

1:08 p.m.

Monday, September 23, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are ready to proceed. Apparently Mr. Allen is not present. Therefore, if Mr. Hall is here and would like to proceed, we shall do that.

Yes, Mr. Hall. Welcome.

MR. HALL: Thank you very much. I have really a relatively lengthy series of comments that are very difficult to summarize in a brief presentation, but I can recite the main guidelines first and perhaps explore the remainder as far as we might be able to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. HALL: Canadian constitutional reform comments are made in response to a political invitation for citizen participation despite general public unfamiliarity with existing provisions. Relatively brief consideration has been given to a demanding topic. It should be studied in depth, edited, and reviewed over an extended period of years. Passage of time and changing conditions influence a continuing update.

Reference jurisdictions include federal, provincial, territorial, offshore, and international, with repercussions through the municipal, community, and individual responsibilities associated with social, cultural, economic, political, and bureaucratic consequences. Order of reference is subject to close inter-relationship of some topics.

Constitutional matters of concern. Number one, definitions: Canada, Canadians, political systems, political mantle. Number two, regional historical changes: initial divisions, development divisions, current regional status and balance. Number three: development of Canada internally, internationally, and globally; extraterrestrial. Number four, regional differences: geographic and population distribution, cultural and social, economic, political, federal impact. Number five: impact of socialistic state federally, provincially, individually; bureaucratic growth; economics; national debt and social services; tax policy and reform; inflation and taxation. Number six: tradition versus pragmatism, financial burden of political representation, public servants or masters, unions in the public service. Number seven, revise approach and reform: revision of old party lines, introduction of political alternative, establishing individual rights, senior rights and recognitions, responsibilities and expectations regarding children.

Under definitions, (a) is Canada. Today's Canada is a huge area. A small population of 27 million includes 10 provinces, two territories, and the district of Franklin in the Arctic islands. Evolution from colonial status and associated native Indian, Spanish, French, and English derivation has been achieved by historical treaties which changed the areal division of Canada.

Economic and social developments made Canada an independent country remarkably attractive to other cultures for its characteristics of peaceful, democratic freedom, cultural and social development, and opportunity under middle-of-the-road political policy. Participation in two world wars, immigration, and economic development increased population and established Canada globally. Dedication to unity from sea to sea has been undermined by stubborn traditionalism focusing on Franco-phone/Anglophone entity.

Item (b), Canadians. By heritage, tradition, and current action, Canadians are identified with exploration, immigration,

enterprise, industry, education, aesthetic development, adjustment to local and international factors of influence, and a preference for a democratic way of life. Aboriginals and immigrants acted as explorers assisting in creation of settlements throughout Canada. Today we have sophisticated social services, travel accommodations, advanced education, industry and employment through private enterprise, and an increasingly heavy tax burden prefaced by horrendous national debt. We honour the national flag, as with each provincial standard. Though we are a component of multicultural parts, our philosophical and practical enthusiasm has been demonstrated through two world wars, international business activity, educational and scientific contributions, the sports arena, and diplomatic theatres.

But what is a Canadian? Perhaps a North American Indian, Eskimo, Inuit, English, Scottish, Irish, French, Chinese, Japanese, Dutch, German, Italian, Norse, Russian, Greek, Asian, Turkish, Egyptian, African, Spanish, ad infinitum. Does each one or all of these feel undying loyalty to Canada? Are we proud of our country, its natural resources, its people, its place in the world? Will we be loyal in adversity and sensible in times of prosperity? Do we have compassion for each other across Canada, or are we regionally diverse and divided? What is so special about any one person or people? Since we're all a hank of hair and a bag of bones, do we have trouble maintaining respect and commonality? What is our bond inspiring mutual support? Can philosophy and pragmatism be united?

It is suggested the spirit of Canadianism is related to a sense for right and wrong, good and bad, personal respect and respect for others, a sense of value, of spiritual philosophy, and a recognition for personal responsibility within acceptable legal and moral guidelines in the country of our choice. If it's good enough to teach our children, it must be worth while.

Political systems. In Canada the parliamentary system of government prevails except in Quebec, which clings to the Napoleonic Code. Growth and development in Canada has emphasized shortcomings in our existing political systems. Canada shapes its own needs, which are in contrast with the heavily populated British Isles or Europe. The heavily expanded bureaucracy subjects Canada to top-heavy government, resulting in an unbearable economic burden compounded by unequal constituent and regional representation. Citizen resentment toward politicians and members of the bureaucracy obligates our country to provide equitable and balanced changes.

Political mantle: democracy. While "democratic" is applied to Canada, it is a very misleading title or adjective. Election methods divide and conquer the people. Population distribution results in political representation controlled by central Canada, with a governing caucus of MPs rejecting a dissident vote from party lines. Objectors are outlawed from party caucus. Democracy is sacrificed to totalitarianism or fascism. The socialist state engineered by Canada's three-party system fails to respond to Canadian needs. It rules by implementing political and legal provisos seemingly modeled from other countries. Reform is critically necessary.

Political manifestos and educational institutions must encourage personal responsibility abetted by tax laws that encourage enterprise over state welfare and unemployment insurance. Local minorities must be identified as minorities and not the voice of the silent majority.

We are overly governed and legislated. Politically abusive power has been demonstrated repeatedly, and citizen taxpayers do not accept the current status quo.

Regional historical changes: initial divisions. Beginning in 1667 North America was divided into New Spain, English colonies, New France, and Rupert's Land. The Boston Tea Party gave birth to creation of the United States in 1783, 20 years after Quebec had emerged alongside Indian country and Nova Scotia. In 1774 St. John's Isle separated from Nova Scotia, later becoming P.E.I., and Quebec expanded to include Indian country to the north and Labrador. In 1784 New Brunswick and Cape Breton separated from Nova Scotia. This was followed by establishing Upper and Lower Canada, Rupert's Land, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, St. John's Isle, Cape Breton, and Newfoundland as part of the Canadian scene. In 1798 St. John's Isle was renamed Prince Edward Island. In 1809 Anticosti and the coast of Labrador were transferred to Newfoundland. Subsequent divisions confirm and demonstrate that Canada's image is not cast in stone.

### 1.18

Development divisions. In 1840 Upper and Lower Canada merged to form the province of Canada. By 1849 the North-Western Territory, New Caledonia, which is B.C., and Vancouver Island were established, along with the 49th parallel boundary. The Dominion of Canada was created by the British North America Act of 1867, the same time the U.S.A. purchased Alaska from Russia. By 1880 Canada acquired the Arctic islands. By 1912 the present Canada was in place except for Newfoundland-Labrador, which joined Canada in 1949. Current regional status has developed a change in balance attributed to population distribution; economic, technical, and social developments; and the pressure of Canadian, North American, and global economies. For reasons of areal size, population, and economics, Canada's makeup warrants adjustment.

Development of Canada. Internally, despite an inhospitable climate in some areas, Canada's abundance of natural resources prompted major social and economic development. Incentives of land and mineral ownership promoted far-reaching exploration, settlement, and industrial achievement. Western Canada, discounted by written historical description, has made and continues to make huge contributions to Canadian finances and unity. Individual enterprise generated these achievements. Without these significant contributions, Canadian unity is sacrificed to demanding economics compounded by overbearing politics.

Internationally and globally, Canada is a major portion of North America, sharing the world's longest unprotected border. It has much in common with its southern neighbour, the U.S.A., a powerful world influence and guardian of the North American status quo. Western Canada has a close affiliation with the U.S.A. geographically, economically, and socially, without the deterrent of united empire loyalism or cultural demands.

Free trade benefits western Canada significantly in face of penalizing transportation costs and taxes associated with east-west trade. In a global sense western Canada has an impact on grain, livestock, energy, lumber, coal, and other minerals. Alberta's energy sources are economically dwarfed by costs associated with Arctic and east coast offshore exploration, completion and production expense, plus operating expense. East coast offshore energy projects are not currently viable economically. Eastern Canada could use western Canadian oil and gas or import Middle East oil more cheaply than developing Hibernia at taxpayers' expense, perhaps by the GST, but it cannot expect western regional contribution if it fails to purchase energy. Canadian unity requires increased recognition and respect from central Canada for adjunct areas.

Of serious concern is the absolute curtailing of funding to Third World countries that have shown no indication of repayment.

Extraterrestrial. Canada's population and economic thrust can carry only a small share of costs peculiar to space exploration. We can contribute materials and major technical assistance.

Regional differences: geographical impact and population spread. Favourable climate, transportation, and agricultural conditions in a wilderness area brought settlement to the Great Lakes part of Canada, supplemented by refugees from the U.S.A. after the Declaration of Independence. Access and weather conditions hampered the inland flow of people, but exploration for an inland sea route to the Pacific resulted in western settlement. Natural resources in the plains and Rocky Mountain locales prompted effective exploration and development, building of railway lines, and gradual clearing of agricultural land. Continuing mineral exploration expanded our country's western and northern development and positively effected a place in the Canadian economic and political arena in North America and in global acceptance. Federal government assistance and legislation can encourage expansion of a partially frontier area.

Cultural and social adjustments are constant in a strongly multicultural country. The impact of aboriginals and immigrants forges a broader field of tolerance and understanding on all sides, requiring mutual respect and constructive intent. Third World expenditures should be put on the back burner until we have our own house in order.

Economic. In a debt-ridden country business and personal economics are self-defeating without reasonable recognition for tax burdens, social service requirements, inflationary impact of economic policy and management, with special negative effect on creative but retired seniors and a debt-free country for present and future generations. Costs of bureaucracy and politicians have ballooned beyond tolerance, and the general public resents the associated salary scales, pension provisions, superior attitudes, and union approach. These concerns are deeply aggravating to the public, which does not enjoy the same fruits of labour at the public purse. Government tax policy and legislation must establish the principle of personal responsibility to encourage personal initiative. Current tax, welfare, and unemployment insurance provisions dictate a higher basic deduction from salary than retired income, with a serious reduction in the number of government employees and a total exposure of all salaries payable in government job positions, other perks, and retirement provisions. Accountability is the basic requirement. The poverty line speaks for itself.

Political. Economics help to mold regional politics, which vary provincially more than federally. Political representation must be subjected to a very close and critical surveillance from the view of merited balance. Prince Edward Island does not warrant its present political position provincially or federally. The maritimes as a group are carried by the rest of Canada but have senatorial representation outweighing the practicality. Together with provincial and federal bureaucracy, their financial burden is proportionately too heavy. This problem could be resolved by merging the maritimes into one unit.

Federal impact. Overwhelming pragmatics encourage adoption of alternatives if we are to retain unification in contemporary Canada. Perhaps Ontario and Quebec should weigh the advantage of subdividing their more heavily populated region to counterbalance existing inequities of representation. Manitoba and Saskatchewan could be one unit. The far north might have united representation, while Alberta and British

Columbia can presently retain their existing position. Our national, North American, and international recognition and acceptance will suffer from internal separation as opposed to revision and merging. Continuing demands for bilingualism and biculturalism will discourage unification. As for the reported costs of \$450 billion, a national debt of \$400 billion and counting, economic mismanagement fuels the country's breakdown and sacrifices our role of a catalyst in international relations.

The impact of a socialistic state is bureaucratic growth. The explosion of bureaucratic employment is choking the economic lifeline of our country. Federal and provincial delegates are flying all over the world in the so-called public interest. Our politicians tell us we are adopting tax processes used successfully by other countries and this usage will solve our problem. At the same time, socialistic Europe is breaking up; Sweden is bankrupt; our national debt is extraterrestrial. Deficit financing à la Keynesian theories does not work. We must pay as we go. Pension perks for politicians must be revised to a lower scale and effective date. Why should they get a pension before age 65? If there's a just and equitable reason for payment, prove it, and then we'll cut it down to acceptable levels. Short-term service fails to earn perks in place, which are resented by the general public.

Revise. Public servants have become public masters in their own mind.

Economics. Federal and provincial economics vary significantly. The "have" provinces contribute heavily to the "have-nots," and the federal government acts as draw master in charge of play in delegation of assistance by equalization payments. That which is in place is perpetuated by legal and accounting skills. Tax becomes increasingly heavy. Revision of Canada's power play economic chessboard calls for decentralization to a degree that encourages movement of population in our country. The west is ideal for further settlement, and economics improve an industrious people. Unit cost of production makes Canada noncompetitive in world trade.

National debt and social services. Canada's national debt is not attributed solely to medicare as a social service. The in place tax burden is so heavy that the wage earner looks for ways to beat the system, dual jobs, cash payments, so leisure-time activity can be had and living made easier. Third World giveaways insult the man on the street, who doesn't understand the authority behind such grants. The political and bureaucratic burden of expense add to drainage from the public purse to an alarming degree. Are we returning to a feudal age? Remember the lessons of history.

Tax policy and reform. Exorbitant taxation is contributing to Canada's downfall. Money mismanagement, federally and provincially, filters down, and the factor of public resentment has never been as high and strong. A socialized state encourages lack of individual initiative and produces government financed athletic programs, as an example of wasted money. Canada claims as its own the imported track and field athletes from other countries on the premise that we are obliged to meet standards set by other heavily populated and richer countries. We can't do it financially, and we can't do it with homegrown talent. Nor can we finance football teams. Our hockey players prefer to play for the U.S.A. teams because of tax advantages. Athletic earnings scoff at the milkman, the barber, the grocery clerk, and the dedicated professional.

1:28

Taxation must be reformed to provide a basic incentive for individual effort which will surpass welfare or unemployment

insurance. Basic deductions must be raised accordingly. Retired seniors deserve the same recognition and respect.

Inflation and taxation. Inflationary and taxation balloons are soon to burst. Spiraling wages to meet spiraling costs is a never ending concentric circle that takes the income of retired people that helped build the country. The younger generation is victimized, demanding wage scales beyond earning capacity and capable levels of responsibility. Unemployment becomes rampant, and the public purse is further drained. Old age security was paid for and cannot be denied, but increased taxation chokes off business productivity, promotes bankruptcy, and creates instability. GST and the Hibernia project loom grotesquely.

Taxation versus pragmatism: a political financial burden. Our overly governed country is being legislated into individual submission by a top heavy and expensive bureaucracy. The pathetic demonstration of game farms and multimillion-dollar bailouts is an example of the insulting and overbearing legislative power that is contrary to the public interest. Who is accountable? Public service is attractive for guaranteed financial reasons covering salary and perks that are unmatched by the risk and travail of private enterprise, yet private enterprise pays the toll.

In Alberta the provincial Treasury was lined with proceeds from the sale and development of government owned mineral rights undertaken at risk by private industry which gave the public ownership a cash flow and carried interest. Now industry is being heavily taxed by a demanding government that has catapulted into the lap of luxury. That's almost instant pudding.

The people have been served by extraordinary facilities and highways, and Alberta contributes heavily to Canadian financial needs, but it's cheaper to live in the U.S.A. despite costs of medicare. Their rate of taxation encourages personal initiative; taxation has made us slaves to the state. Revision is absolutely needed to foster individual effort, the most critical link in the chain of our country's progress. Responsibility lies first within ourselves.

Public servants or masters? Party clout, control displayed by the federal Progressive Conservatives when rejecting dissident constituent votes, demonstrates the nature and imbalance of our political system and representatives. Public servants vote themselves huge raises without citizen approval. Strikes for wage and retirement benefits are standard for public employees by way of union representation. The public is blackmailed and insulted. If these people are unhappy with their jobs, they're free to look elsewhere, because the paying public is unhappy with them.

Revised approach and reform. The old party lines are outdated and out of step. Revision is critically important. Regionalism is unavoidable and inescapable in a developing, progressive country huge in size and disturbingly disproportionate in population distribution and regional contribution to Canada's public purse. Meech Lake provisions will not balance and consolidate the country. Provincial equality includes concern for areal size, population, productivity, and representation.

The only unique people in Canada are aboriginal natives and their descendants. Their free ride is wearing thin and demands greater personal accountability, as with everyone.

Political alternatives. Change must be made with the changing social and economic environment and world exposure. Alternative political credo must be available.

Individual rights. Growth in responsibility and initiative is desirable and appropriate for all people. It is the essence of

family life. Taxation policy and consideration must be molded on this basis. Current complexities of taxation compound the felony of additional government employees, a confusing presentation to the taxpayer, and a perpetuation of legal and accounting assistance which should not be so critically necessary. Individual and corporate provisions should be parallel and equal. If it's a crime to make money, let's fire the overpaid bureaucrats and politicians.

**Seniors' rights.** Seniors with relatively stagnant incomes are adversely affected by inflation and higher taxation. Those that built the country are being bitten by those they fed. Higher basic deductions allowances and exemptions are needed to offset higher costs of living and difficulty in maintaining independence. Seniors paid and earned their way.

**Responsibilities and expectations for children.** Care, understanding, food, clothing, shelter, and education are family obligations to children. Training to assume personal responsibility is of primary importance. No one wants their offspring to be a load on society. Our country must concentrate more on educating our own youth than granting benevolent programs of education and training for youth or otherwise from other countries. Look after our own first and foremost; then consider assistance to outsiders. They too have that obligation and responsibility.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

Are there questions or comments?

You've given us a very comprehensive overview of your concerns, and you've made some concrete suggestions relative to the realignment of the regions of the country into different political units than are now in existence. Many of the things you have touched upon are really matters of government policy rather than constitutional change as such, but we appreciate your thoughts in that respect.

Yes, Stock Day.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hall, I appreciate all the work you've gone into. You've touched a lot of bases and covered a lot of ground for sure. On the point the Chairman has raised, you talked about realignment of regions and suggested the maritime provinces, for instance, becoming one. Could you just quickly tell us how you accomplish that type of a goal if in fact those particular areas don't want that to happen? In terms of the realignment of our Constitution, how is that approached?

MR. HALL: Well, firstly, I don't think I have absolute answers. I can take a good stab at it just as anyone else can. The biggest revolution in the world was created by Jesus Christ. He can walk on water, and I can't.

All I can say to you is that the people down there are not happy with their lot. The people out here are dismayed that Prince Edward Island enjoys senatorial representation as it does plus federal and provincial legislation with a population that's half the size of the city of Winnipeg, if that. Prince Edward Island was originally a part of Nova Scotia, which embraced a larger area, including New Brunswick. It makes sense that competitively within Canada they should be united to cut down their operating overhead and to present a stronger front to the rest of Canada. The difficulty with the maritimes, at least in a personal opinion, is that they'd be better off as part of the United States. Now, they may not want to do that, but econom-

ics have become so forcibly strong that alternatives dwindle, and we have to face up to these facts.

Alberta is a major contributor to Canadian economic balance and has been for an extended period of time. The rest of Canada, I'm sure, appreciates the fact that Alberta and B.C. contribute what they do, yet the central Canadian situation is a drain. Quebec takes \$6 billion a year, the figure I've had quoted to me. I'm not an expert in that; I'm going on someone else's quotes. Ontario now is in a deficit budget. What can be said for the maritimes?

MR. DAY: Thanks. I appreciated your thought. I was just wondering how you approached that.

1:38

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Hall. That's all being recorded in *Hansard*. Even though you didn't have a fully written presentation, we will see the written presentation through *Hansard*. Thank you.

Yes, Eileen Walker.

MRS. WALKER: I'm Eileen Walker of Strathmore, and I represent the Family Unit Committee and wish to bring the following proposal before this meeting.

**Overall goal.** At present there are no policies, programs, and services that support a family unit other than the family allowance. I want our provincial or federal government to initiate and put into force a new program called the family unit program - "family unit" is to be defined as husband, wife, child, or children - wherein our provincial/federal government will pay one parent to stay home to raise their children.

**Objectives for this program.** One, our government has never given out reward programs for moral values, only amoral values. I compare most of our present policies, programs, and services to reprimanding a child when they have done something wrong by rewarding them by saying, "That was a bad thing you did, but here's \$20; go spend it at the arcade," instead of sending the child to his room and missing a meal so he will learn that doing wrong is going to receive punishment instead of reward. In other words, our present government policies reward those who lead amoral lives. I have lived in a family unit for a number of years, and the only reward I get is a family allowance cheque. I believe people on welfare, divorced, separated, single parents receive this along with all the other subsidized programs the government has for them.

It's time our government started rewarding moral life-styles. After government support of amoral values over the last three or four decades, the results are becoming devastating financially, socially - divorce rates are escalating - and morally: AIDS for one example; government support of \$16,500 to the Canadian Mental Health Association for the 1991 feminist fiasco at Banff, Alberta.

Number two, this program will pay for itself. One ex-working parent will leave an opening outside the home workplace for a young adult just joining the work force or someone on unemployment insurance or welfare.

Three, lots of current subsidized programs could be eliminated; e.g., subsidized day care.

Four, the most important point of all is that our children will greatly benefit from this program as nothing can replace a moral, loving, caring mother or father who is always there for their children. In Alberta in the year 1990 one-quarter of all crimes, including murder, rape, assault, et cetera, were com-

mitted by youths under the age of 18. Could programs such as JIMY be responsible for some of this?

Qualifications to belong to the program. One, must be a family unit, join program on birth of first child or adoption of first child. Two, parents staying at home cannot hold a full-time, part-time, or any kind of job outside the home, must specify which parent is staying home. The program ceases when the youngest child attains 18 or 25 years of age if child is enrolled in an accredited learning institution. Four, a family unit cannot be on welfare and qualify for this program as well; they must choose which they prefer. Number five, maximum support for four children. Payments to be made on a monthly basis. Amount: for use as a base figure, add up all the handouts given to welfare recipients, divorced people, single parents, subsidized day care, and any other government subsidized programs. Let's use this as a fictitious example. The government pays out, based on two parents and one small child up to 11 years of age, \$510 for shelter, \$600 standard allowance, \$240 subsidized day care, \$50 government allowance to day care. Total: \$1,400. The money received to be income tax free, and the family unit is to remain classified as one income to give people an incentive to get off our present welfare programs and to be proud of belonging to a family unit.

The second presentation the Family Unit Committee wishes to bring before this meeting is that the current human sexuality, or sex ed, programs now in place in our schools be replaced by a healthy sex ed program based on the following criteria. I'll only give two at this time. I believe you've got copies of this. Number one, adopt curricula that stress traditional family values as the ideal, and adopt curricula that teach sexual abstinence before marriage and fidelity in marriage as the only acceptable life-style in terms of public health, as this is the best and only sure way crisis pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases can be prevented.

I want to ask each and every one of us here the following question: using a condom, would you willingly have sexual intercourse with someone you know has AIDS? If your answer is no, like mine, how can we let someone teach our children that safe sex, premarital sex, homosexuality, multiple sexual relations are fine when we wouldn't do it ourselves? They say they can't teach morals, but they teach our children amorals. Every law in this country is based on a set of morals.

These proposals may not seem appropriate to bring before a constitutional meeting, but I firmly believe that the future of any society or country lies in what is being produced in the home. If we are not willing to save the family unit, we will not save Canada from internal decay. We must abandon the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms Act and the Young Offenders Act and replace them with the laws and moral values found in the book which is used in the judicial system, which everyone swears upon in court, and which is given to every immigrant upon receiving their Canadian citizenship. Use the Holy Bible as your guide in building a new and united Canada.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Walker. In your presentation you do point out that constitutionalizing these issues would be very difficult to do and that these are very clearly policy issues that governments have to face.

Are there questions or comments that any one would like to propose? Yes, Stock.

MR. DAY: Mrs. Walker, these are fairly unique proposals and would require funding. The answer might be obvious, but I'd

like to hear your view. The federal government in its transfer funding on social programs does require some compliance with their stated values or goals of those social programs. From a constitutional aspect do you support that present approach? Do you think it would be right or proper for a province to be able to get federal funds yet still be able to operate, let's just call this, a very unique program like this even if it's not compatible with a federal goal?

MRS. WALKER: Yes, I do. I believe it's the provinces that set the standards of what social policies they have. The federal government, I believe, supports them 50 percent, so in actuality the provinces set these social policies. Is that not correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct.

MRS. WALKER: Yes, it is.

MR. DAY: Yeah, it's correct.

MRS. WALKER: In other words, this province can institute these policies. They do not need the federal government to tell them to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: One question. I'm intrigued by the idea of providing an income to a stay-at-home spouse. I think, as you point out, that would do a number of things. One is it would probably make for more attractive wages in the work force. If there were fewer people seeking jobs, I daresay that employers might have to make conditions more attractive in some instances. It does seem to me, from my personal knowledge, that where spouses are forced to work to bring in more family income, often it's poor-paying jobs, part-time jobs, that type of thing.

How would you structure eligibility, though? For example, in our society, whether we like it or not, there are a lot of single-parent families. Are you saying that they would not be eligible in this program?

MRS. WALKER: No. I'm saying this program plus what you have intact now.

As for the problem of paying for it, you'll be surprised how much your court system will be alleviated by all your juvenile delinquency that's going on and the billions of dollars it costs by the damage that is being done. Plus with one parent staying home, then those children will have a job out in that workplace.

MR. McINNIS: So a single parent would be eligible as a stay-at-home spouse?

MRS. WALKER: That's up to the provincial government. This is a new policy. This is not to replace or to get rid of any of the assistance you have for other people, but I think this would be an incentive for some of these people to get off the program they are on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much for coming forward and bringing us your views today.

I understand that the next presenter, Mr. Dandurand, is not yet in attendance. I have to make an urgent phone call, so perhaps we could briefly adjourn.

Thank you.

[The committee adjourned from 1:48 p.m. to 2:06 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Dandurand, would you like to come forward, please. Have a seat here.

MR. DANDURAND: Right here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DANDURAND: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to reconvene. Would you like to proceed?

MR. DANDURAND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, before I express my views, and also because it is known to some people here that I am a provincial candidate with the Alberta Liberal Party, I'd like to make it absolutely clear that I'm not speaking on behalf of the Alberta Liberal Party and the views I'm about to express are strictly my own.

My perspective of our constitutional deadlock is the perspective of a truly patriotic Canadian who was born thousands of miles from here and was lucky to have had parents who insisted that both their children master English as quickly and as best as possible so they could take full advantage of all the benefits this great country has to offer. I really hope today's parents would still recognize this need for multilingualism, a need for mobility now more than ever. My sister's background and my own are not any different or more special than that of most other young Canadians raised in the '50s and the '60s. What has made a significant difference in our lives is being able to speak Canada's and the world's most widely used language.

The self-serving political philosophy of decentralization promoted by some of our country's politicians will result, if adopted, in the creation of cultural ghettos riddled with ignorance and vulnerable to expensive patronage and corruption. If you wish to be convinced of this statement, I suggest that you read of the Duplessis years in Quebec. For over 30 years Maurice Duplessis and his government cronies successfully and sometimes violently promoted the status quo which resulted in millions of people finding themselves a century behind the rest of part of this continent. The coming out of this shameful era in provincial Canadian politics was tumultuous and painful. Quebec will forever bear the scars of Duplessis' rule and its ensuing so-called quiet revolution. To repeat this very sad chapter in Canadian politics would be a crime against the very same children we love so dearly and for which all of us so readily sacrifice anything.

A patronizing and isolating government breeds secrecy and unaccountability. It breeds elected officials who often have too much to lose politically to represent the will of their constituency. The same strategy used to manipulate an entire population like Maurice Duplessis did with Quebec is promoted through the use of party-line dictatorship.

There are huge fundamental differences between leadership and ruling. It's this very desperate need to rule, not to lead, that presently allows certain governments to refuse as legal rights some basic human rights enshrined in other parts of our country. There's no doubt that we're in need of constitutional reforms, but if we are to be sincere about our motives, we must implement reforms that guarantee every Canadian openness and political accountability at every level of government, reforms that guarantee the free expression and promotion of one's own

culture but not at a cost to the social, economic, or cultural heritage of the majority of Canadians. But for any reform to be successful – and this is a plea – we must once and for all give birth to a true Canadian ideal. We must quit sitting on the fence of compromise. Canadians as people and as a country must take responsibility and stop abdicating their future and the future of their children to a self-serving, blame-the-other-guy, unaccountable group of selected peers. More importantly, we cannot allow any politician to fragment this country for the selfish and cynical purpose of control.

I wish I could ask all of you to take a seat inside my head and read my mind like a giant screen. This would convince you of the sincerity of my next comments. Our mouths can be used to lie to other people, but we can never lie to ourselves.

Let me state that until recently we never had a Quebec problem in Canada. Canadians like my grandfather, my father, my entire family, and most of my Quebec acquaintances are among the strongest Canadian federalist patriots I know. My sister and I are from some of the oldest Canadians. Although some roots can be traced back to early voyageurs, they're not exclusively French. I discovered an influence of Irish, Greek, and Jewish. My Canadian-born wife is of Norwegian descent. I believe this ethnic quilt makes me a real Canadian, an authentic Canadian. Both my father and his father were volunteers in their respective wars. I'm a reserve veteran myself of the Royal Canadian 22nd Regiment. Trust me; we're not special, we're not distinct. We're only part of the silent majority in this country.

But when it comes to Quebec there are basic facts and covenants which must be recognized and respected. Around 1768 – and, please, I use the word "around," because I'm sure there are historians here and I'm just an amateur when it comes to history – following a victorious but very long military campaign, the British had taken control of this new territory and to secure this control had deported most Acadians, virtually guaranteeing safety in numbers. However, the unpredicted threat from Americans now posed a serious problem. In order to protect their hard-won colony, British forces needed to enlist the support of the French settlers who, in turn, could rally natives. To do this an agreement was signed giving the settlers who were virtually abandoned by France the right to their own culture, religion, language, and laws. As you well know, it's the Civil Code. It's not just a thing over there; it's the law. Furthermore, it promised the country-starved settlers a new homeland of their very own where English and French would live in harmony and self-govern in a true, independent, and democratic way. In some opinions this never truly materialized. Nevertheless, in their desperate need for a homeland, French settlers quickly adopted this new Canada. For centuries French-Canadians from all walks of life referred to each other as Canadiens and to British colonials or immigrants as les Anglais.

I just want to introduce a very quick little anecdote of my own grandmother. She refused to move to western Canada at the time and starved in Montreal during the Depression simply because she was of the very strong belief that if you spoke French – which she did – you were Catholic and a very good person. If you spoke English – which she recognized but couldn't communicate – you were automatically a Protestant and not so good. If you were anything else she couldn't figure out, you were a Communist. So there was no way she was going to immigrate to a part of the country that was filled with Protestants and Communists. That shows a little bit that the Canadiens, or Quebecers as they're called today, considered themselves Canadians way back.



Forgive the simplicity of the following evidence. It's really simple, but it's the best I could come up with. When it came to naming their beloved hockey team – if any of you have spent time in Quebec or in Montreal, you know how important the Montreal hockey team is – they chose les Canadiens de Montréal, the Montreal Canadiens. That's the name. When Molson Breweries needed a name that would sell in Quebec, they spent untold amounts of dollars to find the best possible name to sell beer where it's consumed at the highest rate per capita. They came up with "Molson Canadien," Molson Canadian.

Many years ago I had the opportunity to spend a few minutes with René Lévesque. I asked Mr. Lévesque why a patriot such as himself – and at one time in his life he was a very strong Canadian patriot – had become separatist. He said very calmly: Michel, they – meaning the English – never wanted their own country; we'll start ours.

How can we say we're neutral when we just sent men to a conflict where the underlying goal was to protect American interests? How can we say we're independent and sovereign when we use monarchs of a foreign country as our official symbols? How can we sell Canada to all Canadians, particularly some of the oldest ones, when Canada is not yet clearly defined? I challenge the politicians of this country at every level to quit using this constitutional deadlock as some political football and find the courage to finally create a true, independent country.

## 2:16

Why is it so hard for Canadians to be patriots? Or is it something only felt and defended by men and women in uniform? I believe very strongly in individual freedoms; there's no doubt about that. But I also support this old logical statement: when in Rome, do like the Romans. It's difficult to ask someone to act like a Canadian when there doesn't seem to be a distinct Canadian way. How come it takes veterans to protect the sanctuary for all soldiers? All soldiers. Why did we sit still and witness the cheap treatment of a uniform which reflects more than anything else a truly Canadian heritage particularly special to the west? Let's have a country that promotes multilingualism and multiculturalism but does not force or restrict it, a country which is one of the few that can still save its environment, a country whose independence can be recognized seriously and with a high degree of credibility, a country made of people and for people where exists the courage to look forward and regard the past not only with pride but for what it is, simply the past.

In conclusion, if there's one constitutional reform that should be the basis of all others, in my opinion it's the creation and superpromotion of a Canadian ideal. Let's give Quebec the opportunity to join a Canada they've been calling home for nearly three centuries, not an association of provinces who tolerate each other: a strong and very distinct society, all right; a Canadian society. Then we can bring forth reforms that will eliminate regional frustrations while securing that Canadians all across the land will not be subject to destructive or perhaps unacceptable disparities. It was Sir Arthur Eddington who once said – I like this one – verily, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a scientific man to pass through a door; it might be wiser that he should consent to be an ordinary man and walk in rather than wait till all the difficulties involved are resolved.

Let's stop trying to appear as experts in constitutional matters, and let's all work at becoming true, distinct Canadians. Once we

are one nation with a common denominator, I think the solutions will come by themselves.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Questions or comments? I have one. I just wasn't sure whether or not I caught you correctly on this, whether it was something Mr. Lévesque had said to you or whether it was a position you were adopting yourself relative to the issue of the monarchy. Are you suggesting that the monarchy be done away with? You made reference to a foreign monarch as the head of state.

MR. DANDURAND: That's right. Now, I don't suggest that they do away with their system of government. That's entirely their decision. What I suggested is that we . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I mean as Canadians.

MR. DANDURAND: As Canadians we have enough symbols here. We have enough terrific people of our own. We have Nobel Peace Prize winners we can use as symbols. We don't have to go to a foreign country for our own symbols.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in other words, you would abandon or change the monarchy from our current monarch.

MR. DANDURAND: I didn't know we had a monarch in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You didn't know that Canada is a constitutional monarchy, that the Queen is the head of state?

MR. DANDURAND: I understood that, but I thought we had repatriated our Constitution and had done away with a lot of that except as symbols. Now, that's what most Canadians understand also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I understand your position now; I just wanted to be clear on that.

Other questions or comments?

Well, thank you very much.

MR. DANDURAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Gregg Schell here yet? If not, then Dick Nichols is here, I understand.

Good afternoon.

MR. NICHOLS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. My name is Dick Nichols. I live at 407 Oakside Circle SW in Calgary. I want to thank the committee for giving me the opportunity today to present my views concerning the constitutional changes required to enhance the quality of life in Canada.

What Canadians shall someday become will rise inexorably out of what we are today. In turn, what we are has come from what those before us were, what they planned, dreamed, and hoped for, the trials they faced, their successes and their failures. Decisions concerning our Constitution must not, therefore, be made simply for our own time alone. To properly revise our Constitution, we must understand the past, acknowledge the present, then responsibly fashion and articulate a vision for the future.

In 1867 representatives of two founding cultures undertook the series of political and legal actions which resulted in the creation of the Dominion of Canada. By today's standards these men would be considered ignorant and unsophisticated, but they were idealistic men living during an idealistic age in a land big enough and endowed with sufficient natural resources to make them believe that idealistic dreams could come true. They had faith in parliamentary democracy and believed its establishment in Canada would be a good thing. The land still exists, the potential remains, but I think the faith has grown a little thin in more recent years. We have perhaps become too sophisticated for our own good and forgotten that there is a difference between intelligence and wisdom. Too often we look for legal guarantees, which never last, where we should seek goodwill and trust, which do. The society of the two cultures was born amidst, and has since endured, much rancorous debate and occasional political deadlock, but all in all, it has spawned remarkably successful economic and social values. Canada is a good country. Canadians are heirs to a tradition that, although there have been lots of mistakes, has seen most decisions made for the common benefit by good, well-meaning leaders.

After the Battle of the Plains of Abraham the approximately 200,000 French colonists in Canada lost contact with their mother country. The British, in an amazingly generous act for its time, guaranteed French-Canadian linguistic and legal rights in Quebec. Confederation later confirmed French Canada as an entity in a primarily English-speaking continent. In the two centuries after 1759 the population of Quebec increased to about five million, and only 25,000 or so of that was attributed to immigration from France. Think of what that means. The Quebecois have not only survived for 200 years, but in their own house their culture has prevailed. The success of French Canada is a significant triumph. If to state that Quebec is a distinct society is to acknowledge a unique people who possess their own history, traditions, and ways of doing things, I see nothing wrong with saying so in the preamble to our Constitution. After all, the Anglophone majority encouraged, sometimes by design and often by neglect, the political and cultural environment that allowed them to flourish, and in that sense their success is partly our accomplishment as well.

Acknowledging a group to be historically or culturally distinct is not to imply that distinct characteristics confer special rights or privileges to those in that group. Today our nation is a mosaic. We are a country of English, Scottish, Irish, German, Ukrainian, Sikh, Chinese, West Indian, Vietnamese, and Pakistani Canadians among others. While many countries actively discourage people from becoming citizens, Canada welcomes them. What's more, people from all over the world are fairly beating down the door to get in. As a fifth-generation Canadian, I'm proud that my country is so highly regarded. In Calgary about 38 percent of children entering the school systems speak English as a second language. In Toronto and Vancouver that number rises in some parts of the cities to more than 50 percent. What's more, the first language is not often French. To me that means that suggestions that our country can somehow turn back the clock are mere pipe dreams. Our childhood is over. Any realistic projection of our future must include great numbers of distinct societies. Increasingly confident and influential groups of native Canadians, along with people from other countries who have decided to cast their lot with us, will eventually all expect to claim their place in the cultural and political mainstream; many already do.

2:26

Any country, but particularly a federation, must become greater than the sum of its parts or it will become simply a

group of independent units held together by economic or structural convenience. Canadians have for some time struggled to find a common vision and sense of purpose to achieve this. We must not allow ourselves to be discouraged and defeated by that struggle. We must succeed in developing a new national dream, new national standards of integrity and quality, and a new national purpose.

The elements to create these essential characteristics of nationhood are not lacking in Canada. They come, as they have always come, from the land. The challenge that has faced our nation from the beginning is to use and preserve our enormous portion of the globe for the benefit of future generations throughout the world. This is a challenge of great consequence not only for us but also for humanity. It is a challenge worthy of a great nation. It is a challenge that has in the past and can in the future occupy the imagination and labour of generations. Confronting it will create untold wealth and other benefits for Canadians and for the world.

Today I sense that many of our leaders have forgotten the need for a vision, and our people, preoccupied by less ambitious thoughts, do not consider common purpose as important as they used to. Canadians must learn again to appreciate and share the excitement of building a nation and understand the role each of them can play in this great task. We must regain confidence in ourselves.

Our national government has always assumed a significant role in nurturing the preservation of French Canada, but now, by its own admission, Quebec can stand on its own. I believe, therefore, it is time to admit that it may not always be realistic to provide all services in both languages everywhere, and I believe we'd be better off if we stopped.

While French Canada is a strong, confident society, in recent years its birthrate has been drastically reduced. Many of those who espouse the separatist cause I believe do so because they fear that as the percentage of Francophones decreases relative to the national population, the time may come when French Canada may not be able to muster the political power required to preserve itself in a country where the majority always carries the day. I believe that's the key to the puzzle. Quebecers have little else of consequence to gain by taking the legal step of declaring their independence. It won't make them richer; it won't provide them with more security. However, it would free them to make those decisions necessary to perpetuate their race. I believe constitutional changes providing for greater authority at the municipal and provincial levels would provide the opportunity for Quebecers, through locally elected representatives, to make those decisions. If this results in certain areas of the country becoming less desirable to Anglophones, so be it. Similarly, if local decisions in Anglophone Canada result in other areas becoming less desirable to Francophones, so be it.

I believe it is unrealistic for Canadians to perpetually maintain either legally or fiscally any ethnic society or special interest group. Canadian taxpayers must accept responsibility to mitigate the impact of past errors relative to our treatment of native Canadians, and we should assume responsibility for providing an orientation to our culture for new immigrants.

However, that's where the financial obligation should end. If Polish Canadians or Chinese Canadians or Pakistani Canadians or Quebecois wish to preserve their ethnic identities or special interest groups want to organize to promote their causes, that should be their right as individuals, but the resources they use should be their own.

Since the end of the Second World War our nation has mortgaged its future to train, feed, house, and employ the



strongest, best educated, healthiest generation in the history of the world. That generation should by now be focusing its attention on repaying that debt. We need to recognize that our primary responsibility is to preserve this country and, as our parents did, pass it on to the next generation better than it is now. If nothing else, we must pass it along intact.

However, outside Quebec the intelligence and resources of our generation have not been adequately directed towards those aspects of our history, present and future that unite us rather than those that divide us. I believe Anglophone Canadians now understand their moral obligation and through this constitutional process want to play their part in rejuvenating our country. That is why I believe the appropriate format to develop a new Constitution is a national constituent assembly, elected exclusively to create a constitutional instrument and amending process based not only on legal and political considerations but also on goodwill and trust among individual Canadians.

I believe that the new Constitution should recognize the primacy of the nation, that the provinces should be constitutionally subordinate to the federal government. The role of the federal government should primarily be to reflect the national vision and allocate resources in such a way as to move the country toward it. Beyond traditional responsibilities – for example, currency and national defence – the federal government would define and use its resources to co-ordinate the implementation of minimal national standards in such areas as education, health, social services, commerce, safety, and communications technology. The federal government should be responsible for civil rights and have the power to ensure that individuals enjoy freedom of opportunity in all parts of the country. Any individual willing to work hard enough and take the risks necessary to succeed should have that right. Individuals must, of course, adapt to local rules of language and comportment, but the playing field must be open to all who want to participate. This is the price I would expect Quebec to pay for the freedom to make local conditions. Quebecois historically do not readily admit outsiders to their society, and that will have to change.

The federal government must also have the power to protect individuals against unfair domination by either the majority or the minority. In a country as large as ours policies are often good for people in one part of the country and bad for those in another. Protection of the rights of people in both the more populous and less populous regions can best be achieved through houses representing both interests. I therefore favour the establishment of a full triple E Senate, not because it removes the right of representation for the larger provinces but rather because it gives meaningful representation to the smaller provinces.

While the federal government should be the forum for national policy, I believe decisions affecting the quality of day-to-day life for individual Canadians should be made as close to home as possible. I favour greater powers for the provinces in determining how to achieve nationally mandated standards and to exceed them where local conditions allow. I also favour full provincial control of cultural policy and an independent role for municipalities within the constitutional framework.

Of course many other issues must be resolved within a constituent assembly. My purpose here is not to discuss all of them but rather to try to impress upon you my belief that the right attitude can not only make this process succeed but in doing so can be an example to other nations of how people in a democracy conduct their affairs.

The inscription on the memorial to General James Wolfe and the Marquis de Montcalm reads: Valour gave them a common death, history a common fame, and posterity a common monument. We are now forging the common monument by which posterity will recall this generation of Canadians. With vision and courage let us make it one that justifies the faith of those who brought us this far, and let it serve as a beacon for generations yet to come.

Thank you very much.

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

Pam Barrett indicated she wants to ask a question.

MS BARRETT: I had preread your presentation, and while you were reading it, the same question came back to me that arose the first time I read it, and that is this. I think when you said that you've got no problem with the concept of distinct being embodied in the preamble to the Constitution with respect to Quebec, you then suggested that that need not carry any special rights with it. Then you went on to say that you would like to see a sort of devolution of powers to more localized governments. I think you probably understand full well that the current position of the major parties in Quebec is that the designation would carry with it some additional rights. You didn't actually say how you want to handle that. Are you suggesting, for example, as with Meech, where Quebec may get entrenched in the Constitution a right that it currently has with respect to immigration, all other provinces would get the same? Is that what you were really getting at?

2:36

MR. NICHOLS: That is exactly what I'm really getting at.

MS BARRETT: Do you think that would be acceptable to Quebec?

MR. NICHOLS: I think the issue is larger than just any one particular subissue. I think the issue really is: is membership in Canada even under changed circumstances better for Quebec than independence? I think it is, because as members of Canadian society they are members of a larger unit that has existed in the past and can exist in the future to nurture them in the sense that they can continue their own growth. I don't think they could get that if they declared independence.

Specifically, what would happen if Quebec declared independence and the rest of Canada – and, please, I hope this doesn't happen – decided to . . . You know, things didn't go well and the rest of Canada and Quebec could not make it on their own. The rest of Canada has a very viable option which, like it or not, is there, and that is to join the United States. What would Quebec have? They would have nothing. They couldn't negotiate terms with the United States on anywhere near the types of terms they could negotiate with Canada. I believe it's in their interests to stay within Confederation, but I really think their problem is that they're worried about what happens when English and other ethnic Canada is 15 million people and they're only seven.

MS BARRETT: No question that that is the essential worry.

MR. NICHOLS: I think what we have to do is accept the point that anything they get is something everybody else has to get. In doing that, in resolving these types of things, in my opinion you have to go away from the concept of collective rights and go

toward the concept of individual rights. Within their scope as individuals lies the capability of organizing themselves to do anything their resources or their intelligence can take them to do. As long as the rest of us don't have to pay for it, it can be part of our society.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon and Stock.

MR. CHUMIR: I see, not without pleasure, that you favour the federal government having a role in defining and implementing minimum national standards in health, social services, and a few other areas. I note you include education. This is not an area in which there is current involvement of any significance in establishing national standards, although we do have significant funding for advanced education. Do you have any thoughts with respect to what minimum standards, what areas, what role the federal government might reasonably play in that area, or is it a more global thought?

MR. NICHOLS: I included education because I thought that was one of the pillars of a strong society, and I would like to see assurances that a student entering elementary school in Nova Scotia is going to come out of secondary school with roughly the equivalent education of the same person in British Columbia. I have a particularly selfish reason for doing that. I think it would be good for our country if people moved around a little more. If people could be assured that they were going to get at least on a minimum standard the same quality of instruction throughout the country, this would be appropriate. Nevertheless, I think that within individual jurisdictions it should be possible for people to augment what would essentially be minimum standards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stock.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

A couple of areas, Mr. Nichols. You say that the new Constitution should recognize primacy of the nation, that the province should be constitutionally subordinate to the federal government. What exactly are you saying? Status quo? More shift to federal government?

MR. NICHOLS: Redefinition – perhaps redefinition of powers – and definitely inclusion of municipalities. In 1867 the tallest building in the world was a church in Hamburg, West Germany, which is 400 feet tall. Cities have grown up since then. I think we have to recognize that in our Constitution while we have the opportunity to do so.

In looking at our country and developing a mind-set of what our country is, I think we have to envisage it initially as a whole. I guess that's what I mean by this. First of all, we are a country, the country of Canada; subsequently, we have chosen to divide ourselves into provinces and even further into municipalities. Status quo only in the sense that that may be the way we divide ourselves. There is a lot of open ground left in that statement. For example, do the current provincial boundaries have to be maintained the way they are now? Is there anything magic in the fact that we have 10 provinces? Could we have 14? I don't know. I think that as a principle the country should be first and the constituent parts second.

MR. DAY: I appreciate your difficulty, then, in not being able to say categorically either status quo or more power, because you're talking about redefining.

You talk about the federal government should reflect. The role should be to reflect the national vision and allocate resources in such a way as to move the country toward it. The tearing factor, the disintegrating factor in the situation now is that western Canada and to a degree eastern Canada feel that because of the accumulation of MPs in central Canada and their defining the role the way they see it, our definition isn't sufficiently included. This would seem to – correct me if I'm wrong – direct us to the same problem. If it's the national government defining the vision, allocating resources to move us toward it, then I see the central accumulation of MPs being the main factor in that definition and the west still feeling like: what about our definition?

MR. NICHOLS: The upper House, which would be a triple E Senate comprised of equal, elected, and effective representatives, would be the balancing factor which would allow representation for the smaller provinces. I do not favour the "equal" in the triple E Senate representing regions. If our country is made up of regions rather than provinces, then let us use this occasion to redefine our provincial boundaries to reflect regional boundaries. But if our country is made up of provinces as it is now, then it is appropriate in my opinion, because of the size of the country and because of the diverse nature, to have two Houses, each of which reflects a different reality. The House of Commons remaining as it is now, and I agree with you that it has an overabundance of Members of Parliament from the central portion, would be balanced by the powers of the Senate, which would have equal representation and therefore more – I hate to use the word "equitably" – positively reflect the aspirations of minorities within the country.

MR. DAY: So included in the effective powers of the Senate, then, you would give them that ability to – I don't want to say "cancel" – dilute that national vision set by the . . .

MR. NICHOLS: I would say the national vision would be the result of deliberation and debate of both Houses. It is not a continuous process that it goes from one to the other; there would be a development of national visions from both and then cross-fertilization between the two of them. I recognize that in many ways this is using the American republican model. I'm not sure, given the diversity we have, that that's a bad thing in this instance. We can adapt it to Canadian standards. We've adapted models from other countries before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gary.

MR. SEVERTSON: Yes. Mr. Nichols, we've heard a number of presentations about a constituent assembly, and it's in your brief too. I always have trouble defining what a constituent assembly is, because everybody has wide opinions on that. In your idea of a constituent assembly, would you foresee it being elected equally from all provinces or the same as the House of Commons, rep by population? What's your perception on that?

2-46

MR. NICHOLS: When I thought of it, and the reason I didn't add this – but I'll tell you. I thought of having the constituent assembly made up of representatives from each of the provincial constituencies and the territorial constituencies across the

country, with one proviso, that no one could run on a party ticket, that people would be elected as individuals. That would provide on the one hand representation by population, because of course the Ontario and Quebec Legislatures are larger than any of the other Legislatures, but I think Canadians by and large have a fairness of spirit that would be reflected in the way individuals elected without party affiliations specifically to do this job would approach it. It's a question of faith in the system again. I can't justify it on any legal or mathematical grounds, but I think it would work.

MR. SEVERTSON: So you think it would do a lot better than the House of Commons. It would just be a duplicate of the House of Commons then, the numbers and . . .

MR. NICHOLS: I'd like to see it bigger than just the 285 or so members of the House of Commons. I would like to see it as a very large cross section. When you're talking about 58 members from New Brunswick, 83 and some odd from Alberta, and so on from Ontario and Quebec and British Columbia, by increasing the sample, as it were, you would get a better cross section of opinions. By eliminating the factor of party affiliation, you result in those elected concentrating on this task to the exclusion of everything else. Once again, sir, I can't tell you why I think it would work. I just believe it would.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dick, for your presentation. I just want to tell you . . . I don't want to make it sound unfair to either you or another presenter, but when you say, "I also favour full provincial control of cultural policy," that would run into direct collision with the last presenter we had this morning, who was very concerned that the federal government maintain control of cultural policy. I just point that out to tell you how difficult a task becomes when we hear well-reasoned and well-thought-out presentations from very thoughtful Albertans.

Thank you very much for coming forward.

MR. NICHOLS: Thank you, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Brendan Dunphy is here. Is Mr. Andrew Pask not here yet?

All right, Brendan. Welcome.

MR. DUNPHY: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of preciseness, I'm going to read my brief into the record and then welcome your questions that follow. At the outset I want to say to the Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform that I certainly appreciate the opportunity to make this submission this afternoon.

I also want to say that less than two weeks ago I almost made the decision to opt out of this opportunity, and that was for two reasons. First was my perception that the time lines outlined by the two other key players in this drama, particularly the federal government and Quebec itself, are so far advanced as to make Alberta's intervention an after-the-fact scenario. Unless the process is fast-tracked from this point onward and a fall sitting of the Legislature convened, I believe the province and its citizens will be caught in the awkward position of reacting to someone else's proposals. In other words, we will be playing catch-up. Secondly, I was also depressed by my belief that right-wing extremists, zealous nationalists, and constitutional academ-

ics or intellectuals, which usually represent opposite ends of the population spectrum, have dominated too much of the constitutional debate and media attention to date.

Much of the common sense inherent in the majority of the Canadian population is missing from the current constitutional discussions. Therefore, I'm appearing before you today as a representative of a silent majority of Albertans and Canadians, a group of people who rarely write letters to the *Calgary Sun*, the *Alberta Report*, or even the *Calgary Herald*, a group of people who have never publicly demonstrated in front of any building or Legislature, nor have they had their hard-luck stories portrayed on TV or on the front or middle pages of any newspaper. It is a sort of group that often says, "Let George do it," and hopes things turn out okay. It is, moreover, a group that believes in the concept of a strong Canada that includes Quebec. It is also a group that reluctantly understands that the political posturing associated with so much of the current debate is a regrettable reality of our country today. Despite this, it is our hope that Alberta leaders like yourselves will rise to statesman-like status and present a position that will demonstrate to other Canadians that the future of our country is more important than the future of any political party in Alberta whether it be the PCs, the NDs, the Liberals, or even the Reform Party.

We are a group of pan-Canadians who fairly recently have chosen Alberta as the best province in which to live. We contribute positively and energetically to the economy and the community life of Alberta. Our children are already assuming leadership roles in their everyday lives and will exponentially make greater contributions to the vitality of this province in the years ahead. We are really DPs, meaning delayed pioneers. However, we have been conditioned by the experience of a federalism that embodies a strong central government and a political system built on trust, tolerance, and understanding, one that embodies sharing with those regions and populations whose resources and geography historically have dictated economic and social inequities.

It is imperative that we view Canada from a long-term perspective and not from the recent past of some 40 to 50 years or less, not to mention the last two or three. It should be our long-term goal to rebuild Canada as a model of political, economic, and cultural co-operation. In the short term, however, it will involve a compromise of the emotions and the diffusing of partisan and intellectual walls that have been built by so many of our esteemed political leaders and academics.

Now I want to make a few comments on some of the outstanding issues surrounding the constitutional debate. Notwithstanding much of the genuine concern about provincial equality, we must recognize very clearly that the question of Quebec within Canada is central to any of these discussions. Our group is concerned that Quebec nationalism combined with regional disenchantment will lead to the weakening of our federal system and the inability of our government to govern in the name of all Canadians. One of the realities few Canadians seem to understand is that not all provinces enjoy equal powers today. This arrangement, which is called asymmetrical federalism, allows, for example, Ontario to control their provincial police and Quebec to utilize their own civil law system. This does not mean that we advocate any extensive transfer of federal powers to all the provinces or even to Quebec alone.

In this context, however, there is obviously room to discuss the division of certain powers that can be functionally exercised better at a provincial level but whose division does not impact on the federal government's ability to fulfill the goals of a strong nationhood and a preservation of national values. We don't

believe, for example, that control over the environment or immigration should be the exclusive prerogative of any one province, nor do we believe that the policies that promote bilingualism and multiculturalism are inherently divisive or unfair. In fact, we are more concerned that the bonds that have traditionally linked Canadians together are being dismantled by the Mulroney government in Ottawa. We are referring here to the dismantling of our post office system, the curtailment of Via Rail service, and the downgrading of the CBC as an independent and vital communication channel for all Canadians.

2:56

The argument that Quebec is not a distinct society has become an intellectual as well as a bigoted cause célèbre for many Canadians in the so-called rest of Canada. Quebec is a society with a different legal system, a society with specific institutions, a society that existed two centuries before the Fathers of Confederation met in Charlottetown in 1864. Today as we are becoming more willing to accept the distinctiveness of our native peoples, we should continue to allow Quebec's distinctiveness to be recognized through the existing realities of asymmetrical federalism. Those who argue against distinctiveness understand little about the interrelationship of language and culture, nor do they realize that periodic elements of legislative distinctiveness have been historically enjoyed by other provincial governments in the past.

How we will resolve our constitutional impasse in the short time facing us is uncertain. Distrust of politicians and the political processes they promote is colouring the whole debate. Excessive emotionalism and political partisanship is hampering responsible political dialogue. It would appear to us that some form of constituent assembly of Canadians should be convened to grapple with the constitutional crisis. In this respect I have attached to this submission appendix A, which is a recent article from the *Globe and Mail* that outlines a possible model for such a body. This particular body would be essentially equal in nature. I believe the outcomes of the deliberations of such a body could help to vividly demonstrate that a body like a triple E Senate can make a significant contribution to Canadian political life, that it is more than just a western-based political dream and therefore more likely to be acceptable to those who oppose its essential three-pronged characteristics.

We also hope that Alberta will continue to be a leading proponent for the cause of Canadian unity, that we will become the embodiment of statesmanlike stances and attitudes, and that we will be seen as the embodiment of the real essence of Confederation characterized by a sense of sharing our resources and co-operation in times of need. This presents a great challenge to all of you as members of the select committee. You have been thrust unexpectedly into the roles of nation healers and nation builders, roles that you were not necessarily elected for in the first instance. As a representative of a group of proud Canadians and Albertans, I sincerely hope and pray that you will not fail.

By way of conclusion: you will realize that there is not much specific in the way of recommendations but some general comments that will echo the sentiments of a lot of people relatively new to this province who are determined that Canada shall remain one, and I pass these to you for your consideration.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, and thank you for attaching an item which you endorse. It's a sample of what the constituent assembly may look like.

MR. DUNPHY: Right. I was listening to the last speaker and thinking I have something there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
Yes, John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: Brendan, I certainly think your desire for us to hear from the silent majority is a commendable one. I think those of us who sit in hearings are never quite certain whether we're hearing a representative sample opinion or not, although I daresay many people hear different things in the sounds of silence, if I can put it that way – and to let you know that this committee is trying to get the benefit of social science to do some polling among the general population to try to at least get some idea of how those who don't come to hearings feel about things.

I want to ask you a specific question about the distrust of politicians, because I think that's part of the backdrop of what we all face. You are, I believe, the second Liberal candidate who's come to speak with us this afternoon. We've also had submissions from the Liberal Party provincially, from university Liberal clubs, and other manifestations of the party apparatus. Because the other parties haven't undertaken that type of representation to this committee, I'm kind of curious whether you feel that's the kind of forum we should have as opposed to, I suppose, the alternative view that we're trying to hear from the more general public and that the political parties are better to stay back and listen for a period of time.

MR. DUNPHY: Well, it's perhaps an unfortunate coincidence that I'm a member of the Liberal Party and a candidate for election. Given that reality that I would stick out because you know who I am, I really wanted to come here and try and portray that I was speaking for a group of Albertans and Canadians who have a special feeling about Canada and about the way Canada should evolve in the future. It may be that some of the statements I made do reflect or mirror some of the things the Liberal Party has said in the past, but that's also coincidental.

The reason I attached the appendix on the constituent assembly is that I believe there's a lot of people out there who would like to see the process work in a way in which more – I won't say the average Canadian – nonelected people would have a say in how the country would evolve. I think you can't deny the right of the elected politicians to be involved in the process, but a constituent assembly which would have a balance of so-called nonelected people and elected people, and you have to have academics for some resource power – a blend of non-elected and elected and others – should be more acceptable to the Canadian people.

MR. McINNIS: Just so I'm clear on it, you would prefer that we read your submission as coming from you as an individual?

MR. DUNPHY: No. It comes to me from a group of people I know and associated with in the last 20 years who have moved into this province. In my dealings with them on a regular basis I know this is the way they feel about Canada. I'm not the president of organization X, but I do represent a lot of the people from other parts of the country who have chosen Alberta as the place to live.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.  
Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Even though you are a Liberal, Brendan, and many of the ideas I agree with, I must say there are two very significant things you've proposed that I'm on the opposite side of. Be that as it may, I don't want to talk about those. I point that out as an opener because I don't know where you stand on this particular issue that I've asked almost everybody who's appeared before this body, and that is in respect of the federal role in setting national standards for medicare and social services and then even beyond that to an area where they're not involved now, and that is education. Because you're an educator and perhaps see some of the practical implications a little more closely than we would – and there is a view that the federal government should be out of those areas altogether – could you give us your thoughts in that area?

MR. DUNPHY: Well, I support national standards backed up by resources from the federal government to help those provinces with the greatest needs. In terms of education I guess a thing that really focuses my attention on the need for national standards and national assistance is, let's say, a province like Newfoundland with very limited resources. As Canadians I think everyone is entitled to the same basic level of education, and for some provinces that is only possible by significant amounts of federal funding. So I see national standards in a sense of money to back up. I believe there's a minimum kind of education that all Canadians should be entitled to regardless of where they live.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stock.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Brendan, I just need clarification. You mentioned some federal institutions, some colossal money-losing ones as a matter of fact – Via Rail; you talked about the post office – and shared your concern about the effect of the federal government moving away from, as I gather, the fairly massive subsidization of those operations. Are you suggesting there be constitutional protection for federal institutions whether they're losing money or not? I don't quite understand, in the light of this constitutional discussion, what you'd like to see there.

MR. DUNPHY: By alluding to those three examples and the current government, I guess I was trying to make reference to the fact that there are certain things in this country that traditionally have held it together. I mean, there are not just three items, but three things that have made Canadians seem to feel like Canadians no matter where they live are institutions like the CBC and Via Rail and, to a degree, the post office. I realize that in some cases there are inefficiencies, but sometimes you have to live with some inefficiencies if you want to have people feeling they belong to one country.

3:06

MR. DAY: If you could just help me, then, because we're trying to get a sense from all Albertans, and when someone comes, like yourself, representing a group, as you say you do, I'm trying to get a sense of that representation. I'm a little bit confused. At one time I thought you had said silent majority, and then a little while later you said a group of new Albertans who have moved here is who you're representing. I'd just like to ask you, whichever that group is, if you could let us know who you feel you're representing there and does that group support, for instance, the post office not having to deal with competition and being protected as a monolith having that stranglehold on the public. What's your sense from the group you represent?

MR. DUNPHY: Well, let's take the CBC as perhaps a better example.

MR. DAY: I was referring to the post office mainly.

MR. DUNPHY: Okay, but I want to talk about the CBC first. Most of us, the people I represent, have been weaned on the CBC; it's been an integral part of their development as children and young people. So naturally they have a strong affiliation to it and would want to see the CBC remain a very viable entity. The post office: maybe you could argue there's some nostalgia attached to that, but I think that just because you live in rural Canada, you shouldn't be condemned by not having the services of something that you feel is vitally important to your psychological and political beliefs.

MR. DAY: In answer to my question then, if you could just help me, and then we'll move to the next question here, the group you represent: you said silent majority and then you said a group of new Albertans in the last 20 years. Which group is that that you're saying, and do they share your sentiment for the protection of the post office?

MR. DUNPHY: The group I represent I can say is the silent majority, because I tried to elaborate the fact that these people aren't out there demonstrating and saying, "This is what I believe should be done." They're more the silent group of people who go about their everyday lives very diligently in terms of the workplace but have not taken the time to make their opinions known on these kinds of issues. I feel it's time that someone heard from that kind of group of people.

MR. DAY: And you feel the silent majority is supporting the post office from other forms of competition?

MR. DUNPHY: The silent majority would want to promote and believe in the continuance of those links, those essential federal links, if you want to call them that, that help to bind this very diverse country together. If the post office is one of them, which I think it is, then they support that.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Brendan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Well, one question about the CBC, of course, that has been bothering a number of people is the fact that Radio-Canada in Quebec is not, in fact, giving the same news [interjection] – it doesn't – to Quebecers that the CBC gives to English Canada. If it was indeed an independent and vital communication channel for all Canadians, including Quebecers, I think we'd be better off. I think the fact of the matter is that it has not been, and this was well pointed out by one of the Premiers in Whistler. Radio-Canada constantly played a visual image of a Quebec flag being burned and trampled in Ontario, and the CBC we watch, English CBC, has shown us a number of pictures of the Canadian flag likewise being desecrated in Quebec. The Premier asked the rhetorical question: is that – Radio-Canada/CBC – promoting national unity? If it were indeed the communication channel for all Canadians including Quebecers, I'd be a lot happier, and I think that's been pointed out on a number of occasions.

MR. DUNPHY: Well, I don't disagree with those observations. Those kinds of spectacular media promotions certainly do great

harm for the country, and I hope people would be more sensible about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Brendan.

MR. DUNPHY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is Gregg Schell here? Andrew Pask? Okay. Caroline Russell-King?  
Welcome.

MS RUSSELL-KING: Hi. Thanks. I don't like microphones that much . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, unfortunately we are recording the proceedings in *Hansard*, so I'd appreciate it if you'd use them, whether you like them or not.

MS RUSSELL-KING: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay? Thank you.

MS RUSSELL-KING: I'm going to be doing an informal presentation. I'm not here on any other political agenda; I don't represent any parties. I am your Joe Citizen. I've never done anything like this before. I hope you've seen a lot of us. I hope we're a breath of fresh air to you as opposed to comic relief.

The Prime Minister last night said that he wanted to communicate with Canadians using plain and simple language, so that's what I hope to use: plain and simple language. I'm also going to use diagrams, because I'm an artist and that's the way I work.

I see this as Canada, and I see this ideally as Quebec being a distinct society within Canada and yet still being a part of the nation. I see other groups of marginalized people also being within the circle which is Canada. However, I see this as an ideal. What I actually see happening is this: I see marginalized people outside of Canada. So if this then is the ideal, how do we get from this to this? I see us getting from this to this by breaking down these boundaries and allowing people to enter.

So then I think to myself, "What makes up the majority here?" I see the people who make up the majority as being white. I see the people in power as being male. I see them having money, and I see them having education, and I don't necessarily see those in all the factors on the outside.

I see that there are three steps we have to go through in order to go from this to this. The first thing that usually happens is a lack of knowledge; we have a lack of knowledge of what's really going on in Canada. I think this is happening with the First Nations people. I feel very strongly about this: there's not a real understanding of what's going on. I think the second thing that happens is that there's a fear of change. What will happen if we allow certain people into our society? What will that mean for us as Canadians? I see that in terms of Quebec as well. So the second thing would be a fear of change. The last thing I see is a perceived threat. You can take a lot of things and you can work it into this model. Something as local as the kirpan issue, something we had recently, would be a real perceived threat. If we allow these changes to happen, then that will be a very real thing that we have to worry about.

I'm worried that society is like a triangle, though, too. If this is the base and if this is a silent majority or not a silent majority, right at the apex of this are our groups like the KKK and the Aryan Nations people. I'm very concerned about them. I'm

very concerned that they consider themselves marginalized people and would like to be taken into consideration as being a part of Canada. I don't; I see them being supported by the status quo.

I have four points I'd like to make, and if you'd like to write them down – I don't believe in giving handouts – that would be great for me, because then I'd know that they're going in your brain and out your arm. The first thing is that I'd like nations people to be given a stronger voice in the shaping of the Constitution. The second: I'd like landed immigrants and people on a visa and refugees to have the same rights and freedoms extended to them as Canadian citizens. Thirdly, I'd like specifically that homosexuals be guaranteed rights and freedoms so that they can no longer be discriminated against in the court system, the legal system, and the workplace, and I'd like the Constitution to be amended to say regardless of sex or sexual identity or origin or gender or whatever. Fourth: I don't know if you could make a proviso for this, but I feel that a lot of groups are hiding behind their freedom of religion act and are actually a shield for racist groups; that is, these people that are doing a lot of harm to the fabric of our society. It's those specific points that I'd just like to bring to your attention.

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

Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: Well, first of all I'd like to thank you for drawing out what you wanted to present to us. I think that's a very special way to do it and probably the first time anybody has done that. Given your statements on religion, that people are hiding behind certain things to promote racism, could you just elaborate which component of the Constitution you think it is that they do this with?

MS RUSSELL-KING: I don't know specifically what they're doing. I just know in general terms that freedom of speech doesn't include inciting the public to violence against certain groups, those kinds of issues, and that the gun is not a religious symbol of the Church of Jesus Christ Christian Aryan Nations people – a gun is a gun – and that it's easy to get caught up in those kinds of rhetoric.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I see. I'm sorry; I didn't know that anybody had made the case that a gun was a symbol of a church. Okay doke. I'll look at this one. Thank you.

MS RUSSELL-KING: Sure.

3:16

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Stock Day.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Caroline. It is refreshing to look at drawings rather than this mass of words. It helps us to refocus, I guess, literally. I don't know about theoretically.

I would like to just question a little further how you come to the conclusion that the status quo could possibly support something as bizarre as the KKK or the Church of Jesus Christ Christian Aryan Nations, whether they use a gun for a symbol or not. Can you help me, show me how this table is part of that?

MS RUSSELL-KING: I offer that in the fact that none of your people are of colour and that I don't see any marginal groups represented on this panel.



MR. DAY: That none of us are – I'm sorry – coloured?

MS RUSSELL-KING: People of colour.

MR. DAY: And therefore we're supporting the KKK?

MS RUSSELL-KING: No, not directly, but indirectly. The people that I see on the panel are in majority white males, and because of the power structures that we have in our society, that's how groups like that . . . They go through to the last stage, the first stage being the lack of knowledge, of understanding, of integration, and fear of change, and then a perceived threat. They take the perceived threat, which is what I hear in the media all the time: what will happen if . . . What will happen if . . . So I see it as a power base that supports those kinds of people. I really do.

MR. DAY: Okay. I just share, even for my colleagues in opposition parties, that I can assure you that none of us around this table support in any way, shape, or form those types of fringe groups. Actually, one of our members, a native woman, isn't here today. She's not on this committee by any amount of tokenism. She rightfully earned her place as an elected representative, but isn't with us today.

MS RUSSELL-KING: Yeah. I don't want to say that you're all, you know, Nazis. I don't want, you know, labeling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: I just wanted to compliment our speaker on her sensitivity for human rights. I might mention that although your concerns with respect to homogeneity are well taken, we're not all males here – my friend to the right here – and are not all WASPS. I'm a member of a tribe that's not that popular with the Aryan Nations; I'm a Jewish boy. So there is some flexibility, and different groups can get a toehold in being represented in this province, although we can certainly do better.

However, to no surprise of my colleagues, I want to move away from the heart of your presentation and deal with an issue that's been very fundamental in our deliberations, and that is the role that the federal government should play in our medicare and social services programs as opposed to what the provinces should do. At present the federal government funds and sets minimum national standards for medicare and social services. Some say that the federal government should get out of that and the provinces should take over jurisdiction over the medicare and social services programs, and if there are to be national standards, that they should do it and get the feds out. I'm wondering what your position would be with respect to the role of the federal government in those programs.

MS RUSSELL-KING: I lean towards federalism. I believe in unity. I believe in keeping Quebec in the Constitution and in the strength of Canada as a nation. I'd say in apple pie and the American flag, but, you know, it's the maple leaf and the whatever.

MR. CHUMIR: Okay. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You've given us four specific items which would require some constitutional change or at least changes to some of the legislation which is now in place. Thank you very much.

MS RUSSELL-KING: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gregg Schell is not yet here nor Andrew Pask. Our next presenter is Treasa Van Ommen Kloeke.

I understand that you'd like to wait until the appearance time of 3:30 which you had been given. Is that correct?

MRS. VAN OMMEN KLOEKE: It's a little difficult. I'm sorry, but a third member of our group is on his way from another meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Then is Rick Pollard here?

Okay. We're jumping ahead of ourselves a little bit by the fact that two of our presenters have either decided not to come or are late. We will take a 10-minute adjournment.

[The committee adjourned from 3:23 p.m. to 3:32 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, members of the panel, if you could please return to the table.

Okay, there are three presenters now. You are aware, of course, that we're going to have to try and keep the presentations within the time limits.

Please proceed, Treasa.

MRS. VAN OMMEN KLOEKE: Thank you. My name is Treasa Van Ommen Kloeke. The Canadian people have been asked for suggestions for change for the future course of Canada through constitutional reform. I present to you the need for the Constitution to provide full protection for our society's foundation stone, which is the traditional family. This foundation stone should not be open to any organization, international or otherwise, to tamper with or nullify. However, it seems that the Canadian government has been allowing this to happen. It is clearly obvious to those who care and observe that the generous funds handed over by government to special interest organizations and radical groups at taxpayers' expense are in turn used to fund those groups' antifamily agendas through further infiltration of and pressure on our government.

To illustrate, let me mention here two groups who predominate. The first group consists of radical feminist organizations who confess to surprisingly small numbers of membership, who overlap into each other's organizations, and who receive out of taxpayers' money over \$13 million per annum from the office of the Secretary of State. These women's groups advocate the destruction of the traditional family structure and marriage due to what they call enslavement of women and claimed oppression of women. Furthermore, these groups advocate universal day care and free abortion, again at taxpayers' expense, and the destruction of the patriarchal system; hence their involvement in rape crisis centres, et cetera, and their support for the homosexual agenda. They also support and further their regime through involvement with the sexuality programs right through the school system and into the universities. This runs the gamut from introducing homosexuality as an alternative life-style to grade 5 children in elementary school to organizing so-called women's studies in the university where the feminist lecturer introduces her new students to the program by qualifying it as male-bashing. One completely baffling situation arises when government ministers complain about the tight financial situation and they in turn go forth and attend workshops for feminist groups and tell them how to lobby governments and get funding. This has become an annual event in Alberta, in Calgary in particular.

Something else which baffles us is when the provincial government matches dollar for dollar for some of these groups, not questioning the source of the original dollars, which is commonly the federal government. I suggest that some members of our government need to become conversant with reality, learn how to discern right from wrong, and become strong enough to stand their ground against these radical pressure groups with their vested interests who are a threat to the stability of Canada.

The second group which predominates is on the international level, now outpacing in size the International Red Cross, and is called the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Our government supports this organization directly and indirectly, financially and otherwise, though it is well known to be the largest ever killer of humanity. The Planned Parenthood Federation kills at least 60 million unborn children every year, either directly or in conjunction with other agencies throughout the world. In Canada this figure reaches over 100,000 a year. Canada, in the near future, has yet to confirm that the signature which Prime Minister Mulroney has already placed on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child treaty is ratified by each of the individual provinces through their Premier. This is a very serious issue, as once ratified, the laws of the UN treaty will be the laws which will govern Canada and will nullify the Canadian Constitution in respective areas.

Though the UN convention on the child contains some good material, some extremely dangerous articles are included. It should be understood that this convention was held behind closed doors and the provincial follow-up is also held behind closed doors. New world order laws are being made which concern whole nations without consulting with the people who are affected. Let us question whose thinking values went into forming this treaty.

The only part of the convention that mentions the need to protect the unborn is in the preamble, and this is not binding so therefore has no value. Articles 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 24(2)(f) all jeopardize the family, parental rights, and the unborn, not the least to say the child. For if parental rights are taken away and children by law are given the freedom to do as they please without any parental control – have family planning, abortion provided at any age – and laws against concerned parents established, there can only be chaos to follow.

A very frightening connection can be made between the UN convention on the child and the Planned Parenthood Federation, and this must be kept in mind when we ask that question: whose thinking and values went into this treaty? The chief spokesperson for the Planned Parenthood Federation is Faye Wattleton, who is a board member of the UN's child relief agency, UNICEF. Also, the first charter member of the UN was a man named Mr. Owen, who ultimately became the secretary-general of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. There are, most probably, many more ties than these two.

Coming to the conclusion of this presentation, I would ask the members of the panel to please urge Premier Getty and other Premiers not to ratify the UN convention on the child, or at least to place reservations on the aforementioned list of articles so that they are not legally binding on our nation. We would ask our government representatives and ministers to turn around the destructive trends threatening our country and to have the courage needed to do so. They should be confident in knowing that the vast majority of Canadians support the protection of the traditional family of husband, wife, brothers, sisters, children, both born and unborn, and not the least the handicapped and the elderly. Supporting the elimination of the family, marriage,

the unborn, elderly, and handicapped is not the role of a government that really cares for the people. Let the family be protected by the Constitution of our country.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Next.

MR. COLVIN: My name is Robert Colvin. Mr. Chairman and committee members, Alberta has a long and proud history, revealed time and again in the lives of some remarkable people who overcame great adversity in their personal determination to forge a life for themselves and their family in a new, previously unharnessed land. Throughout this colourful history the communities of Alberta were established and maintained on the commitment of a group of people bound together by their shared vision of a life-style offering great opportunity for those bold enough to sacrifice for it.

The strong and vigorous Alberta community, of which we carry such pride, was established and maintained on the foundation of three major pillars: the family unit, in which the individual uniqueness and spirituality of each person was nurtured; the community, in which the spirit of common concern, morality, and co-operation allowed each family to multiply its resources and rely on the strength of the group; and the school, which consolidated the beliefs and the instruction of the home in a curriculum of instruction that prepared children to one day assume positions of positive contribution to society. The family, the community, and the educational system were working in concert to establish and maintain a strategy of life that empowered each member of the group to withstand the harsh physical and social influences facing those in pursuit of new opportunities and achievement. The sanctity of each was confirmed and promoted through solid provincial legislation endorsing their necessity and rightness.

Significant changes have been taking place in Alberta since those years, changes that have in many ways completely transformed our unique culture. However, not all changes are progressive. Within the fabric of Alberta society we are witnessing to an increasing degree the transformation of these three traditional pillars into fragile and unsteady supports. None of the three has managed to escape erosion, and because of their interdependence the process of decay has been greatly accelerated. Increasingly we are witnessing the rapid polarization of Alberta's parents on the basis of how they prioritize the importance of nurturing their own children in relation to their desire to pursue personal career and financial goals.

To a significant extent there is a growing recognition that the traditional parenting values that so appropriately characterize the strong communities of Alberta are giving way to a new parenting value system. This emerging perspective relegates children to the level of a possession and, not infrequently, a significant inhibitor of career aspirations and personal freedoms. Contingent to this attitude is the evolution of a societal norm or a cultural expectation that under the rights available to Canadian stakeholders, the fabric of society should assume responsibility for the rearing of their children. This amounts to little more than parenting in absentia and complete abdication of parenting responsibilities.

The problem of freeing individuals to pursue their personal dreams and aspirations is solved by society's willingness to assume responsibility for the rearing of these children. However, the barometers of Alberta's social health are indicating that this response has set in motion a series of destructive trends. Firstly,

there has been a significant loss in the right of a child to be raised within a family setting that is focused on nurturing his independence of personhood. Collective care programs are well documented to restrict rather than enhance the emergence of individuality, and a generation of Albertans are emerging who understand the meaning of coercion and control far more clearly than their perception of co-operation and love.

3:42

Secondly, there is a significant erosion of benefits and programs directed at enriching and endorsing the efforts of parents who in traditions of Alberta culture are willingly sacrificing their personal dreams and desires to one extent or another in the personal service of their children. Constitutional guidelines are leaning heavily toward the side of empowering people to pursue their wants, while those very things of value, the family and its capacity to nurture a person's uniqueness, are in drastic decline. The struggle encountered later in life for people who have only experienced the emptiness of communal child care and collective child rearing emerges throughout our society. We see evidence of lost people in social welfare programs. The lonely and desperate withdraw and disappear only to be recorded as a statistic somewhere in the health system. Those without hope or connection to others fall into the criminal justice system.

The capacity of the medical, educational, and social systems to be a surrogate family and address the need for the nurturing of healthy people is limited and ineffective. The institution of the family and the richness of a caring parent/child relationship is now, as it always has been, the foundation of a healthy and vigorous Alberta. A strong family is the only solution, and constitutional reform and legislation aimed at reinstating and re-empowering the family is essential in this process. It is the only answer to the great challenge that lies ahead of us all in our hopes of preserving the character of society which has stood the test of time and which is certainly capable of enduring the face of the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
David.

MR. NYGAARD: Good afternoon, members of the panel. My name is David Nygaard. I'm a second-year student at the University of Calgary. As an external commissioner I'm an elected member of the students' union. Although elected to represent U of C students on a broad range of issues, today I'd like to speak to you on behalf of Canadian youth generally and on behalf of myself personally.

I'd like to briefly address what I perceive as two of Canada's largest obstacles to possessing a Charter which respects the views of young adults and attempt to outline some specific points which could contribute to a solution.

My first point is that of responsible or responsive government. We should never make decisions on behalf of other persons based on assumptions which might well be false. We arrive at these assumptions by either not giving the particular group a voice or by giving it a voice and then interpreting only what we'd like to hear. An example of this could be the reactions of the various levels of Canadian government vis-à-vis the issue of native rights.

However, my point today is that you of an older generation should not make decisions in a vacuum in the absence of a youth voice. For instance, decisions taken in a committee might very well be the exact opposite of what we the youth would like to

see. The preceding generation is making decisions on behalf of the arising generation based on a belief system or world view that we the youth do not necessarily subscribe or adhere to.

Most persons of university or college age have surpassed the emotional instability of adolescence and have already formed firm beliefs and/or a world view for themselves. It is frustrating, to say the least, when a room of 40- and 50-year-olds takes the decision to place condom machines in every possible public school or university or college simply because they feel that this is probably what the kids want. Perhaps a different conclusion would have been reached had we been consulted.

My second point is that of a specific protection in the Charter for the fundamental rights and freedoms of the unborn child. It is this child who if not deprived of his or her right to life would eventually become a young adult citizen of Canada.

Firstly, a short example from history. In 1928 the Supreme Court of Canada unanimously ruled that women were not persons. A year later, on October 18, 1929, that decision was appealed, and the Privy Council in England declared that the word "person" - section 24 of the BNA Act, 1867 - includes members of either sex. Today we take that decision for granted as a simple acknowledgment of truth. The glaring question begs to be asked then: why in the world would the Supreme Court of Canada rule in 1991 that unborn children are not persons, not Canadians, and not worthy of the rights and freedoms detailed for them in the Charter? If this argument is followed to its illogical conclusion, it is no wonder that we encounter a court ruling that states that unborn children are not persons with rights until they have fully exited from their mother's womb. Thus we have absurdities like the British Columbia midwifery case where the infant's head had exited from the birth canal but it was not deemed a person because its torso and lower body were not yet exited as well.

Specifically what is needed is an amendment to the Charter recognizing that the unborn child is a person with enforceable rights and freedoms. This means that in part 1, section 7, which states that "everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person," the word "everyone" must include in its meaning the unborn child just as the British Privy Council ruled that the term "person" must include women as well.

Part 1, section 15(1) must be enforced as to be true to its stated intention that

every individual is equal before . . . the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on . . . age

as well as other factors. A significant percentage of Canada's citizenry is brutally discriminated against every day simply based on age and place of residence, namely the unborn child.

In conclusion, let us strive for a Constitution that is truly, as it states, representative of equality for all regardless of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, or mental or physical handicap.

Thank you, members of the panel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you all for your presentations. You've targeted specific issues relating to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and have not addressed yourself to some of the other issues we are dealing with such as division of responsibilities and so on.

I think, though, it's fair to say that you will appreciate, if you heard the last presentation, that your views are diametrically opposed to the last presenter, particularly with respect to sexual orientation being included in the Charter of Rights. The last

presenter urged that that be done to protect the rights of homosexuals. So you see the dilemma that our committee has before it. Furthermore, I can assure you that we have had on a number of occasions people who have taken directly the opposite perspective relative to the issue of the unborn. So it's a very interesting challenge that we are facing, obviously.

Questions or comments from anyone at the table? Yes, Stock Day.

MR. DAY: On the item of the unborn, I gather you're clearly asking for that protection to be enshrined constitutionally.

MR. COLVIN: Yes, that's correct. That's what we'd like to see.

MR. DAY: Right now, though, that is federal legislation. There seems to be some availability, I guess, from province to province for the provincial medical association to have some say in this particular area. I use as a case in point the discussion advertised this weekend. Last week it said that the term could be 18 weeks at which abortion could happen in the Morgentaler building, and then later on, on the weekend, the provincial Medical Association said it could be extended to 20, perhaps 24 weeks, which caught my attention since I have a 17-year-old son who was born at 28 weeks. It's no longer a medical marvel to see a 24-week birth happen. So are you suggesting that the ability for this to be enshrined in the legislation then should overrule any provincial medical association? As ours is drawing time limits now, are you suggesting that that should overrule all provincial medical associations?

MRS. VAN OMMEN KLOEKE: May I answer that one, please? I would like to say that I don't think that in this day and age when the almighty dollar has become such an important factor in everybody's life it should be left to the individual who's making the money off this business of abortion to make the decision. There are far too many doctors who, I'm afraid, have forgotten that the physician is for healing, not for taking a life. The dollar has, I'm afraid, taken predominance over that. So I don't think it should be left entirely to the doctors of the country to make decisions in that form.

MR. DAY: We're hearing a lot about referendum and constituent assembly. Would you be willing to put that constitutional question to a referendum or a constituent assembly to let them wrestle with?

MR. NYGAARD: I think as Canadians we pride ourselves on living in a democratic and a pluralistic society, and I don't see any problem at all, personally, with putting a very, very controversial issue like abortion to the public. I have enough confidence in my fellow Albertans that we'd see a favourable result, "favourable" meaning that we would see some sort of restriction on abortion as opposed to the status quo. I have confidence in the province that that's what we'd see.

3:52

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would that just be in Alberta? If it's a national referendum, would you be prepared to accept the results of that national referendum if it went opposite to your perspective yet in Alberta it went in favour of your perspective?

MR. NYGAARD: In fairness, we'd have to abide by the national referendum. It's a tricky issue. I guess it's tied with the division of powers: what would we like to see left to the provinces, whether the federal legislation would override the provinces or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's another dilemma we have to face.

Thank you very much for your presentations today.

MRS. VAN OMMEN KLOEKE: May I just say one more thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, certainly.

MRS. VAN OMMEN KLOEKE: Just in respect to: should this go to federal decisions? I would think that in that case, harking back to what I have presented, it should be that the federal government would not then give further funding to special interest groups who have as one of their main interests the furthering of abortion. So that issue would be on a fair playing field, if you know what I mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Thank you very much.  
Andrew Pask is here now, I understand.

MR. PASK: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I'd just like to say that this is a good opportunity for Albertans to present their views. I think we have to go back to the grass roots and do this more often.

My presentation today will touch upon the areas of constitutional affairs which I feel are most important in maintaining Canada. These areas consist of Senate and Commons reform, bilingualism, Quebec sovereignty, the constitutional amending formula, and aboriginal self-government.

With regards to Senate and Commons reform I believe that achieving a Senate that is equal, elected, and effective should be a preference not only for Alberta but for Canada as a whole. Continuing with an appointed upper House that still has precedence over elected representatives I feel is undemocratic as well as being unproductive for effective governing. In the case of the House of Commons I feel all parliamentarians should be free to vote on behalf of their constituents and not on behalf of their party. Such a concept would require a change in the rules of the Commons so as not to put a government in a position of nonconfidence, but I feel this change would be good for all Canadians.

In the area of bilingualism I don't believe that coast-to-coast federal bilingualism is warranted or fiscally responsible. Quebec, New Brunswick, and the National Capital Region I feel should be federally designated as official bilingual jurisdictions, and in these jurisdictions provincial and federal services would be, by law, provided in both English and French. The financial savings of serving a possible 8 million people as opposed to a possible 24 million or 25 million people I think would be considerable.

As for the contentious point of Quebec sovereignty, I feel a national referendum should be held if Quebec decides it wants to leave Canada. I think all peoples have helped build the province of Quebec, not just Quebecois, and I think all Canadians should have a say in something as important as a province leaving Confederation.

In the area of constitutional amendments I believe the regions of Canada and not the provinces should be looked at for amending the Constitution. For instance, the provinces of

British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba would make up the western region, as would the Atlantic provinces make up an Atlantic region. Ontario and Quebec would be regions themselves, and three of four regions would have to agree to amend the Constitution. In doing so, a province could still oppose the amendment to the Constitution, but because their region voted for it, the majority of the people in that part of the country would still be represented.

In closing, I'd just like to speak about aboriginal self-government. I believe a forum that aboriginal self-government could take would be either the municipal model or something along the lines of a canton like they have in Switzerland. The federal government would have jurisdiction over taxes and defence, and everything else would come under the aboriginal government. They'd be semiautonomous, and the provinces would have no jurisdiction whatsoever over these cantons, municipal models, or whatever you want to call it.

Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Questions? Yes, Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: Thank you for your point-form presentation.  
I want to ask about regional governments. I haven't heard this one for a little while. Were you suggesting that we should proceed with regional governments to replace provincial governments whether or not we have a national or just a Quebec referendum which resulted in the people of Quebec leaving Canadian Confederation?

MR. PASK: ~~If Quebec were to leave, I would think just a~~ national referendum. I don't think regional would come into it at all.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I understood that. What I'm saying is: would you advocate regional governments to take over provincial governments, basically change those jurisdictions if, let's say, Quebec stays in Canada? Do you still advocate regional governments to replace provincial governments?

MR. PASK: Oh, no. I would just advocate regional in the sense of amending the Constitution. I think other than that we'd stay in a provincial jurisdiction.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I see. Okay. All right.

MR. PASK: It would just be in the case of amending the Constitution. That way you'd have a western region, an Atlantic region, Ontario, and Quebec. It would be four regions.

MS BARRETT: So it would be four regions becoming some type of constituent assembly, a different creature all together?

MR. PASK: Yeah, but it would just be for amending the Constitution.

MS BARRETT: I understand. What about public involvement then? I understand that you're saying we wouldn't just do it on the basis of 10 provinces having a say; we'd regionalize ourselves to amend. What about public involvement?

MR. PASK: With it being regional, it would almost be easier for an interest group, I think, because they could influence not

only their provincial government but their whole region. I think that would be easier for public involvement.

MS BARRETT: So you do advocate more public say in the future?

MR. PASK: Oh, I think so. I think people are cynical just with government in general, regardless of whether it's municipal, federal, provincial. I think that's the way we have to go: more grass roots, more input from people. This is a good example.

MS BARRETT: Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. Andrew, are you supportive of the national medicare program?

MR. PASK: Uh huh.

MR. CHUMIR: There's some suggestion in some parts that the federal government should not be setting the standards or doing any of the funding, that this should be done by the provinces. What's your view? Are you federal in that regard or provincial oriented?

MR. PASK: The way I look at it now, I think it's kind of haphazard. Some things, I understand, fall under federal, and some things fall under provincial. I would want to believe that the federal government would be the body for setting standards. ~~That way, if somebody moves from one region to another or one province to another, they've got the same standard of care.~~

MR. CHUMIR: What about social services? There is now some federal role with setting minimum standards and doing some funding. Is that the way to go, or would you support a change in that mechanism?

MR. PASK: I think there should be a minimal standard, yeah, but if a province like Alberta or British Columbia has an opportunity to provide above that standard, I'm all for that as well.

MR. CHUMIR: The minimum standard should be the federal government.

MR. PASK: The minimum should be federal, yes.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. PASK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Rick Pollard here? All right. Cindy McCallum?  
Yes?

MR. CHRISTIE: It's possible that the presentation for Banff-Cochrane - they won't be able to get a speaker here today. They said if they were not here at 4 o'clock, they will be giving a written presentation and will be forwarding it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Gordon Christie is here, I understand. Are you familiar with the Banff-Cochrane constituency association group?

MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, I am. Sister Cindy just phoned a few moments ago, and she's stuck in Edmonton. The person who was going to come from Banff and do the presentation probably won't be able to make it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which party is it?

MR. CHRISTIE: It's the New Democrats.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see. Okay.

MR. CHRISTIE: Anne Wilson was supposed to do the presentation, and I believe she's unavailable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll be getting a written presentation.

MR. CHRISTIE: Yes, definitely.

On behalf of the Calgary Labour Council and the 30,000 members thereof, I'd like to thank you for this opportunity. We originally had prepared back in May for a presentation here on June 1, but due to time constraints we weren't able to present that. In lieu of going through our presentation from last May and/or updating it, I was asked to revamp or bring forward a number of things that we feel are very timely and should be dealt with at this time. So we're bringing forward only the most urgent issues that we feel should be included in the new Constitution for Canada.

We feel that the Constitution of Canada must include a social charter which is based on common standards which are going to fully protect labour, social, and environmental rights. The Charter must entrench the rights of all Canadians in our Constitution.

4:02

Before we get into that, first and foremost, on behalf of the Labour Council I must express our grave concern with the current political situation across our nation, especially the contempt by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney towards his own employees; i.e., the members of Canada Post, CUPW, and the Public Service Alliance of Canada, PSAC. We find it very hard to believe it's possible for the Prime Minister and his government to negotiate an acceptable solution to our constitutional crisis when he can't even negotiate a fair and equitable solution or a collective agreement with his two largest groups of workers.

Getting beyond that, Canada has been built and has grown on the basis of a strong public service. Programs such as the national transportation system, Via Rail; the national communications system, CBC; the national postal system, Canada Post; and the national health care system, medicare, are all under attack by the federal government and slowly but surely are being dismantled. The public services are for people and not for profit. They are part and parcel of us as Canadians, and it must be maintained under a new Constitution that public services are for the people and not for profits.

As recently as last Monday, Harvie Andre threatened to terminate the monopoly by the postal service of mail delivery. We feel this very regressive move would not only destroy over 40,000 jobs but would implement a two-tier system where immediately the rural areas of Canada would be charged one rate for postal service and the urban areas another. Eventually

even the urban areas would suffer, as they would be taxed to the limit in this market system.

Another issue that we wanted to bring forward at this time that needs to be dealt with under a Constitution is the concept of pay equity, that being equal pay for work of equal value. This concept is also being totally ignored by the federal government. The Public Service Alliance went on strike September 9. One of their main issues at that time, other than the wage freeze, was refusal of the Treasury Board to discuss pay equity. The federal government in 1977 passed legislation and they actually participated in a study from '85 to '89 on pay equity, but now when you come back to the table two years later, they refuse to even talk about pay equity.

I'd just like to add a little local note on that. The Alberta government is just as much at fault with pay equity as their federal counterparts. Over the past several years they've refused to negotiate any pay equity with their employees; i.e., through the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. I did sit in on negotiations on one of the bargaining units there, and the government out and out just refused to deal with pay equity, period.

You can't talk about pay equity without also talking about a nonprofit child care program. It is very important to the future of Canada. It has to be enshrined in our Constitution. I find it very disturbing that during the last federal election in '88, Brian Mulroney was all willing to talk about it, but since, it's basically been put on hold. The promises that were made during that time haven't come forward.

Probably the number one concern affecting working people in Canada, and in Calgary in particular at the moment, is our very unjust labour laws. There's a real, urgent requirement to revamp our labour laws, to implement policies that are going to benefit workers, not protect unjust and unfair employers. Right at the top of the Employment Standards Code or the Labour Code we have to talk about the minimum wage in Canada. When it was set at \$3.75 eleven years ago, it was totally unacceptable then. Here we are 11 years later, with rampant inflation, and we're still looking at only a 20 percent raise over the last 11 years. The example that really comes to mind is that a single parent with two dependents has to work over 92 hours each and every week at the minimum wage just to reach the poverty level, and to us the poverty level is far from acceptable as it is.

As part and parcel of a new Labour Code we have to have the ability to balance the process between employers and employees. Right at the moment it's so heavily weighted in favour of the employers that it makes it impossible for employees to bargain collectively. We need antiscab legislation similar to what was passed in Quebec in 1977 to level out the balance between workers and their employers.

Also included in the social charter as part of our new Constitution, we have to have rights for both native people and our environment. These have to be enshrined in the Constitution under the social charter. The federal government hasn't negotiated with the native people for the last 124 years. I had meetings two weeks ago with the Lonefighters at the Oldman dam, and this is just a prime example of how the government abuses the system. They were ruled against building that dam, and here they go straight ahead and build it even though the courts have ruled against that. That's the way they have dealt with our native people for 124 years. They have not negotiated with them, and they have not followed the laws that they have set. Environmental protection really has to be front and centre in our new Constitution, particularly the social charter, because



if we don't protect our environment, what are we in fact protecting?

I'd just like to conclude by saying that the only way we are going to protect social, labour, and environmental rights is through some form of social charter in our Constitution. The Constitution has to protect Canadians from the government unilaterally imposing its agenda upon the citizens of Canada. The current system doesn't protect the wishes of the citizens. One possible solution to this may be through some sort of referendum system to stop the government from unilaterally imposing their system. It appears that during the election campaigns they come out with their broad-based promises, but as soon as the election is over – you know, 28 days later – the government just goes straight ahead with their agenda and does not listen to the people. I feel our Constitution should be a guiding hand on government on what they can and cannot do with the citizens of Canada.

I put forward the two papers, both the one that was earlier presented June 1 and the one today, for reviewing at your pleasure, but I just wanted to highlight those topics here today and would like to respond to any of your questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ken Rostad.

MR. ROSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I'd like to do is actually, for the record's sake, correct what I think I heard. There has been absolutely no court ruling that the government of Alberta not build the Oldman dam. I'd like that correction in the record.

Thank you.

MR. CHRISTIE: I'd just like to respond to that. While you have a little more knowledge on the situation, of how the court ruled – I have not read the ruling myself, but my understanding, after having met with the native people who have lived for generations in the Oldman River area, is that the government was ruled against by the Supreme Court and in fact went ahead with that procedure. That is my understanding of it.

MR. ROSTAD: Well, I would just like to correct your understanding, because there has not been a court ruling at any level that that dam not be built. I would like to also, in response to you, indicate that you have had communication with a faction of a quite large band, the Peigan band, and as the minister responsible for native affairs past – I'm not presently – I worked an awful lot and quite intimately with the Peigan band. Although there have been some differences, they are being worked out and they are quite delighted. But just for the record's sake, there has not been a ruling against.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, we could get into an interesting political discussion on the basis of your presentation, but I think we'll avoid that now in terms of the constitutional matters. Yes, John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: It certainly is tempting. I think the fairest way to state the circumstance is that the Court of Appeal ruled that a permit which the provincial government had obtained for the construction of the Oldman River dam was required and was invalid, and the government went ahead and built anyway. Now, we can argue what that means all day long, but in fact I think you're probably both right in some respects.

My question is more specific to the submission, which deals with the question of a social charter protecting rights of working

people, collective bargaining rights, social benefits, and environmental protection. I understand those concepts to be consistent with the idea of a Constitution as enshrining our basic values as a society, but I would like to throw the counterargument at you, because we get it quite a bit from especially people in government, who feel that putting those things in the Constitution, in the Charter, effectively ties the hands of governments and makes it difficult for them to respond to circumstances as they see them and in reality also transfers a certain amount of authority to the courts to make rulings. Are you aware of that, and does that change your view of whether to put those in the Charter or not?

4:12

MR. CHRISTIE: No, I don't think that changes our opinion at all. I think we very strongly feel that these have to be enshrined, the social charter has to be part of our Constitution. We're not happy with the current setup, where we don't feel the government's hands are tied at the moment. We basically feel as workers that the government is doing anything they want, whether it's legal, illegal, or whatever, whether it's moral. We feel that all the cards are stacked in favour of the government, and we feel there has to be a balance of power in some kind of mechanism to protect the environment, to protect workers, be it whatever. You know, I'm quite familiar with writing contract language as such and would be very pleased to put something forward in that line. I'm not familiar with writing constitutions, quite honestly, but we feel that the way it is spelled out now is not acceptable, and through some kind of contract language or some sort of social charter it has to be protected to enshrine that the government cannot destroy these rights and attack the people and the environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon Chumir, and then Gary Severtson.

MR. CHUMIR: In terms of health and social programs, there are two competing visions based at least on the current structure. One is that the federal government should be establishing minimum standards from end to end and with some funding clout. The other view is: Get the feds out of this thing, and let's give the provinces exclusive control over it. Where would you stand on that particular issue?

MR. CHRISTIE: Well, we are strongly in favour of a strong central government. We feel the federal government should be there to set minimum standards right across the country, regardless of which province a person is born, raised, or would choose to live in. We feel the federal government has to have a strong position on medicare and on the funding and the setting of standards that are tied into the funding for all those programs. I guess our biggest concern is the passing of Bill C-69, where basically over the next six years they're cutting out totally all their funding to medicare and to education, et cetera. That is a real fear of ours, that hey, the way we're going right now, to the extreme right, is not the way to go. We have to protect and educate our children and make Canada a healthy and prosperous place for these people to grow up in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much. We are moving along now. I see you've engendered a number of people who wish to participate.

Gary Severtson, Stockwell Day.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You're saying that in a social charter the right to strike and antiscab legislation

– personally, I don't like that word. How about the right of the third-party person? Like, lately in the PSAC where the grain handlers on the coast are on strike, it's the farmer and the agriculture community that are not part of the negotiation which are the ones that suffer more than probably either party if it goes on for a long time. If that's enshrined, how do you protect the third-party people involved?

MR. CHRISTIE: Well, like the first . . . You might be aware that the president of the National Farmers Union came out in favour of the Public Service Alliance and is working hand in hand with the Action Canada Network, a number of groups, to help the alliance achieve their goals. First, you must remember that how it affects the third party is because of the total imbalance now. All the cards are in favour of the government. The government came out in their budget – they didn't even table the negotiation – they came out in the budget and said, "We're giving zero, 3, and 3." In fact, if the working people of Canada had an equal playing field, as you like to use the term, with their employers, and in this case the government of Canada, the strikes and the antiscab legislation . . . What you find happens is that you have much fewer strikes and the duration of the strikes is much, much shorter, and therefore you don't have the side effects that affect your third party. But as long as the rules are set up the way they are currently, you're going to have long, long strikes, and it's going to negatively affect not just the working people but the third party as well. Until we change those rules and start protecting and levelling off and making it better for workers, we're going to have those problems.

MR. SEVERTSON: So you see no problem for protection of third-party interests?

MR. CHRISTIE: Not at all, and I guess the example we'd give you is Quebec, where they do, since '77, have the antiscab legislation. The history there over the last 14 years shows that they have fewer strikes and those strikes they do have are of much shorter duration, with therefore much less side effects on the third party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stock Day.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions. You mentioned the post office, and I asked this of a previous presenter. You would like to see – because we're talking about the Constitution here – constitutionally enshrined protection for the post office as an entity as it is. Is that what you're saying?

MR. CHRISTIE: Well, not exactly as it is right now. I would like to see it back to the way it was and, in fact, expand the services to the citizens of Canada, not cut back and contract out and privatize all the services and basically what are just continual cutbacks to the postal services. We should be increasing postal services to Canadians and doing it on a national, universal basis available to each and every citizen.

MR. DAY: Some people are suggesting that polls – and as politicians we're very careful about polls. You know, if they're for us, we say that's a great poll; if they're against, we question it. But some people would suggest that a majority of Canadians feel that if there was competition allowed and in fact the post office didn't have a stranglehold monopoly, that would bring down rates and would make for more efficient service.

I have two questions, and then you can move to another questioner, Mr. Chairman. The first would be: even if a majority of Canadians are for allowing healthy competition, you would still want to overrule the majority? Secondly, a single native mother wanting to establish on a local basis a personal mail delivery service and having the wherewithal to do it, providing an equally efficient, maybe cheaper service, you would want a law that would prohibit her from doing that? So the two questions are the majority question and stopping, let's say as an example, a single native mother who could do that, and you would say no, there should be a law that you're not allowed to do that.

MR. McINNIS: Disabled, perhaps?

MR. DAY: Toss that in, if you like.

MR. CHRISTIE: Okay. On the first question, like you said, to use your own words, a poll is a poll. I guess you read out of that or into it exactly what you want, and I can show you just as many polls saying the opposite. Having been the past chairperson of the task force on privatization, contract, and other services for the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, I can tell you exactly what you're talking about on your privatization, and I think you'll find just the exact opposite. In studies that have been done, from the sunset study in Pennsylvania right across to Australia, each and every one of them will show you that two things happen with privatization, contract, and other services. First and foremost, it costs consumers more; it doesn't cost you less. You may have a temporary minimal decrease in rates, but the long-term goal is that rates escalate tremendously and you have a real decrease in service. You have service for profit, not for people, and it does nothing but cut back service and increase your costs. As for a single, native, disabled woman wanting to create her own postal service, I guess I need a little more detail on what you're saying there, but quite honestly the contracting out and privatization of any service does not lead to increased service. It leads to decreased service, it leads to a profit in an individual's pocket, and it takes away from service to the customers.

MR. DAY: Would you be willing to live by a referendum question, the post office being included in a referendum question in Canada, in terms of making it available for privatization? Would you and your folks you represent be willing to live with a referendum question on that?

MR. CHRISTIE: If it was properly posed. I think you'll find the problem is that the working people and the government and the media are controlled, and what is put across by the media is not always a hundred percent. I don't believe half of what's in the media, to put it quite honestly. If the truthful information is given to all the citizens of Canada and they can make an honest decision on it, I don't have a problem with that. I feel if they are given the truthful, factual information, they will make a decision based on not privatizing or contracting out any government services but would be very happy with increased service of the postal system as it currently is.

MR. DAY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I just want to clarify something that I don't think was fleshed out sufficiently well a few minutes ago. When you talked about the social charter and Sheldon said, "Well, how do you feel about certain programs; do you want them federal?" and you said yes, I'm not sure if you had the ability to discuss this as a group with the Labour Council. Do you think either you or the council would be of the opinion that you would want to see a shifting of jurisdiction to the federal government where currently it is administered by the provincial government, or would you be satisfied with a social charter that assured federal funding participation in programs that are provincially administered?

4:22

MR. CHRISTIE: Oh, yeah. Correct me if I was wrong before. What I meant to say is that we want to maintain the current funding system where the federal government gives the money proportionately to the provinces, but the education system and the medical system should be administered by the provincial governments in their jurisdictions.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Yeah. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Pearl.

MS CALAHASEN: That was actually one of the questions I had, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Thank you very much.

Anne Wilson, do you have a presentation to make on behalf of Cindy McCallum?

MS WILSON: Yes, I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you please come forward then.

May I just ask if Rick Pollard has yet appeared?

I should point out that Pearl Calahasen, the Member for Lesser Slave Lake, has joined us.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Anne.

MS WILSON: My submission is from the Banff-Cochrane NDP Constituency Association on constitutional reform for Canada.

The provincial constituency of Banff-Cochrane rests between Calgary's northwest city limits and the B.C./Alberta border. It harbours Canada's oldest national park, provincial parks, and tracts of native reserve land. The population is dispersed among farms and ranches, small villages, and the three main centres of Banff, Canmore, and Cochrane. One of the most beautiful constituencies in the province, the landscape is as diverse as the interests and the needs of the people who live here. That includes new Canadians, transplanted Canadians, native Canadians, ranchers, industrial workers, tourism merchants, environmental guardians, the very wealthy and the very poor, a microcosm of Canadian diversity within one small political boundary.

In spite of our many differences in history, culture, religion, and priorities, there are many things which bind us together. We share the belief that our children have the right to grow up in a society which provides peace, health, and freedom, that they have a right to inherit a world with clean air, pure water, unpolluted soil, and unfettered wildlife. We share the belief that

all people have the right to quality health care so that no person is excluded based on financial considerations. We share the belief that education is a key to freedom and that it is a right and not a privilege for all people to receive quality education. In order to ensure these rights are not eroded, we must maintain a strong central government which respects national standards. We must not allow our health care to be left in the hands of profit-driven, private-sector companies, as that will lead to different levels of service and care dependent upon your level of income. We cannot allow our health to become a market commodity.

One of the strongest bonds tying us together is a concern for our environment. Governments can no longer turn a blind eye as developers and foreign investors join together to exploit our natural resources for profit. Governments must develop a longer vision, a vision which exceeds the length of office of any particular politician or political party. Decisions must be made now to stop the current trends and practices of destroying our earth, air, water, and the habitat of other creatures which share our world. Governments must protect our long-term interests by developing tough standards and regulations to control pollution and provide effective means to enforce these regulations against wealthy corporations which find it cheaper to exploit than to comply. Assistance must be provided to help individuals and communities adapt to necessary changes in lifestyles, and governments at all levels must take on leadership roles to facilitate these changes. There is no future for Canada politically if we continue to destroy it environmentally.

As New Democrats we share other visions which we believe must be part of the development of Canada's future. We believe that our governments, both federal and provincial, must be inclusive and accountable to the people. The blatant arrogance of the current federal government is a shocking disgrace to Canada. The aligning of both levels of government with the interests of big business against the long-term interests of the people makes democracy a farce. The fact that Canadians are cynical about the political process and government is due to the attitude of government officials and their contempt for the electorate. We experienced it under Liberal regimes and now under the Conservatives. Elected representatives must be reminded that they are empowered to serve the people and not just their friends.

We have a vision of a society in which all people regardless of gender, ethnic background, or beliefs are treated with equal respect, provided with equal opportunities, guaranteed equal rights, and paid equal wages for work of equal value. It won't be an easy task to eliminate archaic, antiquated, and irresponsible attitudes which have prevented that vision so far. Governments will have to place a significant priority on eliminating the social and economic barriers which exist. In order to ensure women claim their rightful place as full partners in society, governments must provide quality and qualified 24-hour, nonprofit child care centres. We don't need to provide arguments to defend this statement; the need is well known by governments at all levels. Governments must also challenge those who promote violence against women as acceptable behaviour both in the home and in the video stands. It must work with legitimate and progressive women's organizations such as NAC, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, and ASWAC, the Alberta Status of Women Action Committee, to seek solutions to the identified barriers women face and to implement those solutions. Governments must set an example and recognize the worth of the contributions of women both in the workplace and in society. These contribu-

tions must no longer be trivialized and must receive respect and fair financial compensation. Governments must also recognize the inalienable right of women to control their own bodies and their own destiny. Elected officials must consciously work to conquer their own deep-rooted biases and then proceed to work with women for social, economic, and political justice. That work must begin now.

In the process of reassessing and re-evaluating social norms, we must also redefine our understanding of the history of Canada. The myth that Canada was founded by two peoples, the English and French, must be exposed once and for all. It is time to remember a group of people who waited on the shores of this continent to greet the Europeans, who shared with them, guided them, and taught them the skills needed to survive in this new world. The Europeans expressed their gratitude by seizing their lands, trivializing their customs and way of life, and trying to force European perspectives, values, and priorities on them. Once we redefine our past, it will be easier to redefine our view of the future. No discussion on the future of Canada can take place without the direct input of our first peoples. They have been ignored far too long, and we have all suffered as a result. The multicultural nature and ethnic diversity of this country is one of our greatest strengths and assets. Our Constitution should recognize and celebrate that fact. The cultures and perspectives of the people who have made this country home offer us exciting possibilities and provide us with an opportunity to become a more tolerant, generous, and enlightened society.

It should also be useful to assist us in evaluating the global economic strategy which this federal government is pursuing. Instead of viewing trade purely on an economic basis, our governments should be concerned about the effects and ramifications of trade deals on people. We vehemently oppose economic policies such as the free trade agreement and now the trilateral free trade agreement between Canada, the U.S.A., and Mexico, especially when such agreements are made in isolation from social concerns. We have seen the devastating effects of the existing accord in two very short years: thousands of jobs lost, plant closures, depressed communities, and industries relocating to areas where climates are warmer and there are fewer restrictions on exploiting people and the environment. This government will be guilty of treason if it fails to negotiate a social charter in conjunction with any trade agreement. We can't succumb to the corporate vision of a North American assembly line where Canadians are forced to sacrifice precious natural resources, where Mexican men, women, and children are forced to sacrifice their health, safety, and dignity in virtual slave labour processing those materials, and which allows a few American distributors to get rich flogging products on behalf of the foreign companies which control the whole process. No elected government has the right to allow that scenario. If Canada is to survive politically, it must maintain its economic and social sovereignty. There is no future for Canadians if our government allows people to be manipulated by the corporate agenda, and there is no honour for Canadians if our governments enter into agreements allowing exploitation of our partners.

4:32

Canada means many things to many people. It is an evolving nation with old wounds to heal and new visions to consider. It is our contention that the elected representatives who have the task of redefining Canada can't do this adequately if they do not have the trust of the people. There is no room for tossing the

dice or treating this process as a game or a power struggle between nation and provinces.

Canada is more than just an economic union of provinces; it is an emotional union of people. It was built on the blood and sweat, joy and sorrow of generations of women and men who carved their places into the landscape and into our history. If we are to continue that building process, it must be done in an atmosphere of respect for the needs and aspirations of our citizens. We can't resort to the old standbys of force, dominance, or intimidation to hold this country together. Canada must become a country where all people can feel they belong, a place they can all call home.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your presentation.

Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: I'd like to thank Anne and Cindy for their comprehensive presentation. It covers a lot of ground. I don't have a question, but perhaps an observation.

I think it's appropriate the way you linked the social charter to trade deals with Canada and Mexico. As I understand it, the origin of the concept of the European social charter arose with the rise of the European Economic Community. The member countries wanted to be sure that the lowering of trade barriers wouldn't be used to trade one country off against the other in terms of environmental standards, wage protection, and the rest of it, so they put the charter in place to try to prevent that as a consequence of the trade arrangements within Europe. I think it's appropriate that you put it that way in the Canadian context. We have entered a trade deal with the United States and may very well with Mexico, and we face problems similar to what Europeans did before they decided on the social charter as a means of alleviating it. That's really just a comment.

MS WILSON: Oh, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Sheldon, I don't suppose you have to ask your question of this witness.

MR. CHUMIR: I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for coming on behalf of your colleague.

Ted Matthews. Welcome.

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me back. It was very kind of you. The last time I was here was on June 1. That was the day you left early for your daughter's party. I hope it was successful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's always interesting to see high school graduations.

MR. MATTHEWS: It reminds us of how lucky we are that we got through when we did, doesn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Definitely, and got into law school when we did too. Right, Sheldon?

MR. MATTHEWS: Well, I didn't get into law school like Sheldon, and I guess that's why I'm here and he's there.

I would like to follow up on my remarks that unfortunately you were absent from, and your colleagues were also precluded by time constraints from discussing them with me. Unlike other remarks I have heard since I have been here – people are telling you what to do, what to put in, how to do it and everything – my approach is totally different. My approach says that this constitutional process we're talking about is a very exciting thing, a very dynamic thing, and it is the opinion of this presenter that we all have the right to vote on it. Not just you people here, not just the people in Ottawa, but every Albertan has the right to vote on it.

Now, I'll discuss the summary format and then go into the text of remarks I made on June 1. The reason for everyone having the right to vote is that we have three senior Ottawa representatives in this province: Mazankowski, Clark, Andre. Each one of these three – this was written up in the paper – has a pension of over 2 and a half million dollars. That's an astronomical amount of money. Those people obviously are affected by that, because it's the biggest asset they've got if they kept their hands clean. I see this as a tremendous conflict of interest. I also see with these three important men in Ottawa that Andre, who's my member – he overlaps you, Sheldon – doesn't live in Alberta, doesn't have any money invested here, doesn't have a house, doesn't have anything. How can he represent us? You go home to your people; you go up to Edmonton. It's a job. It means you have two places to live. I mean, that's the job. I don't know where Clark fits in this thing. I know Mazankowski does come home. But those are important factors. Do you come home? Do you see your people? Do you see what's happening? It's a tough part of the job. It's a hell of a lot easier to sit in Edmonton and not do it.

The second point I raise, looking at provincial biases, is that the Alberta Legislature does not have equal representation for all Albertans. For example, one rural vote equals two urban votes more or less. I might be out by 5 percent. The effect is that a city candidate that can't get elected can be resurrected and elected in a rural area. There's a bias there. You say you represent Albertans; you represent them differently.

I'm going to talk briefly now about my paper. I tried to structure my paper with two views: what's happened to Canada in the last while, and how does Alberta fit into Canada? In the latter one, how Alberta fits into Canada, a specific thing just shocked and amazed me: if you pull out the numbers from the federal/provincial transfer payments, you find in applying an interest criteria that each Albertan has paid over \$250,000 more to Canada than other Canadians have. That's a quarter of a million dollars. Now, to you guys that might not mean a lot, but to me it does. I see it as saying . . . The average home in this province is about a hundred thousand bucks. They've got a mortgage on it – most of them do – and here they could own their own homes and own a lot more. There's been a quarter of a million dollars sucked out of here to Ottawa to be spread as Ottawa sees fit. I also see as an effect against Albertans laws that preclude Albertans from high-priced, high-paid civil service jobs, the action of the government of Ottawa.

If you would like, I'll pass these out to you. Or do you want to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Garry will pass them out.

MR. MATTHEWS: Okay. Thank you very much. The date is wrong. I apologize for that.

Canada. Why did the government of Canada not send an army to support the United Nations' actions in Kuwait? Does

the government of Canada plan to use the army only against citizens of Canada? Why does the same automobile sell in the United States for \$20,000 and in Canada for \$30,000? Why do Canadians living adjacent to the border shop outside Canada? Does this action confirm that Canada is not viable? All you have to do is get down to southern Ontario or southern Quebec and watch the border points to see the lineups there; it's amazing. Why has Canada fallen from the world's second position in gross domestic production per head in 1970, after the United States, to ninth? Now, we're talking 1970 and 1991. In 1988, eighteen years, we were number two in the world. Now we are number nine. Isn't that shocking? We're talking about Canada.

Let's look at what we're talking about, who we're getting in bed with and why we're getting in bed with them. The statistics follow how I did that. If we turn to page 4, Alberta in Canada, there are some interesting facts.

Mr. Horsman, you were talking of your daughter going on to university. Wonderful. Why do children in Alberta have a significantly lower chance of attending university vis-à-vis other children in Ontario and in Canada? That's a statistic. Why? Why are twice as many Albertans incarcerated per capita? That's a shocking statistic. Why? Why does life expectancy in Alberta, in spite of government medical programs, provide no significant advantage vis-à-vis the American experience? Interesting. You'd think medicare would improve the quality of health and subsequently you'd live longer. It doesn't.

#### 4.42

Why did the government of Canada remove the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's operations from Calgary? Did the government take the same action throughout Canada? Of course not. Why did the government of Canada eliminate rail service in Calgary? These origins stimulated the development of this area. Did the government take the same actions throughout Canada? No.

Why have six deaths of citizens of Alberta been caused by action of the police of Canada? Why have the people responsible been protected by the laws of the government of Canada and the secret appointees of the government of Canada? This is a shocking comparison between the Los Angeles police investigation directed only at an alleged beating of a motorist not involving the loss of lives.

What action did the federal government take to provide employment for Albertans and to compensate them for the discriminatory bilingual, bicultural rules? Are Albertans charged less by the government of Canada because of a lower quality of life? No. Albertans have been especially taxed \$243,102, about a quarter of a million dollars, per person more than other Canadians in the last 30 years.

Subsequently, it follows that we're dealing with Canada, a country that's declining. That's page 8. It also follows that Albertans have an inferior relationship to other Canadians. Therefore, we demand that you and your government bring to us, the citizens of Alberta, any proposed agreement between Alberta and Canada for every Albertan to evaluate and to approve by a vote in the same procedure as utilized for approving our original elected Senator. We have a precedent on this. This vote would offer Albertans the same democratic right that the province of Quebec is offering its citizens. This vote is required, as no one little group has the right to commit the lives of the citizens of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ted. You've been following the committee, and you've heard presentations just before you that we need a strong central government and that

the federal government is the government that should be setting the priorities for health, education, all these things. Would that be your view, or would you have a different perspective?

MR. MATTHEWS: My view very simply, sir, is to ask every Albertan to vote on what kind of a deal you can get, and we either approve it together or it's not approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're asking Albertans to tell us what they think at this stage so that when we do go to negotiate a deal with the rest of Canada, we know what Albertans are thinking. We're being told on one hand that we should negotiate a deal whereby the federal government has overriding powers on the provinces relative to education, health care, social services, and those things. Now, if you were going to give us advice on what to do, what is it?

MR. MATTHEWS: Well, my advice to you is: bring it back, whatever deal you have, to the people, and let the people tell you at that time what they want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're not going to tell us now what you think should be done.

MR. MATTHEWS: That was not the purpose of my paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we're supposed to go out there into a vacuum, in a sense.

MR. MATTHEWS: You're supposed to go out there and use your common sense that got you elected and use your vision of the society you wish your children to have, and bring us back a deal. If the deal flies, you've got a deal; if it doesn't, it doesn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's one way of looking at it.

Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: I have one question just about the mechanics of that. If you say that a deal should come back to Alberta for a vote in a referendum and not be approved or agreed to unless a majority supports it, would it be logical to say that you would support providing that for every province so that each one individually would have the right to a referendum?

MR. MATTHEWS: I'm not interested in the other provinces, Mr. McInnis; I'm only interested in Alberta. I'm interested in where I sit, and I'm saying that this is what I believe is critical to be done for Albertans.

MR. McINNIS: Well, let me put the question a different way then. Are you saying that Albertans, through the referendum, should have the right of veto of any new constitutional deal?

MR. MATTHEWS: I'm saying they have the right to approve it or not approve it.

MR. McINNIS: And if they don't approve it, it doesn't go ahead?

MR. MATTHEWS: It doesn't go ahead. Simple.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pearl.

MS CALAHASEN: From what I gather on what you were saying on Alberta in Canada, the questions you've brought out seem to indicate that you're really not a strong centralist believer of the federal government having all control over things that happen. When I look at the incarceration issue, the children attending university, the elimination of rail service and how the government of Canada did that without any kind of direction from Alberta or at least Alberta having some say in what happens in those services – is that what I'm reading into what you're asking here?

MR. MATTHEWS: What you're reading into – what I was trying to show you was saying: this is the status when people run around and wave the flag and say, "Isn't it wonderful?" I'm saying: hey, this is what Canada means to you as an Albertan; if you're living in Toronto or you're living in Montreal, it does not mean this; it's totally a different scene. Now, whether it's a system of the people we have representing us or the people who are secretly appointed, I don't know. I'm saying: this is what we have today; when you're looking at your framework, where do we go?

MS CALAHASEN: You're saying, then, that we should look at a different way of what presently exists?

MR. MATTHEWS: That's right. I'm saying that that's not good enough.

MS CALAHASEN: Regarding the spending powers of the federal government, should they have all the say in terms of what happens, in terms of what they spend on Canada, or should that be delegated to provinces or various services delegated to decision-making within the provinces?

MR. MATTHEWS: Ms Calahasen – is that how you pronounce it?

MS CALAHASEN: Calahasen.

MR. MATTHEWS: Ms Calahasen, the world changed after I wrote this. I never believed I would see the U.S.S.R. collapse. What I think you will see will be a Quebec vote, and you'll see Canada collapsing. Then I'm saying that the best government is our own government to run our own show. That's the way I see the world unfolding. I'm not trying to convince you it's going to happen; I'm just going to say that there are precedents. If any of you sitting around this table thought that Gorbachev would be kidnapped, thought that the sovereign states of the U.S.S.R. would break away, you're much more clairvoyant than I am.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; thank you very much, Ted, for your presentation.

MR. MATTHEWS: Well, thank you for listening to me. I hope it gave you some insight. It's very hard to find out what the people want. The only way I think this time is to give them a vote. Thank you again, and it's nice to see my member out working.

MR. CHUMIR: It happens from time to time.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Rebecca Aizenman. Is that the correct pronunciation?

MISS AIZENMAN: Yes, you did very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Welcome.

MISS AIZENMAN: Thank you.

Firstly, thank you for the opportunity to allow an individual to participate in these forums. I was very grateful to be accepted at the last hearing, because I think the way to go is the way that you're going, members of the commission. It gives each of us who are interested an opportunity to present in a very direct form what we believe should be part of the discussion on constitutional change. I find it rather significant that today marks the 15th month birthday since the death of Meech Lake, and tomorrow marks the beginning of another era in Canada.

I have approached my presentation to you more or less as an interested layman, as a person who is very keenly interested in what happens in my country. Some people have baseball, football, and hockey as their hobby; mine is politics. I'm a news nut; I'm a news freak. I have attempted to present my own synopsis of what I think you should be looking at without borrowing from other sources, although much of what happens in the news does affect my presentation.

I find it remarkable that in the three years preceding Confederation, from 1864 to 1867, it took only three years to get a deal. I always marvel at what happened at the Charlottetown conference, at the Quebec conference, and for whatever external reasons or internal reasons affecting Canada, come July 1, 1867, we had a Constitution for Canada. A great country was born. I always marvel at the way in which George-Etienne Cartier and Sir John A. Macdonald worked together to put Canada together for us.

4:52

I was not around in 1931, when the Statute of Westminster allowed Canadians to take the first step to constitutional patriation, but I do remember the events of 1970 very vividly. I lived through them. I remember November 15, 1976, when the Parti Québécois was elected. I haven't forgotten that; I have not forgotten too many of the headlines and the excitement and the emotion with which Lévesque addressed this country. I remember the attempts of the federal government, with provincial input, to patriate the Constitution. I recall the events of November 1981. I recall the Queen signing our newly patriated Constitution of April '82. I remember 1987 and the beginning of Meech Lake, and we all watched the events unfold in 1990. It is now 1991, and we're going at it again.

To some extent some of my remarks were affected by a newly arrived publication on the Canadian scene, *Deconfederation*. I took the opportunity to read through it in the last few days. Regardless of one's beliefs, regardless of one's points of view, I recommend that members of this commission take time to read it. It is a very succinct statement of where our energies as Canadians have gone. It is one of the most outstanding summaries of Canadian history that I have come across. It should be in every Canadian household even if you have to abstract it, because Dr. Bercuson very clearly and to the point illustrates the relationship between Canada and Quebec, the relationship between Quebec and Canada.

I've approach my remarks to you on the basis of a definition of a Constitution. According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* a Constitution is a set "of doctrines and practices that form the

fundamental organizing principle of a . . . state." It is "the whole scheme whereby a country is governed"; involved is "much else besides law." I consulted our recent publication, the *Hurtig Canadian Encyclopedia*. A Constitution was defined as "the system of laws and conventions by which a state governs itself; the basic law of a country; the law of laws."

I wish to present some different items to you from my perspective. I approach it from the kind of government that we have in the country with respect to organization and structure. I was very much affected by a comment made by Professor Desmond Morton on a channel 26 program about six months ago. He referred to my country as a constitutional dictatorship or a democratic dictatorship. On two occasions I have seen the term used in the *Financial Post*. It affected me so much that I clipped the letter, and I sort of keep it in my daybook. According to my *Webster's* dictionary a democracy is "government by the people" either directly or through representatives; a country with such government and equality of rights, opportunity, and treatment. To quote from the writer: under the current Tory regime, which I class somewhere below a benevolent dictatorship, neither of the three characteristics applies.

I'm very saddened by the way our system works to some extent, and if you're going to input in changing the Constitution, let's get away from the large conceptual areas; let's get away from the emotionalism of Canada, to which I will return though. I'd like to see some nuts and bolts looked at, please. If free trade is the panacea to our economic problems and our place in the new world game of global competitiveness – and we seem to be very, very chummy with the United States as conditions suit us – let us intelligently and objectively borrow from the American Constitution.

I took the time to skim through the Constitution looking for relevant parts to uphold my point of view; I looked at the 1867 Constitution of Canada and the 1981 edition. My concerns are simple. I would like to see a set term for our system. I would like to see a set term of office, be it four years, be it five years, instead of our term of office going by tradition at the whim of the Prime Minister with respect to where he stands in public opinion polls, and albeit the parliamentary system depends on upholding responsible government. I think it would do the committee a world of good to look at a set term for our system. I can remember in 1979 when the election date was stretched to the limit, and I get the feeling that the present Prime Minister proposes to do the same. We saw it happen at the provincial level in British Columbia and Saskatchewan.

I would like to see a set term written into the Constitution. I'm not going to get into a debate over the parliamentary system versus the presidential system. Let us have a set term. I think that would restore some responsibility to government, because we as taxpayers would not see goodies being handed out to us, starting now, just two or three years before the next election. The Americans may do it, but consider the structure that would result if the term of office were stated in the Constitution. Why is it that the Americans can have their election for the President in November in virtually every year that is a leap year? Let us limit a term of office, and while we're at it, why don't we limit the term of the Prime Minister: two terms as in amendment 22, section 1 of the American Constitution? I'm only borrowing what I think is good and what is comprehensible to me based on how I see our institution of Parliament function.

If the Constitution is going to be changed to take in so many of the features that I had the privilege of hearing just as I came in this afternoon, let us look at structure and organization. If you limited the Prime Minister to X number of terms – I use

two because that is the American model; I'm not familiar with the French or West German models – it would give people a chance to restore their faith in leadership. No one is perfect; even Churchill had his bad years. And at the appropriate time he could come back.

I would like to see the process of recall instituted in our Canadian system. I think our present system is rather ineffective, where somebody is elected, be it to the provincial government or the federal government, and unless you have a very well-organized, responsive Member of Parliament or MLA: goodbye, MP; I never see you again. The gentleman who presented prior to me alluded to that condition. I would like to see my MP accountable for what he or she does. I don't think it's enough to say: well, I'm off to Ottawa or I'm off to Edmonton; see you in four or five years. I want accountability, however that can be defined, however that can be structured, written into the Constitution. I ask for accountability so that faith and integrity and respect are reintroduced to Canada and there is respect for our institution of Parliament. It is not there at the present time.

I would like to see parliamentary behaviour and decorum constitutionalized. Those of us who are fortunate to have channel 27 showing parliamentary debates during the course of the day watch in horror at question period. I watch some of the debates, and I base my comments on a plea to restore dignity and respect to the institution of Parliament. Name-calling is not acceptable in a constitutional parliamentary process. Sending paper airplanes across the floor is not acceptable. Telling people to sit up and behave themselves, as I understand had to happen in our own Chamber in Edmonton, is not acceptable either. I base my comment on a situation that did develop in the House in Edmonton. I feel that parliamentary decorum and behaviour has to be constitutionalized however it is done so that once again the institution of making laws for our country is restored in the eyes of the public. Politicians have very low ratings. They have lower ratings than the worst TV show. The TV show is canceled; our MPs continue to be there. The incident last week speaks for itself. I can't see anything strong enough to restore the way Parliament should conduct itself.

5:02

I would like to see the use of a free vote. I would like to see private members' Bills passed. I watched the introduction of an interesting private members' Bill last week, and he was pooh-poohed: "Well, we can't do that; we can't do that." The man had done his homework well. He delivered it in a very exciting manner, and because it was a private member's Bill it went nowhere.

I would like to see a de-emphasis on partisan politics to make the system work, be it at the provincial level, be it at the federal level. Just because you come from the other side doesn't mean that you can't have input. Why are some opposition amendments continually defeated? I'm not talking in the case of an amendment to the budget to defeat the government. Many a time there is an amendment to a Bill which would give it a more positive flavour, but no, because you're the opposition, you can't input. The present scheme makes for an ineffective Parliament.

I would like to see some referendums carried out. I would like to see the use of a direct vote as the case may be. I'm a great believer in direct representation, in direct democracy; hence I welcome the opportunity to present my views to you in person instead of having to go through a political party process, getting to my MP, who is virtually nonexistent, or making contact with whomever. I see no reason why we can't have a vote on

some of the issues of the day, and if it came to Quebec leaving Canada, if it came to us having to approve of a new Constitution, why not? Certainly the details would have to be worked out, but at least this way you would restore democracy to the people; you would restore their faith in the system.

I would like to deal with the distribution of powers. I, like many other Canadians, am a strong believer in the federation of Canada. I believe in a strong central government with appropriate powers to the individual provinces. I believe there is need to change as conditions in the world change. It is now 1991; it's not 1867. I understand the need to update the Constitution but not at the expense of making the provinces more powerful, more potent than the central government. I vaguely recall from my few American history classes that one of the reasons for the civil war was the states versus the federal government. It had to do with too many strong powers being granted to the state governments. I do not want to see that happening in Canada. I want a strong federal government. Canada is an expression of synergy, to use a Buckminster Fuller term. Canada is more than the sum total of its parts. Canada is more than the 10 provincial governments and our administrative governments in the Northwest Territories and Yukon. I want the federation to continue with a strong central government, because that is Canada. That gives the backbone and the structure to Canada. I do not want to see poorer provinces not getting their equal share of powers when they're distributed or the stronger provinces using those powers should you deconfederate Canada. I use the term to mean to take away powers from the federal government.

Any polls that I have had access to by way of information in the national media show a strong support for a federal system with only the necessary powers being devolved to the provincial level. I pay taxes to the federal government. I want it to maintain the institutions that, to me, are Canadian. I strongly believe that a decentralized approach to the sharing and redistribution of powers will result in a patchwork quilt where the quality of life, the quality of government, the quality of perception will be very state oriented, provincially oriented. It will make for very poor feelings between the provinces in this country.

I can understand why Quebec wants cultural powers to preserve her identity. I could understand why Alberta was upset with the national energy policy some 10 years ago, but at the same time I do not wish the powers in sections 92 and 91 of the present Canada Act to be so distributed that Ottawa is merely reduced to housekeeping. I got the sense that that is what it would be from one of the reports that was submitted to it this January.

Oddly enough, because there has been discussion of education, I note with interest that the Council of Ministers of Education is meeting today. This is a bias of mine. I would not like to see education made into a federal responsibility, at least to grade 12. They are responsible for funding at the postsecondary level. Even though the Americans have a federal state office of education, I would not want to see that happening in Canada for the simple reason that all you would do is begin the construction of another bureaucracy. It would make for a great deal of employment for unemployed doctoral students in education and the like. I think education is very close to people within their provinces. It needs improvement provincially, but let's just improve it. Let's not mess around with it, because I think we could create more difficulties for ourselves than we have. We can't agree on national testing. Some of the provinces are in; some of the provinces are out. Let us leave that alone.

I would like some institutions of Canada constitutionalized. By that I want to see them written into the Constitution. I want those institutions that give me my Canadian identity preserved and protected. You may disagree with me, but to me Canada is the CBC. Canada is the National Film Board. It is even the beautiful scenery of western Canada. I would hate to see something like the Banff Springs Hotel, God forbid, even though it's under private ownership, sold off to foreigners. That which is Canadian, and it doesn't take much to elicit that response from anyone, keep that Canadian. I'm not going to get into the free trade debate. I'm not going to get into economic prerogatives of federal/provincial trade agreements. Other people, probably more qualified than I, have, I'm sure, addressed those issues.

I want all those institutions that make us Canadian and distinct from the Americans, at least in makeup and character and culture, constitutionalized. You could add multiculturalism to that list and, above all, medicare. When I came up with the idea, probably affected by much of what I was reading, Bob Rae's submission of a social charter being included in the new Constitution had not yet been published, but I stuck to medicare because that is ours; that is Canadian. I wouldn't want to see that destroyed. There may be some shuffling of funds, there has to be an examination of how funds are spent, but keep it federal. Don't let another bureaucracy develop where medicare becomes a two-tiered system as we were almost going to have it done a few years ago in Alberta. I was very involved in that situation. Let us keep it as a federal program.

I am in agreement that a social charter, however that is defined – albeit it needs, I believe, a great deal more discussion – be included in the revised Constitution. I believe that is an area that requires extensive discussion. I don't think one can go by a singular model that the Premier of Ontario has presented. I think Canadians, once they understood the idea, as we now do the Charter of Rights, would be in agreement.

5:12

You've heard a great many submissions on an elected Senate. We seem to zero in on the elected Senate as another panacea to our problems: "It will solve all our problems, and as long as we get it into the Constitution, wonderful. That's all we need." Making it effective by giving it more legislative power: perhaps. I have difficulty with: how are you going to make it equal? Are you going to give each province two representatives, as is the case in the American Senate? Or are you going to give Prince Edward Island and Ontario and Alberta and B.C. the same number of representatives? If you're going to do it by a geographical region, what's the difference between that and the way in which it's presently constituted, with amendments, to make up 104 people in the Senate? I'm not talking about the stacking that occurred last year. What criteria will you use to have an equal Senate? Will it be a regional number? Will it be a provincial number? Will it be based on proportional representation? I think we're gliding over the issue of an elected Senate too quickly, thinking that will solve our problem.

I would again suggest to you that our parliamentary institution – at least the House of Commons and what it stands for: the laws of Canada, the passage of such laws through the House of Commons – without the disagreeable tactics that we saw last spring in the upper House, would work. Government would be more effective if we got rid of partisan politics. If it has to be legislated, so be it. To me, that's the reason why people want an elected Senate: they're tired of seeing the nonsense in the

House of Commons, so if you elect the Senate, it will be better up there. I am not so certain.

I have left the most controversial item, from my point of view, to the end of my submission. It will create a great deal of controversy. I have spent a great deal of time thinking about it. I attempted to familiarize myself as best I could as a layman. I'm not a constitutional expert; I'm not a lawyer. I'm just a concerned Canadian. I have watched with interest and sadness the discussion on the D word in our Canadian society, the "distinct" society. Thursday night and, I believe, last night it was leaked to the media that there would be a distinct society type of clause in the new Constitution. With regret, I cannot go along with the use of that term. The concept may be different, but the term is so tainted now that it raises one's emotions. It has a strict meaning as it was developed from the days when Meech Lake was born. Most of us had to figure out what it meant. It's simple: Quebecers want to preserve that which was preserved by the 1774 Quebec Act.

So we lost Meech Lake. We're going through Meech Lake again. I heard it on the news last night. I can hardly wait to hear the discussion on it: that we will enshrine that which means distinct society in various parts of the Constitution and in the Charter. The term is loaded. Already this morning polls had shown that two out of every three Canadians were opposed to the use of that term. I recognize the historical place of Quebec in Canada. I recognize the place of aboriginals in Canada. I recognize the place of other people in Canada.

I cannot understand why this is one of the few bargaining chips on the table: either we have it in the Constitution or we don't and then bon voyage. I don't think it should be that way. If you enshrine – I use the word "enshrine"; maybe I should use the word "constitutionalize," which to me means writing it in. If you do that to Quebec, what about other groups in the rest of the country? There are 750,000 Ukrainians on the Prairies. Are they no more or no less distinct than another part of our Canada? There is a large number of Chinese, Oriental people who helped found the lower region, who helped to develop and settle it. I refer to British Columbia. They were responsible for the building of our railway in western Canada. What special acknowledgment do they wish? It goes on and on. I think there is a way of accommodating Quebec but not in those terms.

To go to the other end of the scale, why is she so insistent upon this clause? Personally, I abhorred the notwithstanding clause being used – or was it the override clause? – when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Bill 101 was illegal and Bill 178 was instituted in Quebec. I find it very hard to rationally accept Bill 178. I think that was an emotional piece of legislation. I don't know what I would do if I lived in Quebec and if English were my native tongue and it was virtually outlawed. I think I would do like other people have done: I would leave the province. There has to be give and take. Why would you outlaw the use of English as a language for signs? Why would you outlaw the use of it at one time in the playground yet you insist that I be recognized as distinct? We are all equal; we are all parts of Canada. Simple as it may sound: live and let live. I think that area still has to be looked at.

If I may go in another direction, I come back to this text. As I understand it, the central argument of this text is that far too many energies in the history of Canada, far too much time has been spent accommodating the desires and wishes of Quebec. I thought Quebec was there; I thought she was part of my country. I understand some of her history. I am not bilingual, with regret. When I read about it being presented in these terms, it really makes me stop and think. How much more time

will we spend on revamping and revamping, redoing and redoing, and hearing and hearing efforts into a Constitution when there are other concerns in this country that need immediate attention such as our economic matters, unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, job retraining. We're still busy building a Constitution.

It's a strong thing to say, but it amazes me that when some African countries became independent in the 1960s and '70s, for better or for worse they had a Constitution. We're still working on ours. I realize it's an evolutionary process, but nobody has been able to explain to me why the American system works. They did it up in 1787. They added a number of amendments. It works. We now have to rewrite ours, change the framework. Or are we redoing it because it's a silent expression of partisan politics? I often wonder what the committees that were struck after the death of Meech Lake so that we can deal with the issue have cost the taxpayers. I welcome the opportunity to have my own individual input, but to go to the extreme . . . Hopefully we will not have gone overboard.

I will not refer to the need for a constituent assembly. I would just like to summarize the salient points of my presentation because I did not prepare a written submission. I felt I could make my points far more effectively as I have done. I would like to see a set term of office, a limited term, for the Prime Minister. I would like recall written into the Constitution. I would like parliamentary behaviour and decorum constitutionalized. I would like procedures in the House of Commons as separate from Acts of Parliament governing the Act of Parliament, the actions of Parliament, or whatever they call it. I want to see free votes. I want proper allowance and proper procedures, the proper accepted legislative procedure for the passage of private members' Bills, and channels opened up for effective input of the opposition.

I want the federal idea of Canada to remain. I don't want you to give away all of section 91 to the provinces, because then all you do is make the provinces little fiefdoms, little states; I don't want to see that. I want to see the very best, the most excellent of our institutions set up in such a way on paper that they remain part of Canada to remind us that we're Canadians. I would like to see a referendum to allow for a direct vote on such matters as accepting a Constitution. If necessary, let there be referenda on more emotional issues like capital punishment. Once and for all, let's get it out of the way. I think more important are more cerebral matters that would require a referendum, and in doing that, it would require that people become more educated to the constitutional parliamentary process. If you're going to vote on something, you'd better know what it is. I think it's a better way of making people aware of what's happening. Nobody knew what Meech Lake was until January of 1990. When all the discussion started, it was a hot item.

I will not repeat my comments on the distinct society. I'm in favour of including aboriginal rights in the Constitution. I'm in favour of maintaining or stating that multiculturalism is a basic characteristic of Canada. It built Canada. I want to see a Constitution that will keep my country together. On July 1, 2001, I still want to be present for celebrations of Canada Day.

5:22

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I think the length of your presentation has precluded any opportunity for us to have any dialogue, but you've certainly stated your position very clearly on a number of major issues. I thank you very much for your appearance today. I'm sure you'll be following with interest

the balance of our discussions as a committee and, furthermore, the discussions we will be having with the federal select committee when it visits Alberta and the discussions that are being proposed by the Premiers for all the provincial commissions to meet and discuss amongst us the future of the country. Thank you very much.

We're adjourned until 7 o'clock.

[The committee adjourned at 5:23 p.m.]