrically opposed ideas about what it is to be a western Canadian. The Dynamic Federalists are supportive of government involvement, and they really see a strong role for the federal government. They're located, as I said, in mainly urban areas, and they do like to keep up with news and current events. They feel that most of the problems with western discontent can be linked to the big banks and big corporations rather than to any design by the federal government to keep the west out of the picture.

Some of these people's concerns can really be highlighted by looking at some of the different segments. You can see here that when we asked whether people see the federal government as the main problem or a main western concern or whether it's big banks and big corporations from the east, the Radical Westerners are very likely to feel that, and in fact so are all of the more pro-western, less federal groups. They look at the federal government as the main problem, whereas the Dynamic Federalists are more likely to say that big banks, big corporations, the economic structure itself is probably to blame.

We've got some stuff about the economic outlook too. I won't go into that, although that does affect the way people view federalism quite directly. People are pessimistic and fairly alienated in Manitoba and Saskatchewan right now, and their anger is being vented at the federal government and federal economic policies much more so than, say, the provincial government, although that's not the case in Saskatchewan.

We asked about the impact of federal and provincial economic policies. This shows whether or not people feel that federal economic policies have helped, have hurt the region, or have made no difference. Well, not many people feel that they have helped; 5 percent of western Canadians feel that federal economic policies have helped the region. That is highest in Saskatchewan, probably because of some farm support programs, and it's lowest in Manitoba here. Most people think that the policies have hurt, and with the exception of B.C., most people feel that their provincial economic policies have hurt them; you know, their own province's economy. You see that 23 percent feel that their provincial economic policies have helped, 36 percent say no difference, and 38 percent say it's hurt. The reason why those numbers aren't as high is that B.C. shows that a third of British Columbians think that their government has actually helped the situation economically. That's at only 16 percent in Alberta, 11 percent in Saskatchewan, and 16 percent in Manitoba. So there is a sense that the leadership at the current time is not doing the job in terms of the economic policies that would be necessary. That plays to a large extent into the feeling of alienation and frustration with the system.

When you ask whether the west has gained or lost economically as being part of Canada, you can really see the difference. If you looked at it just by region, you would find that most western Canadians say that the west has gained as a result of being part of Canada. If you look at British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, it's all about the same. It's all about 53 percent, the majority saying that the west has gained as a result of being part of Confederation. When you look at it via those segments that we talked about, you can see the difference. The Dynamic Federalists definitely think that the west has gained; so do the Ambitious Pragmatists and even the traditionalists there. But if you go down to the Radical Westerners, 70 percent think that the region has lost as a result of being part of Canada, and the pessimists are also more pro-western.

2:39

Now, I'll get on to issues associated with the Constitution. We've got a lot of things about how westerners feel they're unique, which I won't go into because we don't have time. I'll say one thing here on that, and that is on the overview of western Canadian perceptions of their identity. This is important when considering a provincial policy on this issue. You know, we saw before in the national unity study that most Canadians in English regions think their Premier should represent Canada's interests first, not the province's. Well, that's because most western Canadians think being a Canadian is more important than being a western Canadian or being an Albertan. Seventy-five percent of western Canadians think that being a Canadian is more important to them than identifying themselves as a western Canadian or as somebody from that province. Especially when they're meeting somebody from another country or discussing national issues or even deciding on the federal vote, they think nationally. However, when they visit Ontario or Quebec, they don't think of themselves necessarily as a western Canadian but as an Albertan or a British Columbian or somebody from Manitoba or Saskatchewan. That's important in terms of the delivery of services, I think, because the federal government sometimes comes up with western initiatives that may not be targeted towards western Canadians, because western Canadians look to their province as representing their interests at that regional level.

MR. McINNIS: So if you're going to ask people if they feel like an Albertan first or a Canadian first, you'd say it's important to put the context of who you're talking to and what you are talking about in order to make that judgment. That seems to be the way this is structured.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, exactly. Depending upon where they are and who they're talking to, they'll describe themselves differently.

Part of the problem of western alienation and part of the reason for clamouring for reform of the institutions is the feeling that the system isn't working. One of the issues we asked along that line of thinking was whether or not people perceived that the west was underrepresented in cabinet or whether it was well represented in cabinet at the federal level. We had a preamble that said that in the current cabinet there are more western Canadians than at any time in history and asked people whether they felt the west was well represented or not represented. Three-quarters of western Canadians still feel the west is not well represented. That's true across all provinces. By segment it's really pronounced in the Radical Westerners, although even

a majority of the Ambitious Pragmatists down here think that they're not represented.

I don't think it's because of the individual MPs themselves. We asked this question, and it always surprises some people. On the perceived performances of western MPs and the adequacy of the federal system, we ask people: how good is your MP's representation? You get 28 percent saying very good or good and 36 percent saying fair, which doesn't seem to be too angry. That's fairly consistent across the provinces. It's a little more pronounced in British Columbia, where people feel that they're being represented better by their MP, but it's still fairly positive. However, when we asked about the electoral system itself, only a third say it's effective. Most people say it's not effective, and they're blaming the system, not necessarily the individual politician who's representing them at the federal level.

Along those lines we asked whether the people thought there was a better chance of improving the west's treatment in Canada if there was new political leadership or constitutional change. People were equally split on that, really, whether it would take new political leaders or a constitutional change, about 44 and 47 percent. That's true across all the regions. It's also true across all of the different segments. So there's a real division of opinion on whether the current state of affairs calls for new political leadership or constitutional and institutional reform.

Getting directly to some of the questions that you would want to ask as well. This issue of achieving constitutional change: we asked about it in the national unity study. This shows in western Canada slightly different wording: should amendments require unanimous provincial approval or regional approval? We went through the regional blocs - the west, Ontario, Quebec, and the maritimes - and 67 percent felt that the unanimous veto should be necessary rather than just a regional veto.

There's always support for referenda too; 26 percent said an amendment should be approved by public referendum rather than in provincial Legislatures.

MR. McDONOUGH: The top question combines both the idea of equality of provinces and unanimity. Do you have one that deals with equality of provinces without unanimity?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, we do on the specific issue of different, selected areas. In fact, I think I have it coming up. We did get into some of that, although not specifically. I think one area that the committee would want to look at very clearly is the issue of unanimity to amend the amending formula.

Not surprisingly, there's public support in western Canada for a triple E Senate, and that is true across all regions. It ranges from 72 percent to 80 percent in Alberta. It's higher in Alberta than it is in other provinces, although it's fairly high in all regions.

Another issue which would be important in the constitutional debate is aboriginal Canadians' placement on the agenda, and the recent meeting that Joe Clark had at the Nakoda Lodge I think falls in line with the thinking of most western Canadians. Aboriginal concerns should be addressed in any new agreement: 81 percent agreed that they should be addressed directly in any new agreement, and 82 percent, a similar proportion, said they should be represented directly in negotiations. We didn't know at that point that this would be an issue of parallel process, but we did a very extensive study on native issues, and it showed overwhelming support for including native concerns in constitutional matters, making sure that they are well represented and included in the process.

Another issue that you may or may not want to investigate is this issue of support for official bilingualism.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We heard that there isn't much.

MR. CAMERON: Well, there's probably more than you heard. This shows from May '86 through to April of '91 the degree of support for official bilingualism. It has dropped off slightly. It used to be split, just a slight majority in support of it, either moderate or strong support back in May '86. Now, that's a slight majority opposed moderately or strongly to official bilingualism. However, we asked about the concept of enclave bilingualism - English west, French Quebec - and 60 percent of western Canadians reacted positively about that, if that kind of situation was entrenched.

MR. ANDERSON: Do you have that broken down by province?

2:49

MR. CAMERON: We do. I don't have it right here. We do have that in the tables. I don't remember if there were any major differences between the western provinces on that. As I said, there are some groups that are very antibilingual and there are some groups that are pro-bilingual.

MR. DAY: Bruce, when that question was asked about support for official bilingualism, is that all that was asked? Was there a response back saying, "What is official bilingualism?"

MR. CAMERON: No. We prompted with a description of what it was, and it's included in the questionnaire.

MR. DAY: Would that include hiring of bilingual for federal services, that type of thing?

MR. CAMERON: No; I don't think we got that specific. We did a brief introduction on that, about services being available in French and English throughout Canada in the courts. I'd have to check the actual wording to find out.

But as I said, there are some segments that really support bilingualism, and in fact you may find that if there was a radical change and a shift away from bilingualism, some of these groups, such as the Dynamic Federalists, who are fairly active and fairly articulate, would rise up against that kind of policy, against cutting back. So you see that 41 percent of Dynamic Federalists strongly support bilingualism, 37 percent moderately support it - and even the Ambitious Pragmatists as well. These two groups are fairly urban. They are higher educated. These are probably the people who are driving up the numbers in terms of the French immersion schools as well, in the enrollment of those schools. Whereas you get over here to the Radical Westerners and 60 percent strongly oppose it. I mean, it's very dramatic opposition to it. You may have heard in the committee from the Radical Westerners or the Frustrated Federalists. I read some of the comments, but I'm not sure whether in a committee setting some of these groups would really feel articulate or motivated enough to get up and talk about their feelings.

MR. McINNIS: Enclave bilingualism. That's sort of where numbers warrant. It's not quite the same as making language provincial jurisdiction. It's more just identifying pockets where there are sufficient numbers to make it . . .

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. To make it economically feasible.

MR. McDONOUGH: It's not just Quebec. You know, the way you put it at one time was that it was Quebec . . .

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. In fact, let me get back to the actual wording on it, because there's a lot of zipping through the questions here. There are a lot of questions. I can't find it right now, but I will. I think it was where numbers warrant. The title on the other graph had it saying that it was English west of French Quebec. In fact the description of it wasn't quite like that in the question.

Now, this shows that we had asked nationally the question of division of powers. This shows it provincially, and we've got numbers between February and April: whether people favour a substantial reduction in federal powers, with those given to the provinces, or the same arrangement or an increase in federal powers. What you can see here in Alberta is that there has actually been an increase in the proportion of people who say the substantial reduction in federal powers would be an option available and a decrease in the proportion of people who say there should be federal powers increased. Now, I think there are areas obviously . . . [interjection] Well, there are areas we can debate in terms of the question of wording. I'll just counteract that or at least balance that by saying that despite that there is strong support throughout the west for national standards. We said that if the provinces were to take over responsibility for different social services and programs, including financial responsibility, do you think the federal government should establish national standards which all provinces' programs would have to meet, or should social program standards be set by the individual provinces? Sixty-eight percent are in favour of national standards for those kinds of social programs and policies.

MR. CHUMIR: Alberta as well?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. Alberta as well; the same number.

So it's not total provincial control over the setting of the standards and the setting of the programs; it's provincial control over the administration, I think. That's where that nuance in terms of devolving powers – maybe there could be some additional questions asked to get at that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about asking if they feel the provinces should be involved in setting those standards collectively?

MR. CAMERON: Collectively in conjunction with the federal government. Yeah, you could investigate that more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Or even not in conjunction with the federal government. Why do we always have to say . . . That's the question I'd like to ask: why is it that we have to start with an idea of whether the federal government should be involved at all if they're not paying anything? There is a principle called the . . .

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, that's something we'd want to explore, because there is support for national standards. Now, exactly what that means to different people, how you interpret that . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that should be pondered a little bit.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

MR. McINNIS: I'm not going to disagree with that, but the question clearly does say the federal government should establish. That's what this question says.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. And two-thirds of western Canadians support that idea.

MR. CHUMIR: That must be a mistake. They mustn't have understood the question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But that's why I think it's important we have to see the background to the question that was asked.

MR. CHUMIR: It must not have been asked in Drumheller.

MR. CAMERON: Anyway, I will end up with just a couple of things here. This issue of transferring powers: we asked for western views on transferring power to Quebec and to all the provinces. Now, we did that for a number of different areas specifically in the national unity study. Here we just said:

There have been calls for the transfer of responsibility to Quebec from the federal government of a greater level of responsibility for a broad range of areas, including immigration, health care and the environment. In general, do you support or oppose this proposed transfer of powers to the province of Quebec?

And then,

Would you support or oppose such a transfer of powers if this transfer were made to all provinces and not just Quebec? Well, most western Canadians, 77 percent – no, 81 percent actually – in April opposed transferring those powers to Quebec. When you say that you'd transfer them to all the provinces, it rises to a slight majority if all provinces were equal in terms of transfer of the powers. That's true in Alberta and throughout the west.

MR. ANDERSON: We've moved quite a bit on all of these from February to April, eh?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. There has been . . .

MR. ANDERSON: Any single reason you can point to?

MR. CAMERON: No. I think it's a whole range of issues. I think the debate has just started to take off in those directions in that if Quebec is to be accommodated, can it be accommodated by accommodating all provinces? There's even been talk about provinces opting out and giving power back to the federal government to administer that if they don't want to. So I think it's just started to become part of the public debate, and that's why the numbers may have shifted.

MR. POCOCK: Also, matters such as the GST and federal policies would affect that.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. It's particularly an issue in Saskatchewan. The harmonization of the GST was a provincial . . .

MR. ANDERSON: Although you would think that in February – the GST feeling, I think, probably peaked about then. I don't know.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. We've been doing tracking on that.

MR. McINNIS: I wouldn't say that shift is much over the margin of error, actually, in terms of the confidence . . .

MR. CAMERON: In Alberta? We've got 45 to 39, six percentage points down. You've got, well, nine percentage points up, because some of you, I'm sure, have now opted for support. I mean, you could read it that way. It's a trend, and again that's a stronger trend line than some of the other ones when you have - what is it? - nine percentage points. The problem is that this February number, the sample size, is quite small, so you really have to be careful in reading into that.

MR. CHUMIR: But again it's the same thing. Like Stan's concern, you're asking this from the perspective of transferring it to the provinces. It's a suggestion. If you'd asked should the federal government have a role in X or whatever, you'd have a different kind of nuance. But we'll get onto that, I assume, in just a few moments.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, sure. Okay.

MR. McDONOUGH: Have you ever asked if they transferred the power to Quebec but took away power from Quebec at the federal level - the idea that there would be a trade-off with Quebec. If Quebec got immigration powers for the province, have you ever asked if there was a trade-off where they would cease to have an effect on immigration nationally?

2:59

MR. CAMERON: No, we haven't asked that question. The only way we asked about that kind of trade-off was in Quebec itself: what would you be willing to trade off to come to a deal?

Anyway, the other issues we've got at the end here are really issues involving political standings, political impressions . . . But that's not the mandate of the committee.

So if you want to talk about the questionnaire, I've got both questionnaires on overhead here. I'm not sure how we want to proceed, whether you want to just start with some general comments about the questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'd sort of like to know how many questions we've got available for this 20-minute survey, what room we've got to get our concerns accommodated.

MR. CAMERON: That's about 60 questionnaire items.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sixty?

MR. CAMERON: Sixty. Yeah. A question sometimes can be a number of different items: do you support or oppose a number of these different options, and then you describe the option.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much of that space do you think is required to accommodate our concerns about shifting powers back and forth?

MR. CAMERON: I think probably eight questions or something like that.

MR. POCOCK: That would include national standards.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. Eight.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Eight of the 20. Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: We've got some time constraints, and rather than specifically go through a whole bunch of forms of questions now, I have some problems with the questions. I've read them, and I have some problems with them. I want to do two things: talk about the specific areas. I think we should outline the areas we want to have questions on, and to the extent we have any difficulties in terms of philosophy of how questions are asked here or elsewhere, perhaps we can make those comments to Bruce and let him come back with some proposed questions.

MR. DAY: I'd agree with that approach.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think that's a good approach. John.

MR. McINNIS: On the question of numbers, 60 overall would include the demographics, things you need in order to categorize the data? I'm just wondering how many questions we actually have to work with. Let's assume we take your advice. Are we going to start with the general soft question about what's the most important issue on your mind today, and then questions at the end about your age and income and so on and so forth? How many do we actually have to work with?

MR. CAMERON: Well, the demographics will take up about the equivalent of five questions. I think we'd want to do a number of the key issues: age; education; region, obviously. Actually we can take the region from the samplings. That wouldn't be a question. We do community size. There are a number of key things we would suggest that we did on the other studies. Then you're left with 55 items.

MR. McINNIS: I agree with Sheldon's suggested approach.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think you should find out from us the areas we're concerned about. Then you come back with some proposed questions and we go from there. I think that's the sense.

Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with that. I just wonder if you could give us a sense of the timing we're talking about. What are we aiming at? How many more meetings do we plan? How detailed do we have to get at this time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, my sense is that there are going to be some holiday things. We're going to have to have another meeting for sure to discuss some specific questions, and then you have to get ready to mount the thing. Can you do that by towards the end of September?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. In fact the majority of the time spent in getting ready for this will be debates about the questions themselves. From the time we have an approved questionnaire, we can be in field within three working days.

MR. ANDERSON: What about pretest, or do we do any pretest?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. What I would do, once I get some direction about the questionnaire, is develop a draft questionnaire, and we'll pretest it to make sure before we go in the field.

MR. DAY: If 20 minutes is the time limit we're looking at in talking to potential respondents, if the sacrifice has to be more questions and less explanation or more explanation before each question, I'd certainly lean towards giving up the number of questions within that time limit to have a very thorough explanation for the person of what's being talked about before the question is asked, just as a general direction. I don't feel compelled to hit the number 55, but I do feel strongly that the nuances that will come out in the debate right now have to be addressed before the question is actually asked.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah; they are fairly complex. You will notice that some of the questions in the questionnaires you have had a fairly lengthy preamble to them to describe some of the complexities.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In order to get this debate going, what would you like to know from us, then, in order to get some questions ready?

MR. CAMERON: As I've said, I have gone through questionnaires and checked questions that I think, as a very first run-through, are questions you should consider including, maybe with some modifications. Maybe I should just go through that, and then you can check it according to . . . You don't have the second copy, but you have the copy of the questionnaire dealing with the national unity study in each of those documents. Maybe as a starting point I can go through and just check what I think are questions you could consider including.

MR. CHUMIR: Could I suggest again that I don't think that's particularly fruitful. It's going to take time. I think what we should be doing is telling you the topic areas we want to have addressed, and then we can give you some input re questions.

MR. ANDERSON: I agree.

MR. CHUMIR: I think you need our input.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, Sheldon. You make your input now if you like.

MR. CHUMIR: All right. I'll be happy to start. I think the first area, probably the one that's of greatest concern collectively to members of the committee - they'll correct me on that if I'm wrong - is the issue of jurisdiction between the federal and the provincial governments, the issue of centralization versus decentralization. I think we want to know the views of Albertans with respect to who should have jurisdiction, whether it's exclusively provincial, exclusively federal, or some shared jurisdiction with respect to areas such as, for example, the social services and income support programs. There are different kinds. Women's shelters, for example, come within that category. There are income support programs. There's medicare. There's education, which I suggest should be treated separately from culture and language. It's joined with culture and language in your . . . Then we've heard some opinions that there should be a federal role in education even though there isn't in the constitutional sense now; there are no federal standards. There's been some sense - I think we have to know

about that. There's the issue of the environment. There's the issue of immigration. There's culture and language. There's communications and there's taxation. Now, there are many others, but I think those are the heartland issues. There's been a discussion of national standards. To accept national standards as an issue, we have to know whether they want national standards, whether these are to be national standards by the federal government or by the provinces, or what mechanism. We have to have some good and fair questions to elicit that information.

Now, I have some real problems with your questions. I'm wondering: is this the time to talk about the problems I have with the question methodology that I've seen here, or should we kind of go through the topic areas and then talk? Maybe it's probably a good time to do it.

3-09

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you could, as briefly as you can, highlight some of the things there, Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I guess I do have some problems with the question methodology here. I must say, with all due respect and with a kind of a feeling that there's a very well-intended approach, that I find that the way in which these questions are asked is very much directed towards softening the perception of differences vis-à-vis centralization and decentralization between Quebec and the rest of the country. I think there's a sense in the way in which they're asked, and I happen to be centralist oriented, so I can sniff these things. I think they're asked in a way which generally tends to bring out the response, "Yes, we could go for more decentralization." For example, the way in which your questions on page 7 are asked: you start with the suggestion about a new constitutional deal. The direction of the question is asked about giving the provinces total control over certain . . .

MR. DAY: Where are you there, Sheldon?

MR. CHUMIR: This is on page 7. There's a questionnaire right at the end of the main book, Portrait of a Troubled Country, the advance report. At the end there, the last portion is the questions, and page 7 of the questions asks: would you give the provinces . . . We've made a suggestion in that regards. Now, there's a different, alternate way, and far be it from me normally to refer to *Alberta Report*, but they did have a questionnaire not so long ago in which they asked in terms of options there. They said: should the jurisdiction over certain things be exclusively federal, exclusively provincial, or shared? I think that's a more equitable and fair way of presenting it. This is one that implies the general direction of movement and then says: how far can we get Canadians to agree with that general direction?

I'll give you another example of my concerns here in terms of the questions. If you look on pages 8 and 9, right at the bottom you'll find the issue - you start with the very last question, (i) - about control over income support programs. Your last portion of those questions is "with no federal regulations in these areas," and your next question, (ii), talks about transferring those to the provinces "with no federal regulations in these areas." You've never had that provision, "with no federal regulations in these areas," with respect to any of the other questions on there. It just so turns out that this is the one where your percentage shows that most people want to have some federal role. It's a

very low percentage for transfer. You know, your questions tend to be loaded in that regard.

Then when you get on to the issue – you'd mentioned that there's some desire for national standards. I can't find that question in your main questionnaire, but you did raise it in the question with respect to the provinces. If you look at page 73 of the provincial report, after you talk about how we're all quite happy with moving to a more decentralized federation, then you talk about:

Fully two in three . . . of western Canadians said they believe the federal government should establish "national standards" that all provinces' programs would have to meet in the event provinces were to take over complete responsibility for areas such as health care and post-secondary education.

Well, the fact is that if they want to have those national standards, then that implicitly says no takeover. It means no transfer, because that's all you have now; all that you have now in the areas of social services and medicare is a national standard. We administer the whole thing.

So there are all kinds of hidden little twists in this thing. I would like to see the questions much more neutral.

MR. CAMERON: Well, I think your issue of the exclusive versus shared jurisdiction is a good one, and that we can incorporate. On the other issue, national standards, it seems like an incompatible result, but it is not. In fact, I think your example is a good one in that regard, that people right now are in favour of national standards for programs and even look to, say, the medicare system as a good example of what it is to be a Canadian. Yet it's provincially administered. I don't necessarily think you can say that because someone agrees that there should be national standards, they also agree, therefore, that the province shouldn't be totally in control of the administration of that.

MR. CHUMIR: I don't think so, either, but the language is at odds with that, these statements about favouring decentralization. I'm trying to point out to you that as soon as two-thirds of people tell you they want to have federal standards, if they do, if that's an accurate and fair result, if they tell you they want to have national standards there, that means no decentralization in those key areas, because that's exactly what you have now. If they want that, that's the status quo. Your question has to reflect that. Anyway, I'd like to hear other comments, but I want you to take that away as you craft the questions.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. ANDERSON: I'll usurp the Chair here since Stan's gone.

[Mr. Anderson in the Chair]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: John's next.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you. Well, I certainly agree that centralization versus decentralization is an important theme that ultimately resolves itself to division of powers. But I also think that if we attempt to spell out all of the permutations and combinations and to explain them properly, as Stock wants to do, it would be about a four-hour instrument and we wouldn't cover any other issues at all. I think we have to try to go relatively broad-scale on centralization versus decentralization and division of powers. Sheldon's list of I guess the top seven areas is probably a good list, but there may be more to go from

there. If we were to explore even those seven, I think that would endanger us in taking up half the survey, and there are some other areas that I want us to try to get to.

I guess the question of who decides national standards is an important one and it should be resolved, but I think we need to ask some very general questions about how people view this whole exercise, whether in fact people do look at it as making concessions towards Quebec, if that's what it's all about or if they see it in a different context. "Spirit of negotiations" I think was the term that was used. I see a lot of process issues, especially in the aboriginal area, but constituent assembly; the ratification process, which ultimately gets into amendment process; things such as referendum and whether all provinces, in particular our province, should have a veto.

Then there are a whole bunch of Charter of Rights and Freedoms issues which came up at the hearings. It's very difficult for me to sort out on what side of those issues – there's the question of whether the courts or the politicians ultimately decide, which is really, I think, the notwithstanding clause, and maybe we need to look at that with people a couple of different ways. It generally looks like people want to get rid of it, but I don't know if that stands up under all the circumstances. The question of expanding the Charter to include new rights and freedoms came up on numerous occasions. Some people want to extend the Charter to include, for example, freedom of information, environmental protection, and possibly other areas as well. I think there were others that came up in the presentations.

MR. CHUMIR: A social charter.

MR. McINNIS: A social charter was also mentioned from time to time in the presentations, so that, I think, would be part of the exploration of the Charter. I think we have to have some general approach questions and process questions and some specifically related to the Charter in addition to this division of powers business.

3:19

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was next on the list, and then Stock.

In terms of the general format and so on, I think that once we get your questions back, we can then go at you with respect to the validity of those particular questions. I have mixed feelings on some of the things that Sheldon indicated. Generally I feel the survey was well balanced, but there may be some truth to a weighting on some areas of it. I would endorse heartily what seems to be the item which we have most consensus on requiring further data, and that's not just the distribution of powers, but the establishing of national standards and who does those. The question of whether there should be a collective establishment of some standards in areas where there is provincial jurisdiction, health and education most notably, I think is very important, and I guess I'd take exception with Sheldon on the one issue where he stated that there was no devolving to the provinces if you still had the establishment of national standards. I don't think that's the case because of the dollars that are taken federally and the fact that the government has used the dollars to drive the standards as opposed to setting them. Exploring that I think is important. Does that mean that the dollars should be collected and the programs administered provincially and either the federal government or collectively the provincial governments or jointly the governments establishing a standard that deals with

education and health care, in particular, or not. So we get into some details there.

The one area that hasn't really been mentioned – I think John mentioned it – that I would like to see explored more is native issues, particularly with respect to self-government. What is the definition of self-government that people have? Is it municipal government? Is it more wide-ranging if they support the concept to start with, and what about other native issues? Is there some way of resolving all this? I think it's one of the more difficult areas to get a handle on.

I almost hesitate to raise this one, but I think a related area that we're not exploring is the frustration people have with the institutions of government. We have Senate reform, and I think that's clear on what the answer is there. Unless anybody debates it, I think your previous work and every other we've seen speaks to that one. But should we be looking at dramatic change to the House of Commons and provincial Legislatures in how we operate? I get a feeling – and the Spicer commission report spoke to it, I think – that people want fundamental change there. At least I think we should get a flavour of that to see if that's part of the unity package, part of the deal we could make for Canada.

I agree on the courts versus the politicians and exploring that area as well. The constituent assembly, referendum: I think the answer to the questions should we or shouldn't we have them are clear in the report that you have done, but I think we need to assess what people mean by constituent assemblies or do they have any idea. Does their opinion change if we talk about the composition? Referendum: again it was alluded to I think in terms of does that mean 51 percent of Canadians or is there a veto by province or by region on referendum. I guess those are the three options there.

Those are the main items that I see. There's also perhaps in that referendum and constituent assembly area a process question, I guess John would call it, and that's when do we consult? You know, do they feel that they're being consulted at this point with public hearings and so on, or is it a package that they need to be presented with on a referendum basis? I guess people will say that they'll always want to be involved at all points, but when is it decision time? When do they vote or not vote?

MR. McINNIS: So you're thinking we should put some models forward on the constituent assembly?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we need to explore, if you have some aspect of models. Just saying there's a constituent assembly, it's easy for people to say, "Yeah; that's a good idea." But what it is and how it's selected is another question. I have real difficulty figuring that one out myself, and I don't know how people would respond. You know, the American Philadelphia conference was, I guess, the assemblies electing seven people, some of whom were politicians and some were public. Is that a process, or do they want direct election of people other than politicians? There's a number of models there. We're getting quickly on to 60 questions, I know, but . . .

MR. CAMERON: It's the same thing with Senate reform too.

MR. DAY: Since I'm next on the list, I'll just keep going on some of the stuff that Dennis has raised.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

Actually, there's a lot of agreement on different points that we're all touching here. I disagree, though, with Sheldon's concern about the loaded questions. He mentioned the one on page 7. I think it's fair to ask to see if Albertans are part of an international trend away from highly centralized governments. I think that's a valid question to ask, as long you're going to explore it deeper, which it's obvious that we're going to. I think it's valid to ask: in general, are you in favour of a reduction in federal powers or an increase in federal powers? I think that's a very valid question to see if we do fit in with an international, worldwide trend moving away from highly centralized powers. But it does show – and I think it applies to all of us – how when a question is answered away from our particular philosophic belief, we tend to bristle. We need to be able to recognize that, so that when the hair goes up on the back of our necks, we have to ask ourselves a question: is it just because I didn't like the answer or is it indeed that the question is invalid? I don't think that is an invalid question or approach as long as we move to do, as has been done here, explore this broader question more specifically.

John, you mentioned that all the permutations and combinations could lead up to a four-hour questionnaire, and they could. I'm not suggesting that at all. I'm suggesting that somehow in the questionnaire we take the time – for instance, when we ask a question about national standards, that somehow the questioner explains or asks the question in there or alludes to the fact that national standards can be set arbitrarily by the federal government in a unilateral sense. Is that how people want to see it? Or do they want to see it done with each province having input into . . .

MR. McINNIS: Arbitrarily.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A group of provinces though.

MR. DAY: Yeah. Each province working together with the other provinces developing standards that they can accept as acceptable national standards and then maybe refereed by some kind of federal body. That has to be explored, because again Sheldon's comment that people want national standards definitely means on a questionnaire that they want a strong, centralized government – I'd like to see if my question is valid as we explore it. That's what I mean by taking some time to explain to the people what we're talking about when we say national standards.

Dennis has already raised the aboriginal side. I think that's definitely got to be explored, especially explaining what we mean by asking for self-government to be defined. People need to be asked about that.

On the institutions. I'd like to see some direct questions asked when people say they don't like the institutional system. If we can work in: would you support elections every four years on a certain date? Is this the type of thing you as an Albertan are looking for? Would you like to see a system developed where a government doesn't fall because a Bill was defeated, therefore allowing for more of a free vote? I think as elected people – even though we might not like this whole process called recall and it makes us feel awkward and nervous and we say how tough it would be to administer – we hear it. We hear a lot of people raising it. So I'd like that. In terms of questions about our institution of government, I think we have to ask those questions of people and get their feeling and their suggestions on it.

I think communications is an important issue, but if we're going to ask a question on that, I'd like Quebec left out of the

equation there and the question would be federal control of communications. I'm willing to be bristled on this one if the response comes back, but I have a sense that Albertans are not saying that they really like being controlled by the CRTC, that they really like the fact that a radio station in Alberta that wants to get off the ground has to go crawling down to Ottawa for divine approval. I question whether Albertans like that, and in your question on communications there was a mix of Quebec authority there. I think that would get a response where people are saying, "Whoa; I don't want Quebec having power there." So that communications thing is directly related to regulation and control, CRTC.

3:29

MR. McINNIS: Do you think the licences should be granted on the same basis as wine store licences?

MR. DAY: You're not to ask me that question; we're asking Albertans the questions. It's not my opinion I'm looking for. I want Albertans' opinion on this.

I think that covers most of the areas. If we could balance some questions off – for instance, though people might not understand or be aware of the Edwards-Beaudoin committee in terms of the amendment process, et cetera, I think we need to find out: should Quebec and Ontario have some special status in the amending process? You know, do people feel comfortable with that? Those are some of the areas I'd like to see explored a little more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Boy, are you out of touch on this CRTC thing. Get out of Red Deer or wherever it is.

MR. DAY: Well, that's what we need to find out, Sheldon, and as I said, I'm prepared to bristle.

MR. CHUMIR: Jeez, you're not listening.

Now, I agree with a lot of the subject matter. You're going to have a very big baby, and you're going to have to be fairly Solomonic in terms of getting it down. But let me throw out some other question areas that I think merit inquiry, and then we'll see where we have to perhaps prune down. In the issue of the jurisdiction and the national standards, I think we perhaps have to include something about the funding issue, whether there should be a funding role in there, because that's quite central to a lot of the discussion.

MR. McINNIS: Funding?

MR. CHUMIR: Federal funding of health care, medicare, education, and stuff.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A continuation of abuse of spending power.

MR. CHUMIR: Yeah. Which gives you an idea of why it's so important that we do find out about that.

There's the issue of multiculturalism, which was a very pervasive issue. There is the question of bilingualism, some sense of our feelings with that. In terms of the triple E, I understood the suggestion to be made earlier that the views of Albertans and I think ourselves collectively seem to be so well

entrenched that we need not waste a question getting that information. I would agree with that; that's what I would think. There's the issue of whether Albertans believe all provinces should be equal. I don't think that has been specifically discussed so far this afternoon here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I guess if we do get down to a space problem, Sheldon, we're going to have to say: are we going to redo the same questions that were done on the previous surveys?

MR. ANDERSON: Look, I think the equal one is in the study.

MR. CHUMIR: I think, though, that Bruce can wrestle with this, because I would be more inclined to say that we leave out a lot of the general types of things: what do you think about a whole range of world issues, what type of person are you, and so on. I'd leave most of that stuff out, quite frankly. That may be very unscientific, but I'd be . . . Let me just kind of have a look – I've a long list of things here – and just go over the ones that I wanted to raise. There are questions reflecting the attachment to Canada vis-à-vis attachment to provinces that I think are very meaningful. I guess there's an issue of whether we want to ask, in the event there would be a decision to go their own way by Quebec, the degree to which we would want to be negotiating – playing tougher or less tough, should we have a joint currency – because I think that type of thing may help us reflect to Quebec where we're coming from. I think we definitely want Quebec to stay, but I suspect there may be some feelings – you know, perhaps a little hardball if they wanted to break things up. So I think perhaps we might want to take that into account. You've got questions already in your survey on that. As I say, my main concern with the survey has been re the division of powers end of things. I think that's pretty well about my end.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dennis, followed by John.

MR. ANDERSON: I don't disagree with Sheldon and some of the priorities. I just wanted to make it clear, though, that unless there is a fundamental reason to think there is significant change between April and September, we should be giving priority to those questions to which there aren't answers in here and following up on them as opposed to reasking the questions. I would hope there'd be agreement on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any disagreement with that?

MR. McINNIS: I wanted to make that point, and also the point that I don't think we should presuppose too many things down the road, because we're not at the stage now where we're negotiating with Quebec having decided on the referendum. We may get to that stage, and perhaps when we do, we should do another survey at that point. I think we should try to focus as much as possible on the task at hand, which, however you conceive it, is somehow to renew this federation and keep it going. I think most of us share that.

MR. ANDERSON: You won't be appalled at the costs of another survey? I couldn't help that, John.

MR. McINNIS: This is on the assumption – I take your point. If the worst happens, probably we'll consider spending some money.

MR. CHUMIR: I wonder if I could ask Bruce something in terms of this overall broad survey: whether or not those responses are broken down in terms of Alberta. There are charts which tell how Albertans responded on those?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. We have detailed tables with all of the results broken down by province, so we have access to that information. In some cases it's not presented in the report because there was no major difference. But if there are specific areas where you want to look at a selected question and it's not there in the report, we can access that information.

MR. CHUMIR: Would it be possible just to get, say, the Alberta detailed response to all of these questions?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. By region.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just Alberta's.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. It would be broken up by region, so you'd have Alberta, B.C., Manitoba, Saskatchewan. That would do it; yeah.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about the western survey or the national?

MR. CHUMIR: Alberta would be there, though, separately designated, but it would happen to have all four of them on the chart, is what you're saying.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, right. That's the western Canada study.

MR. DAY: I can appreciate the cuteness of the pie graphs broken into the - what do you call them?

MR. CAMERON: Psychographics.

MR. DAY: Psychographics. But I'd like to avoid that on our survey. It's highly subjective. I mean, we can appreciate it, but for instance, what was referred to as a Radical Westerner, that person might look at a person called a Dynamic Federalist, which has a positive connotation to it, and say, "Well, no; you're just a wimp because you want more federal power." Whereas Radical Westerner looks like somebody who's coming off the wall, or Apathetic Traditionalist or whatever it might be. I can appreciate the cuteness of it in this survey, but I want to avoid it in ours.

MR. CAMERON: Well, I assure you it's not just cute. Actually, it's quite useful from our communications standpoint. But with the mandate of the committee I agree that it's not . . .

MR. DAY: Right, because if these groups become largely accepted in the public eye, if this is put out, you'd find people thinking, "I want to be called a Dynamic Federalist; that sounds positive," you know. So just the naming of the group can have a lemming-like run to them, especially if it's something . . .

3:39

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to ask: is there any better word than "power," when we're talking about the division? Sometimes I get some response to that that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What about "responsibility"?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: "Authority" or "responsibility" or "jurisdiction." Has that ever been considered or studied, whether it leads to any type of conclusion?

MR. McINNIS: I think "jurisdiction" is too vague a word.

MR. DAY: Didn't he say that it's "beefed-up muscle"?

MR. CAMERON: "Power" or "authority" or "jurisdiction."

MR. ANDERSON: "Responsibility."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could you let us know what you feel about the use of different words? I personally don't like "power."

MR. CAMERON: Yeah.

MR. CHUMIR: Politically incorrect, Stan?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't know.

MR. POCOCK: On the aboriginal issues Mr. Anderson asked that they be surveyed. I think you have done a study that deals quite extensively with aboriginal issues. Could we get access to that study?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, and we did a specific booster sample in Alberta with attitudes. That was last year, and we updated it in the national unity study, but the sample's not that large in Alberta.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, specifically on definitions of self-government; what people understand, for example.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah, we've done that quite extensively. I didn't get into it in this. We have it in the information here. We have some of it there.

MR. McINNIS: I think we should be clear. When we're trying to get people to define things for us, that's an extremely difficult thing to do in a survey. You can't ask people, you know, what is your concept of aboriginal self-government, and then listen to what they say and write it down. You won't get useful information. You have to put something forward to say, "It's this; do you support that?" essentially. Self-government came up and one other issue as well, the constituent assembly. If you want a range of opinion, you have to put forward something for people to respond to on a survey.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah; I agree you can't leave a blank space, but I think as well that it's not going to be too helpful to us to just conclude that generally 55 percent agree with self-government. We don't know what that is or how we're going to proceed from there because the range is so great on possibilities. I think we need to narrow down what's acceptable to Albertans and what isn't to some general direction.

MR. CAMERON: Well, you can review. We did quite an extensive analysis of that, and we went through a number of different options and explained them and got people's reaction

to those options from a number of different perspectives. So I think it covers that issue quite thoroughly.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, maybe that'll do it. Then we'll want to have a discussion on those results. We'll see.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You've got quite a menu before you.

MR. CAMERON: Well, a questionnaire designed by a committee is always a fairly creative task.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As far as you're concerned, when do you think you could be ready to meet with us again?

MR. DAY: Would Wednesday morning be okay?

MR. CAMERON: Well, we could come back with a draft questionnaire within a week on this.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm going to be gone Thursday until about August 5 or 6.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: See, that's the trouble we're going to get into.

MR. CAMERON: Exactly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm going to be gone from the 7th until the 14th.
What about you?

MR. McINNIS: Well, I'm gone from the 17th on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Of August?

MR. McINNIS: Yeah, until Labour Day.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So you'd like to meet before August 17?

MR. DAY: I'm gone actually the first part of August, too, so that's bad for me.

MR. CAMERON: Sounds like I'll have to get it done in the next couple of days then.

MR. DAY: Well, you'd have the draft ready in a week, you said?

MR. ANDERSON: I'll be gone.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When are you leaving?

MR. ANDERSON: Thursday.

MR. McINNIS: Can you take a fax machine with you?

MR. CAMERON: Just what you wanted, right?

MR. ANDERSON: Well, I could probably get a fax.

MR. POCOCK: I'll deliver.

MR. DAY: I'll be gone two weeks in August.

MR. ANDERSON: You leave on the 7th, and you're gone from then on?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm there for a week. I'm going to be back on the 14th. We have caucus on the 14th and 15th.

MR. ANDERSON: And you're leaving when, John?

MR. McINNIS: The 17th.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sheldon, when are you here and when are you away?

MR. CHUMIR: I have to come up for whatever, so it doesn't matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but are you here all summer? You're not leaving or going anywhere?

MR. CHUMIR: No, I'm planning to leave, but I'm not sure when. I can tell you that within the next 10 days I'll be here. After that it's uncertain.

MR. DAY: Three a.m. on the 26th is the only opening.

MR. CHUMIR: Perfect. That happens to be the only opening I have.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, actually it looks like Wednesday, but that's putting too much pressure on Bruce to get this stuff ready by Wednesday.

MR. CAMERON: What? Wednesday of what date?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This week, the 17th.

MR. CAMERON: That's this week. If it was later in the day, we could get it together, sure. If that's the only . . .

MR. ANDERSON: Well, I have cabinet during the day.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but you're finished around 2 or so, aren't you?

MR. ANDERSON: Probably. It's usually 5:30.

MR. DAY: What's your latest day this week before you go?

MR. ANDERSON: That's it.

MR. DAY: Wednesday, then?

MR. CAMERON: May I make a suggestion? Often it's useful when we develop a questionnaire and there's a number of people of reviewing it to have us submit the questionnaire and then the comments be submitted back through one person, who channels and funnels all of that back to us.

MR. McINNIS: Well, I volunteer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You mean the secretary would do it.

MR. DAY: I trust John would do that.

MR. McINNIS: Right.

MR. CAMERON: Just so that, you know, commonalities can be seen right there. So I don't know whether we all need to meet to see this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We can get it to you?

MR. ANDERSON: Sure. It'll be easier. For one week, anyway, I'll be in Vancouver, but then I'll be traveling around and it will be more difficult.

MR. CAMERON: That's fine. It just may take longer to get the questionnaire done.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sometime next week - say, a week from Thursday - could you have this ready?

MR. CAMERON: Yeah; I can even get it before.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When do you think you could have it ready and send a draft out?

MR. CAMERON: I could get it ready and send a draft out on Monday afternoon, the 22nd. How does that sound?

MR. CHUMIR: Then we'll have a meeting when, the Thursday?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then we have to consider a meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tuesday looks good anyway.

MR. CHUMIR: You don't have to be here, Dennis. We'll kind of look after your interests. Just phone your comments to me.

MR. DAY: Sheldon will cover all your concerns.

MR. CHUMIR: Stan and Stock can kind of look after your interests if you get the comments to them, if you get the stuff.

MR. DAY: So when do you want to meet?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, do you have any suggestions? I would like to suggest myself that it sure works better for me if it's a Monday, Wednesday, or Friday, because I have to be in Edmonton.

MR. DAY: How about Wednesday?

MR. CHUMIR: A week from Wednesday?

MR. CAMERON: A week Wednesday? Actually, if it was early in the morning Angus Reid is going to be in town himself. I don't know whether that would make it any better to discuss the questions in the morning or whatever. He's available to do a presentation at that time. I've got that written in here.

MR. CHUMIR: That's not great for me, as I've got to come all the way up for that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, early in the morning is not great for me either.

MR. CHUMIR: We've got to come.

MR. DAY: So do I.

MR. McINNIS: What about the same time as today, 1:30?

MR. CHUMIR: Sure; 1:30 is perfect.

MR. CAMERON: One-thirty, a week from Wednesday, on the 24th of July. Okay.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Wednesday or Thursday?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Wednesday, July 24. You would have to tell Bruce where.

MR. ANDERSON: I'll get it to Garry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dennis will be in Vancouver, and his copy will have to be faxed out.

MR. CAMERON: Sure. Okay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think it can be sent here.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. Or if we have the number, we could send it directly if you want.

MR. ANDERSON: In the end we have to take this back to the whole committee, I understand.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Uh huh.

MR. ANDERSON: That's my understanding.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The questions have to go back to the whole committee?

MR. DAY: I can't remember.

MR. ANDERSON: That's what I recall.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that how you recall it, Louise?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Yes.

MR. POCOCK: Well, I would think it's a fairly substantive decision, so the committee may want to address it as a whole.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I guess we were charged with coming up with a proposal for the committee.

MR. ANDERSON: What's the date we have to have it all? You said the end or the middle of September?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. By the middle of September we'd like to have this ready for you to go the field.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah. That's a fairly lengthy lead time. Usually we work in a matter of weeks or days.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We've got trouble with our manpower, you know.

MR. CAMERON: Yeah; exactly. No, that's fine. I mean, if that's fine with the committee, that's fine with me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, we have to work with what we've got.

Is there any more business? We are adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 24.

[The committee adjourned at 3:49 p.m.]

