

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS
Tuesday, 18 November, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Warren Steen (Crescentwood).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Just before we get back to the Catholic Women's League of Canada, where they left off their brief at Page 10, Family Life, it's very obvious to all members of the committee and the public that we are not going to get through today hearing all those who wish to make representation here in the City of Winnipeg. So the committee will sit on Monday and Tuesday, December 8th and 9th, the regular hours 10:00 a.m. to 12:30; 2:00 to 5:00, on those two days, to hear remaining presentations from those who wish to make presentations here at the City of Winnipeg. So any member who is further down on the list and doesn't feel that they will be heard today, we will announce as of now, officially, that we will have to sit again for those two days, the 8th and 9th of December, a Monday and a Tuesday, the regular hours that we have been sitting.

Mr. Parasiuk, on that subject?

MR. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Yes. I would suggest that on one of those two days that the committee meet from 2:00 to 10:00, say Monday from 2:00 to 10:00, to enable people, who would like to make presentations but possibly can't because they are working, to make their presentations. Some people could take a day off work but they might not even get on anyway and that's one of the difficulties that people might have. I don't know if the committee should try and meet for 12 hours because you can't really absorb that much after that, but I think that if we started sitting from 2:00 to 5:00 for example and then from 7:00 to 10:00, that would be sufficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, can we sort of hear from other members of the committee?

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Could we leave that flexible at this time? Definitely the first day the ordinary hours and let's see what is left then and if we have to accommodate people who can't make it, well then we will go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can guarantee you that on the 9th you will not have any members of the government side there for an evening time because they have other obligations that night.

MR. DESJARDINS: Then it would be an orderly meeting. We could go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You might have an orderly meeting but we would not . . .

Mr. Einarson.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, if I might make a suggestion. A decision, I think, has been made; that is, a suggestion has been made, maybe I should put it that way, that we meet from 10:00 till 12:30 on the 8th and 2:00 to 5:00 o'clock on the 8th in the afternoon, also the same hours on the 9th. That's the understanding I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that was my suggestion.

MR. EINARSON: Yes. I think that that sufficed. We have now started that pattern and it seems to me that the public are accepting that. I have heard no comments contrary to the hours that we have and I think that we should carry on in the same fashion on December 8th and 9th as we are doing yesterday and today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Westbury.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY (Fort Rouge): A contrary comment has already been heard and I would like to offer another thought. You, Mr. Chairperson, have indicated that nobody on the government side is available on the evening of the 9th, a Tuesday, so what are we going to do for those people who haven't had time to make their presentations by 5:00 o'clock on that day? The House is sitting on the 11th and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We may have to sit in the month of January. Even though representations may be made to them, the committee will have to meet again after the 9th to consider a report.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, of course, Mr. Chairperson. So that means you are going to ask people to sit here for another two days in the second week in December, and this committee is not prepared to put itself out to make sure that they are heard in those two days, and that is what astonishes me. I feel that the suggestion made by the Member for Transcona, Mr. Parasiuk, is a reasonable one, in view of the fact that the government members cannot or will not be available on the Tuesday evening.

A CITIZEN: Could I ask a question? What number do you expect to get to today?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sir, if you can tell me how long each person will be, then I can tell you where we'll get to. I have no idea. I would hope we would hear three or four more this afternoon.

A CITIZEN: You don't know what number you left off at?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we don't go by numbers. I can tell you we will start again by letting the Catholic Women's League complete their presentation; then we will go to Mr. Forest; then Mrs. Friesen; and there are two representatives from out of town from the

Women's Institute, that have asked if they could be given consideration that their brief can be heard today. They have driven in from out of town, and that's been the normal practice of this committee, is to give out-of-towners preferential treatment. Then after that there's a Dennis Cyr, Professor Gordon Rothney, Charles Lamont and Bernice Sisler. Those are the names that are in the list.

A CITIZEN: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the desk that the Ukrainian Canadian Committee was listed next after Mr. Forest. That's so listed on the desk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, according to the list that I'm working off, is about twelve names down, and what you're reading from is the original list. We didn't conclude yesterday's list, so they were backed up to today, and they were given preferential treatment over the list of people that asked for the Tuesday hearing.

A CITIZEN: Well, I suppose I should be going home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would say, sir, that it's very doubtful we'll get to you.

A CITIZEN: Could you repeat the hours then that you're . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we haven't decided yet.

MRS. WESTBURY: We're still trying to decide.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think you should read the complete list to give an idea to the people where they're at, because I think they might be getting the wrong information. It might be that they feel they should go home and come back the next day, instead of waiting for two days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyde.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE (Portage la Prairie): I wonder if it wouldn't be well for the convenience of the people who are waiting that they be numbered, then they can't be shuffled around. We got ourselves in a bit of a mess this morning and I hope we can correct that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's decide on the hours for the 8th and 9th. What is the will of the committee for operating hours on the 8th and 9th? Mr. Mercier, have you a suggestion?

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, the list that was given to us today indicates only three people cannot attend until after 4:00, so I would suggest we maintain the 10:00 o'clock till 12:30 and 2:00 till 5:00. I am prepared to extend that even till 6:00 o'clock on the Monday to make sure these people have a chance to make their presentation, and leave it flexible and open. If we have to sit in the evening, I think that the Monday night is the only night, members of the government side are obligated on the Tuesday night. I'd be prepared to suggest we leave it flexible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the hours on the 8th and 9th will be the regular sitting hours and the committee will . . .

MR. VIC SCHROEDER (ROSSMERE): Mr. Chairman, I've had my hand up here for quite some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you. It would seem to me that it would be logical, if we are going to talk at all about an evening meeting on that Monday, to decide right now to have it and that way we will have the morning off. We will start at 2 o'clock, go to 6:00, and start again at 7:00, and we could get about seven hours of hearings in on that day. As well, I think we could have an extra hour today and go to 6 o'clock so that we can get some of these people through. They have been waiting here for some time. It doesn't seem to me to be logical to say we'll start at 10 o'clock in the morning on the 8th and then have you people say at 5 o'clock, well, we're tired, we want to go home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It's obvious that there is a disagreement as to sitting hours. Would some member of the committee be prepared to put a motion as to the sitting hours on those two days? Mr. Desjardins.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'll move that on the — is it the 5th, the Monday?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Monday, the 8th.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . that we meet from 2:00 to 5:00 and from 7:00 to 10:00, and on the second day that we meet the same hours as we are meeting now. If there is more people that want to come in, we'll have to meet after the session, some time in January.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Desjardins' motion understood by all? All in favour, please indicate by showing your hand. Motion is carried.

So the hours will be 2:00 to 5:00 and 7:00 to 10:00 on the Monday; on the Tuesday, they shall be 10:00 to 12:30 and 2:00 till 5:00.

Mr. Parasiuk.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. I have a copy of a petition that was sent to the Attorney-General from a number of people, I think some 30 people from Dauphin, Manitoba, who have said that: "We, the undersigned, strongly request that a public hearing be held in Dauphin to serve the Dauphin residents and the neighbouring communities."

Originally we had thought that Winnipeg, Brandon, Swan River and Thompson would sort of cover the area, but we did say that if there were people from a particular community who were sending in sufficient requests for us to hear them that we would consider meeting specifically in that community. That's what we had talked about and I thought agreed to when we first met, I guess, a couple of weeks ago when we had the organizational meeting of this committee. I'm wondering if the Attorney-General has any response

that he would make to that petition that he has received regarding this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as you know, I gave you a copy of that petition this morning at 10 o'clock to raise with the committee. I think before we decided on that we'd have to know from the Clerk's Office what number, if any, notices have been given of people who wish to make representations in Brandon and Swan River. If it's possible, we might on the way from Brandon to Swan River meet in Dauphin for an afternoon or 12:00 to 2:00 or 12:00 to 3:00, something like that. It would be fine with me.

MR. PARASIUK: The reason why I raised it is that this will be our last opportunity to discuss this before we meet in Brandon next Monday, so I thought we should just try and clear this up before we get into hearing submissions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the information of the committee, the Clerk informs me that there are three or four persons that have indicated a desire to meet with the committee in Brandon. His office has heard from no one in regard to Swan River and no one in regard to Thompson, as of today.

MR. PARASIUK: Anyone from Dauphin?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have heard from no one in Dauphin. The only thing we've heard from in Dauphin is the petition.

MR. CLERK: We never advertised in Dauphin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we didn't advertise for Dauphin. Mr. Parasiuk.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, in this respect I don't know who sent the petition. I called up someone in that area, a Mr. Ficzyz —(Interjection)— Pardon, was he the person? Well, I phoned him up at noon just before we got in here, and he said that he knew that there were at least three or four presentations being developed, possibly more, from groups like the Chamber of Commerce and individual groups, who would be presenting in Dauphin if it was stopping in Dauphin, but they felt that it wouldn't be stopping in Dauphin. I got the impression from him that they would come forward if we made provisions to stop in Dauphin. Given the fact that this is a petition of some number of people, and given the fact that he is saying that groups are indeed prepared to make presentation, and possibly may not be able to go up to Swan River or to Brandon, then I would suggest that maybe we try and have an afternoon in Dauphin, possibly on the 25th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that it's impossible to have a meeting between Brandon and Swan River and Dauphin. The Clerk has to advertise it and he's got less than a week to do it. If a meeting must be held in Dauphin, I'm afraid it's going to have to be held after the 8th and 9th of December.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, did I hear correctly that there's nobody so far in Swan River?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody has indicated so far.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, are we definitely going there anyway?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was advertised.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I know, but if there's nobody there it's kind of ridiculous to go there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There could be persons that show up at the meeting without informing the Clerk's office.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I see, they are not required to let you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, to give an indication of . . . The advertisement the Clerk has just shown me says "may register".

The gentleman back there, yes, have you a comment?

MR. DENNIS CYR: My name is Mr. Cyr and according to you last night before we left, I was to speak after the Catholic Women's League. Now, this morning, I'm willing to step aside and let Mr. Forest . . . Mrs. Friesen is scheduled to speak after Mr. Forest . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: She was on the list yesterday, and called in and said that she couldn't.

MR. CYR: I would still like to speak. This is my second day off work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then we also have the Women's Institute, I think they're present.

Okay, let's carry on with the Catholic Women's League, please. We've used up 24 minutes already of the afternoon.

MRS. BERNADETTE RUSSELL: Yes, I can appreciate the fact too of an evening session. It's costing me yesterday afternoon's wages and all day today's wages to appear before you here, and I appreciate the fact that someone has decided to hold an evening session.

We will go on, and once again I'll note that our recommendations are found at the beginning, and we have gone through the first three and we will go on with Family Life, Page 10.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: The Catholic Church has always given marriage and the institution of the family a place of honour, both in its teaching and its pastoral work and indeed right at this moment we have just seen that the bishops of the world have met at the Vatican to pursue the concerns for family. I will be giving, for your information, a newspaper article which tells us that the Bishop Synod will be asking the United Nations to formulate a brief of human rights for families as they . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blake on a point of privilege.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): The submissions are missing pages 10 to 14.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: I'm sorry about that.

MR. BLAKE: We'll just listen very carefully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blake, you just listen very carefully then.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: We did that late at night. What I was saying then was not all in the submission anyways, but it is a newspaper article which will tell you the draft of a recommended human rights for families, that the Synod of Bishops have decided that they will consult with the U.N. and other organizations, that have a like interest, that the United Nations would come up with rights of families. We would challenge you here to consider if that isn't also possible within our constitution, because the family is the basic unit of humanity and foremost of the elements that make up our society. The family is defined as the place where all humanity is knit together and assured a future. It is part of the natural order willed by God.

In the family, human rights are of equal importance to every person. Expressed in a constitutional document they would be both a statement of common purpose for, and a limitation on all governments within Canada.

No fundamental value should be denied or be permitted to be denied to any Canadian. This includes Canadians of all ages, and particularly the young, the aged, the helpless and the disabled.

Security for the elderly, assistance to the disabled and protection for the helpless from physical or psychological abuse are also priority concerns with our organization which believes that "... any form of violence inflicted on a person, but particularly on the defenceless, is deplorable and in family situations has a traumatic effect which should be a special concern to every Canadian."

We know that a strong family life can prevent some of the problems from arising and can deal effectively with some when they have arisen. However, it is imperative that these protections be embodied in a Canadian Constitution, and we recognize that unfortunately there is no statute that can preserve the life of a family that is faced with unbearable crises and the breakdown of a family presents a personal tragedy to many numbers of Canadians. The results have been very widespread and affect all strata of society, the schools and the courts, etc.

We know that separated parents are trying to cope alone and they face many obstacles apart from loneliness and the difficulties of dealing singly with the problems of growing children. The problems of obtaining support payments, when the supporting parent moves from the province, have highlighted the need for certain aspects of family matters to be handled nationally as well as provincially. Inter-provincial court orders require federal authority to operate effectively and we have suggested provisions for this to be included in the Constitution.

The BNA Act, Section 91(26) has established that marriage and divorce are matters under federal jurisdiction. We believe that just as Canada has a

single uniform criminal code, so it should continue to have a single divorce law. It is in the interest of all Canadians, especially those whose marriages have broken down, that such jurisdiction remain unchanged. Further, the CWL seeks inclusion in a Constitution of provision for the protection of citizens affected by divorce from the action of one parent who removes from a province children lawfully in the custody of the other parent or a third party, and from the problems which result from a spouse who fails to pay lawful support and who moves from province to province.

In the original United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child, the preamble states "Whereas the child by reason of his physical and mental immaturity needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection before as well as after birth . . .". Principle four of the same document states "The child shall enjoy the benefits of social security. He shall be entitled to grow and develop in health; to this end, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and his mother, including adequate pre-natal and post-natal care."

The CWL reiterates its support then for guarantees for the protection of children before and after birth and urges the Government of Canada in its considerations of The BNA Act to be vigilant in recognizing the need for legal protection of the unborn and the value of human life until the time of natural death.

We are also concerned about the recent and continued advances being made in genetics because it raises the spectre of potential misuse of science. So regarding human experimentation we need to identify basic ethical principles and develop appropriate guidelines for continued research, while at the same time protecting basic human rights. The CWL believes this to be a serious matter which needs firm action by the Government of Canada and the provincial governments, and we would ask you to take note that we do have a very extensive brief prepared on genetic engineering for anyone who is particularly interested in that document.

MRS. RUSSELL: Recognition of women as equal citizens: The Canadian nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of a human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.

The Catholic Women's League of Canada strongly urges that this recognition of the dignity and worth of the human person be included in a new Constitution with particular recognition of women. It is only in the last 50 years in Canada that women were granted the status of persons, yet apparently there are many still in society who have not accepted this verdict and who do not deal decisively with the reality.

As women, we are determined to guard jealously the decision of the Privy Council in England which overruled the Supreme Court of Canada, making the proposition that women are fully persons a part of the constitutional law of this country.

Discrimination based on sex must be avoided by both the careful use of language in the laws of our country and the positive proof of affirmative action on the part of governments. This will ensure and

demonstrate to our nation a willingness to give reality to the concept of women as fully human persons and would encourage their participation in the life of the country. The appointment of women to high political positions, the encouragement of women to run for office, the enactment and strict enforcement of anti-discriminatory laws in the labour force, the availability of equal opportunity in employment are all ways in which government can and should lead the way.

It is deemed timely to urge that the use of language referring to both men and women state specifically, in reference to persons, persons of both sexes and to state "he" or "she" where required, rather than as in The BNA Act of today and current documents where the references are to "he" and "him".

The Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada made its report to the government on September 28, 1970. While many of the recommendations have been implemented, we would remind the government that there are still many more to be implemented which will benefit all Canadians.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Native Rights: A guarantee of human rights embodied in a written document, one which is difficult to alter, would represent a commitment to all Canadians. Whatever their origins or regions, whatever their training or skills, all Canadians should be assured of the opportunity to obtain the education they desire, to practice the religion they prefer, to speak the language they choose, to pursue the occupations they wish, where they wish, to receive equal treatment at all stages in their lives from their fellow citizens and particularly from their governments.

The CWL has expressed on several occasions its concern for the native peoples of Canada and believes that the native peoples are striving to have injustices corrected, to re-establish for themselves some measure of self-sufficiency, health, dignity, personal worth and independence. In a statement on Human Rights, we made reference to our efforts directed to the achievement of an improvement in the lives of the native peoples and our commitment to urge the government to such improvements.

We urge that with due consultation with representatives of the native people concerned, that positive provisions for the preservation of the rights of native peoples of Canada and for equal opportunities for them.

We would like to make mention here of an opportunity we had of hearing the then Minister of Indian Affairs, Warren Allmand, in 1977 when he addressed our convention. He expressed the need for national reconciliation in these words which are still applicable to the situation of our native peoples at this time. He said, "Reconciliation is needed not only between native Canadians and others or between English and French, but also between immigrants and native born, urban and rural, rich and poor." His challenge to the listeners was that they be in the forefront of this reconciliation and he suggested the process be carried out wherever there is division or misunderstanding.

We have urged the government of Canada and want you to know that in its discussion of the BNA

Act we wish them to act upon our recommendations and ensure that Indian women who marry non-Indians can regain and retain their Indian status. We believe this to be a woman's right. We ask our own provincial government to support us in this.

This right of a particular minority group has also been the subject of representation by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women and we support the Council's view in this matter.

We want you to know that we have also referred to the 1970 recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women regarding Eskimo and Indian women and have urged the government in Canada to include the recognition of the distinctive cultures of the native peoples in the rewritten Constitution and Bill of Rights.

MRS. RUSSELL: Environment and Resources: The dimensions of Canada are vast but its geography is such that only a small proportion of its land can be devoted to the production of food and agricultural products. Thus the preservation and development of forests, of arable land, the resources of the sea, animal and bird life, are seen to be matters of national concern. Present provincial laws are inadequate to the task of protecting this heritage. For example, new urban areas continue to use up rich productive land rather than unproductive acreage.

Many voices now warn that mankind has reached a turning point in history. Critical decisions must be made now to stop plundering the earth's non-renewable resources before it is too late. Yet this industrialized society treats the resources of the earth as if they were limitless.

Those preparing the original British North America Act in 1867 could not have foreseen the awesome results of increasing industrialization, but in 1980 there is the opportunity in the repatriation of the Constitution to write in guarantees for the protection of the natural resources of our country for future generations and the CWL would urge that this be done.

In the concern for such protection, consideration should be given to such areas as: preservation of arable land; utilization of the sea's vast wealth in protein and minerals; controls to protect the ozone layer; intelligent conservation of the forests and prevention of water pollution; the misuse of nuclear energy and the questionable methods of waste disposal and; more study of economical and renewable sources of energy such as solar, wind and hydro.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: The last topic we wish to address is Responsibility to Developing Countries, because we believe that an attitude at the provincial level is essential in order for our federal government to function in a certain way.

Since a country is no more an island than is any person, Canada must so order its affairs that it functions as a responsible member of the larger community — the international community, and the CWL is aware of strong obligations in this regard.

Barbara Ward Jackson in her book "World Development" said, "Since this vast wealth is rooted in the new technologies, it flows only to those who have the capital and the education to deploy and use

the new techniques. Two-thirds of humanity, living in the excolonial lands of Latin America, Africa and Asia, are only just beginning to cross the new scientific threshold of abundance. For the time being therefore, the gap between the already wealthy Atlantic nations and the rest of mankind is very wide and can become even wider."

Canada has been a participant in the deliberations of world bodies, such as the United Nations, and has been a contributor of citizens time and taxpayers monies in rendering assistance to those countries whose development has not reached the same stage as that of Canada. However, Canada's aid still falls short of the goal of 0.7 percent of the gross national product recommended in the Pearson Report.

We believe that a Constitution for Canada which would include provisions dealing with the responsibility of Canada and of Canadians to the world community must ensure the continuation of efforts and of support for efforts to achieve not only world peace and harmony but the individual fulfillment of other peoples whose current situation does not afford that opportunity.

We'll leave the rest for you to read, there are little bits there that we feel you will be able to accomplish, in respect for the others who still wish to present.

MRS. RUSSELL: In conclusion: A Constitution is much more than an abstract document. It is the fundamental law of a country; and, as such, it ensures the establishment and maintenance of a legal order whose objective must be to protect the rights and promote the well-being of its citizens.

The Catholic Women's League of Canada is mindful of the complexities of the problems facing the governments in preparing a Constitution for Canada and expresses its earnest hope that the correct deliberations prove fruitful for each individual Canadian.

It is the responsibility of all citizens of good will to work together for the common good. The Catholic Women's League of Canada welcomes the opportunity to present the opinions of its members and dedicates itself to continue to contribute to the understanding and growth of religious freedom, racial justice, peace and harmony for God and Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, ladies. Will you ladies permit questions from members of the committee?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Yes, we will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any members of the committee who wish to question either of the two ladies representing the Catholic League? Mrs. Westbury.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chairperson, first of all, I would like to congratulate them on the quality of the brief. I think it was very well done, very well presented, but anyway, I just wondered if you, too, would comment on the statement that these rights, and presumably all the rights to which you have referred, are best protected by the Legislature, rather than having the final decision with the Supreme Court. Would you make a comment on that statement that has been made, not by me?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: In preparing the brief we recognized that we did not state per se that there ought to be a human rights statement, but we recognize that there has to be human rights recognized in a Constitution, and that because we did not discuss the absolute topic per se with our members, to say, do you believe as a group of members that a human rights statement should be a part of the constitution, we did not discuss that, we did not take a vote on that so we cannot speak for them. But what we could say were the many concerns that the League has voted on over the years, which do speak of human rights. Does that answer your question?

MRS. WESTBURY: Not quite, but almost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? Mr. Desjardins.

MR. DESJARDINS: Could I pursue this to make sure that I understand. I think that you're saying, you're trying to give us a message of the rights that you figure are fundamental, and you are not saying at this time, you are not taking sides, should it be enshrined in a Bill of Rights or should it be left to the Legislature. Is that a fair assessment or are you saying 'no' there shouldn't be a Bill of Rights?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: We are not saying, no, there shouldn't be a Bill of Rights.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're not taking a side on that as long as a way is found to protect those rights. Right?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's fair.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Einarson. Oh sorry, Mr. Desjardins.

MR. DESJARDINS: I have a concern. I agree with most of this brief, but I have a concern. You want to make sure that the women are recognized as persons, and I don't think that you'll find an argument here today; but are you going in the right way if you start stipulating that a certain number of women justices should be added. In other words, it could be a token representation. I would think that you have enough confidence, and it might take a while, mind you, but you might have enough confidence that if they're treated and looked at as persons, that is the only thing that we want.

I'm a little afraid if you say that and then later on you say, encouraged to run for office by government. Government don't encourage, it's people, and I would think that, by experience I can say that all political parties are looking all over to try and interest women in running; even if it isn't for no other reason but for good politics. So I'm a little concerned. I hope you don't misunderstand what I'm saying. I wouldn't want to see that there should be certain justices, a woman justice should be added. I think they should be as women. If you start that I

think you're going to go against what you're trying to do.

MRS. RUSSELL: If I may answer that question. I had trouble with that when I was putting thought into the brief, and because it has always been my belief that that would be tokenism, but I've come to the conclusion that if that's where we have to start, we have to start. We haven't been able to get it any other way. Maybe this is the way we'll get them in. It just hasn't happened and, you know, I think that we have to spell it out now, because it just hasn't come about. We've waited and we're being patient and we're not getting the appointments to the high office; we're not getting the kinds of jobs that some of us want, and so it has to come another way.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Even the fact, further, of the recognition of women, we noticed that at the Premier's meeting there were no women around the table. We noticed, and thank goodness that Mrs. Westbury was able to come and join you, that there wasn't a woman here, and we recognize that that is the women who haven't made it, so to speak, in the political field, and we're striving and preparing ourselves, but we need more encouragement.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm not fully satisfied, but I think I understand what you are saying. I think you agree with me that this is not the best way, but if it's the only way you are ready to start that way and . . .

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: It's a beginning.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . and later on we might change it to make sure that there are some men in the justice office.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Oh, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Einarson.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the ladies present, on behalf of their organization, there's been much talk, and it seems to me that this is the crux of a good deal of our problem in regards to our Constitution, and I'm wondering if you've had this discussion within your group as to whether or not you feel that the Constitution should be patriated back to Canada, without any amending formula. In other words, what I'm saying, do you think that the British Parliament, which I think, as I understand, the Prime Minister wants to see happen, that our Constitution be amended in Great Britain before it ever comes to this country? I wonder if you've had any discussion on that matter and how you people feel about that.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: I'm sorry, we have not. We meet once a year at national and provincial conventions, and it's at that point that our consensus are taken, and that was not brought at that time. It wasn't an evident concern, but we did pass the resolution that we should speak on the Constitution, but that particular item was not dealt with in a vote form, I'm sorry.

MR. EINARSON: Well then through you, Mr. Chairman, to the ladies. Are you aware — and I

stand to be corrected if I'm wrong, and we have the Attorney-General here — that all Premiers across Canada were in full agreement with the Prime Minister that the Constitution be patriated from Great Britain to Canada. Is that your understanding of this whole matter of debate that we're going through?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Yes.

MR. EINARSON: That's why I posed the question previously, and if you are aware of that, I just wondered as to how you feel. To me, this is an important matter that we must consider.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Yes. Unfortunately, we can't speak for all the women.

MR. EINARSON: Very good. Thank you Mrs. Wyrzykowski.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mercier:

MR. MERCIER: In your section on Family Law, you talk about a number of matters. Are you familiar with the position that Manitoba took on Family Law at the First Ministers' Meeting on the Constitution?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Very much so. Yes, I listened to that.

MR. MERCIER: Is there any area of that that you disagree with?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: The whole of it. It would be difficult to say at this point.

MR. MERCIER: In preparing your submission, did you consider the detail of the Federal Constitutional Proposal? Because in your submission, you make reference to the legal protection of the unborn. We had a Dr. Doyle here yesterday, who made a comment on Section 7, "Everyone has a Right to Life", and it was his view that there should be some improvements in that section, in his opinion. Are you making any specific recommendation on the specific federal proposal.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: When we drafted this, the document that is now the resolution document was not out at the time when we began to prepare, so therefore if it does not seem to relate to the final wording of the resolution, it's because we were working with the previous document. The concern that we made regarding the rights of children, and so on, it's not spelled out.

MR. MERCIER: So that would be covered then, I think it's on Page 9 of your brief at the last sentence, after referring to the right to life, you indicate the way the Constitution reads now, it seems to us too much is being left to be resolved in the courts.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Yes, and that's not only in terms of the unborn, as much as it is the fact that the statement could include that children have the right to vote. It could be presumed that, the way it's worded, and that there are not specific rights for children; for example, the right to belong to a family,

or to be protected, that the family would be protected for the right of the child. They say everyone, every person, every citizen, and some of those are not truly rights of children, and others are missing for children.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Mr. Walding.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask a question on Native rights as it appears on Page 15. I'm not sure from the text there whether you are suggesting that all Canadians should be treated equally or whether there should be certain additional rights for one particular ethnic group.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: In the case of native people.

MRS. RUSSELL: In the case of native people, if they are consulted, then I think that maybe there are specific rights that need to be put in there for native people. It may not apply to all of us, to all the rest.

MR. WALDING: I read in other parts of your brief and from other people that have appeared us that they very conscious, very concerned, about certain discriminatory things happening between different people in this country. They say, are we Canadians and shouldn't everybody be treated equally and subject to certain safeguards. Are you then saying that is not so and that your organization would support additional rights for one particular group that others do not enjoy?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: I would say that our council would agree that at this point in time the native people, specifically, ought to be able to verbalize for themselves the ways in which they believe that they have not received justice in the past and that this is the point in time in which it should be, that they ought to be discriminated in that sense to their benefit. Other groups, we have not dealt with in that same way. Does that answer your question?

MR. WALDING: I think it does and it then leads on to the next one which appears on the next page. I understand it's now a right of native bands to have a certain amount of control over their band areas and that they do have the right to exclude certain persons from residing on that area. Now, is that a right that you would want them to continue to have?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Your observation is valid because on one hand we say they ought to make their decisions and on the other hand we dare to say that one of the decisions they themselves have made we do not find acceptable. We do that as women in concern for women.

MR. WALDING: What about your concern for the rights of the native people?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: I think, that even in terms of anyone else speaking to rights that are being

unjust in other countries, we would want to speak about that.

MR. WALDING: In order to satisfy this concern that you have about women, would it not be necessary to take away that right that the bands presently have, and that in order to benefit some people, you have to take or limit rights of other people.

MRS. RUSSELL: I would probably say that, it's reasonable.

MR. WALDING: Do you see that as being a political decision or something that a judge should make that decision?

MRS. RUSSELL: I can't respond to it. I think probably consultation with them would be the best way to answer and try and get them to come up with an opinion that would be acceptable to them.

MR. WALDING: Even if it didn't make this provision for women that you're concerned about.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: We would hope that even this provision about women would be presented to them as to be reviewed in terms of a more just situation among their people.

MR. WALDING: If they considered it and said, no, we want to keep our rights.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Well, then we have to give up, but we still believe that it ought to be. It's really our statement of what we think is unjust there.

MR. WALDING: Can I also ask you about family rights that you mention in here? It hasn't been brought up by anyone else appearing before the committee. Could elaborate on, perhaps, with specifics on what you are referring to there?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: We have a couple of them. We believe that there are inefficiencies that serve as a deterrent for families, especially to couples who are disadvantaged, but who with sufficient resources would have perhaps more children or would be able to live more comfortably if there were the necessary support systems available to them. Or that a revision in our tax structure should take place so that elderly people cared for by family members could be reasonably compensated for the added cost of caring for their family member. Or, for example, the allocation of funds for program development and services, that they should be increased to voluntary social service agencies who can provide direct services that reflect diverse values, traditions and needs of families in this pluralistic society. We also believe that employment policies and programs should not just be satisfied with helping individuals find jobs. We think that families would benefit if employment policies should respect the nuclear and extended family needs of which employed individuals belong to and that forced mobility for employment reasons often creates more problems than it solves. These are the kinds of things that we think are really affecting and tearing families apart and causing the problems we are faced with. This is why I will have that distributed, that the bishops in the synod have

said, the kinds of things like the rights of a family to exist and progress as a family; that every person, especially of the poor, has a right to form a family and sustain it with appropriate helps; to believe and profess one's own faith and to propagate it; the right to educate one's children according to one's own traditions; the right to obtain physical, social, political, economic security. These are the kinds of things that have been written now; that it is possible to work from some of these family rights and draft something.

MR. WALDING: I understand a little better now what you are getting at. I'm just wondering, will it happen, if you get it written into a Constitution, because it seems that a number of the things there — care for the senior citizens, aid to children, employment support — these could be in large measure or in small measure. It depends on the amount of dollars that are provided to get them. Do you see what I am getting?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Oh, yes.

MRS. RUSSELL: Oh, yes.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: It's a valid question and, believe me, we've listened carefully and we've wondered and it's a big decision that has to be made. We have to believe that the fact that it would be written down as a right, surely, isn't going to take away the right, isn't going to prevent the right from happening. I can't understand that because it's written as a right that it would lose something no matter where it's implemented. If it's implemented already without it being written but the fact that it's written, is that going to stop it from being a right? We've heard that the Russians have a very magnificent document of human rights and it doesn't ensure human rights in that country. But does it stop, is it the cause of it not being carried out that it's written? I don't believe that.

MRS. RUSSELL: I don't believe that either. I think it's, if you've got it written, at least you have a better chance of getting it, but at least you're not going to lose it. Nothing is going to be lost by having it written.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: And the fact that the United Nations have made a declaration of their rights of children, has that taken away rights from children or does it enhance the possibility of greater rights for children?

MR. WALDING: But do you see any danger that might be used as an excuse for not improving the present situation? For example, for children, that it might be argued, well, there is a children's allowance of whatever the amount is and that satisfied the Constitution and you will never get anything else because that's the way it is. It's written down and engraved in stone, nonetheless. However, you might come back and argue, well, children deserve much more than this.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: The rights have to be spelled out more than that and then you have to

come back to recognize what those further rights than just the monetary needs.

MR. WALDING: I thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kohnats.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Radisson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To follow up just a little bit on what Mr. Walding has been asking some questions on, and it's really, my position on this committee is to listen to the briefs to help me formulate an idea as to whether I am in favour of entrenchment or not in favour of entrenchment. I would like to go women's rights. When it comes to women's rights, I believe that they do have the same rights as any person. How would you, and I'm looking for some assistance here, how would you handle a situation when we are trying to support and encourage women's rights where there is a conflict with religious rights? Women who could be more active in church activities or synagogue activities — I'm not trying to differentiate — under what circumstances, if these rights were entrenched, would you allow women to be able to bear down that conflict between religious rights and civil rights, if it was entrenched in a Bill of Rights? Am I getting across the type of question that I am trying to present to you?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Are you asking that in the event that rights for women might be spelled out in a Constitution that it might then enhance some rights that they don't already entertain in their religious circle?

MR. KOVNATS: I guess that's what I'm asking.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: We believe that the whole of women's rights are in a state of evolution and that we, the women, have to spell it out, recognize the call to become more fully person in all areas of our lives, that seeing changes happening within our family relationship, in our church, in our society, wherever we are, we as women are being called to become more fully person and that the rights, if they were described in the Constitution would deal with our right in the government of the land, in the community, and in terms of the church we also make presentation for more recognition of us. We have done that at the same time.

MR. KOVNATS: Have you had any success in your presentations to the church?

MRS. RUSSELL: I would say so. I would say that women in our particular church I can speak for have really gone a long way in the last few years and we're continuing to speak to them and, in fact, I saw someone laugh or I saw someone smile when they came to the part about the documents being changed to be "he" or "she", into that kind of language. We, this year, have presented that kind of resolution to our bishops asking that in liturgy that terminology be changed to include all persons instead of just brother and brethren which we see so often in our liturgy.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, to the delegates, that pleases me. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you through, Mr. Kovnats? Mr. Desjardins.

MR. DESJARDINS: I want to pursue something that was put in by Mr. Walding and I think I'm disappointed. I was disappointed by one of your answers, I think because I thought I understood, and I'm talking about the Native rights. You were saying that should be discussed with the Natives of course.

Then you were asked — there is something apparently that the Natives have not seen fit to change and you're talking about the rights of the Indian women. Your answer was, "As women were doing that, but as a person or a Canadian or whatever, we'd have to desist." I'm disappointed in that if that is your idea. You have no hesitation to come in and say some of the things that were done for years that you think are wrong as women and it seems to me that fundamental rights, you know, I'm not trying to dictate to you, but I'm disappointed that you are not saying no, this should be changed, because it is not fair. It is very unfair and I think you would get a lot of support. Are you suggesting then because something was done, that it should go in the Constitution, maybe in the Bill of Rights the same way, when you know that something is definitely wrong and it's not fair for women?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: I sensed that the question was whether it ought to go to a parliamentary situation or to a judicial.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh no, that's not, I'm talking about what you have on Page 16.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: But on that topic, that was what I understood the question to be, more dealing with that method of handling that concern which we have.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I was getting ready to ask that question. Mr. Walding talked on it, then I tried to be careful. I thought you were asked, well, what do you do in this case. In effect you were more or less saying leave that to the Natives themselves. But then Mr. Walding I thought asked you what in this case were you saying that you want to ensure that Indian women who marry non-Indians can regain or retain their Indian status. I thought I heard you say, and I hope I'm wrong, that well, as women you still believe that, but you might have to desist because the precedent should be that they should determine for themselves. Am I wrong?

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: I'm really having difficulty.

MR. DESJARDINS: What are you advocating?

MRS. RUSSELL: We're advocating, and because it was a statement made by us and we endorsed it, it was made by the Advisory Council of Women and we would think and we would be sure that kind of input would be put in by the Native people and that they in fact want it.

MR. DESJARDINS: If they don't, what are you telling the Legislature?

MRS. RUSSELL: I think I would be speaking for the CWL because we have a statement on Native rights, which we have made, and I would say that yes, we would be prepared to ask that it be included as it is here.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay, I am no longer disappointed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions to the two ladies? Seeing none, thank you very kindly.

MRS. WYRZYKOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Forest, we have finally got around to you, sir. Mr. Forest, I understand that you have a prepared text for members of the committee.

MR. GEORGES FOREST: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I've given them to the Clerk, Mr. Reeves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The text is in English I understand. Is that true?

MR. FOREST: That is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you will be speaking in French?

MR. FOREST: In French and English.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To assist the translators, would you go reasonably slowly. I am told that you usually speak very quickly.

MR. FOREST: Qui, M. le president.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:
Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk is out of the room at the moment. Can Mr. Forest start without the presentation in front of each member or do you want to wait? Mr. Desjardins.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if it would be fair to ask Mr. Forest to tell us why the text was prepared only in English? I've got the answer already but I think it's important he tells the committee, because of the facilities that we have.

MR. FOREST: It's as a result of a promise I made to this House in this building some time in June when I promised I would never again speak French in this building unless there was simultaneous translation. Therefore, I was not expecting to be heard in French.

I wrote a letter, I admit it was late, on November 13th, and it reads as follows:

To Mr. Steen, copies to Mr. Steen, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Mercier, Mr. Pawley, Mr. Desjardins and Mr. Reeves:

"Last week I called the Clerk's Office to have my name recorded as one desirous of appearing before your committee. Since the subject matter of the deliberations is the Canadian Constitution, I stated that I believed it to be in order for simultaneous translation service to be in use at those meetings.

"Mr. Reeves urged me to call you by dialing 489-6777. I have not been able to reach you after several calls since last week.

"May I urge you to consider having the simultaneous translation service at the constitutional reform meeting to show and respect the inherent nature of the Canadian Constitution.

"I recognize that your decision on this question may be a difficult one. I sincerely hope that you can uphold the bilingual character of our nation without drawing out the uninformed radical element in our midst. On the other hand I do not want to be told that for lack of a request for it, simultaneous translation was not available.

"May I suggest that on previous constitutional meetings here this year both of Canada's official languages were in use. Also, I am convinced that Ottawa's state secretariat would assist once more in rendering this essential service.

"In order that I may complete my text of my remarks to the committee, may I hear from you as soon as possible."

It was late in the evening of Friday night that my children brought to my attention the article appearing on Page 13 of the Free Press. Mercier says, "Province unable to offer translation at hearings." I waited until Friday and over the weekend I prepared my text, five or six drafts of it, until I finally settled on that and then I had the great news yesterday morning that translation would be available.

I wish to at this time, Mr. Chairman, thank Mr. Mercier most sincerely for having taken this decision and you, the committee, who have I hear approved it yesterday morning, and I think that whilst it takes me by surprise . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a pleasant surprise.

MR. FOREST: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a pleasant surprise.

MR. FOREST: It is a very pleasant surprise and I think it puts Manitoba, in my opinion, in the forefront of the debates in the Constitution that are going on insofar as what is Canada going to be tomorrow. We could, I know, speak day in and day out on all sorts of compromises, economics and everything else, but if we cannot settle this, the major key of Canadian identity, I think we are wasting a lot of time.

M. le président, j'apparais devant vous aujourd'hui comme témoin du grand besoin qu'il y a pour nous d'avoir au Manitoba une action gouvernementale beaucoup plus prononcée sur la restauration de la justice pour la minorité française. Pour ceux d'entre vous qui êtes contre l'enchâssement des droits humains, y inclus les droits linguistiques, permettez-moi de vous dire avec toute la force de mon être, au tout début de mes remarques, que je ne suis pas d'accord avec vous. Comme je n'ai pas confiance entièrement dans la résolution proposée puisqu'elle ne donne pas les garanties suffisant à l'enchâssement des droits linguistiques. Je reviendrai tout à l'heure sur ce point.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you today to bear witness to the need for greater government action in restoring justice to Manitoba's French-speaking minority. For you, who are against the entrenchment of human rights, including linguistic rights, may I state emphatically at the outset that I not only disagree with you, but I have not sufficient confidence in the resolution which is proposed, since it does not give sufficient guarantees to entrench minority language rights. I shall come back on this point later on.

Sunday, November 16, the day before yesterday, a small group of Manitobans gathered at a graveside in the St. Boniface Cathedral Cemetery to commemorate the 95th Anniversary of the untimely death of the father of Manitoba, Louis Riel. Louis Riel foresaw his work, in part, that of fostering peace amongst religious and linguistic groups, based on solidarity and unity would take some time. At his trial Louis Riel had this to say: "If I have any influence in the new world it is to help in that way and even if it takes 200 years to become practical, then after my death that will bring out practical results, and then my children's children will shake hands with the Protestants of the new world in a friendly manner. I do not wish these evils which exist in Europe to be continued, as much as I can influence it, among the half-breeds. I do not wish that to be repeated in America. That work is not the work of some days or years, it is the work of hundreds of years."

On that note, Mr. Chairman, permettez-moi de vous dire que c'est à cause de cette vision lointaine que je peux dire qu'il nous faut avoir de la persévérance. Le progrès social ne vient qu'avec la persévérance, l'éducation, la tolérance et la compréhension. L'attitude des gens doit changer. Je crois qu'il est approprié pour moi, en ce moment, de vous raconter un incident dans lequel j'ai eu expérimenté sur une période des derniers cinquante ans.

Au printemps 1930 quand je n'avais que six ans, mon père Ambroise Gabriel Forest, du subir une opération pour la mastoïde. Invalide comme il était, l'ensemencement de son terrain était impossible jusqu'à ce qu'un voisin du nom de George John Fisher est venu avec ses hommes, ses chevaux et ses machineries agricoles pour ensemercer la terre. Typiquement, de la coopération entre voisins, une pratique qui encore vivante mais qui est peu usagée aujourd'hui, M. Fisher a donné son aide sans rémunération. Un an plus tard environ, M. Fisher est mort.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

It is because of this far-sighted vision that I say that we must persevere. Social progress only comes with perseverance, education, tolerance and understanding. Attitudes of people must change. I believe it is appropriate for me to tell you at this time of an incident in which I experimented over a period of 50 years.

In the spring of 1930, when I was only 6 years old, my father, Ambroise Gabriel Forest, was operated upon for mastoiditis. Handicapped as he was, the seeding of his farm was impossible until a neighbour, George John Fisher, came with his men, his horses and machinery to seed the land. Typical of co-operation between neighbours, a

practice still alive but rare today. George John Fisher's help was without remuneration. A year or so later, Mr. Fisher passed away.

I remember seeing our neighbour before his death. My father, under threat of excommunication by the Roman Catholic Church was forbidden from attending George Fisher's funeral. Our neighbour was of the Anglican faith.

Earlier this year, Elizabeth Fisher, widow of George Fisher, passed away. After consultation with my mother and my sister, we had a prayer card filled out arranging for mass to be celebrated for the repose of the soul of Elizabeth "Bessie" Fisher. The card was signed Elise Forest and family. The commemorative mass to be celebrated at Holy Cross Catholic Church. All available members of our family attended the funeral service of Elizabeth Fisher which was officiated by Reverend Bruce Myles.

Le jour après l'enterrement, la plus vieille des filles d'Elizabeth Fisher, Mary Baxter appelle ma soeur Anna et exprime son appréciation vivement pour la marque de sympathie que notre famille lui avait donnée. Mary a demandé à Anne de voir s'il était possible de retarder la messe en question au moins jusqu'à ce que l'année de la famille, aussi du nom de George, puisse y assister. Que les attitudes changent.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

The day after the funeral, the eldest daughter of Elizabeth Fisher called Mary Baxter, called my sister, Anna, and requested her appreciation for the sympathy expressed by our families. Mary asked Anna if it was possible to delay the commemorative celebration, at least until the return of the eldest brother, George, so he could be here to attend. How attitudes have changed.

The spirit of ecumenism is hard at work in the world today. I sincerely hope that a like spirit of inter-cultural tolerance will continue to develop.

In the preamble of the Federal Governments Official Languages Act there is a quotation of Northrop Frye. He wrote:

"A sense of unity is the opposite of a sense of uniformity. Uniformity, where everyone "belongs", uses the same cliches, thinks alike and behaves alike, produces a society which seems comfortable at first but is totally lacking in human dignity. Real unity tolerates dissent and rejoices in variety of outlook and tradition, recognizes that it is man's destiny to unite and not to divide. Unity, so understood, is the extra dimension that raises the sense of belonging into genuine human life."

Mon ancêtre paternel en Amérique était un français protestant. Il fuyait la persécution religieuse de la France.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

My paternal ancestor in America was a French Protestant who fled religious persecution to France.

Jessie de Forest, my paternal ancestor in America, was a Huguenot and in 1623 he led a group of 300 men plus women and children out of France because of religious persecution and came to establish the first colony on Manhattan Island, now known as New York.

Conscious of the changes in my own background, of my ever-developing Canadian culture, with social experiences steeped in conflict, but while maintaining a deep desire to promote tolerance and understanding, I look into the future with confidence.

I question Manitoba's decision to fight the federal government's proposed resolution for what I call Confederation II, The Canada Act of 1980. We can still, however, enter a new era with full dignity. I do believe that Manitoba can be a kingmaker for Canadian unity.

En 1977, j'écrivais à notre premier ministre du temps, pour lui demander de reconnaître la langue française comme étant officielle au Manitoba. En partie j'ai dit comme ceci: Étant depuis aussi longtemps que je puisse m'ensouvenir, épris de la cause des Canadiens-français du Manitoba, je me permets aujourd'hui de vous transmettre quelques idées que je crois importantes dans le débat sur le problème de l'enseignement en français dans cette province et sur la question de l'unité canadienne.

Vous connaissez l'histoire du Manitoba. Vous connaissez la difficulté de sa naissance comme province et les assauts législatifs de 1890 et 1916 sur les droits des Canadiens-français au Manitoba. Vous savez qu'avec le projet de loi, An act to provide that the English language shall be the official language of the province of Manitoba 1890, le français fut aboli comme langue au Manitoba. Et qu'avec l'amendement à l'acte scolaire 1916, le français fut bani comme langue d'enseignement. Je ne crois pas faire erreur lorsque j'avoue que rien depuis 1916 n'a été fait pour redonner aux Canadiens-français du Manitoba les droits qui leur ont été enlevés en 1890 et puis en 1916.

A la page 3 de ma lettre, j'ai dit ceci: La justice au Manitoba doit être rétablie avant qu'il y ait discussion sur une nouvelle constitution canadienne. Et nous pouvons constater aujourd'hui, M. le président, que cette justice nous a été rétablie le 13 décembre dernier.

Je continue. Excusez mon hardiesse, mais je dois vous dire jusqu'à quel point j'ai confiance en vous. J'ose vous dire humblement que la voix du Manitoba sera providentielle dans le débat sur l'unité canadienne si l'autorité suprême de cette province que vous êtes, disait au Manitobains et à la nation canadienne un peu en ces termes.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

In 1977, I wrote to our Premier of the day, asking him to recognize the French language as being official in Manitoba. I said in part, being as far as I can remember taken with the cause of the French in Manitoba, I take the right today to submit to you certain ideas that I have on the problems of teaching of French in this province, and the question of Canadian unity.

We know the history of Manitoba. We know the difficulty of its birth as a province and the legislative assaults in 1890 and in 1916 on the rights of French Canadians in Manitoba. You know, that with the project of the law, an act to provide that the English language shall be the official language of the province of Manitoba in 1890, French was abolished as a language in Manitoba, and that with the amendment to The School Act in

1916, French was banished as a language of teaching.

I don't believe that I am wrong when I admit that nothing since 1916 has been done to return to the French Canadians of Manitoba the rights which were removed in 1890, as well as in 1916.

On Page 3 of my letter I stated this, "Justice in Manitoba must be established before there is any discussion on a new Canadian Constitution. We can state that the justice has been re-established the 13th of December of last year.

I continue, I humbly ask you to excuse my frankness. I dare say to you that the voice of Manitoba would be providential in the debate on Canadian unity if the supreme authority of this province, said to Manitobans and to the Canadian nation something like this:

I was actually putting words into the mouth of the then-Premier of Manitoba. I was suggesting that he should tell the Manitobans and the Canadian nation something like this: "We recognize the error of 1890. In order to correct the situation, we will do everything within our power to favour the redevelopment of French in Manitoba. In the Department of Education, we will have the French school network, the same as the English school network exists in Quebec. In all the departments of the government of Manitoba, we will render services in both official languages of Manitoba, and recognizing the mosaic of Manitoba, we will encourage, not the development of one or other official languages, but the preservation of the diverse ethnic groups."

Nous avons fait beaucoup de progrès, M. le président. Aujourd'hui nous avons d'abord la décision de la Cour suprême et en plus nous avons aussi un sentiment, je crois, très fort dans tous les partis politiques pour voir à ce que celui-ci ou celui-là puisse réussir à enchsser des droits. Nous avons à l'autre bout du pays, le gouvernement de M. Hatfield qui reconnaît pour sa province des droits linguistiques qui sont, je crois, adéquats pour le moment, mais qui seront probablement davantage enchssés.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

We have progressed enormously, Mr. Chairman. Today, we have the decision of the Supreme Court, and as well we have a sentiment that is quite strong in all political parties to see that either this one or that one should be able to succeed entrenching rights that are necessary.

We have the government of Mr. Hatfield, who recognizes for his province the linguistic rights which are, I believe, adequate for the moment, but which will be entrenched even more in the future.

Eleven months have gone by since the historic decision handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada last December 13th. The 1890 Official Languages Act was then ruled unconstitutional and Section 23 of our Manitoba Act 1870 was reinstated as being the law of the land for equal status of the English and the French languages.

Ladies and gentlemen, I feel that our provincial government is handicapped. Is it pressure by individuals who misunderstand or who are poorly

informed? Is it partisan politics? Is it political trade off for a still undisclosed bounty?

I recognize that public opinion at times favours the status quo. However, after the famous decision of Chief Justice Samuel Freedman rendered public April 25, 1979, concurred in by his colleagues of the Manitoba Court of Appeal, and upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada by unanimous decision last December, Manitoba has a moral duty to respect the Constitution of this province and in particular, Section 23. Manitoba does appear foolish in the eyes of Canadians by adopting the attitude of Premier Rene Levesque towards the second official language.

I am reminded of Pierre Babin's remarks: "Those who govern lead the blind, those who teach give men eyes."

If Manitoba effectively redeveloped bilingualism in this province as promised to Louis Riel and to the people in 1870, I am confident that Ontario would not be far behind in becoming a true member of Canada's bilingual family.

Alors avec le Nouveau-Brunswick, le Québec, l'Ontario et le Manitoba, plus de deux tiers de la population canadienne seraient sur la bonne voie de la coopération pour l'unité dans ce que j'appelle la Confédération II.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

So with New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario and Manitoba, over 2/3 of the nation would be on the right track for co-operation for the unity in what I call Confederation 11.

The other provinces, I am sure, could be encouraged to follow suit.

There I go, Mr. Chairman, my optimism is overflowing again. I keep forgetting that old habits die hard. Perhaps you could all benefit, however, from a brief flashback on Canada. In an article written several years ago entitled "Manitoba Schooling Involves Many PM's, Bob Bowman had this to say:

"One of the most bitter and puzzling issues in Canadian political history resulted from Manitoba's decision to abolish separate schools in 1890. It not only rocked Manitoba, but Parliament in Ottawa as well. It went through all the courts, and even to the Privy Council in Britain. Prime Minister's MacDonald, Abbott, Thompson, MacKenzie Bowell, Tupper and Laurier were all involved. Six Prime Ministers in six years.

"When Canada acquired the northwest from the Hudson's Bay Company in 1870, one of the deals made to Louis Riel was that there would be state-supported schools for Roman Catholics in Manitoba. By 1890 the complexion of Manitoba had been changed by the influx of Protestant settlers and the provincial government decided to abolish separate schools.

"Sir John A. MacDonald escaped most of the row because he died in 1891. Sir John Abbott, his successor, got it full force. He was glad to resign and get out of it after one year.

"Then Sir John Thompson, a Roman Catholic, became Prime Minister and seemed to be making some progress when he died suddenly while having lunch with Queen Victoria at Windsor Castle in 1894.

"Sir MacKenzie Bowell was next, and he was in the worst position of all. MacKenzie Bowell was a former Grand Master of the Orange Order, but it was Conservative policy to try to restore separate schools in Manitoba. So he, the Orangemen, was supporting Roman Catholics, while Wilfrid Laurier, the Roman Catholic Leader of the Opposition, was supporting the protestants. The Liberal view was that the federal government had no right to interfere in education, a provincial matter.

"There was a Cabinet crisis in Ottawa on July 7, 1895, that forced Mackenzie Bowell to resign a few months later when seven of his Ministers left the government.

"Sir Charles Tupper, one of the Fathers of Confederation, in London as Canadian High Commissioner since 1894, was recalled to lead the Conservatives as Prime Minister and was defeated by Wilfrid Laurier in 1896.

"So Wilfrid Laurier eventually achieved a compromise after he became Prime Minister in 1896. It was arranged to have religious teaching in the last half-hour of school by christian priests and clergymen, but children were not forced to attend."

The perils of party politics never ceases] I believe it is characteristic of politicians to claim that they within a party are the only ones that are right. Compromise appears to be too difficult.

On the school question in Manitoba I have often heard politicians say: "The school question will be resolved only when we are in power, not before."

M. le président, after having made all these references about religious faith, the school question in Manitoba and the rest, one may still believe that our constitutional debate is either a religious conflict or an English versus French struggle. Far from that, ladies and gentlemen. May I assure those who may be so concerned, that the future of this country hangs on more than just two official languages. It is a question of respect for all cultures and languages. Canada can neither be an English or French "melting pot". By recognizing this simple fact one will readily see that there is room in Canada's developing culture for contributions by the various ethnic communities which form the great Canadian mosaic.

Without a firm resolve, however, to make this nation effectively bilingual, we are promoting the two solitude theory. We are perpetuating a schizophrenic society, bilingual at the federal level and unilingual, at the provincial levels. People tend to ghettoize and that is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Chairman, Madam, oppression against an official minority leaves no hope for the other minorities.

It was undoubtedly to keep people in the dark that the Manitoba governments of 1892, 1909, 1977, failed to recognize the injustice of the iniquitous law of 1890. In 1892 in the County Court of La Verendrye in Sainte-Anne, in 1909 in the county court of St. Boniface and in 1977 in my own case, our governments refused to appeal the court decisions which declared the 1890 law ultra vires and unconstitutional.

Et maintenant en 1980, je sens qu'on m'a volé quelque chose. Je crois que le gouvernement a des conseillers qui lui recommandent de faire tout effort possible pour enlever la section 23 de notre constitution. Je ne peux pas expliquer pourquoi le

département de notre procureur-général n'a pas traité comme priorité la traduction officielle des actes de la cours, des tribunaux et les rglements ainsi que celui de la ville de Winnipeg.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

Now, in 1980, I feel cheated. I have the feeling that the government advisors are recommending to them to do everything possible to remove Section 23 from our Constitution. I cannot explain why the Attorney-General's department has not treated as a priority the official translation of the court acts and the regulations as well as The City of Winnipeg Act.

As you may recall, I need those four documents in my appeal of the parking ticket conviction of July 27th, 1976. No, my case isn't finished. At the rate we are going it may be 1985 before I can dispose of my case.

Can I be blamed for being wary of provincial governments vis-a-vis language rights? Can you blame me for suggesting that the federal government must consider plugging the loopholes which now could under some circumstances allow Manitoba, Quebec or any other province to opt out of certain terms of union?

M. le président, plus tôt dans mes remarques, je vous disais qu'il n'y avait pas suffisamment de garanties pour les droits linguistiques ou l'anchssemment des droits linguistiques dans la résolution proposée. Je vous réfre maintenant aux sections 34 et 43 de l'Acte du Canada 1980:

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

Mr. Chairman, earlier I stated that I believed that there was not sufficient guarantees for the entrenchment of language rights in the proposed resolution. I now refer you to Sections 34 and 43 of The Canada Act of 1980:

Section 34: "Until Part V comes into force, an amendment to the Constitution of Canada in relation to any provision that applies to one or more, but not all provinces, may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor-General under the Great Seal of Canada where so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and by the Legislative Assembly or government of each province to which the amendment applies."

This section provides a special rule whereby some amendments that would not apply to all provinces, such as language rights, such as the terms of union with certain provinces, could be made where authorized by both Houses of Parliament and the Legislative Assemblies of the provinces concerned.

Section 43 is the same but it's after the two-year period of the Constitution.

The Manitoba government since 1870 has not had an enviable record in the realm of human rights, particularly minority language rights. However "hope springs eternal", and today's experience is one of them. And there are signs that Manitoba is working hard at bringing about the restoration of justice in that field.

M. le président, je me demande si le gouvernement de cette province agit en bonne foi.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the government of this province is acting in good taste.

Premier Lyon says that the Bill of Rights disembowels the British parliamentary system because it replaces parliamentary supremacy with what he calls "judge-made laws". Our Premier maintains that "rights are better protected by the Legislature". My own experience of the past four years has proven that our legislative government has not protected my rights until told to do so by the Supreme Court of Canada.

I have been waiting for 11 months now for a timetable whereby the Manitoba government proposes to restore the entrenched rights legislation of 1870. Besides the simultaneous translation service in the Legislature and the publication in both official languages, all I want to know at this time is the government's commitment to respecting the letter and spirit of the law.

Tel que Louis Riel l'avait dit durant un discours politique en 1874, "Tout ce que nous voulons, c'est l'application de l'Acte du Manitoba de 1870, rien de plus, mais également rien de moins."

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

As Louis Riel said during a political speech in 1874, "All that we want is the application of The Manitoba Act of 1870, nothing more but equally nothing less".

Section 23 of The Manitoba Act stipulates, "Either the English or the French language may be used by any persons in the debates of the Legislature, but those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses."

Pray tell me, is the Manitoba Gazette not a record or a journal, and I don't believe it is being published in French as yet? Is The Wills Act in the process of being translated? It should be an absolute priority. At my own office I help people to prepare their wills and nine out of ten times they want to have it in French. As it is, I believe it will have to be translated in English before it is probated and I don't think that should be.

We are told that there is a dire need of translators. What is the government doing to remedy this situation, at least on a long-range basis? Our schools, our universities, should be promoting this now important area in the communication of justice.

Mesdames et Messieurs, où aurais-je pu me tourner pour avoir le respect de mes droits sinon devant les tribunaux du pays?

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

Ladies and Gentlemen, where could I have turned for the respect of my rights if not to the courts of the land?

Even now, while claiming Legislative supremacy, Premier Lyon of Manitoba is going to the courts to seek an opinion. Evidently the courts are the means to enforce constitutional rights.

Parliamentary supremacy has produced segregation in the southern states. Parliamentary supremacy has produced the apartheid monstrosity of South Africa. Parliamentary supremacy in the hands of unscrupulous politicians can become the tyranny of the majority.

On another point, Mr. Chairman, may I add that while opposing the entrenchment of rights in the name of parliamentary democracy, can we imagine why we are here today providing opinion on the matter of the proposed resolution, when the Manitoba government has already taken a unilateral position? I believe that is called "consultation after the fact". The democratic process can be flouted at will when a majority government considers itself supreme over constitutional guarantees.

J'ai été réticent dans la décision de venir ici devant vous aujourd'hui. La démocratie après les faits m'apparaît être du verbiage politique. Je suis encouragé toutefois en réalisant que le gouvernement doit changer . . . doit le faire. Je pourrais souhaiter bonne chance au gouvernement de M. Lyon, mais à moins qu'il y ait des changements, je crois que sa crédibilité lui manque et qu'il va tôt ou tard, comme premier ministre, doit se retirer ou être retiré. Le rapport de ce comité toutefois va survivre; il sera retenu; il sera usage pour d'autres gouvernements.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

I was reluctant to make the decision of appearing before you today, democracy, after the fact, appears to me to be political verbiage. I take heart, however, in realizing that the government must change as this one must. I could wish the Lyon government long life, but unless changes occur, I am afraid that his credibility is missing and that sooner or later as a Premier he will have to either retire or be retired. The report of this committee, however, will survive. It will be retained; it will be useful to other governments.

People generally agree that the federal government's politically motivated plan of treating civil servants as learning a second language was a failure. These same critics rightfully say that the second language should be taught from kindergarten on. But what are we waiting for?

I would like to speak to you about three points here.

En 1978, j'étais invité à parler à l'occasion de la Journée du patrimoine à l'école Kelvin High School. Et après avoir présenté ma conférence, une jeune fille du nom Blair Lockheart s'est levée pour me remercier. Elle parlait cette fille, je crois qu'elle était en onzième année, elle parlait un français impeccable tellement que je me suis fermé les yeux et j'aurais juré que c'était Sa majesté la reine Élisabeth qui parlait.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

In 1978, I was asked to speak at the Kelvin High School on Heritage Day, and after having spoken, a young girl called Blair Lockheart stood up and thanked me. She was speaking — and I think she was in Grade 11 — in absolutely impeccable French, so much so that I closed my eyes and I would have sworn that it was Queen Elizabeth speaking.

Shanon Burns: Shanon Burns is the granddaughter of former Premier Doug Campbell. Shanon Burns took her kindergarten at Madame Ragot. She went to Sacre Coeur. She finally did her secondary schooling in St. Boniface College and

graduated last year with a Bachelor of Arts degree at St. Boniface College University. People will say, well, there is an anglophone who can speak French. As far as I am concerned, she is a true Canadian. She can possibly and effectively can speak as good French as I.

Like this young Blair Lockheart, that I mentioned before at Kelvin High School, who is now taking her Bachelor's degree at University of Manitoba, these two persons at least, and there are hundreds more, and with Manitoba now at the forefront of all Canadian provinces in immersion schools, I am sure that is the way to go.

What I would like to add and this is the point that I have been pleading with. I pleaded with the government here. This is one of the rights that should be natural and recognized, that teaching of languages should be effectively started in kindergarten when the children between the ages of 6 and 10 can best learn other languages.

Lee Colvar is the daughter of our Dick Colvar, formerly the Leader of the Conservatives in Saskatchewan. Lee Colvar is a personal friend of my son. She is perfectly bilingual. She is teaching English in a university just south of Leon, France. It's ironic to see an individual like Dick Colvar who, sometime ago when he was more spoken about, who has said that French language is not compatible in the west and yet his daughter is perfectly bilingual. He was born too early.

Manitoba is foremost in the nation in the field of immersion schools. Manitoba has a duty to restore the balance of justice. There are no two ways about that.

I recall that former Premier Duff Roblin, was telling the people of Manitoba who were pressing for school rights during his term of office, saying, repeating, "Keep talking about it, keep talking".

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, yes, il nous faut parlementer, mais il ne faut pas exclure l'action positive in setting the stage for the future development of our nation. We have to move into action, . . .

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

. . . we have to talk about it, but we do not have to exclude the positive action . . .

As I look into the future, I can see that most Canadians will not only speak Canada's official languages but a third, fourth and fifth. That is the summit I am striving to reach. Believe me, Canada will then be the mecca of higher learning in the world. Remember, languages are the tools of life's learning.

The art of languages is the basic art of communication. We begin to communicate and we are on the way to greater understanding and peaceful co-existence with others when we can talk with their tongues, listen with their ears, see with their eyes through their own language.

Mr. Chairman, madam, gentlemen, you will be seen in the future as being Manitoba's chief corps of advisers to the Fathers of our new Confederation. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Forest, will you permit questions?

MR. FOREST: Yes, oui, Monsieur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Forest, in your presentation you make some references to priorities of translation of court acts, etc. About, sir, two weeks ago, a little less than two weeks ago, I issued somewhat of a status report on translation. Are you familiar with the . . .

MR. FOREST: I wasn't at their press conference, Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: There was no press conference, sir, but are you aware, sir, that some 1,500 pages of legislation is being translated including 14 Bills, including a very large Public Schools Act, that legal translation has been under the direction of a Mr. Belair, who has been seconded to the province by the Federal Department of the Secretary of State? We've contracted with three translators from Ottawa; that we have advertised for qualified legal translators and out of 40 applicants, after advertising in Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec city, only one passed the civil test indicating the difficulty of finding qualified legal translators; that we are supplying translators to the courts and making people available there; that New Brunswick, since they passed their Official Languages Act, 11 years ago have only now turned to their regulations.

I'll give you, sir, a copy of this release that indicates where we are and attempts to point out the effort that is being made, but some of the difficulties also that are being faced by the translation people within the department.

MR. FOREST: I'd be pleased to have the official text, Mr. Chairman. However, in response to his question as to whether I was aware of all this, I must say that I recall seeing the article in the newspaper, and like I always do on such important questions, I possibly have taken the clipping.

My feeling, however, is whilst there is a problem, for example, as an analogy, if we were to suddenly discover that we had all the oil that we needed in this province and we had to explore it, would we not be rushing to our universities and get them to produce engineers and the necessary technology to gather that resource? I'm sure of that.

A very effective case in point is that of the hydro-electric power in Quebec. The universities in Quebec have produced enough electrical technology engineers that they are now in the position to export that technology throughout the world.

I am saying here, Mr. Chairman, that even if it takes another generation to prepare translators, to prepare bilingual lawyers, bilingual judges, is anything being done today on this the 18th day of November, 1980, or is it left to hazard, left to he who may wish to, he who may be able to afford? I'm confident. If the government isn't doing it, I'm sure that the people, through the efforts of the parents for French and the immersion school groups, are, however, difficult it might be at times.

I recall the hassle of the parents for French in St. James. Ironically, I remember reading an article by Vic Grant about him pressing parents in Fort Garry

to attend a course or to attend a meeting where immersion courses were to be discussed and he was all in favour of it.

I'm saying that it is good; it is great, but I really don't care too much about all the efforts made on translating the laws of yesterday. I would expect that somehow or other we would take the necessary means to make sure that no more injustice is done and that the languages on that score in Manitoba are treated in equal rights.

If not today, when is the timetable? When will that be? This is it. If it's going to be left like this, we'll always be walking with one foot shorter than the other and we'll always be hobbling along. I would like to know exactly when will the full restoration be possible.

MR. MERCIER: Sir, if you don't care about the translation of acts, why did you say in your brief you are concerned about the priority of court acts, The City of Winnipeg Acts?

MR. FOREST: The priorities are there because we do need them, and as I mentioned, the reason why those were mentioned is because of my court case. I don't know just whether we have not pressed enough for them or we have just been patient and I'm prepared to be patient for a long time. Even after I'm gone, I'm sure that the question is now enough in the open that it will continue to remedy itself. But I certainly would like to be relieved of this somewhat pressure of knowing that the case is not terminated.

I say that there should be more importance on the everyday practice of the reinstatement of the official languages of Canada and it's in that field. The reason why I have dwelled on it is that I find that — and to get back to the point in case of the Constitution that is being proposed — entrenchment has to be strongly secured; otherwise, we have no hope.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Desjardins.

M. DESJARDINS: M. Forest, je vous ai cout avec attention. Il me semblait que parfois vous aviez montr un peu de discouragement mais un peu plus tard, vous redeveniez l'eternel optimiste.

J'aimerais vous poser une question.

SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION:

I have listened to you with great attention. It seemed to me that occasionally you had a tone of discouragement, but periodically you became the eternal optimist. I would like to ask you a question now.

I would like to ask you this question in English, Mr. Forest. I wonder if you could be kind enough to answer it in English because some of the people here are not fortunate enough to have the instrument that will give them the translation.

In a way I might find that I'm putting you on the spot, but I think that this is something that should be answered. In some quarters you might have the reputation as a person that invites conflict, that would like to encourage a confrontation. Now, if the means were given the Franco-Manitobans for them to enjoy what they consider their fundamental rights, can you envisage, can you see a change in climate

that would make it possible to co-exist the francophone and the rest of Manitoba in a better way and work for the betterment of Manitoba in an atmosphere of unity and serenity? Could you elaborate on that or are you a professional . . .

MR. FOREST: Agitator.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . agitator. Could you tell us that?

MR. FOREST: No, Mr. Chairman. My struggle for rights in Manitoba were initially confined to the community of St. Boniface. Some of you may recall the antics that I went through in 1960 when I lead a delegation from St. Boniface called the Metro March against Metro. That all came about as a result of Mayor Juba sending us a letter of congratulations on the birth of our daughter, Nicole, in the fall of 1959. He came to our house in 1960 and he says, "I don't want to gobble up St. Boniface". Lo and behold, ten years later or so, Juba was then the super mayor and St. Boniface was no more.

Somehow I have the faculty of foreseeing this, but I was fighting, and then on the last rung of the ladder in 1976 when I got a unilingual ticket in St. Boniface — undoubtedly, if I got one, they were being issued to everybody — I felt that this was the last straw.

I was going to court to obtain an injunction to prevent the city from issuing tickets until they came back bilingual, because tickets in St. Boniface have always been bilingual, always been bilingual. If Judge Walker on the 27th of July had said this, "It is true that The Official Language Act of 1890 makes the courts English in Manitoba and things have to be transacted in English here, however, because we have recognized St. Boniface history and St. Boniface cultural presence in allowing the use of both languages under Section 80(3) of The City of Winnipeg Act and this communication is unilingual, case dismissed". I would have been very happy, that's all I was looking for, but he opened this pandora box about constitutional rights and said that the ticket had to be in English. Lo and behold, if I hadn't appealed it, we would have had unilingual English tickets in St. Boniface.

How many people by the hundreds have asked me if they could put their hands on a unilingual English ticket in St. Boniface today? I can tell them they can get one for speeding. They can get one for moving too fast on the street or making a wrong turn, but they cannot get a parking ticket anymore. As a matter of fact, you are all aware that last May, a day or so after the referendum, the City of Winnipeg passed an order stating that next time they print traffic tickets in Winnipeg they will all be bilingual for the entire city.

Am I to suggest that the city is moving faster than the province? I don't know that the province has yet taken a stand on making sure that the RCMP, which is a federal force and act bilingual, generally, could have at their disposition, as well as the police force of all the city, bilingual speeding tickets, bilingual summonses, whatever they are called.

I have and I have a tendency, Mr. Desjardins, to appear depressed at times. It's a question possibly of anxiety. One of the most recent incidents in my

office — I am reluctant to relate, but I think I should — reveals a very deep wound, a very deep attitude, and I'm talking about mixed marriages. I recognize now as I look over my files, some of the 2,000 customers who have chosen to slam the door on my nose and go to another agency, this recent incident was when a man, practically crying, said, "I've had to cancel my insurance at your office because my wife insisted we do so." So this is where we're at.

Now, I am suffering not unduly because fortunately I have my own children working at the office and my business has been good and it's recovering. I have had a young chap come into my office just in the past four days bringing me his entire fleet of trucks, moved into Manitoba from Quebec and he says, "I've chosen to come to you, Mr. Forest, because your name is well known". He says, "I think perhaps you're the man I should do business with". That's quite relieving.

My own argument or my own plea to you, gentlemen, is to recognize, let's be serious about what we are going to do about this factor of our national identity, and I come back to the point, I think it's in the schools that it can be achieved. Unless parents today do not want their children to learn a second or third or fourth language, I think the children themselves are prepared to go that route. They are prepared to go that route, and they will be better citizens, and better Canadians, and better world people for it.

I don't know whether it has answered your question completely, Mr. Desjardins

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, just partly. My question was, if these were changed, if you felt that, and the Franco-Manitobans felt that were given the means, could you see the climate change to have a province where everybody would pull together, not necessarily in uniformity, but in . . .

MR. FOREST: I foresee the day, Mr. Chairman, where there will be no need for simultaneous translation. I foresee the day, Mr. Chairman, where there will be no need for La Societe franco-manitobaine, there should be no more need for it than there should exist today a Societe Franco or Anglo Manitobaine. These organizations are there just because there is a struggle, because you have to, as I think it was, one of the early Presidents of the United States said, "The price of freedom is continuous vigilance".

No, I am confident if there were steps, if there were positive steps, and then again, allow me to say this. Mr. Chairman, I was told last January that the government was not going to be too, too progressive on the practice of bringing French back into Manitoba because they had received 25 letters that were very strongly against it. I'd like to have those 25 letters to compare them with some 25 and more that I've got, possibly the same people.

No, the government has to show leadership and move ahead. It is because of the attitudes of the governments of Canada, the provincial governments of Canada, that Trudeau stands so high today.

It is because of the opposition that I got from my own community that I was able to some time last month receive a recognition, international recognition, from the French-speaking

parliamentarians of the world. I do not want the recognition; I want everybody to be in the same boat and to row in unison. I think we can arrive at that, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry to say that I discard totally, to get back on course, this idea of not entrenching the rights in the Constitution.

Someone suggested to me this morning that Mr. Green yesterday had a very strong argument against the entrenchment by saying that it was going to remove the rights of labour and unions and that. Undoubtedly, the only reason why he is saying it is because the labour movement is in such a strong power today that they have political clout. But if the labour movement were in the position of the Catholic Women's League or other groups without political clout, I think perhaps that they wouldn't really be that concerned; they'd be more effectively working trying to make their voice heard.

Now, I'll come back on that point if I might just take a tangent, Mr. Chairman, is to emphasize the fact that I am for the entrenchment of human rights and the language rights in the Constitution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Westbury.

MRS. WESTBURY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson, and I wanted to thank Monsieur Forest for a moving presentation.

However, I want to ask him, I hope he'll forgive me because I smiled, almost chuckled, when he made reference to his experiences in the receiving of justice through legislatures and legislative processes, and I wanted to ask Monsieur Forest whether he has any comment on the suggestions that have been made to me to the effects that the reason our Premier is so opposed to rights being left eventually to the Supreme Court is because of the experience our Premier has had with Monsieur Forest and the Supreme Court, and the fact that only the Supreme Court in the end upheld Monsieur Forest's rights. So that it's a mixed blessing in one sense, if it has, in the opinion of some people, so embittered our Premier that he no longer has confidence in that judiciary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question, Mrs. Westbury?

MRS. WESTBURY: That was my question.

MR. FOREST: Your question was — I got the question.

MRS. WESTBURY: It was carefully placed in the form of a question.

MR. FOREST: I do agree that it possibly is something like that, that possibly makes Mr. Lyon reticent in moving ahead and recognizing what the federal government is proposing.

On that same score, and I am more familiar with what appears to be ludicrous on the part of Mr. Levesque, who is currently telling the people and he's convincing a lot of them, that with this entrenched rights the Quebec people will lose the right which they recently acquired by Bill 101 to have French as the only official language. Now, isn't that ludicrous. In other words, you can have a right put in

your Constitution by legislative process whenever you want, even if it's a right to step on somebody.

I don't think that my right goes any further than the end of my arm. If I interfere with somebody I lose my rights. This is, I think, possibly what's happening. I mentioned it in my remarks that it sounds foolish to see our provincial government in bed politically, so to speak, with the Quebec government on this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Watch that phrasing.

MR. FOREST: It's not a word to be used. The bedrooms of the nation.

MRS. WESTBURY: Collectively, not individually.

MR. FOREST: At any rate, I think that's it. I was in Ottawa to receive this decoration on the 12th of September last, and as I mentioned earlier, I heard the remarks made by Mr. Stanfield. This is something that I haven't touched, but I am not in agreement either of having the use of French across the nation where numbers require. You will remember Mr. Stanfield's remark, "If a blind person comes and asks for rights, are you going to say I'm sorry, but when your number is sufficient you will get your rights. No, I don't think that one should do that because choosing numbers will tend to ghettoize.

Should the people in Carberry, should the people in Brandon, Flin Flon, wherever, not have an opportunity as Canadian English-speaking people, who are learning French to be able to say, yes, it's coming. Our generation of young children will all be exposed to this process. This is the way we've got to go. I think we've got to look ahead. Too much of our people are looking only as far as their nose.

At this particular occasion, also in Ottawa, I do remember that the Premiers in their opposition, were stating emphatically that they were in favour of Quebec. It was strange to see the nine or ten Premiers of Canada, saying, Mr. Levesque, you're the greatest thing that's happened in this country. Don't make any bones about it. Mr. Levesque is a dedicated separatist. He wants to have a right in the Constitution to separate Quebec from Canada. Don't make any bones about it. That's his course of action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder, I have Mr. Schroeder on the list next. I wonder if we could have our questions short and the answers short. We want to move along to some other delegations if we can before 5:30. Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And I have Mr. Uskiw.

MR. SCHROEDER: I will try to keep my question fairly short. The first one is: Mr. Forest, have you seen a copy of the argument presented by the Government of Manitoba to the Court of Appeal in Manitoba with respect to its challenge to the Government of Canada on its bringing the Constitution . . .

MR. FOREST: No, I haven't, but I have called my lawyer last week. Last week I called my lawyer and

asked him to look into it, in the possibility of filing, before the 20th of this month, a counterproposal.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Forest, on Page 16 of that argument, you'll then be surprised to know that the case which you referred to, that is of Forest versus the Attorney-General of Manitoba, is being quoted by the Government of Manitoba in support of its arguments against the entrenchment of rights, against everything that the Government of Canada is attempting to do in this Bill, The Canadian Constitution 1980 Act.

They, in fact, state on Page 16 of that argument that Manitoba joined the union as a province pursuant to an act of the Dominion Parliament, but here preceding this statute were negotiations with the inhabitants of the future province. In Forest versus AG of Manitoba, 1979, 4WWR, 229 at Page 245, Chief Justice Freedman said that the inhabitants of Manitoba were, "If induced to support the creation of a province and its union with Canada, only on the basis that their rights would be insured for the future". This particular brief goes on to say that the Chief Justice was, of course, there referring to the French-speaking inhabitants and their linguistic rights, but the entire community was involved in negotiations and the rights demanded included provincial status and the powers, rights and privileges therefrom arising. The question is Mr. Forest . . .

MR. FOREST: What side are they on?

MR. SCHROEDER: They are very clearly, Mr. Forest, on the side of the reactionaries, on the side of those opposing the patriation of the Constitution, in support of those opposed to a Bill of Rights. Do you have any comments on the use of that case in opposition to your proposition?

MR. FOREST: I don't know. It sounds rather strange for them to quote my case, which is supportive of The 1870 Manitoba Act, Section 23, which entrenched use of French in the courts and the Legislature of Manitoba, and my victory in front of Judge Freedman and his colleagues, unanimous of course, and then unanimous again in Ottawa on the 13th of December last when both decisions, that of my case and that of the Blaikie case for the English-speaking minority of Quebec were rendered. I have often on occasion congratulated the powers that be for having brought the decisions down at the same time because the two are parallel, and its justice for one and justice for the other. You cannot divide human rights and say human rights are going to be good for people in one province and not for another, or language rights the same way. It's got to be across the land. I'm going to have to study that, sir, and I'll have possibly more comment later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw:

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Yes. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Forest whether or not he places greater emphasis on entrenchment of language rights as opposed to a complete Charter of Rights?

MR. FOREST: I have to admit that without being paranoid, my expertise is on language rights. I have had umpteen times the occasion of participating in human rights debates, the Human Rights Commission of Manitoba. Unfortunately, two weeks ago I was to be present at a conference at the University of Manitoba, but at the same time pre-arranged, I had to be in Ottawa. I have to admit that I've got a penchant for language rights, but I am at the same time recognizing that you cannot separate one with the other — language rights go along with human rights, because it connects there, one and the same parcel.

MR. USKIW: To pursue that further then, are you saying that if through the process of negotiations between the Prime Minister of Canada and the provinces, at some stage there was some agreement which might limit the extent to which rights are going to be entrenched, and that that limitation would simply centre on entrenchment of language rights as a beginning to constitutional reform? Would you then not support that position if it was going to be sort of either an entrenchment of language rights only, or entrenchment of language rights as a first step in the evolution of our Constitution?

MR. FOREST: You're saying, separating the two, human rights and language rights, and entrenchment. My feeling at this moment for my own purpose, my own continuation of what I have been doing for the past four years, would be to say, yes, for me language rights is foremost; but as I mentioned just a few moments ago, I at the same time recognize that human rights, and on that score one could ask, "Why should a province be against entrenchment of human rights which says, elections will be held every five years"? That's one of the conditions, and the transportation of the freedom of movement across the nation. Are provincial politicians and premiers against that, and for what reason? I can adopt those. I can go along with all of those and I think that whatever dangers there might be in entrenchment of rights, they are minimal compared to the massive advantages that they would have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Forest. Any further questions from the committee? You insist, eh? Mr. Einarson.

MR. EINARSON: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in the comments that Mr. Forest made about three different people that he chose to select here and complimented them: Miss Lockheart, Shanon Burns and Lee Colvar. I noted a comment you made, sir, and I just want to make sure that I haven't misunderstood, because I think it's wonderful to be able to speak a number of languages. Don't misunderstand me. But you indicated and used the name Shanon Burns as being qualified to speak the French language as well as the English language and you thought that this person was really a truly Canadian. I ask you, if she was not able to speak the French language, how would you describe her?

MR. FOREST: Well, she is truly Canadian also, but I think she has taken a greater step towards the

Canadian identity and Canadian culture that eventually will develop. We're developing a culture. You know, the nation is only 100 years old. And it cannot be an English culture nor a French culture; it's going to be Canadian. Our friends to the south are Americans, though they happen to speak English, they are not an English country. They are Americans. And we, I think, should be working and setting our sights on being truly Canadians with, of course, respecting the two languages of the country. I'm not adding anything new. You know for yourself if there are two official languages in Canada.

MR. EINARSON: But really, Mr. Chairman, all I was asking, I wanted to make sure that I didn't misunderstand Mr. Forest when he would say, if a person was not able to speak the French language but spoke English, say, or even spoke another language other than French is still not truly . . .

MR. FOREST: Absolutely, absolutely.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No further questions for Mr. Forest? I have Mrs. Friesen of Headingly next on the list.

MRS. FRIESEN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. FRIESEN: There was a Mr. Cyr spoke earlier that he may become unemployed if he were not heard today and I would waive my invitation from you and let him speak so that he could carry on with his job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine, Mrs. Friesen. I'm merely going by the list in front of me. Mr. Dennis Cyr, 400 Pritchard Avenue. Thank you, Mrs. Friesen.

MR. DENNIS CYR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cyr, do you have copies of your brief for distribution?

MR. CYR: No, I do not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You haven't?

MR. CYR: I have just basically notes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CYR: And they're not a continual flow. I've listened to the eloquence of some of the speakers and some of the articles they have brought up and they are very diversified and very well, but I look upon myself as basically your "man on the street" interview. That's basically how I'm going to go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. CYR: The material that I've gathered to speak on basically I gathered through the media, which I have all of my press clippings for the last few

months, and through television, Cable 7, on the parliamentary debates in Ottawa.

First of all, I've listened to a lot of the people speak and they're speaking basically about what they would like to see, what type of rights entrenched or whatever in a new constitution, whatever, whereas I think for myself the gist I got from your letter, that I got from the Clerk, was that you were seeking out opinions, my opinion, in regard to the Manitoba position that they are taking regarding the Constitution as well as my opinion regarding the federal position in the Constitution.

First of all, I might say that I was raised as a Liberal. My foster parents, I was raised with foster parents and we were raised as children as Liberals. Right up until the first time I voted, which happened to be in 1968, I too got caught up in the Trudeaumania and I voted Liberal. I've amended my ways since then, thank goodness, and I never will again vote — I don't say I never will again vote Liberal. I never will vote as long as Mr. Trudeau is in power. Also, at the time I must mention that I was raised anti-Conservative and I've always been anti-Conservative until I heard Mr. Lyon speak at the Premiers' Conference in August. I was unemployed at the time so I happened to be able to catch all of the conference in Ottawa and it's at that time that I was able to form some opinions as to what is happening to this country. Even at the first time I voted — you know, a lot of people go out and vote, and vote, vote, they just go and mark an X and they go home. They don't know who or why they are voting. I've done that in the past. I have wakened up now and I think I'm going to vote better and I'll be more observant in the future.

I want to say, first of all, right off the bat, that my opinion as far as the federal government repatriating the Constitution with their amending formula and the Charter of Rights, I am totally dead against. I hesitate to even try to go to Ottawa to speak to that committee. I might seek out the gentleman, the First Prime Minister of the land and I might punch him in the nose myself because I think he deserves it. I sort of watched how the parliamentarians react in the House of Commons. It's sort of like a little bit of a circus, I guess, with the head magician, the maestro, Mr. Trudeau, governing things there. Basically, I say at this conference of the Premiers, when the leaked document came out, I wanted to get a copy, I don't know how or where to obtain a copy, if it's possible, of this leaked document, but some of the articles that were brought out in it, I can see as the days progress what Mr. Trudeau, in my opinion, is trying to pull over on the people of Canada.

He talks about 53 years that we've tried to come to some agreement to bring home our Constitution. As far as I'm concerned, be it 53 years or 530 years, we are going to try to build a better country for ourselves, for our children and so on. It may take more than 53 years. It was also brought up at the time of the debates of the proposed federal resolution that the combined time was 24 hours. Well, in those 53 years, the combined time dedicated to constitutional talks, I imagine, would be no more than a few weeks. When we're building our nation, 53 years may not be enough time and if there hasn't been agreement by the Premiers in that time, perhaps we're not ready for it yet. We're still young.

One gentleman this morning mentioned Sweden in 1949 how they incorporated their Freedom of Information — Sweden, I believe it was. I imagine they have been around a lot longer than we have or the Americans. And if it took until 1949 for them to come to this decision . . . I mean, we're babies compared to them. We've got a lot to learn.

I don't think that Mr. Trudeau had a mandate to talk of repatriation of the Constitution. He also claimed that he speaks for the people. I agree with other opinions that he speaks for central Canada. I know how the different seats are situated. I mean, how many seats Ontario has, and Quebec, and once he's got through Quebec and Ontario, I mean the rest is a forgone conclusion. We have no say-so; we do not. So what does he do? He sends out one of his Cabinet Ministers, his marionette, Mr. Axworthy; he sends him out here to try to string us along. Well, I'm not going to be strung along by him. He takes away, from what I've read recently and if I'm to understand, the federal government has taken away their share of what they were going to contribute to the City of Winnipeg, of money for the core area. In the meantime he sends Mr. Axworthy here to open up a new federal office of some technical, whatever, type of office. That's not going to help me. I mean I'm not in the upper echelon of the community as far as working is concerned. I'm down there at the bottom. Like I say, I've taken two days off work. If my boss turns around and finds I'm gone, I maybe had it. But what I'm getting at is what he's trying to put back here into the west is something that is not going to help me. I don't know if it's going to help my children should they choose to take that route.

I don't like the way Mr. Trudeau brought out the resolution so suddenly and then he knew that the budget had to be brought out. So then he brought in closure. And then if the Conservatives said, well, we want to continue talking about the Constitution, he says, well, then you're not interested in what else is happening. You're not interested in getting on with the budget.

Well, even that budget . . . this wasn't a budget; that was an energy policy. A lot of it I go along with. I don't like the idea of having to pay more for my heating but I know somewhere down the line it's going to have to happen. We all know that. Everything goes up, it doesn't come down, except horseshoes.

I think it was this morning, Mr. Mercier asked Mr. Scott about a situation in the future where we might have a despotic ruler who might do harm to this nation. We don't have to look to the future. Our despotic ruler is there now; he's over in Saudi Arabia, and he isn't speaking French, as far as I'm concerned.

I would also like to speak on the amending formula. The amending formula in my opinion, that the the government has put forward . . . well, you know what I think about that. I go along with the basic consensus that the Premiers came to, the Vancouver consensus. I don't fully understand it, but the fact that the Premiers came to an agreement, I'm for it. I mean, if the majority of the people, our representatives at the government level can agree to it, then I agree that majority rules. Okay.

I think that also he's given two years to come up with a new type of formula. Why not four years? Why

not six years? Why only two? I think that he wants, this is my own opinion, I think that he wants — whether they come up with it or not, pardon me, they may fail because I think the veto powers that are there or the fact that he wouldn't like what they are coming up with, he will not agree to — but he wants them to come up with something while he's still in power. If he goes through his full four years as Prime Minister, two years from now he'll still have, what? Two-and-a-half years to go as Prime Minister. Then he can come up with a formula that he chooses. I don't agree with that.

I managed yesterday to get a copy through the Attorney-General's office — my own version, it's not very clear — of the resolution that the government is planning to send to Ottawa. I mean, as it stands, naturally there may be amendments. I doubt it. I know that in Part 5, Section 1, Subsection 2, I believe how you refer to it, they talk about the type of formula where Quebec has a say-so; Ontario has a say-so; the Atlantic provinces, whatever the number be; and the western provinces whatever the number may be. They also spell out what they mean by the Western provinces, who they mean by the Atlantic provinces, but they don't include the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. Who are they supposed to be included with? Are they included with the west? It's not in here that they are part of the west. In other words, they have no say-so. Maybe with the new technology there will be people living up in the north in domed houses or domed cities, whatever. What about them? They have no choice; they have no say-so. Under this formula they have, I agree that Prince Edward Island is going to no longer exist. They have no say-so. How are they ever going to have a say-so? Unless we all move down there for a weekend when they are having a big vote and we'll all be considered part of their province and vote with them, because population-wise, they wouldn't even hold that many people. So I don't agree with that type of formula. Like representation by population, somehow to me is okay but when it's used to the disadvantage of the country like I think it's being used now, I don't think it's working. I don't know what the answer is but I think more type of proportional representation at the federal level is important. Because, like I say, we have no say-so.

Mr. Trudeau said last week, I believe, on TV or the week before when he was in Regina, if you don't like it, go vote, the next election, go vote. Well, what good is it going to do me to vote for him or against him? Once it gets past Kenora, I've had it. The votes over; you might as well stay home. Quite a few of the people seem to be quoting American presidents. Well, also, there was another famous American president, Mr. Lincoln, who said you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. I think Mr. Trudeau is trying to fool all of the people for all time, and I'm dead set against that.

Language, here's a good one. I'm French. I was raised by foster parents who were French; I went to French schools when I was younger. Up until my high school, I was in College St. Joseph in Otterburne. I went to a couple of years there. I have nothing against French. I got married in '73; started having my children — which I have six, by the way — I'm

Catholic. I want to say though, when I got married, I had intended on sending my children to French schools to get French education. I thought it was a good thing. I would like to have gone to some form of night school to encourage myself, my wife, if you want it, to take up French, not because of an Official Languages Act or not because the government says I'm going to be a better Canadian because of it — because I wanted to have a second language. When I was young, I spoke French very well. I don't anymore. I don't anymore though because of choice. I don't wish to. If my children wish to learn French as they are growing up, fine. At a certain age they are going to be able to make their own choice. For now, they don't go to French schools and as long as I am — well, I am their father — they will not go to French schools because, believe it or not, I'm a Frenchman who is slowly becoming anti-French. Not against French people in general but against Prime Minister Trudeau and what he is trying to perpetrate on this country. That is what is turning me against the French faction. Yet, I always did like Rene Levesque, the Premier of Quebec. I think that if the Quebec people, whether they want to . . . I don't know if — my opinions aren't solid yet whether they should separate or not. I really don't have enough knowledge about that. But as far as whether they want to speak French in the province of Quebec, fine. I'm all for it, majority rules. If the majority of the people there wish to speak French and have the French language as their official language, who can say otherwise? In Manitoba here, if the majority of the people wish to speak English and make an official language of English, I'm all for that. In Alberta or Saskatchewan, if the majority of the people want to speak Ukrainian, I'm all for that. The majority of the people. Fine, I'm all for that.

We talk about equality and Canadian unity; we talk about one country; we talk about one central government; we talk about one flag, but we talk about two languages. I don't understand that; that doesn't sound equal to me. When I first heard of this B & B Report many years ago, I thought that the government might come to the conclusion — believe it or not, I was so naive. When I thought of bilingualism, I thought of two languages of a person's choice, be it French and German, whatever. I remember reading a paper once where Mr. Trudeau had gone to Nova Scotia or Newfoundland on some business and they had asked a driver at the airport or limousine, whatever, that they asked to have a bilingual driver pick him up at the airport — however they do it. So they arrange this. The fellow was bilingual; he spoke English and Gaelic. That's bilingual as far as I'm concerned. Two languages. But I want to choose the languages whatever they may be. I've also heard talk that if I want to move to Quebec, what about if I want to move to Quebec, take my children and what about speaking English while I'm there? Well, I know better than that. When I go to Tokyo, I don't expect them all to start speaking English because I'm there. If I move to Bangkok, if I move to Tel Aviv, I don't expect to have everybody there start speaking English for my benefit. I know that when I'm there, if I'm going to be there for any length of time, I'm going to learn their language; I'm going to learn their culture. But they're speaking their own language, they are living their own culture

by their own choice, whereas the way it is being put across Canadians now, it's not by choice, it's by decree.

I think it was Mr. Chretien who said a couple of weeks ago, also, that if they didn't try to entrench linguistic rights in their Bill of Rights in Britain before it came to Canada that it would never be done. Why would it never be done? Possibly because it's the will of the people that it never be done. And if the will of the people say that, who can go against it? Like when we talk about minorities, in all these federal talks that I've been watching, they often refer to a minority, end with a "y" or minorities, end with an "ies", but basically they are not talking minorities, they are talking about French, one minority. They are not talking about different types, Ukrainian, or German, Welsh or whatever. They are speaking of French. They are scared; sure they are scared, because they are going to be assimilated into an English type of society. But perhaps that's the way it should be. If it's the will of the people, that down the road, as Mr. Forest mentions, down the road — down this road.

I was reading a book recently called "The Troika Incident". It's about a futuristic human society where in the whole world, the basic language they all spoke was called Panlan. Maybe Canada is headed for something like that, because we know languages have evolved in Europe and whatnot and then over to this country. Eventually, maybe Canadian language will not be a total English and a total French. It may be some other type of language. We can't keep legislating to keep something alive if it's not the will of the people that it be alive. The percentage of French people in Quebec as compared to the English people in Quebec, sure, they're the minority, and that's where they should stay, the minority. Once they become the majority, fine, then they can have the vote and they can vote as a majority. That's the way I feel.

Also, another thing I have always wanted to know about French. I went and got a copy of The BNA Act about a week ago. Section 133 refers to use of the French language at the federal level or the courts in the parliamentary system would not . . . well, what about my box of cornflakes? Why does it have French on it? It's got nothing to do with the courts; it's got nothing to do with parliament. Why do I walk into a store sometimes and I have to start turning things around myself? Sure, the French people will say, well, we have to do the same thing when it's in English. But remember, I'm saying they're the minority and if the will of the people of Manitoba is that it be English, then so let it be English. I like to buy my products in the one language. I don't believe that they should have to be in two languages. When in Rome, do as the Romans do.

Rights, now, I want to talk about some rights. I'm against the federal Charter of Rights, but I am — being a Catholic, you will probably already know I am for pro life. I am pro life. If there is to be a Charter of Rights anywhere along the line, somewhere down the road, whatever, in the Constitution, I may go against the fact that I'm saying that I'm biased against this or that, but I am for pro life. To me, the idea of the right to life is the basic of all rights. Without the right to life, we don't have any other rights. If your mother had willed that

you be aborted, you wouldn't talking about rights to conscience, freedom and mobility, whatever. You wouldn't have any rights because you wouldn't be a person. We have to start right at the very moment. The most basic right is the right to life. If we haven't got that, we have nothing else. I'm pro life definitely. I'm totally against abortions, I hate to even say the word, because it makes me sick to think about it, for any case, for any reason. As far as I'm concerned, the right to life is not a type of right that even should be legislated by this body, or by a federal body, or a United Nations' body. The right to life to me is God given. He gives it; he takes it away. No one else.

Freedom of religion and education. My children go to a separate school right now. If there were no separate schools, guess what? My children would have to go to public schools. But you know what? They would go to public schools, but they would still get their religious education at home and they still do, even if they go to Catholic schools. My children still get additional religious education at home and in our church, because I am the first educator of my children. I don't always trust private schools to, in some of the subjects they teach, so I will teach them myself. Especially, our church is very progressive, some ideas, I don't go along with them. So, some of my older ways I'm passing on to my children. I have that right in my home to do that. So, like I say, my children go to separate schools; and I'm paying for it, by the way. I pay tuition to have my children go. Call it contribution . . . and I believe that if I do want them to go there, I will put out and I will pay for it. I believe that the French people should do the same thing as far as their language is concerned. If they do want French schools, build them. Build them, but for God, pay for them. I'm paying for my children's education. If their language is going to survive on its own merit, it's not going to survive by passing some resolution or some decree in a Constitution. You can put it down on paper, like somebody says, but it doesn't mean it's going to be carried out. You are not going to tell me that people who live three or four doors down from my place who can't stand French anything — they can't stand me, I'm French, yet, I'm basically against the French position. They don't like me, I'm French. I don't understand that. All I say is that they should pay for their education. I'll pay for mine. If they want to pay for their language, fine. If it has to be legislated, it's not worth much. It should survive on its own merit.

We are also speaking — I notice this whole debate in the last two days — if someone who has spoken hasn't mentioned it, you gentlemen, usually bring it up in some form of a question after to try to find out their opinion as far as whether their position is who should be delegating rights. Should it be the responsibility of the Legislature or should it be the responsibility of the courts? I believe the way it is now is that it's the governments that make the laws and the courts that enforce them. Am I right? — (Interjection)— Interprets them, pardon me, interprets them. I like it that way as it is. I like that way. I don't want to see rights entrenched in a constitution. Maybe at some later date, when all Premiers can agree. Maybe if we had 10 Conservative governments and one Conservative federal government, well then naturally, we'd have all agreement for whatever the party may be. But the

chance of that ever happening, we won't hold our breath. (Interjection)— Could be NDP, too, whatever. Anyway, what I'm saying is that basically I am all for human rights. Everybody that comes up here says that. They may be against enshrining these rights in a constitution, entrenching them, but they are for human rights. I, too, am for human rights; I expressed the one I am most in favour of. But maybe we're not quite ready yet to have it in a constitution. I kind of like it the way it is.

I was reading someone else's brief and there was something mentioned about a Canadian Bill of Rights. Apparently we already have a Canadian Bill of Rights. So, as far as I'm concerned, let's leave it at that for now. Maybe some day down the road we can bring that up. First of all, what I would like to say though, I do not support the federal government in repatriating the Constitution with their resolution. I don't like the time limit they've set; I don't like anything they have done. I don't like the fact they used closure and I would like to have been on that floor that night when one of those members crossed the House. I would have crossed the House, too, like I say. So, basically I'm against the federal position. I'm all for repatriating the Constitution. I'm all for an amending formula, but I'm all for the Vancouver consensus because the Premiers are for it. Therefore, there is unanimity there. But I am not for enshrining a Charter of Rights before it comes home, to do this in Britain.

I don't have very much more to say. You notice I have just sort of put down little notes here and there. But I do have this to say, that maybe at some future date, I hope it's soon, when Mr. Trudeau happens to be up in the Peace Tower cleaning the clock or whatever, readjusting the clock, moving the time forward at his own discretion, he may look to the east, and in the east he'll see that London fog, and he's using that London fog to cloud the issues that we have here right now, but if he looks to the west, he's going to see it isn't a fog, it's a steam, it's a hot steam, and it's a steam, a prairie steam, and it's a western express, and it's about to roll, and I'm going to be on it. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you permit questions from any members of the committee, sir?

MR. CYR: Yes, I would. I just hope that they're simplistic in their output because some of them I've heard this afternoon, boy, a little slightly above me. So if they are, yes, I would be glad to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the same time, I might add that the Clerk has a number of briefs that have been sent in by mail and he has a copy for each member of the committee, which I've asked him to distribute. Are there any questions to Mr. Cyr from the members of the committee? Mr. Einarson.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman in the witness stand was very modest when he first stood up and felt that he wasn't really too qualified to meet with us. In listening to your total brief, Mr. Cyr, do I understand you correctly, that you may have heard from a lot of people who've said, "Look, there are a lot of things that are much more important than this constitution at the present

time that we should be discussing, rather than the constitution. It can wait. Do I get that message from you in some of the areas that you were talking about as being so?

MR. CYR: That there are other . . . ?

MR. EINARSON: . . . economic matters, say, bread and butter issues, things like that are much more important than our constitution at the present time.

MR. CYR: That's right. I think this was a bad time to bring up repatriating the constitution. A bad time for Canada, a good time for Trudeau. That man, I've got to grant he's smart, but I think it is a bad time because of the economic slump our country is in and whatnot, but I think he did it purposely so that he could eventually bring out closure, get it out of the way, so now we can get onto some important issues. So, what I'm saying is, I think it was a bad time to . . . I want to see it brought home. I'd like to see it brought home in my lifetime, but not the way he's trying to do it.

I would like to see a more uniform and agreeable with the provinces. I'd like to see him consult the provinces to do this, and he hasn't done that. He has tried he says, but he hasn't done it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Mr. Brown.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): At your place of work certainly you must have discussed this with your fellow workers. Do you think that the opinion of the people that you come into contact with daily is the same opinion as what you hold?

MR. CYR: Well, no matter who I speak to, whatever I speak to, I'm pretty forceful in my own home or with a group of people that I associate with. I believe what I believe, and I'm glad to listen to what they have to believe.

The basic people I've spoken to, who are of the same opinion as me, basically to do with Native rights. I married into a Metis family, so I've got aunts, uncles, nieces, cousins and whatever over all the time, which I really don't mind. I'm glad to have them. In fact, I may be involved shortly with the Metis and the Indian and non-status Indian position regarding the federal government. The people I've talked to they seem to be for a Charter of Rights, but the fact that the native rights have not been included, this seems to be what they're against. But, I think, even by the Indians going over to London to present their case to the British parliamentarians, I hope it's just as a voice of concern to bring to the fore what they're trying to get across, because to me by being there, and by asking for rights to be included in that Charter they are giving the okay for that Charter, therefore, they are okaying the government position. And I would hope that that's not why they're there — that they are against the idea of the federal charter, and that the rights they talk about, Native rights, can be included at some future date in a Canadian constitution. But like I say, a lot of the people I've talked to are of the same opinion as me, but they always say, Well, what can you do about it, who can you even talk to?

When I heard that this committee was asking people to come, I phoned the following morning and I put my name on it. Two or three times I kept saying, oh boy, I can't go ahead and speak to them, but I figured, no, the heck with them, I'm going to go through with it and I'm really glad that I had the chance to do so. I'll be able to sleep better at night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Parasiuk.

MR. PARASIUK: One question to Mr. Cyr. In your presentation, Mr. Cyr, you a number of times said the following: "The majority should rule; if they want French in Quebec, because the French-speaking people in Quebec constitute a majority in Quebec, then their majority should rule, and you said the same thing with respect to English-speaking say, in Manitoba or New Brunswick, or other places like that, that in those instances the majority should rule." Yet at the beginning of your presentation you said that you were concerned that central Canada has too much power because of its rep by pop, and you said that majority rule in that instance wasn't good enough, and that you wanted some type of protection against that, maybe we could get some type of proportional representation or really some type of protection against majority rule in that instance. Now, is that true? Is that what you . . .

MR. CYR: I saw that and I foresaw the question when I was sitting down here, that I seem to be contradicting myself, and I go through my whole life contradicting myself. I've made many mistakes before, whatever. I'm not saying this is a mistake. This is the position I take.

If our government of Canada would represent us, even due to lack of population because of the fact that we don't have a number of seats to match central Canada, if they were to govern us, considering us also, then I would be for representation by population. The federal government at this time does not seem to be doing that. They don't seem to be considering all. Yet, in a way, regarding the French language, I think you're maybe referring to, that if the majority say they want to speak French or whatever, even though Mr. Trudeau, I don't agree with his policy, he does have a majority and I have to live by that majority, whether I agree with it or not, I have to live by it; so I'm going to live by it. But I also want the other francophones in Manitoba to know that if that is the majority of the will of the people in Manitoba, then they too have to live by that. That's basically what I'm trying to get across. I don't agree with the way it is now in the federal, but I have to live with it, and I want them to know that there may come a day when they have to also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Parasiuk.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. If you don't agree with what's happening in Ottawa, would you think that the way in which to deal with that is to try and change it politically, or would you think that the way is to try and follow the example of some provinces, I believe, like the Premier of Newfoundland and the Premier of Alberta, and the Premier of Quebec, in my estimation, who want to change the structure and

change the constitution of the country because they don't like what's going on in Ottawa, they want to change the rules, they want to change the constitution, they want to weaken the central government and they want to give more strength to the provinces. That is one way of changing it because you don't like what's happening in Ottawa. There's a constitutional way of changing it or a political way of changing it. The political way of changing it is to bring in a new government. Often in the west we haven't been that successful in doing that, but you still have that opportunity. Which way do you prefer — changing the constitution or changing the government in Ottawa?

MR. CYR: Well, it's hard to say because on the one hand you've got apples and on the other side you've got oranges, but they're both fruits. What I'm going to say is, as far as changing . . . One of the gentlemen, Mr. Ross, I believe, yesterday of the Communist Party — and if the Good Lord will turn his head, because I happen to agree with him on that one point, and I don't want him to know I said that — is that he believes in starting over, starting over with a new constitution. To heck with The BNA Act; let them use it to shore up some throne or something, they can use it or use it as a duster. Let's start over with a new Canadian "Made in Canada" constitution. I'd be all for that. But I would want it to be in direct agreement with the provinces, who represent us. I do want that to be.

I also agree with one gentleman yesterday who said, I would like to vote, I think, like we do here in the City of Winnipeg, we may vote for councillors but we also for Mayor, I would also like to be able to vote for the Prime Minister, separate from the rest of the vote. I would like to vote for my MP in my area, but I would also like to have a separate vote for Prime Minister, because when I vote usually for a person I don't vote basically . . . sometimes I vote for party issues, most times I vote for personal, the man, not the party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw

MR. USKIW: Yes, I wonder if you could indicate to me and to the committee how you view the need, at least it's my perception that there is a need to have a central government that is strong enough that it may be able to reapportion the wealth of Canada as between its regions. Do you view that as a necessary part of a constitution, the right of the central government to redistribute wealth in Canada?

MR. CYR: I imagine all this has got to do with the oil in Alberta. I agree with a lot of people, that it's all basically a powers issue, central versus provincial powers. I believe in a strong central government. I believe we should have a strong central government. I also believe in provincial governments, who have their own jurisdictions, and a federal government have their own jurisdictions. I know we're all speaking basically about the wealth or the resources of the provinces; like in the case of Alberta — I feel that Alberta should have ownership and control of all its resources; the same like any other province should own and control all the resources; but I also wish that the human element — because to me in

politics a lot of times the human element is not there. they're partisan, they're not thinking like human beings.

I would like to see Mr. Lougheed say, Look, okay, Ottawa you're not getting a fair share; we're just trying to build up our own little coffers here at the expense of the rest of Canada. You know, it's funny I would like to see Alberta get a better price for its oil, but I would also like to see Ottawa get more of the wealth that is being brought in by the oil. I mean, some day, like somebody said, we may discover oil here in Manitoba. I mean plenty of it, enough to do us. Then we may be in the driver's seat for a while. Or wherever it happens to be.

So what I'm trying to say is, I do believe in a strong federal government, but I also believe in a good provincial government. I do believe in sharing the wealth. I mean charity begins at home. I do believe in sharing the wealth, but I believe that they have the right to that wealth. Just like me, using a home situation. I'll teach my little children — I may give this one here a sucker, or two suckers, and the older one might get three suckers, whatever. I'm not going to force them to share it, but I would hope that I would raise them to think that they do have that ability, that to be good human beings they will share it. But they don't have to; these are lessons in life, and I think that a lot of times politicians could learn.

MR. USKIW: Well, yes, just to pursue that. It seems to me that if you're going to have the powers of redistribution of wealth in a constitution, it is there for the very purpose of building a very strong nation from one end of the country to the other, that you would want the national system, the central government, to have sufficient scope to be able to deal with the necessary transfers of wealth from one region to another from time to time, or even on an annual recurrent basis. So, in the context of that, would you agree then that Ottawa should have the right to tax the wealth produced anywhere, including Alberta oil, in order to build up its revenue source, and have the power to redistribute that revenue throughout the country?

MR. CYR: Well, generally speaking, no. I don't know, I kind of think that question is a little bit leading.

MR. USKIW: Oh yes it is, absolutely.

MR. CYR: Okay. So rather than let it be leading and leading me down the garden path, I would like to say that, 'no', I am for ownership and control of resources, on shore and offshore, by the provinces, and if I have to make a choice, that's where my choice lies.

MR. USKIW: Well, the logical question to follow then is that, do you believe that Manitoba should reduce its standard of living, because in the constitution that you foresee, the federal government would not be in a position to give to Manitoba, annually, part of the taxes that they collect from all of Canada from the richer provinces, which they have always done. Last year, under the equalization formula, Manitoba received something in excess of 300 million of transfer payments from the federal

government, moneys which were collected in wealthier regions of Canada and redistributed to Manitoba. Do you want to see, because of your vision of a new Constitution, that a province like Manitoba should have a substantially lower standard of living so that we can give Lougheed what he wants out of his oil?

MR. CYR: First of all, like I said, I'm down on the lower echelon, just above the minimum wage with a family my size. So when you talk about the lower standard of living, you can't get much lower than where I am. So, if it means bringing everybody else down to my level, fine, I'm all for it. As far as the money we've acquired from Ottawa in redistribution or equalization payments, whatever, I don't know, where did I see that? Okay, where did it affect me? If you're putting people in classes, where did it affect me? I'm down on the bottom rung. Economically, I'm down on the bottom rung, but other than that, I'm pretty high up in my own estimation.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, in the last provincial Budget, I believe we had an estimated expenditure of about 2 billion in Manitoba. Of that, a fifth of that is transfer payments from the federal government. Those transfer payments are derived from taxing other provinces who are wealthier and that money is therefore diverted to the needs of this province. For example, about 200 million is rebated to the people of Manitoba, including you, in the Property Tax Rebate Program and the Cost of Living Tax Rebate Program. It's about 200 million, just in that one particular area of wealth redistribution within this province, you see. So you do get a direct benefit now. If you didn't have 300 million of revenue from transfer payments, then you have the choice of having to lower your standards in Manitoba by wiping out property tax rebates or Medicare payments or whatever it is, or your Premier would have to ask you to pay more provincial income tax to make up the difference, you see. That's the importance of it. And, therefore, it's my view that we need a strong central government that has the ability to properly tax wealth where it is found in the nation and to try to come up with some means of redistribution that keeps the nation relatively equal, at least, to a certain point. Certain basic things should be provided in every province of Canada. I think that's the point that a lot of people are missing when they attack the central system.

MR. CYR: What was the question?

MR. USKIW: You want to know what the question is. My question is, in light of that, will you still be prepared to deny the government of Canada that source of revenue in light of the fact that you are a direct beneficiary of it?

MR. CYR: Yes, I would have to stick to my guns. I will stick to my guns. I will . . .

MR. USKIW: You want to be a poor province?

MR. CYR: Do I want to be a poor province? No, I don't want to be a poor province because maybe I'll help you find some oil somewhere around —

(Interjection)— yes, that's right. That's right.
(Interjection)— I will. (Interjection)— Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Mr. Cyr has the floor.

MR. CYR: Like I said, when I was sitting down there, I listened to some of these questions and a lot of them are politically baited, and I may not have the eloquence to answer them or by doing so in the fashion that they are baited, be putting my foot in my mouth. So in the fact of rather than putting my foot in my mouth, if I am not sure . . . I pretty well understand what you are trying to say, but I will stick to my guns and say that I would rather see that the provinces have ownership and control of their own resources. This wealth that Ottawa is taking away and then somehow bringing some of it back, why send it all the way out there to bring it back? Let's keep it here ourselves and work with it here. I'm not really full into politics, like I say, I really didn't get into politics or listening to it until this past summer, the Premiers' Conference and so forth. And I want to get home tonight and watch the Constitutional Debate, now that they are on TV, too. But, like I say, some of the questions I think are a little bit baited to try to get a specific answer out of me. If I feel that is the way, then I probably will have no comment. I'm really not sure.

MR. USKIW: Given the fact that we have had a means of redistributing wealth under the present Constitution, do you view that the government of Canada has misapplied that wealth, that you didn't get your share of it or that somehow you or this province or other provinces were mistreated in that they didn't get their rightful share of that redistributive power that Ottawa has?

MR. CYR: I don't know what the other provinces got, so I can't compare like to what we want or . . .

MR. USKIW: But, do you have a grievance is my point?

MR. CYR: No.

MR. USKIW: Are you annoyed with what Ottawa is doing with their revenue dollar?

MR. CYR: No. I'll tell you why because, basically, the economic issues as far as I've lately been following politics, I'm really not qualified to even speak on. At municipal and maybe provincial level, I am, but federal level I'm not. I came here basically to speak about the Constitution, my opposition to the federal resolution. I am for the government of Manitoba taking action before the courts. I know that these meetings are, like you say, somebody mentioned earlier after the fact — how did he put it —(Interjection)— yes, fait accompli, so to speak. But just the same, my opinions are expressed and that's the way I feel. I am for the Progressive Conservative government's position and I am for Mr. Sterling Lyon doing what he is doing and I hope he continues it and doesn't let up one iota.

MR. USKIW: Given the fact that you are supporting the position of our Premier, are you aware of the fact

that our Premier wants to see the continuation of equalization payments to Manitoba from the central government? Are you aware that he wants to retain that?

MR. CYR: No, I'm not, because somebody mentioned earlier if somebody was aware about some agreement that Manitoba and Saskatchewan made. No, I have no idea about that. I don't wish to comment on it because I wouldn't know what area that is in.

MR. USKIW: This is the reason why I tried to elicit from you just what your opposition is to the constitutional proposals, because one of the proposals does involve the redistribution of wealth and the right of equalization or the entrenchment of equalization principles. The other has to do with language rights and Charter of Rights and I thought that perhaps one of those things you would agree with. And I gather you don't agree with language rights. Am I correct? If I am incorrect, please . . .

MR. CYR: Yes, you are correct in assuming that I do not agree with language rights.

MR. USKIW: And you're opposed to the entrenchment of the Charter of Rights.

MR. CYR: As it stands or at this moment.

MR. USKIW: And you are opposed to the formula of equalization?

MR. CYR: I don't know. I can't comment on that. I can't comment. I'm basically incensed — (Interjection)— yes, you have lost all as far as I am concerned because I'm basically against what Prime Minister Trudeau is doing, acting unilaterally. That's my basic reason why I am here today, to let you people know what I feel, that I am against Prime Minister Trudeau in his actions and I am for the Progressive Conservative government of this province in their actions. I'll not necessarily say I'm going to vote for them in the next election or anybody. Like I say, I don't know who I would vote for in an election. To me, it's got nothing to do with that. I happen to have a certain cat sitting in the litter box at this time and that's the fellow I have to deal with and I am for his position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Cyr, for your presentation.

MR. CYR: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being after 5:00 now, I can report to the members of the committee and the public at large that we're making a lot of progress. We heard 11 delegations yesterday and we heard five today. We have 29 more to go. We have agreed to meet on Monday, December 8, 1980, at 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 in the evening to 10:00 p.m., and Tuesday, December 9, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30, and 2:00 p.m., in the afternoon to 5:00.

Persons or organizations who have registered but were not heard yesterday or today will automatically be placed on the list of persons to be heard. Other

persons who wish to be heard who are not on our list may register through the Clerk's Office in this building.

MRS. WESTBURY: For the edification of the people waiting, could you read out in what order they can expect to be heard if they turn up at 2 o'clock on the Monday?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, I would be glad to. Mrs. Friesen from Headingley, Manitoba is first; Professor Gordon Rothney is second; Charles E. Lamont, 500 Dufferin, third; Mrs. Bernice Sisler, fourth; C.H. Templeton is next; Winnipeg Jewish Community Council; Liberal Party of Manitoba, Fraser Dunford; Alex Berkowits; Georgia Cordes; Manitoba Catholic School Trustees Association, Frank Reichardt or others; Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Dr. P.A. Kondra; Manitoba Teachers' Society, John Wiens, President; Alerted Canadians Alliance, W.F. Green; Church in Society Committee, Manitoba Conference, United Church of Canada; Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties, Paul Walsh — and I understand or he did tell me at noon today that he's hoping to go to Brandon to make his presentation. He's not going to line up with the rest of them here in Winnipeg. But he will remain on the list unless he makes a presentation in Brandon. Alice Richmond; Mrs. Adele Smith; Metis Confederacy of Manitoba, Winnipeg Area; Women's Institute, Mrs. Parker; Mr. Henry Elias; Brenda Scarcella; Lawrence Peterson; Mrs. Asta Asseltine; Mr. Ron Anderson or Roger Barsey; Four Nations Confederacy; Professor R.A. Gallop; and three persons who have indicated that they could appear after 4 o'clock and have always been listed in that particular order, Mrs. Muriel Smith, Kenneth Emberley, Mr. T.P. Walker. So that is the list as it is with 29 persons to be heard.

It is now seven minutes after five. Committee rise.