

1:18 p.m.

Thursday, September 12, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we be seated, please. I understand our presenter has a meeting at 1:45.

If she could come forward and make a presentation.

MRS. STEPHENSON: Hon. ministers, commission members, thank you for this opportunity. I speak for myself, but my views are shared by many.

Let me first state that I am a patriot. I love Canada with a passion. In its borders I can live and work with dignity and have hope for the future. We have freedom and opportunity.

To answer the biggest question: yes, this country is worth saving, and we have to work towards it. How we approach this problem is very important, for in the past it has been mishandled. Mr. Pearson's vision of two Canadas was wrong. It created a wall in our country that would rival the Great Wall of China. You cannot have two countries in one nation. We are Canadians and Canadians only. We cannot be French Canadians, English Canadians, German Canadians, or any other ethnic Canadians. If these are the cultures we desire, then perhaps we should return to the nations that have them. It is a choice we make. It is time for our country to have its own identity, its own culture; to be Canadians, true Canadians.

On the question of Quebec separation, the only answer I see is a simple one: no province has the right to give away any part of our country, neither does Quebec have the right to take any part of our country. If they wish to have a separate nation, a separate Quebec, then that is fine, but they will have to go elsewhere to do it. Quebec is on Canadian soil; it should remain on Canadian soil. It is time they realized that they are Canadians with the same rights and responsibilities as the rest of us. If this is not what they want, then they may leave the country. This is Canada, and the answer is no. We are one nation coast to coast and will remain one nation coast to coast. It's time for our leaders to make this clear.

Although this approach sounds simplistic, it has a history. One hundred and thirty years ago a similar nation, whose age at the time was just over a hundred years like our own, faced the same problem: sectional division caused by differences in economies, ideals, and ways of life. There were also disputes over federal and regional rights and powers. Added to this was political blundering and disorder in the government. There emerged from this a leader who had a strong sense of nation. He referred to his country as a nation divided: 11 states wished to secede. He stood up and said no, and that he would use the nation's full power to hold federal possessions. What ensued was a bloody, bitter war, but the nation prevailed. Today that nation, the United States, exists from coast to coast with a strong national pride we can only admire.

Now, I do not advocate that we declare war and rerun the Plains of Abraham, but there are other ways to say no that are just as effective. Let me first state, though, the reason for holding our nation together. In a world where strength is admired, we appear weak; we cannot handle our own problems. This is not an image that we should be projecting. If we allow separation, we destroy both countries. Our status as a powerful nation will be lost. Our economies will be ruined. Investment in either nation will cease because of instability. Either nation would be a prime candidate for takeover by a more powerful nation. It is an important time for our leaders to take a stand.

It is their responsibility to keep the country together, and it is the people's responsibility to see that it happens.

Further to this I have several suggestions on a course of action. One, stop bargaining. Two, start an aggressive propaganda campaign in Quebec to advise its citizens of exactly what they lose if separation occurs: (a) with every family allowance, welfare, and UIC cheque there should be a blunt notice saying that this benefit will cease to exist; (b) every person receiving health care coverage should also be given a notice detailing the government's contribution and that they will now become responsible for this share; (c) every student, elementary through university, should be told that the federal government will no longer be supporting their education; (d) every civil servant should be given notice that their job will cease to exist or that they will be replaced by Canadians; (e) the monetary and postal systems will no longer be available to them. All industries should be informed of what share of the market they will retain. For example, the dairy industry now holds 42 percent; in the future they will be competing for 2 percent. Work and funding on all federal projects in Quebec would stop. Notice will be given that they will have to form their own defence system, as we will retain the Canadian armed forces. We should also remind them of just how effective the provincial police were at Oka. Also, in the past 50 years Quebec has demonstrated a preference for having others defend their country; not once have they voted in favour of deploying our troops for a worthy cause. Now their defence will be their problem. This should also add to the realization of how vulnerable they are. One wonders how they would respond if we massed troops at the border. The councils of every native band in Quebec should be told that all deals and land claims are null and void and that they will be dealing with the Quebec government in the future. They should also be informed that their benefits will stop, as they no longer live on Canadian soil.

The citizens of Quebec should be told how much of the debt they are responsible for, that we expect payment the day independence is declared, and to bankrupt their new nation would not bother our conscience. It is the price of their freedom. Steps should be taken to assure the loyalty of our federal elected officials from Quebec.

The last point: it should also be made clear that we intend to retain possession of all federal facilities and land. Items like the St. Lawrence seaway were built for Canadians by Canadians and will remain in our possession.

These measures should make the Quebec public aware of exactly what is going to happen if they leave and perhaps the total scope of the benefits they are now receiving. It is hoped that the instability and chaos it will create will force them to start thinking with their heads instead of their hearts and place enough pressure on their elected officials to do something before it is too late. Culture does not stand for much if you cannot feed your children, and demographics show that a large part of Quebec citizens are rural poor. Economics will prove to be the best resource we have in our fight for our nation. If this plan could be followed, we will provide the people of Quebec with some very good and concrete reasons to stay. Now we can start to negotiate but from a far better position.

Three, a new order, a new system has to be found for regional representation, one that embodies fairness and equality. Our elected officials are compromised. It is their sworn duty to represent the people of a constituency, riding, or province to the very best of their ability. How can this be accomplished without their being biased? It may be better to have another segment of society create the blueprint. I would like to suggest perhaps

that we solicit the aid of 50 of Canada's top professionals, give them all information and access to equipment that they need, and perhaps they could come up with a system that has logic, fairness, and equality. Then give it to the accountants and the lawyers and the politicians to have the finer details worked out.

Education. Second-language instruction in our schools has to be rethought. To give a child a second language is a gift. It is brain expanding and teaches a child to think in a different way; it is a definite advantage. But we cannot confuse bilingualism and biculturalism. As our schools exist now in Alberta, we have French immersion and English schools both offering a smattering of each other's language arts. This builds barriers; it forces parents to choose them or us. We really should be handling it like the Europeans do. Every school in our system should teach a second language as a subject starting in grade 1. There should not be separate schools.

We also have to return to teaching patriotism in our schools. It has to be taught with bias and passion. There can be no doubt in our children's minds that Canada is the best place to grow up. As it is now, we have lost our passion for our nation because it violates someone's rights. Our children do not have the right to salute the flag. Well, we have a right to nationhood, and it has been violated.

1:28

More emphasis has to be placed on teaching Canadian politics, past and present. Although it is now taught as a subject in high school, more could be done by the private sector to interest our children in this exciting subject. Perhaps our political parties could help.

Canada Day should be really celebrated and promoted: simple things like radio stations should play Canadian songs, lots of flag waving, et cetera. Although some regard this form of patriotism as frivolous, it is not. It is the starting point of a positive attitude towards one's country. It is important for every Canadian to know the words to *O Canada* and to sing them proudly.

Our people also have to come to terms with the costs they are extracting from our country as the me generation. We cannot afford our people. The good social programs we have in place are not serving their original purpose. Many were designed as a temporary measure to help the needy until they could help themselves, but abuse is rampant. Pride is no longer a factor. Accepting government handouts has become an acceptable way of life. This has to change if we expect to survive as a country. We have to develop pride in ourselves, in our work, to encourage pride in our country.

All government funding for cultural support groups should also cease. This is a divisive factor, and it is splitting our nation into little groups. If these groups wish to form a club, they are free to do so, but they should foot the bill. Our funds should be put towards developing and promoting Canadian culture.

The last question I wish to deal with is the loss of French culture in Quebec. Yes, it is happening, for they are in Canada not France, and it will continue to happen whether they stay or go. Separating will not save it. In fact, it will likely speed its demise. No longer will it be supported either emotionally or economically by anyone else. What we see now is the death throes of a culture. That is why they are fighting so hard. The evidence we have shows that Quebec cannot economically exist within its own borders. It cannot afford to give its people the handicap of not having the most widely spoken language on the continent, nor can it stop the intrusion of the North American

way of life. It is all around them, and they will need to be part of it to survive. So in the end, what would they gain by leaving?

We should also be aware of what has happened in the past. Once before we created a distinct society with disastrous results. Our native Canadians, whose culture was different from ours and we did not understand, were held separate from other Canadians. Instead of benefiting from each other's cultures, we now have mistrust and prejudice. Unfortunately, to many people what is different or distinct is wrong and to be feared. We are all distinct individuals, but we are equal as citizens in this nation. Why create barriers?

In conclusion, I would like to point out that many of us are losing our cultural heritage in Canada, but we are gaining so much more. We are Canadians with our own vision of this nation, the rights and freedom and opportunity to make it happen.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Brenda. You are shown as giving two presentations, one on your own behalf and one on behalf of the Calgary-Shaw Progressive Conservative Association.

MRS. STEPHENSON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to do that second one, and then we'll entertain questions?

MRS. STEPHENSON: Okay.

My next presentation is on behalf of the Calgary-Shaw PC Association and is a summary of the comments made and forwarded to Keith Spicer and the citizens' forum. No attempt was made to rationalize the comments made by the group or to reach a group consensus; thus, some of the comments are contradictory. They do, however, represent the mixed emotions of the group over various issues facing Canada's future.

Our group followed the discussion points that the citizens' forum suggested, so our presentation will be made in the form of questions and answers, the first being: what are the major issues facing Canada now and in the future? One, separation of power between various levels of government; two, aboriginal issues; three, social service provisions, especially health care; four, regionalism, the treatment of different regions; five, nationalism: why aren't Canadians more nationalistic and patriotic; six, the official language policy.

The next question asked was about aboriginal peoples' lands and government. Only one comment: it is time to re-evaluate our position with our aboriginal people.

The third question: what did the group say about a new partnership between Quebec and the rest of Canada? Two comments. One, we should not talk about a partnership between Quebec and the rest of Canada but a partnership between all provinces; there is no reason to separate Quebec out and treat them any differently from any other province. Two, any means implemented to French Canadians to enable them to maintain their culture should also be enacted for English Canadians.

On the question of regionalism and shared interest among regions, the group had only one comment: all regions should be treated equally under the Constitution. While short-term government initiatives need to be tailored to the needs of specific regions, no differences should exist in the Constitution.

We had two comments on official languages. One, the teaching of two languages in schools is viewed as very positive. Two, it is thought that the cost of official bilingualism as

implemented is too high; why provide bilingual government services in Alberta to a unilingual province?

A consensus was reached on the question of ethnic and cultural diversity. Our group felt that we must move to more of a melting pot than a mosaic. We have to be Canadians. This is one reason that Canadians are not particularly nationalist or patriotic.

The last question in the paper dealt with Canada in the world, and it was felt by our forum that it was not the right forum to evaluate Canada's relationship with the rest of the world. This should be an introspective view of Canada.

Thank you for your time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Any questions or comments? Yes, Nancy.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you very much, Brenda, for your presentation.

I wanted to just clarify something. On your education section you talk about the whole issue of French immersion and keeping the programs intact in the single school. I just want to make sure that when you said that there should not be separate schools, you were referring to the issue of immersion as opposed to the right of the minority to create a separate school district, which is entrenched in the Constitution.

MRS. STEPHENSON: No. Mine was the former, the first.

MS BETKOWSKI: Yeah. Okay. Thanks.

MRS. STEPHENSON: I have children in the immersion system.

MS BETKOWSKI: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments? Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Brenda, I thought you did a very good job of articulating your position. I was intrigued by your thoughts on Quebec and how we should deal with them. It's a very strong position indeed.

The other item, though, that I wanted to clarify was that in terms of trying to resolve the constitutional issue you mentioned the getting together of 50 professionals. By that did you mean constitutional experts? Is that what you meant by 50 professionals?

MRS. STEPHENSON: No, not constitutional experts; perhaps engineers, perhaps lawyers, people that actually live in Canada. Then it can go to the constitutional experts.

MR. ANDERSON: You don't feel that by defining it as experts, there might not be concerns on the part of the various other groups who might not be defined as professional in terms of their input?

MRS. STEPHENSON: Yes, there could be a problem there.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, thank you very much.
Any other questions or comments?

Thank you. I know you have to go and do a civic duty by serving on a jury.

MS BETKOWSKI: You didn't comment on the judiciary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Perhaps we'll hear; after your jury duty you'll give us a comment on that. Thank you very much.

MRS. STEPHENSON: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suzanne Sawyer.

MRS. SAWYER: I made a copy of this, which I'll leave with you.

Hello, everybody. Some of you know me; some of you don't. Now everybody will know me.

1:38

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome.

MRS. SAWYER: Hi. I'd like to first of all thank you for inviting me to make this formal presentation. The last time I was here was at the last minute in a pair of jeans and with my two kids on the way to bowling, so I kind of made a few comments off the top of my head, which I've expanded upon here.

As some of you may know, I was recently elected to the board of directors for the Calgary Multicultural Centre, and I'm actively involved as a volunteer with a number of Francophone related activities, boards, and committees. But today I offer only my personal point of view and suggestions. I'm very grateful for this unique opportunity, and nervous . . .

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

MRS. SAWYER: I won't bite you either.

. . . and eager to share my thoughts with you, the first of which includes thanks to our government leaders for creating the Constitutional Reform Task Force of Alberta and for openly encouraging Albertans such as me to actively participate in these discussions. I think this is an excellent eye-opening opportunity for all involved but most particularly for those of little faith in the system and a great penchant for criticism and name-calling of our elected politicians at the drop of a hat.

I am of the opinion that freedom of speech is an abused right and that we should beware of what we allow our unconscious minds to be fed with as a result. Before automatically complaining, serious thought should be given to why one is complaining and just what one would do to improve the situation. Chronic complainers may be surprised to discover that they're merely echoing someone else's opinion because it has been fed to them often enough in various shapes, sizes, and colours, so to speak. Just as happiness and serenity can't help but touch those you pass them on to, ill tempers and bad attitudes rub off too. The media plays a major role in this, and I feel they should be held accountable for their spoken and written broadcasts. Politically friendly or peace oriented reporters are few and far between, yet they are responsible for educating the public. They literally have the power to control the masses by feeding them their own personal opinions. To the unsuspecting public I say beware.

Freedom of speech is a powerful thing, a wonderful thing, but I really question our sense of values when Albertans claim their right to burn crosses, display racial slurs, and parade around town with rude bumper stickers imposing their mental junk food messages on everyone. The "Tax this, Brian" bumper sticker is a prime example of this low-level brain message, the "this" being the upward pointed middle finger of a fist held up in the air. I

resent that kind of garbage being freely fed to unsuspecting customers such as me, and I'm sure many of you have been. I particularly resent my eight- and 10-year-old children being subjected to such negative messages every time I happen to get stuck behind a car flaunting one of these stickers.

Children being children, they initially were deliciously shocked the first time we saw the "Tax this" sticker and then keenly amused as we repeatedly saw it. I have explained the brain food value of messages such as these, and now they try to ignore them. But stuck behind one of these cars at a red light, it's not easily done; they still read them, and the screaming messages still get across. I was horrified last year to hear my then seven-year-old son, visibly agitated, angrily blurt out, "I hate Brian Mulroney and I hate the GST." How could he hate someone he had never met? How could he hate something that he did not clearly know the meaning of? He was relying on the information television and bumper stickers fed his subconscious mind, and the message was clear to him that the GST obviously was a fate worse than death and Brian Mulroney, the man responsible for bringing it in, must be a horrible man. How sad I was to hear such ugly words in my own home. I had a very long talk with my son on the dangerous and destructive powers of blind hatred and reminded him of just how lucky we are to live in such a great country as Canada in the safety and comfort of our beautiful province of Alberta.

Today my eight year old is aware of the burdens our Prime Minister has on his shoulders and appreciates the responsibilities he's faced with. He does not even remember the incident I just told you about. But I do, and I will never forget it, because that totally unexpected outburst of twisted emotion reminded me that the education of our children is to be safeguarded and protected at all costs. Their bright little minds are like sponges, and we must saturate them with pure, crystal clear water, never vinegar or sewage. It has been said time and time again that what we expose our children to should be carefully monitored, but I say to you today that what we as adults unconsciously expose ourselves to is of equal if not greater importance, as we are the people our children look to for guidance and advice.

I'm always amazed at the intensity of some of the negative comments I hear and some of the poor attitudes I sense from time to time when people talk about politicians. You're looking at a new kid on the block here on the political scene, and I'm the first to admit that I have a lot to learn. But I will say this: how can anyone who has never sat on a committee, who has never taken on the responsibility of a community leadership role, who has never been to a community related or politically affiliated meeting, who has not experienced the incredible satisfaction derived from volunteer teamwork or agonized through sometimes long and stressful meetings, who has never taken on any such responsibility dare to point an accusing finger or pass judgment on those such as you who dare to act and dare to care and, yes, in their mere human state make mistakes?

I believe a system of social obligations and responsibilities should be created. You get out what you put into society. I believe personal involvement within the community should be encouraged at a very early age and should be mandatory for social assistance and unemployment insurance recipients. No doubt there would really be a lot of complaining then. But I'll guarantee you that blind criticism, apathy, and ignorance would soon be dissipated and replaced with respect, empathy, and understanding. I would also suggest that you'd be helping a good number of people climb out of the emotional rut they necessarily get dragged down and trapped into as a result of their personal life-styles. I can only foresee good, positive

results flowing from such a decision. I believe more definite motivational programs should be integrated within the Alberta school system and the sensitization and educational process which starts as early as ECS level should be strongly reinforced in co-operation with the home. Keep our children challenged and motivated and drop-out rates are bound to diminish.

I believe – I believe a lot of things, don't I? – a great sense of national pride must be instilled in all Canadians starting with our children. Our schools should not only proudly wave both Canadian and Alberta flags, but our national anthem should be sung regularly, at the very least on a weekly basis. Every child should have the names of Calixa Lavallée, Sir Adolphe-Basile Routhier, and Mr. Justice Robert Stanley Weir on the tips of their tongues and know their stories. The history and meaning of the words to our national anthem should be studied and understood, not just memorized, by every student within the education system. This should be done as part of the curriculum, not just as a special project at certain times. Promoting high self-esteem as Canadians and developing an inbred sense of Canadian pride and nationalism and a sense of belonging should be a top priority in our education system.

I believe there should be an overall national standard of education controlled by the federal government and enhanced by each province in accordance with their individual guidelines. Canadian parents should be able to transfer from one end of Canada to the other secure in the knowledge that their children will receive the same quality of education no matter where they reside.

I believe wholeheartedly in bilingualism. To give you a very brief personal background at this point, I was born in la belle province – Hull to be exact – but raised in Ottawa from the age of two. Though I was born in Quebec, I do not consider myself to be a Quebecois, as I was not raised there. I have visited relatives in Montreal only occasionally over the past 20 years. I am of French and Scottish descent. My heart skips equally to the sound of the spoons or the bagpipes.

1:48

I am proud to say that French is my mother tongue and I did not know a word of English until, when I was eight years old, my family moved to an all-English neighbourhood where I was naturally immersed. It didn't hurt a bit. I was educated at an all-French convent and received no formal English education until I was in grade 9. I am fortunate enough to be fluent in both our country's official languages and am a strong supporter of bilingualism. I cannot imagine Canada stripped of its bilingual qualities. I shudder at the thought of living in a unilingual Canada. After hundreds of years of going two steps forward and one step back, surely now of all times we cannot take any steps back. The suggested review of the policy of official bilingualism points to the uncertainty of the government's convictions with regard to its present policy on the subject. Let us go forward, encourage teaching of more than two languages, and stop dancing around in circles to the sound of the bilingual bingo bop we now gyrate to.

I still have dreams of a truly bilingual Canada. The other day a lady I met for the first time said to me, "Why French schools in Alberta; why not Ukrainian?" I said, "Why not both?" And I meant it. Somewhere during our conversation she said, "Actually, I think all children from kindergarten on up should have to be in a French or French immersion program; then, eventually, you really would have a bilingual country." I confess I smiled from ear to ear. That would be shoving French down people's throats. Consider this though. In just over a decade

Canadian bilingualism would be a reality, and in no time we would find a generation of open-minded, happy to be bilingual people, thanking their parents for having made the right decision for them. French or bilingual education should be available at every school in Alberta. Parents should not have to be faced with a major decision between the temptation of a conveniently located English school right across the street and a French education that you have to go out of your way to get. It should be easily accessible to everyone in our province.

An analogy. On a world scale, Canada is just a child yet should behave like an adult. An adult will send his or her child to school whether the child wants to go or not, will see the child through hours of piano, ballet, or gymnastic lessons and practice regardless of the cost, and that adult will also smile glowingly when the grown-up child waves that university diploma, becomes an accomplished pianist, an elegant ballerina, or a supple gymnast. The aches and pains of the learning process will soon be forgotten, and the child will be forever grateful for the wisdom of the parent who cared. Let us be those parents who care, and let us make this country truly bilingual. Every future adult will thank us for it. Do you think I'm exaggerating? Let me ask you this: is there anyone in this room who can honestly say that if he or she could just push a button and become immediately bilingual, he or she would not do so?

Absence makes the heart grow fonder. Bilingualism was never an issue for me one way or another as I grew up. In 1973 I married a unilingual English-speaking Canadian and found myself living overseas for five adventurous years in such exciting countries as Australia, South Africa, Europe, and the United States of America. I tell you all this because it was while I was away from home, away from Canada, that I realized for the first time how proud I was to be Canadian. It was at that time that I found myself seeking out other Canadians and pinned and stitched our Canadian flag everywhere I could to proudly announce I was a Canadian. It was also at that time, after a couple from France joined our group, that I was amazed to discover how dearly I missed speaking French, how very good it felt to speak my mother tongue with them, and how lucky I was to be a bilingual Canadian.

I believe reduced-rate travel within Canada for Canadians should be federally and provincially funded somehow. I looked in the paper this morning: 2,200 jobs cut. Where are those people going to go? To what purpose? What does that serve? Those people should be working, and people should be out there traveling and meeting people and feeling what this country is all about. Few people have the golden opportunity I've had to travel, and I can tell you from experience that no amount of textbook learning can match any travel experience. Quebeckers I had the opportunity of meeting here this summer through my involvement with the Calgary-Quebec Exchange Committee for the twinning of our two cities were a real pleasure to meet. As ambassadors of their city, they represented a population of people eager to maintain open channels of communication and promote harmony and understanding. The importance of these exchanges is invaluable, as they will have returned to Quebec with words of warmth, friendship, and goodwill. I believe that exchanges, liaison, and direct contact with people on an inter-provincial basis are extremely important and should be facilitated by both the federal and the provincial governments. How can we judge people from other provinces when we've never been there, have never met them, do not know their history firsthand? How can anyone judge the unknown?

My virtually total dedication to the protection and promotion and sensitization of the French language came about when my children became of school age. At that time we lived in a small

town in northern Saskatchewan where French education had never been considered let alone available. This was to be my first experience in trailblazing. It was then that I discovered the all-important role of the Secretary of State and the official minority languages Act. It was quite an education in just what is involved in obtaining French education in English Canada. Thanks to Mary McCann, a lady who became a very dear friend of mine, and the help of CPF and federal government representatives who worked hand in hand with us, Mary and I succeeded in having the French immersion program offered in the small northern Saskatchewan town of La Ronge. The program is now up to the grade 6 level. We also became school board trustees.

After all that work, due to circumstances beyond my control, my husband and I decided to move back to Alberta, where we had previously lived very happily. I love living here. Never say never. I swore I would never again get involved with French things. The work, the incredible amount of hours involved, and the mental stress – never again. I did manage to take a two-year break. But like a moth to a flame, I came back. I'm proud to say that I'm an Albertan, having lived here on and off since 1978. Those of you who know me will also know that I'm equally proud to say that I am a French- and English-speaking Albertan dedicated to the advancement and enhancement of the French factor in Alberta and, more specifically, in Calgary. In light of this fact, I formed Calgary French Connexion Inc., a company specializing in community development projects, public relations, and liaison between the Anglophone and Francophone communities of Calgary and surrounding areas as well as between Canadian municipalities and provinces.

I am a firm believer in the value of public relations and efforts in liaison. I'm a firm supporter of Mayor Al Duerr in all his liaison and business missions be they on a national or an international scale. He has repeatedly gone out of his way, and should be highly praised for doing so, to welcome prospective Calgarians and correctly assure them that Calgary offers Francophone and bilingual education as well as a variety of Francophone services and a wealth of Francophone community activities. Coming from such places as Ottawa where bilingual services and Francophone education are as commonplace as the sun rising in the morning and where you hear French spoken just as frequently as you do English, these matters are important when deciding whether to move to reputedly English western Canada.

I firmly supported Premier Don Getty in his overseas business mission and just shook my head when the media reacted as predictably as they did. We must broaden our horizons, Alberta. Our leaders must establish open channels of communication, build those multifaceted and multilingual bridges, and open those doors. How can this possibly be done without personal contact? I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Premier Getty for Family Day. Once again the media seemed to go out of its way to rain on this beautiful project. Well, I thank the Premier for that day, which I look forward to and always enjoy with my children.

The Francophone community in Alberta in a new Canada. Fact: Francophones have been living in Alberta since 1705. We have strong, old roots here and consider Alberta home. We are from Quebec, l'Acadie, Europe, Haiti, Africa, and Asia. To suggest that Francophones go back to Quebec if they don't like it out here is tantamount to suggesting that disgruntled Anglophones go back to England or Ireland or wherever.

1:58

Fact: there are 56,246 Albertans whose mother tongue is French and a further 14,145 whose mother tongue is bilingual, for a total of 70,390.

Fact: over 13,000 Francophones as well as 42,000 bilingual people live right here in Calgary.

Fact: Alberta's Francophone population constitutes the third largest group of Francophones living outside the province of Quebec, the other two groups being Acadians from New Brunswick and Franco-Ontarians.

Fact: the French-Canadian Association of Alberta was founded in 1926 for the promotion and protection of the French language in Alberta through education. Over 100 Francophone groups and organizations, 28 of which are right here in Calgary, presently exist in Alberta. There is one weekly community newspaper for the whole province, one Francophone television and radio station which broadcasts out of Edmonton. The first Francophone school in Alberta was allowed to open its doors only seven years ago. This September the seventh Francophone school in the whole province of Alberta opened its doors to students in Edmonton. In Alberta 147,840 people speak French, representing 6.2 percent of our population. In Alberta 48 percent of Francophones are younger than 35, and the majority of young Francophones living in the west live in Alberta.

Fact: together we can get a lot further ahead. Alberta's minority Francophone community needs the government of Alberta's unequivocal support. For every hundred dollars spent on federal government services, only 33 cents or 0.3 percent of the budget is allotted to bilingualism. More than 80 percent of Canadians – 83 percent in Quebec, 80 percent elsewhere; pretty close – are proud of the country's French-English accomplishments. This is from the *Globe and Mail*/CBC polls, April 1991. Twenty-five countries have French as their official language, and 33 countries have English as theirs; 44 countries are members of le Sommet des pays francophones, and 49 are members of the Commonwealth.

Albertans working together. Don't forget the Francophones, please. We are not a visible minority, we are, nonetheless, a minority and we need your help.

Please do not be negatively influenced by the Quebec situation, and please do not be concerned about the plight of the Anglophones in Quebec. There are 700,000 Anglophones in Quebec. Fact: there are 306 unilingual English and 66 bilingual schools in Quebec, seven English and two bilingual colleges, three English universities. In Quebec there are 24 weekly Anglophone written publications plus 30 weekly bilingual ones – we have one French one here – and one daily newspaper, the *Gazette*. Eleven radio stations and two television stations keep Anglophone Quebecers informed and entertained in their mother tongue.

Back to Alberta. I believe that our provincial government must support its invisible Francophone minority as well as its visible minority. Ask and ye shall receive. Well, I am daring to care, and I am daring to ask. I am asking for the government's assurance of its guaranteed support of Alberta's minority Francophone population in their continued quest for the conservation, preservation, and indeed survival of their mother tongue now and no matter what the future holds for us, for Alberta, for Canada, for Alberta in a new Canada.

I am by no means a constitutional expert, but I do know what is important to me and to the Francophone population in Alberta, although as I said in my opening remarks, I do not speak officially on their behalf. I feel that it is through the sharing of concerns and experiences that the experts will then be better equipped to successfully bring any changes deemed necessary to our present Constitution while providing Albertans with the opportunity of having a say in the matter. The future

of our country lies with two simple words with complex meanings: education and attitude.

In closing, I would emphasize again the importance of a healthy cycle of education starting with what we as adults allow our minds to ingest, necessarily influencing our actions, which, in turn, will necessarily influence our children who will influence theirs and their children's children. Imagine if the first person who uttered the words, "I don't want French shoved down my throat," had said instead: "We get to learn French? Fantastic. When can we start?"

Thank you for your time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Suzanne. That's an excellent presentation and deeply felt and very well articulated.

MRS. SAWYER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I couldn't help but being reminded when you used two words, "ignorance" and "apathy," of the reporter who asked a person on the street, "What do you think of the problems of ignorance and apathy?" The reply was, "I don't know and I don't care."

Your comments at the last I think are really the answer to the thing. It is education and attitude, and I think you summed it up extremely well.

MRS. SAWYER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fred Bradley, and then Yolande.

MR. BRADLEY: I'd like to thank you for a very excellent presentation and a lot of very useful information. My question was – and I know that you know the answer to the question – in terms of your view that the national anthem should be sung in school. You're aware that there are three versions of the national anthem. There's the English version, there's the French version, and there's a bilingual version. The words in the English version and the French version are different; they're not the same words. Which version should we be singing in school? I guess that's my question.

MRS. SAWYER: Well, what I would like to see – in the Anglophone education system obviously they're going to be learning the Anglophone, but I still think they should learn the fact that first of all the song was written in French, who translated it, when, the process that was involved, that there was a special commission formed by the government that added their comments to Justice Sir Robert Weir. The history behind it: study the words and get the word-for-word translation. It might be interesting in what it says in French as opposed to what it says in English.

MR. BRADLEY: The words of the national anthem in the different languages have different meanings, and it's one of the interesting features of our Canadian state.

MRS. SAWYER: In the French or bilingual, of course, they would study both. What I would like to see the English do is, obviously, study the English, have the French translated word for word and study that as well.

MR. BRADLEY: Just a further question. Should we be working towards a national anthem that means the same thing in both languages?

MRS. SAWYER: Interesting.

MR. BRADLEY: It may be one of those factors that can unite us. The national anthem should be a unifying force, but in Canada it means different things. So the national anthem is not a unifying institution of the country in my judgment.

MRS. SAWYER: It's interesting if you look at the French version, actually, the last two sentences repeat, "Protégera nos foyers et nos droits": "it will protect our homes and our rights." So were they concerned about the Francophone survival way back in 1880 when it was first sung? I mean, it could be a whole interesting thing to study right there.

MR. BRADLEY: Do you think we should be striving for a national anthem that means the same thing in English and French?

MRS. SAWYER: Well, if you could possibly translate the French. I mean, to me I can't imagine stopping singing what I learned when I was five years old.

MR. BRADLEY: I guess the question is: you were talking about unifying institutions. We should sing the national anthem in our schools. If there's going to be a unifying institution across the country, it should mean the same thing when you sing it whether it be English, French, or bilingual.

MRS. SAWYER: Well, I agree with you to a certain extent, but on the other hand, what is already there, I think the idea is to study it and to understand it, to feel it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we've canvassed the subject as well as we can, with respect.

Yolande.

2:08

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. The last time Fred brought this up, I sat down and translated the French version into English, realized that it was much more religious in content, spoke about the cross and the faith and so on, whereas the English version is more patriotic and based on a state, not so much a faith.

Anyway, I really appreciate your presentation and the facts that you've presented. I think so many people are operating on the basis of misunderstanding, myth, generalization. We've heard comments over and over this week and the previous week that indicate there is a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation out there. For instance, the fact that only 33 cents out of every hundred dollars spent by the federal government goes to bilingualism: people think it's \$50, at least half, or something. We've heard such things as English should be the official language in Quebec; we've heard that the French culture is dying: on and on. So I really do appreciate those facts, and I wish you would find a way with your company to make that known.

Tomorrow we're going to have a visit from Jacques Parizeau, and of course he will indicate his strong conviction that separation is the only way and it will be good for all of us. I would like to ask you two questions. If you were able to discuss the matter with him, what would you say to him? Secondly, not dealing with Parizeau anymore but dealing with your type of approach, which is liaison, understanding, travel, and so on, will that be enough? Will liaison be enough to actually keep this country together? Do you think we've gone beyond that?

MRS. SAWYER: Well, to answer your first question with M. Parizeau, actually I tried to get a meeting with him, because how can you judge someone you haven't met? I know Premier Getty and I know many of you, and that's fine, but I don't know anybody in Quebec. I was told that he's not meeting anyone this time, but I was invited to come to the press conference, which I will do, and I will certainly be here to listen to him tomorrow. What would I say to him?

MRS. GAGNON: If you were asking him a question, what kinds of things would you ask?

MRS. SAWYER: You don't have time for all that. This is it. I can't answer that because I'm just going by what the papers are feeding us and the 30-second clips out of the three-hour presentations that he makes. You know, out of the 50 wonderful things that were said, the media has a way of somehow picking the one thing that's going to get people's backs up.

What would I ask him? I'd ask him why in the world he wants to break up this country - I don't think I'd ask him that; everybody has. I don't know.

Do I think liaison is enough? Well, liaison is the springboard, the basics, and from that you create sound relationships and concrete results. It starts with liaison.

MRS. GAGNON: The other thing we've had suggested is a more punitive approach, the approach that if you don't play the game with us the way we say, then you're gone. That's not your approach. Your approach is to continue the . . .

MRS. SAWYER: Absolutely not. Absolutely not. Confrontations never get you anywhere but in trouble.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Yes, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Yes. Suzanne, I'm just wondering, in terms of recognition of Quebec as a distinct society or some sort of special status, what are your views? If it's necessary to do that to achieve a constitutional accord, would you be in favour of recognizing Quebec's special status?

MRS. SAWYER: Well, to a certain extent I believe that all provinces should have the same powers. I don't know enough of the details to really answer that correctly, but from what I'm again reading in the papers, from where things seem to be going - and I can hardly wait to see just what this is going to be - what they're saying is that they will acknowledge Quebec as a distinct society, but they're not saying just what that means. I think they should be acknowledged . . . You know, it's a poor choice of words. When all this started, I think it was quite innocently said. I think it's been picked apart and twisted and turned and blown up. They're distinctive, distinct. I don't know. We don't want to be extinct, eh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Suzanne, for an excellent presentation. We appreciate you coming forward. I gather we'll see you in the audience tomorrow when M. Parizeau comes visiting.

Thank you.

MRS. SAWYER: Oh, yes. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: George Kalin.

MR. KALIN: Good afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon.

MR. KALIN: My voice is probably about as good as you will hear it. It has never been any better, so if you don't get a word or two, I will gladly repeat.

I believe that this so-called constitutional crisis is not a crisis at all, not to the people here or to the people in Quebec. Myself, I don't feel a crisis. I talked to my neighbour; he doesn't have a crisis. But I think it would be a real crisis to the federal politicians from Quebec if that province were to separate because they would certainly find themselves without a job and out of power. Since they include a lot of ministers and the Prime Minister of Canada and since Quebec has practically ruled this country for decades, separation is very, very, very unlikely in my opinion.

The two main factors that cause regions to separate are also in the rest of Canada. The number one factor, I believe, is massive dissatisfaction with the central government and, number two, possibly economic gain by separation. For instance, the regions that are separating in Eastern Europe are practically on the doorstep of the European community, which is already the most powerful economy in the world. Next year, with one currency and no travel restrictions, they will be the envy of all nations. A separated Quebec, however, has no such opportunity. They really don't have anywhere to go. They will always be there between Canada, if they separate, and next to the United States. I don't believe the United States would make exceptions to their culture and language.

Quebec is not a net contributor to Canada. They have been on the take for many years. They have received billions of dollars just for the hydro projects and also received more than their fair share in government contracts. The people in Manitoba can probably tell you a little more about that. The fact is that they do not have any bargaining power, and they do not have a right to special treatment. I believe that's all political brainwashing. They hold thousands of highly paid federal jobs, from the Prime Minister down. They are ministers and ambassadors and commissioners, in Crown corporations from Air Canada and the post office and the armed forces, et cetera, et cetera: one can find them in all federal departments and sometimes only because they speak French.

Quebec has four justices in the Supreme Court of Canada while some provinces have none, and since Quebec is not a signatory to the Canadian Constitution, their justices don't even have any jurisdiction there.

2:18

I had the opportunity to appear before the Supreme Court of Canada, and I called a spade a spade, and they did not like what I had to say, but I believe that we the people should elect the judges for the Supreme Court. Now, I have not gone into that in what form it may be, as through the Legislatures. It does not necessarily have to be at the individual level, but I believe that the judges should be elected, one from every province, and we must abolish all lifetime appointments because they are illegal under Canadian law. Any appointment, patronage or otherwise, discriminates against better-qualified applicants, and lifetime appointments also deny future governments their right to govern and to appoint their own. Therefore, I believe appointment cannot exceed the timely mandate of the politician who does the

appointing. Otherwise, the next government is forced to carry on with a large section of the defeated government still in power, like the Governor General and nine Supreme Court justices and a whole bunch of appointed Senators, who we know can stop the democratic process. At this time, about the tax here we must also remember that there was close to a 50-50 deal in the Senate. The next government, however, may be the Reform Party and the NDP, and that would make it even harder to get anything through the Senate.

Open competition for such jobs would also create higher productivity and less bureaucracy. To give you one example, the Supreme Court of Canada used to have leave to appeal hearings. These were full appeal hearings in which both sides made the complete presentation, and then after the judges heard the appeal, they could then refuse to hear the appeal. Well, I could not believe that such nonsense could exist in our highest court, and I had a lot to say about it. To make a long story short, when I was finished with them on that issue, there were no more leave to appeal hearings in our Supreme Court. The sad part is that while we the taxpayers are paying millions of dollars every year to high-priced appointments in such legal institutions as the Canadian Judicial Council, et cetera, it was an Alberta cowboy with no legal training at all who changed that ridiculous Supreme Court rule, and it didn't cost the taxpayer one penny.

So much for Canadian justice, which, by the way, is the title of my book. Some of you may have already read it; it was sent out to some of you. The sad part is that because it is a documentary about crimes and coverups in Canada's highest places, our provincial government has banned it and has pressured our newspapers into refusing to advertise it. So much for freedom of expression and freedom of the press.

According to the Spicer commission report I am not the only one who does not trust our politicians, so when we see Mr. Mulroney, who is no doubt the Prime Minister of the most corrupt government in Canadian history, coming full circle with the very same Meech Lake accord again, we feel insulted. How can anyone trust a Prime Minister who stuffed the Senate of Canada and destroyed its legal function just so he could force a tax upon our people that the vast majority opposed? How can we trust a government who violates democratic process whenever they find it convenient?

The Constitution we have is only nine years old and the speeches we heard about how good it is are still ringing in our ears. It was said to be the best in the world, and if it was properly enforced, it could be just that. It recognizes the supremacy of God and the rule of law in a free and democratic society. It makes every person in every province equal, and it does allow English signs in Quebec. We should not trade it in for a Mulroney version. As far as the banning of English signs in Quebec goes, that is, in my opinion, without a doubt the best example of how blatantly our politicians insult our intelligence. Here we had Premier Bourassa, who refused to sign the Canadian Constitution for Quebec, actually using it against us.

There is, however, a real crisis in our country, and that is in the administration of justice or the lack of it, where the rights and freedoms of the people are being denied, in particular the right to trial by jury in all cases against the Crown, which is guaranteed in the right to a fair trial by an independent and impartial tribunal, but one can't get it. The Charter of Rights also guarantees a fair trial, and the Charter of Rights is the supreme law of Canada, and therefore such should not be denied.

As some of you obviously know, I was 14 times maliciously prosecuted right here in our Calgary courts, and in one instance

I was tried, convicted, and punished three times for the very same offence, which I did not commit, and was then charged over \$2,000 for the costs of court. How would you like that happening to you? When I tried to sue for compensation, the Court of Queen's Bench here and then subsequently the Court of Appeal ruled, and I quote: lawyers and prosecutors have the right to commit perjury. I think it's a very ridiculous ruling, but because of that I have no case. The same courts also ruled that the word of the police officer must be taken over that of the accused. The actual wording was: if there was conflicting evidence or if there was no evidence, the word of the police officer must be taken over that of the accused. That makes justice totally impossible, and it confirms that justice in this province has completely collapsed. Every member of our Legislature was informed about it and, I believe, six or seven times, but not a single one of you stood up for justice. Not a single one of you requested a public inquiry, which I had asked for repeatedly, over and over again.

Well, that's about all I have to say except if you have any questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Kalin. If you have a written copy of your document you'd like to leave with us, fine, but if not, we have it transcribed.

MR. KALIN: All right. I can leave you this copy here.

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

MR. KALIN: There are no questions, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Brad Willcox.

2:28

MR. WILLCOX: I have a guide here to what I'm going to say, just to highlight a few of the issues that I'd like to present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, Brad.

MR. WILLCOX: Thanks. First of all, I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to come here and express my opinions. I think it's useful to have an open forum like this for discussion. Secondly, I'd like to let the committee know that I'm no constitutional expert, but I have been an Alberta resident for over 20 years, owned and operated a small business in Alberta, and I'm presently a student in neuroscience at the University of Calgary. So I have been around Alberta for some time, and as such I would like to express my opinions. I have no axe to grind. I have no political affiliation, but I do believe that the country is at a critical moment in its history and that we must address certain issues and quickly. One of the biggest problems that the country faces is a lack of vision by the political leaders of the country; I don't think I have to elaborate on that. In reference to specific issues that I'd like to address – I attended the hearings a couple of times earlier. I believe it was around the end of May or early June, when the hearings first commenced. I noticed a lot of people giving speeches but nobody really tackling the main issues. That's one of the reasons that I'm here, to just talk about and give my opinion on specific issues.

One is the amending formula. We had, I believe, the Edwards-Beaudoin committee addressing that. I think they proposed the Victoria formula all over again, which has been

unacceptable to Alberta for some time and, I believe, is still unacceptable, because it gives a couple of parts of the country vetoes over constitutional change and doesn't address the possibility of change. I'm more in favour of something like 7, 50, what we have already for certain parts of the Constitution, or even something maybe a little more stable. If you're going to make constitutional change, you should maybe have at least 60 percent of the population because constitutional change at any point can be quite a destabilizing factor, and if you have 51 percent for and 49 percent against, I'm not sure that you really have a mandate to make constitutional change.

In terms of accommodating Quebec's legitimate aspirations within our society, I don't see Quebec legitimately having the right to have a veto over constitutional change for the entire country. I think legitimately they suffer from a cultural insecurity and that a lot of the problems with the nationalists, et cetera, stem from that cultural insecurity. Some effort must be made to accommodate them, perhaps in the form of a partial veto over specific issues affecting language and culture. I think that has to be obviously very carefully addressed and spelled out. If you grant Quebec a partial veto over specific issues, they should be clearly spelled out; for example, you set up a formula such that the right to educate newcomers to the province in French and solely in French, et cetera, will be protected, this other part of particular Quebec legislation will be protected, et cetera, et cetera.

Distinct society has really opened up a can of worms, so to speak. I think a big error in judgment has been made by Mulroney in attempting to place a clause for distinct society in the body of the Constitution, for obvious reasons, because we don't know what that implies. Once you start calling one part of the country a distinct society – if anybody has a legitimate claim to being a distinct society, the natives do. Newfoundland is a distinct society. The Acadians are a distinct society. At the same time, I think it's important to acknowledge, perhaps in the preamble of the Constitution, that Quebec is a distinct society, and there are other distinct societies, et cetera, et cetera, something akin to the Canada clause that was proposed earlier by Manitoba with a bit of elaboration.

As far as the division of powers goes, the Allaire report, demanding exclusive control over 22 shared or federal jurisdictions, is completely unacceptable. I don't think anybody really takes the report seriously in the sense that they view it as the final position of Quebec. I think it's quite obvious to everybody that it's a negotiating position, and certainly they would settle for less.

As far as the five minimum conditions that were presented by Quebec, you hear a lot of talk about the five minimum conditions. For me, I kind of liken them to those circles that you see in farmers' fields: you hear a lot about them, but nobody knows what they really are or where they come from. One of them was immigration, and obviously that's been taken care of already. There's been an agreement signed between Ottawa and Quebec City on that. I think another one was entrenchment of three judges on the Supreme Court, which I don't have a problem with. They have the Civil Code, and three justices out of nine would seem fair to interpret things properly. A distinct society I think was one of them. Again, like I say, in the preamble of the Constitution. Opting out: I have a real problem with opting out of federally cost-shared programs. I don't know how that got into the Meech Lake accord, because that was something that was gone over and over again in the '82 negotiations with Trudeau. I think it was quite clear back then that the reason Lévesque was so sold on and demanding this condition for

opting out was that it would allow Quebec sovereignty through the back door, setting up their own parallel programs in everything from unemployment insurance to what have you. We have to be very careful with any language in terms of opting out. I think there should be some movement, some accommodation, for differences, but we have to be very careful with that one.

Division of powers: in general there's room for negotiation. I don't think there should be any fire sale of powers, a wholesale giveaway to the provinces. Otherwise, what's the point of having a country? There's a big misconception with various people on this matter; the point of provincial equality and equal powers has been confused. Everybody should be equal under the Constitution in this country, but that doesn't mean provinces can't have slightly different powers. Maybe Quebec could have a little more power over unemployment insurance, maybe make more shared jurisdictions, et cetera. That doesn't mean Prince Edward Island would want to hire 100,000 civil servants to administer a program to 120,000 people.

2:38

Other areas of power such as culture, education, communications, environment: I think there has to be a strong federal presence in all of those. If we're to have a Canadian culture, there has to be the means to promote that culture. As far as giving culture to the provinces, I think that's completely unacceptable.

Education. I don't think there is enough federal input into education. I think it should be a shared jurisdiction at least or a federal jurisdiction. There should be more of an ability of the Canadian government to foster commonality between the peoples of this country. If people are learning the same history of the country rather than different histories, they're more likely to identify with each other.

The environment. Well, it's quite obvious that there already is a strong federal presence, and I think there should be a stronger one. The bottom line is that if we're to have a country, we have to share common values and goals, and there has to be enough power at the national levels to achieve these common goals. I already addressed that with the federal presence in education and some type of national curriculum you can more easily forge a common identity. You can more easily institute means by which people can exchange views; for example, a national educational exchange program. With a stronger federal presence in the environment, you might get a green plan that actually works: countrywide standards for energy efficiency in buildings, automobiles, et cetera.

I think something that's been distinctly lacking is a national industrial strategy. We have to decide where we can be competitive and pool our talents and resources in that direction much the same as a country like France or Sweden has done. I think some type of nebulous free trade with the U.S. at the same time we have these tremendous trade barriers between provinces is ridiculous. We have had over the last 120 and some years this tremendous north-south pull, and when you maintain the barriers east-west yet open the border to the south, it only seems obvious to me that you're destabilizing the country in that sense.

Energy. I hate to use the words "national energy program" in this room for obvious reasons, and I don't want to advocate another cash grab in the Marc Lalonde style, but I think there should be a strong Canadian presence in energy and in the oil and gas industry. I think long-term goals of working toward energy self-sufficiency in the development of nonpolluting,

renewable resources – wind power, solar power, et cetera – should be in the works.

As far as health care goes, again if the federal government doesn't maintain control over the purse strings . . . The way it's going with the EPF and other federal legislation such that the provinces are paying more and more of the share, how can you maintain national standards in a health care program if you don't control at least some of the purse strings? An obvious example is accessibility as one of the tenets of the health care program and extra billing. If the federal government didn't control the purse strings, they wouldn't have been able to withhold money to provinces that were extra billing, which arguably would have decreased accessibility to poorer people in the country.

Another issue that I think should be addressed is that of our native peoples. Some form of self-government at either a municipal or a provincial level, equivalent to that level, where all natives have the ability . . . I'm not sure what it is now – if a specific treaty in a specific area guarantees specific rights – but I think they should have the means to collect their own taxes, have their own schools, and have more control over their resources such that they won't be dependent. Cash handouts from the government foster dependence, and dependence fosters what we see now, despondency in the community. At the same time I think there has to be some accountability to basic human rights and the laws of the Constitution, so maybe interpreting native rights in view of – I hate to use the words – a distinct society might be a useful approach.

The Senate. I know there seems to be a fascination with a triple E Senate, and I think it's offered as a panacea for a lot of the problems in the outlying regions. I agree with an elected Senate and an effective Senate, but I'm not sure we have to have total equality in the Senate such as two members from every province or what have you. I think there's room for compromise on numbers, but I am definitely in agreement with an elected Senate. As far as the powers go, that's a difficult question. I don't think you can have a Senate that overrides the House of Commons; otherwise, why have a House of Commons? You've got to have some higher legislative body, and that has to be the House of Commons, representation by population. Maybe a six-month suspensive veto over legislation such that hastily conceived legislation can be delayed or initial rejection – something similar to the powers the Senate has now.

Bilingualism. There was an interesting presentation two presentations ago. I came in in the middle of it. I thought some really useful comments came out of that presentation. My contention is that the whole bilingualism issue has been blown way out of proportion. Personally, I don't have a problem with bilingualism. I think it should continue much the same as it is. There are small modifications that perhaps could be made, such as it does seem a little ridiculous that you cannot sell a product in western Canada unless it's got both English and French on it. I don't have a problem with seeing French on products. But my father is a small businessman in the food brokerage business. He was attempting to import an item that's not available and that I think would have sold quite well here, a portable breathalyser kit, and he couldn't import it into the country because it had to have bilingual labels. So I think there's a bit of room for manoeuvring there and perhaps in other areas. But at a very minimum, with French as the first language of such a large number of our population, you have to have bilingualism in any federal system. Anything under federal jurisdiction should be bilingual.

Multiculturalism. I think multiculturalism was basically established as a vote getter. I don't see it really helping the country. The most useful aspect of multiculturalism is teaching tolerance and helping integrate immigrants into our society, but I don't agree with financially supporting groups on the basis of their ethnicity. So I think the ministry should be abolished and perhaps immigration could help integrate immigrants into society, et cetera.

As a closing comment, I don't know what to do about it, but I think the media is a big part of the problems we see. You read the French-language press; they want to sell newspapers, so they'll print something inflammatory that happened in English Canada. You watch the French-language television channels; the image you see over and over again ad nauseam is the trampling of the Quebec flag and it inflames people's passions. I think the same thing happens in our press. The *Herald* and the *Sun* want to sell newspapers. They have a heading to a column that has very little to do with the substance of the article itself. So I think the media is part of the problem, and like I said, I don't know what to do about it.

In the end, as a closing comment, I think there can be an accommodation worked out, and we should make every effort to do so. I think the French presence in the country and the native presence and all of our different ethnic groups really enrich this country. We should try to support that.

Thank you.

2:48

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Brad, for your interesting presentation. We've noted your last comment about the role of the news media and the one from one of our preceding participants today as well. You've given a pretty comprehensive overview, and I appreciate it.

Oh, just one question that occurred to me. You said that we should have a national industrial strategy. Were you were talking about that as a matter of policy rather than putting it in the Constitution?

MR. WILLCOX: Right. Yeah. A lot of issues I addressed were of philosophy more than actually entrenching something in the Constitution. But I think what you entrench in the Constitution in terms of the distribution of powers dictates how much control you have over something like a national strategy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know you've given substantial thought in your comments here to some of the content of what a new Constitution might look like or some of the things you'd like to see Canada be or become or retain. Have you given much thought to the process of getting from here to there, especially given all the recent experience and the emotions it's generated amongst Canadians and deadlines now for Quebec to either receive some proposal from Canada or have a referendum next fall? Have you given some thought to how we should conduct ourselves and what we should be doing between now and then and beyond?

MR. WILLCOX: I think there's some useful process to be gained from something like a constituent assembly to address those problems. But at the same time you have to be very careful as to who is on that assembly and how they get on the assembly. I don't think someone that isn't elected really has the mandate to negotiate something for the whole country.

I'm not completely sold on the idea of a constituent assembly, because you can have a constituent assembly debating problems such as they had in Australia for years and never get anything done. If you had something like that, say a constituent assembly of elected members, if those elected members happened to be politicians, I think they would have to resign from their political office so they'd be more impartial, one would hope, on the assembly. Perhaps you could have a constituent assembly either for the whole country or one for Quebec and one for the rest of the country; then they get together after coming up with their positions and all of whatever they settle, if anything, could go before the public in terms of a referendum.

I see a process like that as being useful. Of course, obviously Bourassa is against that idea, so it would be very hard to get something like that off the ground in Quebec. There seems to be a groundswell of support for it in the rest of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you.

MR. WILLCOX: You're welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dianne Klein. Hi and welcome.

MRS. KLEIN: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I'm here on behalf of Kids First, a national organization with over 5,000 members across Canada. We are a single-issue organization, so I won't be speaking about separation and Quebec or a number of other issues you've heard about.

Our issue is child care. We formed in Calgary in 1986 when a group of parents reacted to the then Liberal government's proposal for a universal day care program. The projected cost was \$11.3 billion. Kids First, which receives no government funding, felt that government support for such a program would threaten the choice to raise children at home. Protecting this choice, the choice to raise children at home, is the main focus of our organization. We believe that in most instances parents are the best people to decide what form of child care suits their particular circumstances, and we don't want the family's choice in this matter influenced by unbalanced tax considerations. Social programs that support only one choice seem to us to be archaic.

In addition, we feel there is an equality issue here in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Government policies in general are becoming antifamily. In the mid-1950s the average Canadian income for a family of four with an at-home spouse was \$10,000, and the deduction for a dependent spouse was approximately \$3,200. In other words, one-third of the family's income was tax deductible, and the deduction recognized the valuable work of the care giver at home. Today the figure is less than one-twelfth. In Alberta the average family income has increased by 33 percent over the past 10 years while provincial tax has increased by over 110 percent.

In 1961 the Canadian family spent an average of \$2,671 on food, shelter, and clothing while paying an average tax bill of \$1,675; that is, 63 percent of the basic necessity bill was your tax bill. But in 1990 the expenditure for food, shelter, and clothing averaged \$17,495 while tax payments averaged \$24,568. In other words, today our tax bill is 140 percent of the cost of basic necessities as opposed to 63 percent. It is indeed becoming more and more difficult for a family to survive on one income. This certainly has had ramifications in terms of the numbers of

women in the paid labour force and the so-called traditional family.

We often hear that we need more day care, and the rationale for this statement is that over 60 percent of mothers with young children work. In fact, according to the labour force survey of May 1989, 41 percent of mothers with children under three are not in the paid labour force at all, 17 percent work part-time – that is, from one to 30 hours a week, often juggling work hours and schedules to allow a parent to be at home with the children – and another 6 percent are unemployed. Only 36 percent of mothers with children under three work full-time, and some of these women are doing contract work at home, running day homes out of their homes, or doing shift work in order to better fulfill their parental responsibilities.

A second justification for the trend toward more and better day care is the perception that women want and need to work outside the home for their entire adult lifetimes. A recent U.S. survey revealed that 88 percent of mothers with children under 18 say that if they could afford it, they would prefer to be at home with their children. Only 12 percent actually wanted to work outside the home. According to a Stats Canada survey on income distribution, of all women working in two-parent families with children under six, approximately 40 percent have husbands earning \$25,000 or less. For two-parent families with children under six and wives not in the paid labour force, exactly the same percentage, approximately 40 percent of them, have husbands earning \$25,000 or less.

2:58

Another interesting fact along the same lines and from the same source says that the average salary of the husband in a two-parent family, again with children under six and a working spouse, is approximately \$31,500. When the wife doesn't work outside the home, the average salary of the husband is \$31,000. It's almost exactly the same whether she's working or she isn't. So in some situations they're deciding it's possible to have a parent at home, and in others they're not. Clearly, in two-parent families with young children, wives are not always working outside the home because they financially need to.

If whether to work or not is then a life-style choice, rewarding one choice in child care over another must have its rationale elsewhere. Perhaps, as Michael Wilson once told us, Canada needs its women in the work force. But Canada also needs its children. We need our children to grow into responsible and caring adults, for that is the future of our country. So we must ask what children need and how those needs can best be met.

By selectively funding just one option in child care – i.e., day care – government is making that choice more attractive. If that funding further increases the tax burden on families, then that policy makes it more difficult for a family to choose one of the other options, one that may in fact be better for their family. In fact, we argue in an impending challenge to the Income Tax Act that such policy effectively discriminates against parents choosing to raise their children at home and also against their children. More on that in a moment.

If children really are better off in the day care setting, then we would have no complaint. We had better be sure before putting all our eggs in the day care basket, however, that that is really where we want them. For one thing, the cost of providing high-quality care in an institutional setting is prohibitively high. Children need consistent and responsive care giving. To meet these needs, the ratio of children to care giver must be low and salaries must be high enough to entice care givers to stay at the job. One estimate of cost for implementing full government

subsidies for day care went as high as \$44.8 billion in 1984 dollars.

In Sweden, which has arguably one of the best day care systems in the world, the cost is \$14,000 per child per year, and, at that, the average seven-year-old has had 257 different care givers. Secondly, there is increasing evidence that full-time day care, particularly for infants, even in high-quality centres may be undesirable. A longitudinal investigation of kindergarten and first graders reared since they were three months old in an extremely high-quality day care at the University of North Carolina revealed that these children were more likely to hit, kick, and push than children in the control group. They were more likely to threaten, swear, and argue and less likely to walk away from trouble or talk their way out of it.

In 1988 Deborah Vandell and Mary Ann Corasaniti at the University of Texas looked at grade 3 children with a history of full-time day care, more than 30 hours a week. Children who were in full-time care, regardless of the age of entry, were found by grade 3 to perform more poorly intellectually, emotionally, and socially than children not in full-time care. They had poorer study skills, lower grades, and diminished self-esteem. My point in giving you some of the research here is to substantiate my claim that we need to protect other options in child care. If we didn't have this kind of data and in fact the data were showing that day care was the best place to raise children, then I wouldn't have any business being here. But it's quite the contrary.

In the face of evidence such as this we still hear that the current trend toward impersonal hired care represents reality, that it's going to continue whether we like it or not, and that we had just better make the best of it. We at Kids First don't think so. For one thing, it's not the way we are accustomed to handling other social problems. We don't look at the problem of the homeless people or the elderly or drugs in our schools and say: "Well, look; this is a fact of life. Let's just be realistic about it." Capitulation is not the way we traditionally handle things.

Kids First is now pursuing an equality issue under section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We intend to challenge section 63 of the Income Tax Act, which permits taxpayers with appropriate receipts to deduct child care expenses of up to \$4,000 per child under the age of seven and \$2,000 for other eligible children. Now, this is for people who have paid money out to other types of child care and have receipts for their expenditures. This provision is not available for people who raise their children at home even though there are expenses to raising children wherever you're raising them, including at home.

Two sources of discrimination appear in the legislation as it now stands: one, child care payments by one spouse to another, specifically the father or the mother, do not qualify as child care expenses; and secondly, the child care expense deduction must be taken by the spouse with the lower income. These subsections are discriminatory in two ways: first, there is a discrimination against married persons, as unmarried or common law persons are not subject to these limitations; secondly, there is a blatant discrimination against poorer people, the very ones who need the credit the most.

The requirement to have the deduction claimed by the spouse with the lower income means that persons who have low-paying jobs or part-time work or attend university or simply wish to remain at home with children obtain little or no benefit at all from the claim. Ironically, the maximum benefit can be obtained where both spouses are employed and earning income at the top bracket. The end result of the discrimination in section 63

is not merely discrimination against married couples, and in particular single-income or lower income married couples, but discrimination against the children of these couples.

Kids First has developed a test case to pursue the issue. Two families who feel strongly that single-income families are at a decided disadvantage in today's tax system have volunteered to challenge Revenue Canada using personal tax returns. Both families are members of Kids First, one here in Calgary and one in Kitchener, Ontario. In actual fact, the response to our request for volunteer test families was overwhelming, but due to financial considerations we have stayed with two. In each test family one parent is working full-time as a salaried employee while the other parent is providing full-time care for their children at home. In each case the parent working outside the home has contracted with the other parent for that spouse to provide child care services in the home. At the end of the 1989 and 1990 taxation years the spouse working outside the home with the higher income claimed the child care expense deduction of up to \$4,000 per child under the age of seven and \$2,000 for the older children. The savings in the two families varied from \$700 in one case to over \$2,500 in the other.

The purpose of the test case is to highlight the inequities that exist in our current tax system. Kids First believes that tax breaks should not be given to dual-income families at the expense of single-income families who are in most need of them. Kids First has developed a child care proposal of our own which suggests the use of income-dependent child tax credits as a more equitable system to providing tax breaks for dependent children.

We are fighting the tide of social, political, and economic pressures which have the effect of separating the child from his or her parents. We know that children need consistent, reliable, and responsive care in their early years in order to mature into caring adults with a capacity for trust, empathy, and affection. In most instances the family is best suited to provide this care. We must protect the right of parents to raise their own children. If we're not conscious of the needs of children in the policies our government puts in place, we make ourselves vulnerable to consequences we may not want.

What we would like from constitutional reform is some sort of protection of this right to raise our children, that we will not be discriminated against because we are married and have children and choose to raise them at home.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I was wondering, quite frankly, as to the constitutional position that you were asking us to consider until your last remark.

Yes, Bob.

3:08

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think there's an interesting angle to this, one that we've been discussing throughout our public hearings with people, in particular the Charter of Rights, because you're using the equality section of the Charter to challenge federal legislation. Can I take it that because you've sort of made that appeal, you feel that the Charter of Rights has been a positive change, a positive development in Canada since it was introduced in the early '80s? Or do you think it's a positive influence?

MRS. KLEIN: Yes, I do. On the whole, I think it is. I think it could be more specific with regards to some of the rights. To some extent how this turns out in court would affect my answer. But, on the whole, I think yes, because it does allow us to say

that we have a group here which is being significantly discriminated against, and perhaps we have recourse through the Charter that way. So I do think it's been a positive change.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: One of the criticisms that is sometimes raised about the Charter is that in effect the courts, who are made up of appointed people and not elected politicians, are in fact taking over the job of being legislators. That is, through this process they're not only interpreting but in a way kind of remaking the law and are beyond the reach of the political process. What's your response to that kind of criticism that the courts in fact are taking the place of Parliament or of the Legislatures?

MRS. KLEIN: I know in the recent Symes decision that the case was finally decided against her. The judgment stated very specifically some of the objections that you're mentioning: that it's not in the hands of the judicial system to change the law, that you need to go through the political angle. From the standpoint of being an ordinary citizen with a complaint, my feeling is that I see an injustice, I see something that needs to be changed, and I'm going to try to change it however I can. So I attack it on both fronts. I mean, we're working politically and we're also working through the judicial system. Unfortunately, I think, many times in order to bring attention to legislators, there's nothing quite like a court case to do it. So it's kind of attacking on as many fronts as possible. I'm not sure that it's the best way, but if it works, you try it.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Very good. Thank you.

MRS. KLEIN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Victor Lenko. Mr. Lenko, this is your second appearance, I think. Did you not come and see us before?

MR. LENKO: I visited before to get the hang of the thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You sat and listened, right. Exactly. Good to see you again.

MR. LENKO: If I may, Mr. Chairman, make a comment about remarks that appear in the press, and have even appeared here, about the judiciary writing laws. I think that is completely false. It is the politician who didn't correctly write his laws. The judges are saying, "Here, boys; take it back and do it right." So let's get that understood. I'm rather amazed that the press would let people . . .

MRS. GAGNON: Victor, I'm shocked at you. You should have said "and girls." We're not all boys here.

MR. LENKO: What did I say?

MRS. GAGNON: You said "boys." We're not all boys. Correct?

MR. LENKO: Oh, okay. I stand corrected.

This presentation consists of five papers, copies of which are offered to you in individual white, not brown, envelopes. The comments here are made in addition to these papers. The first four address the need for a newer Constitution, whenever one is contemplated by anyone in a free and democratic society. The

last paper draws the reader's attention to the possible dire results should Canadians fail in the mission of constitutional renewal, if one is needed in the first place.

More specifically, the drafting of a newer Constitution requires grass-roots initiatives, which appear to be totally absent in Canada at this time. The present constitutional review is driven from the top downward, from the elected politicians towards the grass roots. That is wrong. The initiative should be the reverse, from the bottom up. Our nation's Constitution is not just another piece of legislation. If grass-roots readiness is absent, the politicians are left alone in their constitutional talks.

In the old soviet of Europe the people are still fearful. In Canada our apathy may well be politician encouraged and driven. You notice I said "may well be." This plays into the hands of any selfish politician who may not want public input at all. Should there be anything artificial about the need for a newer Constitution, the grass roots will sense it and reflect it by their lack of interest and participation, by staying away in droves. Even 1 million Canadians out of 15 million adults hoped for by the Spicer commission is too small a number. Perhaps the lack of interest and participation is their vote and their prerogative.

Ultimately, the politicians may fail because they acted without the presence of grass-roots readiness. The people sense it when there is no need for the exercise of constitutional renewal. Of our politicians I would ask: did the people of Canada or of any province, for that matter, ask for a constitutional renewal or a review in those specific terms, in a referendum perhaps? Clearly, it is the elected politicians, with delegated authority only, without specific directives from the people, who instigated the so-called need for a constitutional review and took the liberty to create and to magnify one. Those are the politicians who have diverted the attention of many of us towards the Constitution and away from the still unsolved problems of the economy, away from the people's grass-roots, bread-and-butter concerns. This new diversionary order, synonymous to Bush's new world order, seems to be a worldwide political virus, very contagious even in Canada.

The first paper outlines the need for a constitutional assembly, emphasizing the preconditions for success in any constitutional review. There may well be need for a somewhat permanent but dormant but at-the-ready constitutional mechanism. Let's go for it. The second and third papers deal with the very important essence, if you will, of a democracy for all the people and by all the people, universality for all the people in keeping with democratic principles, not yesterday's Leninist, communist principles.

The fourth paper speaks to six regions of Canada, three in the east and three in the west, with regional equality as well as intraregional provincial equality, elected during a regular federal election, keeping the expenses down, with regional numerical equalities, but glaringly absent are the effective powers for these regions. I am suggesting that an elected, equal, and effective new house of regions be formed in Canada. Even proponents of regionalism in the United States, our great southern neighbour, are suggesting 13 topographical regions in their country. Effectively, these advocates are saying that 48 mainland Senates and Legislatures are too many and a colossal waste of money in this modern age of rapid electronic communications. Even insurance companies are moving to Regina. Government costs must be reduced by eliminating duplication of mechanics and services within the same regions. The horse-and-buggy days are long gone, but I think our thinking is back with them. Thirteen United States houses of regional government are sufficient, surely. Our problem is Canadian, not United States-ian,

although both are American. The differences and similarities do exist between us. I might ask: is there any good reason for the prairie's or the maritime's duplication of houses of government? In my opinion, the time for regional houses of government has arrived, but no one outside the maritime provinces has even raised the issue.

3:18

The here and now approach by here and now short-term politicians yields short-term results. This tends to place the label of selfishness upon their activities. As an aside, I think the barbs that have been thrown at the politicians and the media are quite undeserved. Improvements are needed in those areas, but let's address ourselves to the improvements, not be negative about it. The short-term politicians are wanting to pack all their activities into the short term in office. It may be wise to remove the shortness of time from the politician and give it to the grass roots who must take time, for they have only spare time. Grass roots, sober second, third, and even fourth thinking lend themselves towards evolutionary growth rather than radical, revolutionary change. Radical, revolutionary, and rapid changes can be too disruptive.

The world is observing such changes in the new U.S.S.R. of Eastern Europe where it was needed, and in the Adriatic areas of Europe where it is not needed. Closer to home here in Canada, to Quebec my message is: one whole Canada, one official language, one uniquely distinct Canadian mosaic culture from sea to sea; many multicultural languages to prepare Canadians for the commercial global village of which we are but a part and where tomorrow's business opportunities lie, before our grannies who can act as linguistic teachers for free are gone. I think the sooner we wake up to that fact the better. A specific second official language barrier to specific federal jobs is no different than in the old days when if you wanted to go to university you had to have Latin as a second language. This was a language barrier inserted into the education system – and this is well documented – by the then learned, elite upper crust to keep the uncouth children away from the elite children at that university lest they contaminate the children of the upper classes.

We are breaking barriers worldwide even today. Why are we erecting a language barrier in Canada? It boggles the mind to think that a mosaic nation like Canada would even entertain the notion of a language barrier while at the same time entering the commercial global village. I dread the thought that the instigating reason may be racial, globally racial. The people you see today in the world are no longer a Frenchman, an Englishman, a Welshman. You see colours, four colours, and it was one colour, the whites, that was first out of the industrial gate. They had their hands on the wheel of the industrial machine. But economics knows no political or racial boundaries. The others are catching up. How else are the whites going to maintain their hands on the steering wheel? Aha, we'll throw a linguistic curve which says you must be fluent in two languages if you are to get a job in the federal civil service. Now, that smacks not only of ethnicity discrimination but of racial – colour – discrimination. Before a World Court at the United Nations or in The Hague that would not fly, I'm sure, which is one of the reasons the North American natives are winning their cases in the international courts. For that I have to say shame on Canada, if that is the case.

It has been said of multiculturalism in Canada: let them pay for it themselves. I ask: is it not the public purse, the taxpayers' money, that pays for a criminal's costs in a halfway house for integration into the community upon release? Then why deny

similar halfway house integration facilities to innocent new arrivals to Canada? Those Canadians denying the one while paying for the other have their priorities scrambled, in my opinion. I might well ask of these Canadians: what are you smoking? Presto cigarettes?

I thank you for your attention and this opportunity. Merci. Arrivederci.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Vic, for your presentation and the background material which you supplied as well, which is quite extensive and which we will review.

Are there questions? Yes, Yolande Gagnon.

MRS. GAGNON: I'm pleased that you gave us the information that some people in the U.S. are considering a house of regions. That was not something I was aware of. Because so many wish us to emulate the U.S., it is interesting to know that they are also considering some reforms. Your allegation, though . . .

MR. LENKO: If I may correct you. I don't want you to think that they are thinking in terms of the house of regions. What they are thinking of is in terms of eliminating some Senates and Legislatures. Then they would have a regional government, but that is not akin to my suggesting that Canada have a house of regions.

MRS. GAGNON: Okay.

The other thing I just want to deal with for a minute is your allegations of racism, if one requires two languages in the civil service . . .

MR. LENKO: The senior civil service.

MRS. GAGNON: Senior. As you know, many people whose language is French, Haitian, Vietnamese, North African, from Mauritius – I don't think you're accurate in saying there's a tint of racism there and trying to keep away anybody but whites.

MR. LENKO: There are always exceptions. I'm just warning, and wishing that there is no racial instigation behind it. I hope I'm wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lenko, I was fascinated by your Senate proposal. The way I understand it, you would elect all the members of the House of Commons, and then 72 of those would, depending on their plurality, be moved to the upper House. I guess the one question that comes to mind is how the one person elected for just a constituency would be able to represent a region.

MR. LENKO: He'd just be elevated to do that. He'd represent not only his constituency but the region of which his constituency was a part.

MR. ANDERSON: So you don't think he would require a mandate from the rest of the people of that region?

MR. LENKO: You've already got it. If you read carefully there, you'll find out that it's the elected MP with the highest percentage. His percentage is competing with the percentage that the men got in the other winning constituencies.

MR. ANDERSON: I guess my only concern would be that nobody voted for him in the other constituencies that he'd be representing.

MR. LENKO: Vote directly? Yeah, that's correct; they didn't.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. LENKO: You're welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hugh Jones.

3:28

MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman and members of the select special committee, I hope I come before you as the person from the grass roots that Mr. Lenko was speaking of. I have no particular affiliation. I got interested in this during the meetings of the citizens' forum and submitted to you earlier my comments after the citizens' forum. I felt there were a number of topics that were being purposely avoided in that forum and in discussions that I'd hear on the radio, mainly ones that would affect politicians versus the rest of the citizens.

I have condensed this into four items I'd like to talk about today, the first being the provincial/federal power split. Power is divided between provincial, federal, and municipal governments and the boards of hospitals, schools, et cetera. This BNA Act division was made at a time when the country wasn't even joined by rail let alone instant telecommunications. Since that time we've been united into a country by two world wars. Each of us now presumes a right to work, live, and retire in whatever part of the country we choose. Many of us have relatives from coast to coast. St. John's, Newfoundland, is now more closely connected to Tuktoyaktuk than Toronto was to Saint John, New Brunswick, in 1876.

Listening to phone-in shows I detect a feeling among the young that the people who happen to live in a province at this moment don't own the province. I heard a young lady on the CBC the other day say: isn't it all part of my Canada? I think we ordinary people must go wherever the jobs are. I've been in Alberta for 12 years. I feel loyalties to Alberta, but my prime loyalty is to Canada, and I would like to hope that I'll get the same standard of services and the same rights wherever I go in the country. So I ask myself who it is who's supporting decentralization of power, and I think it's surely not the 90 percent of the population who are seeking work wherever they can get it. I think it's big stakeholder groups whose own prosperity is so tied to that of their province or city that they're willing to gamble everything on this one locale. Most obvious are the separatists in Quebec, but there are obvious stakeholder groups, chauvinistic groups here in Alberta as well.

The present power split almost mandates that all those elected to provincial government will serve this chauvinistic stakeholder group and I think not represent this grass-roots citizen that I am claiming to be. Protection of the local turf ruins things like the universality of health care and education, which are now different in each province. With modern transportation why shouldn't each hospital and university across the prairies specialize and draw from the whole region? With modern telecommunications Canadians are more interconnected than are a similar number of groups who live in the region of São Paulo or the region of Mexico City. You and the government will be forced to represent either the local stakeholders or the ordinary

citizens. If you choose to represent the ordinary citizens as I see them – and I admit it's a very personal view – who just happen to live in Alberta, you should suggest that services to all Canadians be rationalized under federal authority. As well as health and education this should include the criminal justice system, police, pensions, and all professional and trade registrations which affect our mobility across the country.

A first step was taken at the First Ministers' Conference at Whistler when they encouraged the feds to set up a Canada-wide education standard. The thought of a federal ministry paying much of our medical costs, of a provincial government building hospitals to their own greater glory, and of a local board doing the administration makes me shudder. The duplication must be appalling. Provincial governments should be mandated to concentrate on resources and job creation. As in international law, anything protectionist dividing between the provinces in business or transportation makes us less competitive in the world as a whole, and I think this was discussed at Whistler as well.

So as my first suggestion I would ask that you suggest a constitutional clause which states that services to the citizens which are common to all Canadians should be funded and directed by the federal government with the minimum of duplication by other levels, that the function of the other levels of government in these areas should be to act as local representatives to bring local concerns to the attention of the federal agency.

The second topic I wanted to discuss was Quebec's separation. I feel that the culture of the heartland Quebecers is as strong and as distinct as any on earth. Les Québécois de souche are as different from us as the Balts are from the Russians. Just as the native peoples have rights that predate those of the French, so too the original Quebecers have a right that predates ours. They've been here twice as long as the rest of us. They were conquered by the English and never given a realistic opportunity, by referendum or any other grass-roots means, to decide whether or not they wish to join with the rest of us. I felt from the beginning that we must eventually give them the right to secede. For that reason I've given much thought to the consequences if Quebec does decide to depart rather than dwelling on ways to bribe them to stay with us.

My first submission to you concentrated on the plight of the nonseparatist portion of Quebec, which I felt was not being discussed. It is now being discussed everywhere, and I beg you to ask Mr. Parizeau tomorrow once again about the plight of the one-third of Quebecers who want to remain a part of Canada. You will discover that he's willing to perpetuate present laws and practices which favour les Québécois de pure laine in employment and culture. M. Parizeau has stated that an 1871 law makes it impossible to reduce the size of a province without the province's consent. I think it would be instructive if you were to quote him the sedition and treason laws of the same era.

The Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area voted the most solidly for separation in the 1980 referendum. Please ask Mr. Parizeau if he would be willing to centre his new country in that region and then to expand outwards as other districts agree by majority vote. If it was handled in this manner, I, like professors Bercuson and Cooper, would prefer that this heartland area be separated. If Quebec is allowed to separate and take the present land area, they will make life miserable for the non-separatist one-third of the population. We will have a generation of dispossessed refugees arriving back in Canada. The thought of the descendants of the United Empire Loyalists and

the Mohawks, our loyal allies of the time, being driven from their homes a second time is very troubling to me.

I would ask that you suggest that a clause be added to the Constitution acknowledging that the Quebecers did not have a realistic option to remain out of Canada at the time of the BNA Act and that they now have the right to leave, taking that contiguous area where more than 50 percent of the population wish to separate. You should also suggest that those who remain in Canada must subscribe to and uphold the Canadian Charter of Rights; thirdly, that there should not be any means to opt out of any portion of the Constitution.

The third topic I'd like to discuss is representative government. Modern democracy, unlike the original Athenian ideal, must be based on representation. We count on the system to bring forth leaders we trust and a government that will rule to our benefit, not their own. I can't even imagine a successful format, but there are a few clues in the successes we have had. Firstly, it is essential that we agree on our representatives. With three or four parties, our present winner-take-all system allows the possibility of a winner with 34 percent of the vote and the other 66 percent of the population preferring any one of the other three candidates rather than the one who won. I call this the Allende syndrome. The political parties don't allow this unfair situation to occur in their own leadership elections. They all have runoffs for their leaders so that the leader is in some sense chosen by the majority. With the advent of voting machines, it's possible to record first, second, and third choices and to do an automatic runoff rather than the six-weeks affair that the French do. I think we should do that for all elected offices.

Secondly, there's an argument about the responsibilities to their constituents of those elected. Many or most politicians seem to believe that the citizen's right is limited to voting and that the elected representative must be left to decide on the basis of his or her party's general philosophy or their conscience. Obviously, the other side in this discussion argues that the representatives should vote as the majority of the constituents would vote if they were able to be there. This discussion comes about because of the crisis in leadership. Good leaders don't take their mandate as a licence to pass unpopular legislation but rather as an opportunity to lead the electorate into their way of thinking. Years ago the ridings were small enough so that we were able to make our discontent readily apparent to politicians. Now it's getting a little more difficult. Secondly, matters are getting so complex that we may very well want a person of a particular party, but there may be something very specific, the abortion issue, where we would want to direct our member.

3:38

I have an example here of what I think is a real failure to lead: the federal government's handling of the Oka crisis. I believe that a survey of the English-speaking population would show that 90 percent of us are convinced that the Mohawk were at Kanesatake before the French and that they were shoved off this aboriginal land by white usurpers. From a very few public statements, a lot of reading between the lines, and some correspondence, it seems to me that Brian Mulroney believes that the French had been at Kanesatake for 100 years before the defeated British brought the Mohawks, that the British installed them in spite of the rights of the French and the Algonquians, whose aboriginal land it actually was, and he undoubtedly knows that this was especially galling to the French because they'd been fighting the Iroquois tribes for 150 years at this point. In his one public speech on the matter he pointed out that the right of

the property holder had been twice defended in court. Mulroney had the opportunity to clarify the complete situation but apparently didn't feel any need to lead us. If we had a tradition of referendums and recall, I think he might have felt more pressure to lead us into his way of thinking before sending in the army.

At the time of my original submission there was some talk of a desire to bring more of the power from the political level down to the citizen. The route most commonly suggested was the voter-forced referendum and the right to recall. I'm heartened by the announcement that British Columbia will ask the voters to express themselves on recall legislation. In my opinion, the Constitution should be altered to give more representative government in the following ways. Firstly, all elections should involve multiple-choice ballots. Secondly, there should be a right to force a referendum if 5 percent of the electorate sign a petition objecting to a piece of legislation. Thirdly, there should be a right to force a referendum on any proposed legislation within a single riding if 25 percent sign. The representative should then be bound to vote as directed by the majority or resign. There should also be recall legislation to be used when over 50 percent of the voters object to their representative and wish to recall. That's a very high percentage to get on any kind of a thing, and it would very rarely occur, but it would be a threat. You should also consider suggesting that a single representative be elected in each riding to represent us at municipal, provincial, and federal levels. I know it's impossible, but think about it.

National debt is the last subject I'd like to express myself on. In my original submission I advocated Gramm-Rudman type legislation to help us to cope with the national debt. As you know, Don Mazankowski has now made a move in this direction, and I guess Saskatchewan's going to ask their voters if they're interested in it. I believe that this fiscal responsibility should be required in the Constitution. The cost of government policies should show up immediately so that governments cannot bribe us with our children's money.

The question is always: where would the money come from? We as a people, represented by our government, enter into tacit and written agreements with industry regarding taxes. We do this to attract employers to Canada and to keep capital here. If there ever was slack in the economy, we as the citizens would wish to take the slack for ourselves. It follows, then, that when there's a deficit, we should make it up ourselves and not try to change our written and tacit agreement with industry. Based on the above, the Constitution should force the federal and provincial governments to alter their income tax surcharges on a quarterly basis to collect an amount which would have balanced the budget in the previous quarter and would have paid off at least 2 percent of any debt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Jones. The question I asked a proponent of recall yesterday I'll pose to you as well. I said: if you're going to vote for recall, should the people who are entitled to participate be only those people who bothered to vote in the previous election in which the person was elected? I said it in jest, but since then, the more I think about it, the more I like the idea, because there is a responsibility not just for politicians but for the public as well to be informed and to vote, and in many cases we see that not taking place.

MR. JONES: A voting machine would make it practical to record who had voted in the last election. Whether you used it

for your purposes or not, I think if a person knew that he was being recorded as having attended, maybe it would have a good effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody who votes is recorded as having voted, and the name goes in a poll book when you go and vote. I'm just saying that because this notion of recall, that has some public interest, is awful concerning to politicians.

Yes, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Jones, could I explore with you your statements on distribution of powers. You expressed a point of view that we have heard before, although we've often heard the opposite as well, that in a nation as large as ours, despite the communications network and the differences that are there along with the population imbalance, the government closest to the people is the one more able to deal with their needs in a particular service sense than others. You don't give any credence to either of those two arguments, to the population imbalance problem in terms of operating a nation in the best interests of the majority which are there, or to the government closest to the people proposition?

MR. JONES: Well, I was speaking to very specific services that would seem to be nationwide: health, the law. Well, we already have most of them on a fairly nationwide basis. It was specifically those, and I very much would like to see more local government controlling anything which has to do with job creation. I mean, I can't imagine going back to a national energy policy, a system of mandating that sort of thing from Ottawa, and services in the sense that municipalities give services it would be ridiculous to consider centralizing. It's only the ones that are Canada-wide.

MR. ANDERSON: In your – I'm not sure if it was semi-facetious – suggestion that politicians be elected to represent the population at the civic, provincial, and federal levels: do you then feel there is this problem in the nation at the moment with the provinces being represented only in the House of Commons through the rep by pop philosophy, and do we need an upper House or other mechanism to balance that, or are you quite comfortable with the way it is?

MR. JONES: No; I would like to see an upper House. I just wasn't addressing myself to everything in this.

MR. ANDERSON: Sure. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
I'm sorry, Mrs. Gagnon, I didn't see you.

MRS. GAGNON: I have a comment as well. Could you clarify your statement that because some constituencies are so large, politicians are not very accessible? I know, for instance, that I do have a huge constituency, and it's growing every day. The houses go up like mushrooms; I think there are about 45,000 people. Nevertheless, when I make myself available twice in the same day at a very well-advertised town hall meeting, maybe 13 people show up in the morning and maybe seven in the afternoon. We make ourselves accessible; people don't always come forward. We make ourselves accessible in other ways as well. I'm just wondering if you have any comment on that. Is it apathy, or is it the fact that people just feel totally disgruntled?

MR. JONES: It's apathy based on experience. The politician 50 years ago in a rural riding – everybody knew they could drive by his farm. They knew they had a way of contacting him. Today everybody thinks they have no way of contacting you, and what percentage of the people actually noticed the thing in the paper?

MRS. GAGNON: But it's such a fallacy.

MR. JONES: Oh, I agree.

MRS. GAGNON: I don't want to defend anybody else, but I think we're all available. We have offices open all day long, phone numbers listed everywhere.

3:48

MR. JONES: I've been unemployed for almost two years now and have done an awful lot of corresponding with various politicians. I've had very good experience in getting considered replies on this matter, and I'm very interested in quite a number of other political things. Ralph Klein, for instance, came by and talked about what I was concerned about. But I don't think you can quickly get that across to everyone in a very big, complex situation like a municipal riding in the city of Calgary or Edmonton. It will take some time and a different division before people will come back and start knocking on your door.

MRS. GAGNON: I guess that's my point. Just because people don't know it, does that mean we need a major change in the way we do things? You know, that's my concern.

MR. JONES: I feel that recall is a good thing anyway as an ultimate defence against someone going in a different direction than what the majority wants to go even after the public discussion. If you have that, that's one more feeling of empowering you as an individual, and it's much more likely that individuals will come forward as you start to empower them in any sense.

MRS. GAGNON: I'm just wondering if it's not more a reflection of the fact that those with whom you agree will feel that, yes, they've been represented; those with whom you don't agree will feel they weren't represented, that nobody listened.

MR. JONES: Well, you feel you've been heard.

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

We'll adjourn now until . . . Sorry, Ms Betkowski, I thought you were pointing . . .

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Jones, I have a question for you. The chairman doesn't want to recognize me. I'm going to keep . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought that Ms Betkowski was pointing out to me that Mrs. Gagnon had her hand up to be recognized. My sincerest apologies, Ms Betkowski.

MS BETKOWSKI: Thank you.

I want to ask you a question on your health care model because it's one I've never heard. I guess I'm one of the chauvinists that you referred to. You suggest, as many have, that we increase the way in which the grass roots might participate in government and enhance that by various means. Yet you also suggest that instead of the local input that we have in running our health care system, through locally appointed and elected boards, we give that to a federal bureaucracy to run the

health system. I wonder how you have come to that conclusion. I've never heard it before, and I just wondered if you could explain it to me.

MR. JONES: It's always best that he who pays calls the tune. It seems to me you can more easily hold them responsible. The overall system is mandated and paid for by the federal government, and then various sections within it get doled out. Each area of responsibility – medical doctors, for instance – feels that they must do everything that can be done. There isn't an overall control. I think the control should be there, and the politicians at whatever level are responsible to make sure that that one agency which is doing it all does it correctly.

MS BETKOWSKI: You know that the federal government contributes about a quarter to the cost of health care in this province, and diminishing?

MR. JONES: Well, the contribution is one thing. The way in which it's come about, we had at one point that a unified system across the country was a federal mandate, and then the costs have come down from that.

MS BETKOWSKI: Actually, it's always been a provincial mandate. The Canada Health Act came in and created the five principles, which in fact have created far greater continuity across the nation with respect to health care.

MR. JONES: But now we're evolving away from it.

MS BETKOWSKI: Well, I would take issue with you on that. I think, in fact, what we're trying to do is ensure that it's sustainable into the future. The constitutional question is the national standard being set, and a means by which the provinces can test whether or not they're meeting that standard is really, I think, the constitutional issue.

The fiscal issue, that I think is starting to come into your perception of how the system runs, is that the federal government is itself backing out of its commitment, dollarwise, to health care, yet it still has the mandate in the Canada Health Act. So that's what we're struggling with as a model of national standard and provincial participation. I think, and certainly most of the presenters to us believe, that the current model of medicare is one that's working and we have to work hard to make sure it's maintained into the future.

Anyway, yours is a very different model than I had ever heard.

MR. BRADLEY: I just wanted to supplement that in terms of information. Ms Betkowski has indicated that the federal government is reducing its allocation towards health care. If you thought of transferring that responsibility back solely to them, do they have the fiscal capacity to deliver that uniform health care system across the country, or would we see, because of their limited fiscal capacity, actually a lessening in terms of the quality of the system?

MR. JONES: Well, anytime there's been a shift of responsibility, there's been a shift of fiscal capacity with it. I guess that would have to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It hasn't always happened. If it happens, that's another issue.

Well, thank you very kindly, and we adjourn now till 7.

[The committee adjourned at 3:54 p.m.]