



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. Phil Eyder
Constituency of River East



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 63 - 2:00 p.m., SATURDAY, 28 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virден	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES & ELECTIONS

Saturday, 28 January, 1984

TIME — 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Phil Eyler (River East)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Anstett, Bucklaschuk, Lecuyer and Mackling

Messrs. Eyler, Scott, Enns, Filmon, Kovnats, Harapiak, Nordman

WITNESSES: Mr. R.W. Wootton, Private Citizen

Ms. Gaye Selby, Private Citizen

Mr. Alan Beachell, Reeve, R.M. of Rosser

Mr. Helmut Albrecht, Private Citizen

Professor A.R. Kear, Private Citizen

Mr. Albert Krawchuk, Private Citizen

Mrs. Lois Edie, Private Citizen,

Mr. Arthur Doering, Private Citizen

Mr. Taras Lasko, Private Citizen

Mr. E.W. Hilger, Private Citizen

Mr. J. Hay, Private Citizen,

Reeve John Loewen, R.M. of Hanover

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill No. 115 - An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act; Loi concernant la mise en application de l'article 23 de la Loi de 1870 sur le Manitoba.

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee will come to order. The next person on my list to call is Reeve William Roth; Mr. Roy Benson; Mr. Eugene Kinaschuk; Mr. Alexander Pressey.

Mr. R.W. Wootton.

MR. R. WOOTTON: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I'd like first to offer my thanks for the opportunity to present my comments to you. I would like also to make clear that I do not appear here as a redneck. I noted carefully the gratuitous insult that I received yesterday from Mr. Mackling, and I think, given its source, I will merely confine my comments to expressing sympathy to such a small remark.

I'd like to make the point first that, as a basis to my comments, Sir, I spent five years during the Second World War fighting an ideology which was intent on forcing its will on others, regardless of their wishes. — (Interjection) — I'd like to use my words if you don't mind. Thus I cannot passively accept the same thing

being done by the Government of the Day under the guise and the mistaken notion that they know best, and the latest incredible line, because "we don't understand." Gentlemen, let me assure you, I, for one, understand only too well. It is not as if this government doesn't know the wishes of the majority of the people, because that has been made abundantly clear and it's been clear that those wishes oppose the actions of the government.

The government's actions do not represent democracy as I fought for it. It seems that travesty of justice to me that the "D" in NDP stands for democratic. What a misplacement of a word. It is not democratic for politicians to completely ignore the wishes of the people that they are supposed to be serving. That is not democracy, that is dictatorship and it is not acceptable.

The opposition to the government's actions is broad and quite obviously crosses all party lines. There is a Manitoban - in the broader sense - a Manitoban objection to the government's clumsy dictatorial handling of this whole matter. It is not a political party ground swell. It is a reaction of a whole cross-section of the people to offensive government action. The closure action strikes at the very root of what we believe in in Canada as being the process of governing. This government is by force opposing the will of the people.

Now if you are so certain of your rightness, then call an election and take the question to the people. The answer is out there.

I'd like to spend just a few moments, having made that point, talking about the issue at hand, Bill 115. I must note first that there is a great sadness within me at the division effect of this bill and everything that attaches to it. I must refer you to a very close example that surely mustn't and cannot, if you're practical and with a reasonably open mind, ignore.

Let's look at the United States of America, a total melting pot of ethnic backgrounds, of people from virtually every country in the world. What do you see? Tremendous pride of country, tremendous pride of flag, tremendous spirit. Look at any American event when they play their national anthem, and compare it with what we have here. What do we have here? Nothing that compares to the spirit and the drive and the motivation that the American spirit provides to its people. I trust that this government will somehow feel the sense of guilt that they should for the damage they have done.

Now I have nothing against French or the French-Canadians per se, but I do object and I object most strenuously to anything which, in its application, does not have a proper relationship between its cost and its benefit or return. Our world turns on the principles of economics. We are not dealing with this matter in realities.

Let me make a point, first of all. I am a member of a small minority, and maybe you're trampling my rights. Do you know what I feel about the fact that you are

not doing anything about it? Great! Butt out! I don't need you, and the reason is that it would make no economic sense for you to deal with the emotional matter that I might raise representing trampled rights. In the comparison of their impact on the country at large, it's meaningless. The cost of correcting these rights that I feel you might be trampling has no economic merit - ridiculous.

Now I want to use that as an entrée to the point that I don't know what it is that we are trying to deal with. We're not dealing with hard facts in terms that are recognizable. We are dealing with intangibles, and intangibles whose value in application or non-application never sees the light of day. It's an emotional subject as far as I can see. Who is suffering from what? What rights are they being denied? What is the impact of that denial? What is the cost of that denial to those people? If it has any merit, what is the cost of correcting it? How do the two values compare? What is the net?

That's the way you run a business, gentlemen. That's the way we run this country. When do we get to deal with this subject in those kinds of basic economic, practical terms? We haven't even approached it up to this point. Nowhere have I been able to establish who is being hurt by what, and what does it really mean to them. I understand all of the emotion, but the only thing that's involved in the emotion is a warm feeling. See what happens to you when you take it to the bank and try and bank it - nothing.

The costs of what are being proposed so far exceed any real benefits that what we are embarked is a program of economic foolishness.

If people have rights, real rights that are being trampled, and they can be evaluated in real terms, and an economic value put on them and assessed as being of merit, and we can determine what the costs of correcting them are, and the balance between those two values is appropriate, then fix them. You don't need a bill for that. That's democracy you're talking about. The normal democratic plan. This is a lot of nonsense that we're going through. Let's supply some practical, meaningful, common sense economic assessments to the questions at hand and be done with the ridiculous emotional points of principle that have obscured the reality of what is truly involved.

Gentlemen, let me close by appealing to you. Let's be sensible. Abandon this foolish process. Let nature take its course and all will be served and served well, and to the government directly, I say remember your mandate is to serve the people, not blindly dictate to them. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Mr. Wootton?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would normally, I suppose, feel perhaps embarrassed in asking this question but of course if we pass this bill, civil servants will be fanning out across the province and asking this question of a lot of Manitobans. While you were speaking sir, I was trying to discern what part of the world or what ethnic group you were from. I noticed somewhat of an accent. Would you mind me asking that personal question, because our language police

officers are going to have to be doing that throughout Manitoba, to determine what was taught in childhood of the two languages.

A MEMBER: Harry!

MR. H. ENNS: No, that's a fair question.

MR. R. WOOTTON: I'm perfectly prepared to answer the question, Mr. Chairman. I find it rather amusing because you must be referring to the accent that I lost years ago.

MR. H. ENNS: It's not quite lost.

MR. R. WOOTTON: In order to answer your question I have to go back a little bit in history. I am not a native-born Canadian. I'm from Australia. I came to this country during the Second World War in the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan as a pilot in the Royal Australian Air Force and I completed my pilot training here, was an instructor for a period of time and then went overseas. Then I elected to take my discharge in Canada and decided to stay here and in the 1950's took out Canadian citizenship. But I'm still an Australian and proud of it, but I don't feel it as being any special tag. It's just a pride point for me and I don't need anybody to protect me - either for it or against it or up, or down, or diagonally or anything else. I'm an Australian and I'm proud of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Seeing none then Mr. Wootton, I would like to thank you on behalf of the committee for appearing here today.

Order please. Mr. Bruce Stewart.

Ms. Gaye Selby.

MS. G. SELBY: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I am here as a taxpaying Manitoban, private citizen, to speak against Bill 115. I was born in this province in the City of Winnipeg, educated in this province, got married, raised a family, who are all gold medalists from the university. Your government, the Government of the Day, chose not to give my son a position, but my MLA wrote him a letter and sent him a gift on his accomplishments. He has now left this province. I don't know where the idea is that thousands of people are pouring into this province. I only know that all my family has left and we're here alone.

I would like to know where is the Premier of this province? Where is the Premier of this province who is directing this and taking us down a dark and hidden path that nobody knows what's at the end of it? Why is he not here to answer the questions? Why does he send someone else to speak for him? Is he unable to speak for himself? If he is, he should not be the Premier of the province. He has already changed two people. The Attorney-General at one time was Chairman of this committee and now Mr. Anstett is the Chairman. I don't know how many more will be changed. I can only say that the people in the Province of Manitoba should be thankful that there was such a man as Mr. Lyon, when he was Leader of the Opposition, who held you people back and I hope that Mr. Filmon shall continue to do the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MS. G. SELBY: Without those people who are backing more than 85 percent of the people in this province, I think you people should stand up and take a look around and see what you are doing.

A plebiscite was held in October - 78 to 80 percent opposed Bill 115, many of them were your own people. NDP's. And I will say this to you, that if the people in this province don't want it, why are you wasting time and money? I can turn to Mr. Filmon, seeing Mr. Lyon isn't here, and say, keep on ringing the bells, I haven't lost any sleep. Just keep on ringing it as long as you wish.

I would also like to know why you are not getting on with the purpose of business in this province, putting people to work, the health that has gone downgraded because you have no time for that, you are all too busy looking at Bill 115. Scrap it and then you'll have more time for the people in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I don't want to have to remind the audience one more time that expressions of approval or disapproval are expressly prohibited in committee meetings as they are in the Legislature.

MS. G. SELBY: When, and how many more thousands and thousands of people will have to appeal to the Government of the Day that they do not want this bit of legislation? They don't need it. We've lived here long enough.

I don't know how many of you sitting on this side of the House are married and have children. Have you ever looked ahead into the future or do you just live for today? What is the future in this province for your children and my children - well they're gone - our grandchildren, or whatever the case may be, if you turn this into a bilingual province? Gradually, one by one, through attrition or whatever you may call it - a rose by any other name - they will gradually be replaced by Francophone people and these people - they're very nice people - I have nothing against the French. My neighbour is French and she's very perturbed about it. She said they never had any problems before this. I think that you people are looking at Rene Levesque and if you feel that strong, I think you should all pack your bags and move out to Quebec.

As I am standing here before you, I am speaking for a number of citizens who could not come today and they gave me their message loud and clear. Would I please tell the Government of the Day to get on with the problems in this province and forget about Bill 115?

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Ms. Selby? Seeing none, thank you, Ms. Selby for appearing here today.

Reeve John Loewen. Mayor Lansky. Reeve Manson Moir. Mr. Oatway.

MR. A. BEACHELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm appearing on behalf of Mr. Oatway. He had to go to a meeting this afternoon and couldn't be here. My name is Alan Beachell, Reeve of the Municipality of Rosser. Mr. Oatway was Deputy Reeve and was going to present the brief.

I'm sorry, I only have six copies. The office was closed today and I didn't know how to run the copying machine. Will I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. A. BEACHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentleman of the committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing here today to express the views of the Municipality of Rosser. We had the opportunity to make and present a presentation to the Legislative Committee on September 29, 1983, which was in opposition to the proposed legislation - entrenchment of the French language. On behalf of the Municipality of Rosser we thank those that were responsible for giving us that opportunity and appreciate those that took the time to listen to our concerns and the reasons for those concerns. We were just one of many in the province who made presentations to that committee. Also, at the time of the municipal elections in a number of municipal jurisdictions, including the City of Winnipeg, an opportunity was given to those who voted, if they so wished, to express their desires in regard to the language legislation proposed.

Even though it has been demonstrated that indeed a definite majority of Manitobans are opposed to the proposed changes to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, the government of this province still appear to be proceeding in a manner that unmistakably the majority of Manitobans are not in favour of. Does not an elected government respect the opinions and the wishes of the majority of the electorate? Does not the government of this province hear an ever-increasing opposition to their proposed legislation?

Even with the considerable assistance financially and otherwise from other levels of government to groups and organizations to persuade the citizens of this province to support this proposed legislation, it has only created greater resistance to the proposal by an ever-increasing majority of Manitobans.

Does not the government of this province recognize that after all these months of discussion and debate on the issue, they have failed to convince the citizens of Manitoba? The majority of the government of Manitoba's elected representatives are not responding to the wishes of those who elected them.

Do not these elected representatives have a commitment to their specific electors or do they respond to the other level of government of which this province has only two representatives? Does it respond to groups who are not citizens of this province? Does it respond to citizens of Canada from other provinces, some of which are seeking separation from confederation to set up their own government, which the Federal Government of the Day felt it serious enough to invoke The War Measures Act?

We cannot stop for a moment here and make a comparison, not to the same degree such as the use of force by means of the army or the police, but along parallel lines. Nevertheless, the input of the Canadian taxpayers' money used to promote the government's intention to make changes to our Manitoba Constitution by biased commentators, TV coverage, interviews, etc., on the subject. No matter what amount of logical honest

observations and concerns are presented to the present Manitoba Government, via committee or otherwise, the results appear to be similar as in the State of Poland.

The R.M. of Rosser has not in the past and does not at the present time wish to have confrontation with the government of Manitoba, for after all, we are but an identity created by government to administer local affairs, but we do have a responsibility to our citizens that we represent, of which the majority are opposed to this legislation being proceeded with and to inform you of their opposition. We ask you for the good of Manitoba to withdraw the legislation proposed and let's get back to the business of governing the province to create harmony, unity and expressly tolerance to those to which this proposed legislation cannot make any contribution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Beachell?

Seeing none, then thank you, Mr. Beachell for coming here today.

Mr. Albert St. Hilaire.

Mr. Helmut Albrecht.

MR. H. ALBRECHT: Mr. Chairman, honourable members of the committee. I'd like to speak today to the proposed Bill 115. First I would like to look at a proposal to change the title of the act. Don't call this bill An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act; please call it a bill to introduce language ghettos in the Province of Manitoba. This is true.

When I look at the proposed bill from the House Leader in charge of the language policy, I don't understand his proposal when he will produce an ombudsman for language policy, advisory council for language policy and so on. These people all have to be bilingual. I propose that the position makes the proposal that the Minister in charge of the language policy has to be bilingual. This is the first and important thing, but I see and saw it in past times the House Leader, Roland Penner, and the new House Leader in charge of language policy demand from a lot of people, they would like to have a job be bilingual, but they are not able to speak both official languages. Here we have to start.

I think the best thing is withdraw the whole bill. Scratch the bill about the amendment of the language policy where you will declare French and English as official languages.

I have had the chance to speak with a few members of Parliament from the NDP, and they explained to me, yes, we have corrected all the wrongdoing against the French. This is a fallacy; this is a lie. This was already corrected under the leadership under the PC's, under the leader, Mr. Sterling Lyon. I think that the PC is very very generous when they say we accepted it when they reinstated the rights of the French-Canadians in 1870; French and English can be used in the courts and in Parliament, but not what you propose here.

When you say now that French-Canadians have the right to go to the Supreme Court of Canada and can demand their rights, what can you expect some French people to do with Parliament and with you when you

introduce in Article 23 and declare English and French both as official languages?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Albrecht. Could you speak closer to your mike? The people at the back of the room can't hear you.

MR. H. ALBRECHT: Yes. You can do nothing in a case like this. Then, so far, you make the amendment and declare English and French as official languages in the Province of Manitoba, you can't see, when I am French-speaking, I have to stay forever in a ghetto. You restrict the free movement from a part of the minority in the country, in your province.

In other cases, when you demand that a lot of jobs in the Provincial Government, in Crown corporations, in institutions, that everybody who applies for a job is bilingual. Have you the money? I know you have too much money to spend on the occasion to give every student in the school the chance to learn both languages so good that they are fluently bilingual. You can't do it.

Another case, think of all the people in evening school. They have been in Canada 10, 15, 20 years; some speak relatively good English, because this is the working language. When they like to have a better paying job, you will invest so much money in the adult education system to guarantee all these people who demand it to get a free education in French that they can apply for other jobs too.

I think with this government, the left hand is not knowing what the right hand is doing. An example, when I look at my driver's licence, on my Autopac card, they are both in both languages. Why not the Medicare card? Why not the membership card of the NDP? This is discrimination against the minorities.

I was a former member of the NDP. I was a member of the executive with Roland Penner, and I will speak a little bit about the French language policy and the doings in the former organization that I belonged to. In the executive meeting, every month from December, 1982, until October, 1983, the House Leader and the Minister in charge of language policy never spoke one sentence about this with his own members of his executive.

I talked to him about this. I say, Roland, you make it wrong. You asked only a few legal experts from the Manitoba Society-Francophone, who are from the Liberal Government in Ottawa. You speak only with these people; you don't like to speak with your own members of the executive. You never mentioned the whole Constitution thing from December, '82, till December, '83 - one meeting on the Constitution thing for the membership. You don't know the emotion. You don't know how your own members think about it, because you don't like to discuss this problem.

You think the leadership makes a decision and everybody has to run. This is a leadership, as I know it, from my past. I came from Germany; I lived in Germany under a fascist dictatorship. I lived in Germany under a Communist dictatorship, and see and hear the government in a style much worse under both of these dictatorships in Germany. Things like in the last year in Poland, the government makes some mistakes, they know that they are the opposition, for the population, they are against this. They call in . . . and change this.

Here we have the evidence behind the plebiscite. First, Mr. Pawley and Penner told they were over 70 percent of the population is behind us. After the plebiscite, he saw that 78 percent are against this position, but he doesn't call it back because he made a second agreement with the Federal Government, with the twin sister from the NDP, the Liberals, and the Manitoba Association of Francophones. It is more important to make secret meetings, and this after an election of the NDP, where we are running to bring them votes. We are supposed to govern, but forget to say behind locked doors and never ever listen to the people.

I know you have very good experts, legal experts, political experts - in the most cases from Saskatoon. They have a lot of experience in winning elections and losing elections, and you recognize very clearly that you have already lost the next election and that the future First Minister will be Mr. Filmon from the P.C. but you'd see before it, we don't like to lose face. We make an agreement with the Liberals. We make an agreement with the Francophone Society and maybe when I am not, in the future, the First Minister, I get revered like Mr. Schreyer. Maybe I get a position there as Governor-General or as member in the Senate and then my future is very well covered. Don't care about the people, care about your own well-doing. This is all what you're looking for, power that you keep your position but don't believe that you come in again.

You make the last year so big mistake that you put the good name of the NDP so down that a lot of people from the Grassroots, a lot of people - I know them - they vote 30, 40 years CCF and NDP but they say never ever again.

I have now some words to the opposition. Please what is sometimes wrong understood in the ethnic groups, tell the people the truth. Work more with the ethnic groups. Don't believe that all the members - we have a lot of people from organization and in most cases, people get a good job from the NDP and they speak all in favour of the government because there's . . . But don't believe that we come here . . . present from the association. Maybe a few guys from the leadership from the group think so, but not the majority of the ethnic groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Albrecht? Order please.

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Albrecht, allow me to pursue with you for a moment, the question of where this government feels they have support for the language measures, both this Bill 115 and the constitutional amendment, because we are told by the Government House Leader and by the Premier that there is a lot of support for what the government is doing out there and we're having some trouble to find where it is. You didn't mind identifying yourself as a member . . .

MR. H. ALBRECHT: A former member.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . a former member of the New Democratic Party. I'm aware, for instance, that the New Democratic Party like other political parties, but perhaps even more so in the New Democratic Party, they work

very hard at their annual conventions. They pass a lot of resolutions. They cover virtually all the public area interests that are concern of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Mackling on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: I've made it a point of trying to get to that resolution that from time to time, it's made for good debating measures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Well my question to this former NDP member is was this question put before the convention last . . .

MR. H. ALBRECHT: No one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackling on a point of order. Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I've enjoyed what Mr. Albrecht has had to say, although I don't necessarily agree with him, I respect the sincerity of what he said. However I don't think it is open for the Honourable Member for Lakeside to ask Mr. Albrecht now to comment on a resolution of the New Democratic Party on some subject matter. It's got nothing to do with Bill 115 that's before us and he's again abusing the rules of this committee, Mr. Chairman. I ask you to call him to order.

MR. H. ENNS: It's totally permissible to ask for further clarification or to use any subject matter that was brought up during the presentation. References to the New Democratic Party were made by the person presenting his remarks to us at this time, and I, Sir, am genuinely trying to find out where the support is. The entire Grassroots organization, of course are rednecks and Ku Kluxers without sheets. That's what we're being led to believe.

Nobody believes that the Conservative Party has any support on this issue when you listen to the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader believes that public opinion is rolling in their favour on this issue, so I'm asking a former member of the New Democratic Party and I ask it sincerely, precisely where do these honourable gentlemen opposite from me get this confidence that they are acting in the public interest, at the public will, and the public support is building for their position and you tell me, Sir, that you had never discussed this issue at your convention.

Mr. Chairman, I have one more question of the gentleman. Would he do me a favour? Would you buy a New Democratic Party membership again . . .

MR. H. ALBRECHT: No.

MR. H. ENNS: I'm asking you to do this - and please go to the convention that's going to be held in two or three weeks, I believe February 15th and 16th and make sure that this kind of a resolution - put this resolution on the floor of the New Democratic Party Convention and see what kind of response it gets?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions for Mr. Albrecht? Seeing none, then thank you Mr. Albrecht for coming here today.

Order please. Mr. Eric Carsted; Mr. Jake Janzen; Mr. John Dyck; Mr. Terry Veenendaal; Mr. Doug Sisson; Mr. Anthony Melnyk.

Professor A.R. Kear.

MR. A. KEAR: Bonjour mesdames et messieurs. Bien venue à l'avenir du Manitoba.

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to Manitoba's future. I would ask the Chairman of the Committee, I know it's one of his responsibilities that I not be heckled during my performance. I realize I'm speaking before a hostile audience behind me, but I have rights and I'm sure the Committee Chairman will protect my rights.

Thank you for this opportunity to engage in the democratic process of changing Manitoba's Constitution for the better, so as to correct a historical mistake committed in 1890 and to provide a better future for all Manitobans to come.

This presentation this afternoon will be partly historical, partly constitutional, partly sociological, and partly futuristic. Futuristic, because we are deciding the future, what Manitobans will become based on Manitobans, past and present. We must turn to history so to understand the present and to glimpse the future which is unfolding as it will.

I have belonged to no political party. I do not belong to any political party. I do not intend to belong to any political party. I do so to maintain my objectivity vis-a-vis different political parties. As a professor of Political Science, I feel this is one of my responsibilities. My approach then is non-partisan. If I make remarks deemed injurious to one or another political party, these remarks are intended only to reflect historical facts and not to express prejudices on my part. But it is difficult to be objective, as you will learn.

I speak as a political scientist and historian. I do not speak in any way for the University of Manitoba, where I teach and do research on the fiscal relations amongst Canada's 11 governments.

I do speak as a member of La société franco-manitobaine since 1969, but not on behalf of La société franco-manitobaine. My first language is English, et ma deuxième est la langue française. I might emphasize that I have been welcomed as a participating member of La société franco-manitobaine for many years in the whole range of its activities. La société franco-manitobaine has treated me equally, as they treat any other member, and at no time have I ever been subjected to any form of invidious discrimination because my second language is French.

I fully support in principle the position of La société franco-manitobaine regarding Article 23 and Bill 115. I was present and voted accordingly at the meeting on January 17, 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Professor Kear, could you speak a little closer to the microphones for the benefit of the people behind you?

MR. A. KEAR: The reason I welcome the extension of French Language Services is simply because the

character of government has changed markedly since 1870. The government today, regardless of the political party temporarily in office, provides many more services than were ever dreamed of in 1870 when Manitoba entered Canada. Health and Welfare services, consumer services and all the rest, particularly that of human rights. It appears only reasonable and just to me that services in French should also be broadened in the same way as services have been broadened to Anglo-Saxons and Anglophones. Why? - because Francophones, too, are taxpayers and citizens. Governmental services have been extended to all Manitobans and have been expanded to all Manitobans since 1870, regardless of the language they speak. This extension of governmental services is a well-known historical phenomenon. It has been extended to more and more languages in recent years.

This extension of services to languages spoken other than English and French began under the Schreyer Government when booklets, brochures, etc., were published in several languages in addition to French and English. The Lyon Government also extended services en français when it created the French Languages Services Secretariat under, I understand, the leadership of Roger Turenne who was the senior person there. If the basis of linguistic equality of 1867, Section 133 of The British North America Act had been fully implemented across Canada there would today be no Parti-Quebecois and our fellow French-speaking citizens throughout Canada would be content and happy partners in a unique experiment in the world. Only Canada has these two linguistic groups - English and French - and Canada is the better for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Kear, apparently people are still having trouble hearing you in the back of the room.

MR. A. KEAR: Fine. It should be recognized that French-Canadians' refusal to assimilate into the Anglophone culture has made it easier for Canadians whose first and second languages are neither English nor French to become themselves. This is a fact that people who are of neither English nor French background sometimes don't appreciate, that the persistent determination of French-Canadians not to be assimilated has made it easier for other groups, Ukrainian, German, you name it, to be themselves. This is a positive contribution the French-Canadians have made to our society and should be so recognized. Canada's cultural mosaic so exemplified right here in Manitoba is better by far than America's melting pot, where only one language prevails. Indeed, I believe we have nothing to learn from the Americans on this issue, and the sooner we stop following American examples, the healthier this country will be.

I urge that the constitutional error of 1890 in abolishing French language rights in governmental services be corrected. Manitoba has acted unconstitutionally for far too long. The Supreme Court of Canada has declared unanimously that Manitoba should begin to act constitutionally. I know there was an effort made under the Lyon Government to do so. But I think this stage must go one step further. The sooner it ceases acting unconstitutionally is to be welcomed for all who believe in democracy.

I would welcome the adoption of the January 17, 1984 decision of the La société franco-manitobaine and without any amendments at all. In other words, I do not want to see any further dilution of French language rights in Manitoba under proposed Bill 115. Indeed, if I have a criticism for the NDP, they have backed off too often in the face of ignorant hostility.

Today's debate in Manitoba is not simply a Manitoban question, it is a national question. All Canada is watching. The eyes and hearts of all Canada are focused on Manitoba. Watch the CBC any night on the news and you realize that this country is watching this province. I know that this Legislature shall rise to the occasion.

Let me turn now to the judgment of the Fathers of Confederation. What did they do in 1867? They put French and English on the same level of equality and they made a wise judgment. This equality of treatment was applied to Manitoba when this province joined Canada in 1870, and was accepted as right and proper by the same Fathers of Confederation.

Equality of treatment certainly applies in Manitoba today to members of both historic linguistic groups because otherwise Manitobans will be rejecting the judgment of the Fathers of Confederation, who included among others Sir John A. Macdonald from what is now Ontario, Sir Georges Etienne Cartier, from what is now Quebec, Sir Leonard Tilly, then Premier of New Brunswick and Sir Charles Tupper, then Premier of Nova Scotia. Equality of linguistic treatment was accepted unanimously at the Quebec 1864 conference by all the Fathers of Confederation. This country would not have been created nor built but for the unanimous decision taken at Quebec in the Quebec resolutions that French and English should be the languages of government for Canada, and note, later for Manitoba. Rief's provisional government wanted this, and Sir John A. Macdonald's government granted it in Article 23 under Manitoba's Constitution.

Manitoba's mistake in 1890 was of the same order of stupidity as Quebec's mistake with Bill 101 in 1977. Languages cannot be abolished either in Manitoba or in Quebec. Canadians are determined to use their language of their choice, and they are determined to get governmental services from their government in the language of their choice.

This presentation is perhaps different from those you have already heard. The approach designs were called to our attention, the attitudes of the Fathers of Confederation in the 1860s concerning minority rights in general and Francophone rights in particular with respect to Manitoba.

This presentation is based on quotations from speeches by John A. Macdonald and Georges Etienne Cartier, the two leading figures in Canada's creation. John A. Macdonald's remarks reflect a man's thinking, resulting from many years of political experience in the life of the province of Canada. He knew what the problems and the solutions were. He was, above all a moderate man. He concerned with a workable, viable, political system. He had accepted French-speaking colleagues in his party and in his government, both before and later after 1867. Cartier was a cabinet member who helped negotiate Manitoba's entry into Canada in 1870.

I want to put this question to you because it's fundamental to my argument. How can our political

system be workable if a linguistic minority always feels aggrieved? How can our political system be workable if a linguistic minority always feels aggrieved? I repeat the word "always" to demonstrate the necessity of finding solutions acceptable to the minority.

The challenge in our system is the relationship between the permanent majority language and the permanent minority language. I wish to stress this point because it rises above all political parties. The challenge in our system is the relationship between the permanent majority language and the permanent minority language. By a rule of democracy a majority rules, but the minority has rights, particularly the minority's right to continue to exist. We accept without question the alternation of political parties so that the majority party may rule and that the minority political party may at some time become the majority political party. There is, as you know, an alternation of political parties in power, but there is not an alternation of linguistic groups in power. You see, the permanent linguistic minority never has a chance to become the permanent linguistic majority, either in Quebec or in Manitoba. What then can the permanent linguistic minority do when it knows it will always remain the permanent linguistic minority? The question then is how to deal justly with the permanent linguistic minority, whether it is the permanent Anglophone minority in Quebec or the permanent Francophone minority in Manitoba. The permanent linguistic minority must be dealt with fairly and justly or there will be nothing but turmoil.

These remarks were prepared in your legislative library this morning, whose figures are prominently displayed for you to see in your library: Monsieur Etienne Pascal Taché, Chairman of the 1864 Quebec Conference; Sir Hector Langevin, long-time member of Macdonald's Government; Louis H. Lafontaine, who with Robert Baldwin won responsible government; Sir Georges Etienne Cartier, but more of him soon; two busts of Sir John A. Macdonald, with more of him soon.

We, you, all stand on the shoulders of great men and women. The debt we owe to the past must now be paid in the future which is unfolding today. What were the actions of men like Baldwin and Lafontaine after they won responsible government in 1848? Their first piece of legislation was to restore the equality of English and French in the government of the Province of Canada. They did this contrary to the unilateral action of the British Parliament under The Act of Union of the Province of Canada in 1840 in abolishing the use of French in government. As you probably know, The BNA Act, 1867, continued to guarantee French and English language rights in Section 133. They were not abolished.

There has been a curious phenomenon in recent years in Manitoba. I'm sure you can all remember the months leading up to the Quebec referendum of 1980. All kinds of people ran around all over Canada, signing petitions, pleading Quebecers, please don't leave Canada, we love you, we want you to stay and all that sort of thing. All kinds of people signed petitions to try to keep Quebec in Canada. Are these the same people who are now refusing to extend French language governmental rights today? Are these the same people who are now refusing to extend French language governmental rights to Franco-Manitobans today? Has their position towards French-speaking Canadians changed from 1980 to today, four short years later,

when they don't want to extend governmental service to Franco-Manitobans? Is it because Quebec is far away, the referendum is over and Manitoba is near-at-hand, and Franco-Manitobans live in our midst?

Let me turn now for a moment to the political support given our political parties. The Liberal Party, ever since Edward Blake in the latter part of the 19th Century, has alternated between Anglophone and Francophone leaders. The Liberal Party has been eminently successful, as I'm sure you know. The Conservative Party, ever since 1867, has never once had a Francophone leader, that is a French-Canadian leader. Indeed, Quebecers refer to the Conservative Party as "le parti des anglais," meaning the English Party. The New Democratic Party has never won one seat in the Province of Quebec.

Now, how can we approach this situation? The worst argument that could be advanced is for partisan benefit. The worst reason that could be advanced for rendering justice out of the Constitution is political expediency. I do not advocate either political expediency or any other unjust method, because political expediency is a terrible argument. I recognize it to be the worst argument.

I believe though that parties represented in Manitoba can gain support in Quebec and elsewhere, even in the Province of Manitoba, if they do the right thing. The right thing to do is to treat a permanent linguistic minority fairly and justly. Treat a permanent linguistic minority as your equals, and they will respond in kind. Treat them differently, and they will respond accordingly.

Now I would like to turn to the written portion of this presentation, of which unfortunately you do not have copies. One abbreviated copy will be deposited with your Clerk. The speeches that I am going to quote to you are from the statements that I shall give the Clerk of the House.

"Dans la première conférence parmi le gouvernement provincial tenue à Charlottetown en 1864 et Québec en 1864, il y avait une discussion au sujet des deux langues. La résolution 46 adoptée par la Conférence à Québec était claire . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Professor Kear. Could I interrupt you for a minute? For the benefit of people in the audience, there are translation units available if you wish to sign them out in the back here. If anyone wishes to do so, we can wait until you have gotten your translation unit before proceeding.

MR. A. KEAR: I have also, to assist the proceedings, given a copy of my remarks to your translator. Dans la conférence parmi le gouvernement provincial tenue à Charlottetown en 1864 et Québec en 1864, il y avait une discussion au sujet des deux langues. La résolution 46 adoptée par la Conférence à Québec était claire.

This was the resolution adopted by the Quebec Conference, 1864, in these words: "Both the English and French languages may be employed in the general Parliament and in its proceedings, and in the local Legislature of Lower Canada" - or what we call today Quebec - "and also in the federal courts and in the courts of Lower Canada," - today's Quebec. This Resolution 46 was adopted unanimously at the Quebec 1864 Conference.

Quand les résolutions du Québec fut discutées en 1865 dans les débats sur la Confédération, John A. Macdonald said - following the Quebec 1864 Conference, there were held what are now famously called the Confederation Debates of 1865. During those debates, John A. Macdonald, long-time Leader of the Conservative Party and long-time Prime Minister of Canada, made these remarks: "I have very great pleasure in answering the question put to me by my honourable friend from the County of Quebec. I may state that the meaning of one of the resolutions adopted by the Quebec Conference is this: that the rights of the French-Canadian members as to the status of their language in the federal Legislature shall be precisely the same as they are now in the Legislature of the Province of Canada in every possible respect.

"I have still further pleasure in stating that the moment this was mentioned in the Quebec Conference, the members of the deputation from the lower or Maritime provinces unanimously stated that it was right and just, and I would underline the word 'unanimously', and without one dissenting voice, gave their adhesion to the reasonableness of the proposition that the status of the French language as regards the procedure in Parliament, the printing of measures and everything of that kind should be precisely as it is in the Legislature of the Province of Canada." "Hear, hear," was the response from the members of the House.

Plus tard, dans le même débat, John A. Macdonald a dit - later Macdonald said: "I desire to say that I agree with my honourable friend that as it stands just now the majority governs, but in order to cure this it was agreed at the Quebec Conference to embody this provision in The Imperial Act." "Hear, hear." "This was proposed by the Canadian Government for fear an accident might arise subsequently." I wish to emphasize this last phrase. This was proposed by the Canadian Government for fear that an accident might arise subsequently." That was very prescient, Macdonald saying this in 1865, because we know what happened in Manitoba in 1890.

"It was assented to by the deputation from each province, the use of the French language should form one of the principles upon which the Confederation should be established, and that its use as at present should be guaranteed by The Imperial BNA Act of 1867.

Pendant les mêmes débats sur la Confédération, Georges Etienne Cartier était le chef des Canadiens-Français et il a dit. Cartier was the leader of the French Canadians and this is what he said, a lifetime member of the Conservative Party. "Now when we were united together, if union were attained, we would form a political nationality with which neither the national origin nor the religion of any individual would interfere. It was lamented by some that we had this diversity of races and hopes were expressed that this distinctive feature would cease. The idea of unity of races was utopian. It was impossible. Distinctions of this kind would always exist. This similarity in fact appeared to be the order of the fiscal world and of the moral world as well as in the political world.

"But with regard to the objection based on this fact, to the effect that a great nation could not be formed because Lower Canada, or what we call today Quebec, was in great part French and Catholic, and Upper Canada, today's Ontario, was British and Protestant,

and the Lower or Maritime provinces were mixed, was futile and worthless in the extreme."

Look for instance at the United Kingdom, inhabited as it were by three great races, and what Cartier means here is of course the English, the Scottish and the Welsh. Had the diversity of races impeded the glory, the progress, the wealth of England of the glories of the Senate, the field and the ocean, of the successes of trade and commerce. How much was contributed by the combined talents, energy and courage of the three races together? Cheers.

"In our own federation we should have Catholic and Protestant, English, French, Irish and Scotch and each by his efforts and his success would increase the prosperity and glory of the new confederacy." Hear, hear. He viewed the diversity of races in British North America in this way. "We were of different races, not for the purpose of warring against each other, but in order to compete and emulate for the general welfare. We could not do away with distinctions of race." And listen particularly to the next comment by Cartier. "We could not legislate for the disappearance of the French Canadians from American soil, but British and French Canadians alike could appreciate and understand their position relative to each other. They were placed like great families beside each other and their contact produced a healthy spirit of emulation. It was a benefit rather than other otherwise that we had a diversity of races. Of course the difficulty, it would be said, would be to deal fairly by the minority." The difficulty it would be said, would be to deal fairly by the minority.

Notice how both Macdonald and Cartier were both concerned with the rights of the permanent linguistic minority. They were both concerned with the rights of the permanent linguistic minority, either the permanent linguistic English minority in Quebec, or the permanent French majority throughout Canada.

Sur votre prochaine visite des terrains de la législature provinciale sur la rue Broadway, examinez soigneusement le bust de George Etienne Cartier et l'inscription là. The next time you're out in the grounds of the Legislative Building, look at Cartier's bust.

This is what Cartier said in 1870, supposedly in English: "May the new Province of Manitoba always speak to the inhabitants of the North-West, the language of reason, truth and justice." I would argue that reason, truth and justice are the elements of the resolution in Bill 115 now before you. I cannot see this province or this country build on any other principles but reason, truth and justice. If we don't, we have a different country.

En addition, la législature impériale a ratifié l'Acte du Manitoba en 1871 avec le résultat que la section 23 est partie intégrale de la Constitution Canadienne et heureusement en dehors du pouvoir de la législature manitobaine. What I am saying here, very simply, is that the Imperial Parliament seat in London ratified the Manitoba Act of 1870 and 1871 with the result of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as an integral part of the Canadian Constitution and happily, as we've learned since the Supreme Court decision of 1979, beyond the power of the Manitoba Legislature.

Well what about the present? Aujourd'hui, la grande question devise n'est pas entre les deux divisions de la foi chrétienne, le catholicisme et le protestantisme, mais c'est la relation entre les deux langues majoritaires, l'anglais et la français. The problem today is not

between the two varieties of Christianity but the question of the relations between the two linguistic groups. Ecumenism has done some good work.

A cause des tensions dans la Province du Québec, le gouvernement Pearson a créé la Commission d'enquête royale sur le bilinguisme et le bi-culturalisme. Pendant la même période, M. Trudeau est devenu le Premier Ministre du Canada. Pendant une visite dans l'Ouest, le Premier Ministre a fait quelques remarques à l'occasion du dévoilement du Monument Riel à Regina le 2 octobre 1968.

During this period the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was created by the Pearson Government and Mr. Trudeau made the following remarks in Regina on the 2nd of October, 1968. "For me," when he unveiled the Riel Monument in Regina, ". . . this is the lesson of Louis Riel. For me this is the reason we are here. A democratic society and system of government, while among the grandest of human concepts, are among the most difficult to implement. In a democracy it is all too easy for the majority to forget the rights of the minority and for a remote and powerful government to ignore its protests, it is all too easy should disturbances erupt, to crush them in the name of law and order. We must never forget that in the long run, a democracy is judged by the way the majority treats the minority." Mr. Trudeau finished his remarks by saying, "Riel's battle is not yet won." Mr. Trudeau's remarks in Regina in 1968 are as apt today in Manitoba in 1984.

Several people I am sure, before your committee have said, let's adopt the American way, let's have a melting pot, let's forget all this nonsense about languages. I think we have a better solution than the American way. Indeed Arway is a lovely example of the American way. Let us be true to our own instinct for fair play. The choice is becoming clear. Either we accept official bilingualism in a multicultural society, as in Manitoba, or we try to live with the unreality of a unilingual English-only Manitoba. A unilingual English Manitoba is an absurd impossibility. It has been impossible before 1870, before Manitoba entered Canada, and it has been impossible in Manitoba ever since 1870 and will be increasingly impossible in the future, as more and more of our younger generation attend immersion schools.

The non-Anglophones, as a group, now constitute Manitoba's permanent linguistic majority. If I may repeat that last comment: The non-Anglophones now constitute Manitoba's permanent linguistic majority. Tables have turned since 1890 and at this point there has been an interesting change in the Conservative Party in Manitoba. It's a historic change in the presence of Mr. Gary Filmon. For the first time in the history of the Conservative Party in Manitoba, the Leader of the Conservative Party is not an Anglo-Saxon. I think what we are seeing is a social change we're seeing right before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon, on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: On a point of order, I might point out that Mr. Sidney Spivak was not an Anglo-Saxon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. A. KEAR: The point I'm making is that we are seeing social change of a significant nature in Manitoba and Sidney Spivak's election as leader of his party and Mr. Filmon's election as leader of his party indicate the changes taking place.

What I would urge this committee and this House to do is to take the high road and do two things. First, correct the constitutional injustice of 94 year standing to our Francophone fellow citizens of Manitoba by adopting the January 17, 1984 agreement with the SFM without any further alterations. Secondly, prepare for the future by establishing official bilingualism in a multicultural society; so all Manitobans can learn anew to live in good relations with one another.

My final comments are based on a survey conducted by the Institute for Social and Economic Research at the University of Manitoba. I wish to refer to Page 5, in particular, because in this survey they asked a series of questions and I will quote directly from this report. "While most surveys on this issue have identified significant oppositions to the proposed legislation, it appears that Manitobans are very supportive of essential services being available in French." The survey confirms this. Then, as quoted, the question that was asked in the survey. "Do you think services like those provided by the police, the courts, hospitals or Autopac should be available in French when requested? Yes, 61 percent. No, 32 percent. Don't know, 7 percent." This survey was taken just before the referenda in October.

What I'm arguing for and what this objective evidence indicates is that the majority of Manitobans want expanded French Language Services provided by the Government of Manitoba to their fellow French speaking citizens.

Thank you, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Professor Kear. There is still approximately eight minutes left. Do any members of the committee wish to ask any questions?

Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Professor Kear, you referred to a January 17, 1984 agreement. Could you tell me with whom that agreement was made?

MR. A. KEAR: Perhaps my wording wasn't precise enough. What I was referring to was the special general meeting of La Société Franco-Manitobaine on the 17th of January, in which they opted - what was it? - 500-and-some-odd to 112-some-odd in favour of the action of the temporary government in Manitoba. In other words, the SFM in a public meeting, in a democratic vote supports the move currently under way being taken by the government in the Province of Manitoba, and I supported that. I was present, and I voted accordingly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Professor Kear, my first question is somewhat on that same line. I hope I'm not misquoting you, Professor Kear, if I may paraphrase you. I think you told the committee that you, "fully support in principle the position of the SFM with respect to Section 23," and my question, Mr.

Chairman, to Professor Kear is: what is that position? Is it the position of last May? Is it the position of last autumn following the presentation of Mr. Penner's proposed amendments of September 6th? Is it the position of these past few days arising from Mr. Anstett's amendments of January 5th, or is it a position that the SFM still must articulate?

MR. A. KEAR: You've asked a good question, and you've asked a difficult question to answer. My concern in appearing before you today is to say that I agree in principle with the expansion of provincial governmental services in French to French-speaking citizens. On this, I have no hesitation at all, and on this ground I agree in principle with the position taken by the SFM. On details, I do not accept all of the things that the SFM go for, and to elaborate on this, I think there has been an unfortunate - let me collect my thoughts. This whole process has been an educational one and my hesitation in accepting the current arrangements in all its details is that the governing party in Manitoba has faced virulent, and I would say quite often ignorant, opposition to what the SFM is asking for, and in the face of sometimes unwarranted opposition, I believe that the government has too often backed off in the face of public opinion, and I think, if a government had earlier realized the depth of feeling among Franco-Manitobans, they would have taken a firmer stand earlier and not made the, what I regard, as an unnecessary series of the concessions to this strongly expressed public opinion.

In other words, I think that the principle of expanded French Language Services is first-class. I see no reason why there should be limits. I think what we're dealing with is a changing attitude in society and particularly a changing attitude amongst Franco-Manitobans. I have engaged in their social and other activities ever since returning to Manitoba, and these people are determined, whether you believe me or not, these people are determined to have their full rights as taxpaying citizens of the Province of Manitoba, and one of the things they want is expanded French Language Services from the government of Manitoba.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Professor Kear, I'm not presuming to ask you to answer this question on behalf of the SFM

MR. A. KEAR: No, I cannot do that. I can only speak for myself.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . but I would like to ask you the question as a member of the SFM, and you have made the point on the record, Professor Kear, for the committee's information, that you are an active and enthusiastic member of the SFM. Would it be fair to assume that you, as a member of the SFM and some other colleagues of yours in the SFM perhaps, are at a point on this issue where they regard the achievement of a consensus that that reflects a respect for the SFM and for all other component cultural groups in Manitoba, at a point where they consider the achievement of a consensus, the essential objective now, and that they would not be and you would not be happy with a decision that came about as a result of any such

arbitrary governmental action as closure of debate on a constitutional amendment? Is that a fair suggestion to make to anybody with respect to the position held by individual SFM members at the present time as far as your acquaintance with SFM members goes?

MR. A. KEAR: I cannot, obviously, speak for all of the members of the SFM. I know a good number. I know them personally. But again, I can't speak for them as individuals. Closure, I'm sure, Mr. Sherman, you are quite well aware is a normal parliamentary practice. Closure was a normal parliamentary practice first created and adopted in Britain, and has been applied in Canada in the House of Commons of which you used to be a member, historically on numerous occasions in the past and the purpose of closure, as I'm sure you're aware, is that the government under the cabinet parliamentary system ultimately gets its way. Now, whether the public likes closure. That's another matter. But under the cabinet parliamentary system the technique of closure is to permit eventually the government to get its way.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'm aware of the history of closure. I'm aware of the fact that it exists as a parliamentary convention that certainly has been invoked in the past and will be invoked in the future, but I'm asking you as a member of the SFM whether it is not more important to you to achieve consensus in this area than to achieve a Pyrrhic victory through closure forced on a constitutional amendment.

MR. A. KEAR: The SFM did not ask for closure.

MR. L. SHERMAN: No, indeed they didn't, but the Government House Leader, of course, has moved a motion of closure.

MR. A. KEAR: I cannot speak on behalf of the government. As I said, I belong to no political party.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'm asking you as a member of the SFM - you don't need to answer the question - but do you think that you would achieve anything other than a Pyrrhic victory by achieving your objective as a means of the invoking of closure on a constitutional amendment by the Government of the Day?

MR. A. KEAR: There is really more at stake here than what you may regard as a Pyrrhic victory. What is really at stake here is that the Province of Manitoba, first of all, must obey its own Constitution which it has violated since 1890. Manitoba's violation of its own Constitution in 1890 has been made very clear by a unanimous decision of the Appeal Court of Manitoba, followed by another unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

I mean the Province of Manitoba has been acting unconstitutionally since 1890. That has been determined in open court by the Appeal Court of Manitoba and Supreme Court of Canada, and I see no reason why the Government of Manitoba should continue to break its own Constitution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. The allotted time for this speaker has expired.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns, on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: I do ask whether the committee would not give leave to allow for some further questioning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed by the committee? (Agreed)

MR. D. SCOTT: Ten minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes?

A MEMBER: Well, we gave Mr. Green five minutes. I think five minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five minutes.

Mr. Sherman, do you have any more questions before Mr. Enns asks?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have one, but in view of the time limitations, I don't want to deprive other members of the committee from asking questions, so I'll yield.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to Professor Kear, I happen to share his point of view with respect to the Canadian way.

MR. A. KEAR: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

MR. H. ENNS: I happen to share his point of view that the Canadian way is, by and large, the better way from my point of view, as compared to the American way.

MR. A. KEAR: Absolutely, we have nothing to learn from Americans.

MR. H. ENNS: However, would Professor Kear not acknowledge the fact that the American chose their way, the melting-pot way, that that in no way has prevented the various ethnic, cultural groups from maintaining and exhibiting their pride in a very forceful way; perhaps no better way than with the start of St. Patrick's Day down in New York every St. Patrick's Day; or when you travel to some of the southern states where entire communities are Spanish-speaking; within the larger metropolitan centres where you have large areas of Italian; or in the State of Louisiana where the derivative Cajun-French language and culture is practised? I don't think you were seriously suggesting that pride in ethnic background and culture is dead in the United States.

MR. A. KEAR: Not at all, but the general thrust of American society, capsulized in the phrase "the melting-pot theory," is that everybody's got to be the same and everybody's got to speak the same language. If there is only one language — (Interjection) — no no, if I can finish my remarks - that everybody should speak the same language, and that governmental services should be provided only in one language. There is only

one constitutional official language in the United States, and that's English, period.

That is not the Canadian manner of government. We have had two languages in government as a normal, operating principle and in practice in Canada since 1848. Both languages, English and French, have been equal since 1848 by an act of Parliament, adopted by the Legislature of the Province of Canada. This was ratified and repeated in The British North America Act, Section 133, in 1867. This was repeated in The Manitoba Act, 1870, under Article 23. These are historical facts.

MR. H. ENNS: A further question to Professor Kear, Mr. Chairman. You also alluded to the fact that during the time of the Quebec Referendum, many people here in Manitoba were signing petitions urging the people and sending a message, if you like, to the voters in Quebec that, no, we didn't want to see that separation take place. Is it not a fact though that the SFM was not signatory to those kinds of petitions?

MR. A. KEAR: I was not party to that decision. I should point out to you, it was the Executive of the SFM, and I was not a member of the Executive of the SFM, nor was I a party to that decision.

MR. H. ENNS: I raise that because, Mr. Chairman, we heard earlier today from a Mr. Maurice Prince who represents an organization, I believe . . .

MR. A. KEAR: Maurice Prince, oui. Je sais.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . that partially grew out of the fact that the official executive position of the SFM was to, in fact, agree with the separation of Quebec from Canada in terms of that referendum position.

MR. A. KEAR: Maurice Prince speaks for his organization; I speak for myself.

MR. H. ENNS: That's fine. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. A. KEAR: If I could make another comment, Mr. Enns, just go back to elaborate I think on your earlier remarks. It's a particular contribution that French Canadians have made to our society which is often not either understood nor really fully appreciated. French Canadians have persistently and repeatedly through the generations refused to be assimilated into English-speaking Canada for their own reasons, which are historically understandable and quite justified. They refuse to assimilate; they refuse to give up their language, okay?

The consequence of this, which is not often appreciated nor understood, particularly in Western Canada, where I know there is a great variety of people of a variety of ethnic backgrounds - this refusal on the part of French-Canadians and also Franco-Manitobans to refuse to assimilate, to give up their language has made it much easier for groups other than English and French to maintain their heritage, their language, their customs, their culture and so on and so on. I think that's a positive thing. I think that's a positive contribution that French-Canadians and Franco-Manitobans have made both to Manitoba and to Canada at large.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That expends the remaining five minutes. What is the will of the committee, a further extension or proceed with the next? Proceed?

I'm sorry, Professor Kear. The time guidelines were set down at the first meeting, and they have to be applied to everyone.

MR. A. KEAR: Thanks very much. Thank you.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please.

Mr. Claro Paqueo. Mr. Terry Wachniak.
Mr. Albert Krawchuk.

MR. A. KRAWCHUK: Mr. Chairman, committee members, I tried to write something down last night and I decided to discard it, because I felt that if I write it I'm orchestrating it. I would rather go with just a gut feeling and nothing else, just a gut feeling.

Until I came here several days ago and listened in the House, it was my first time that I've been in a Parliament Building and it's an eye-opener. I saw people being disrespectful to each other; I saw posturing; I saw politicking back and forth. I didn't see anything accomplished. I didn't feel good. And now I have a piece of paper here, it has some proposed legislation in it. I tried to understand it; I understand most of it. I understand what the intent is, what I don't understand is the need.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer if we tried desperately to appease the gut feeling and by that I mean a consensus across. Some people may be hurt, others may be more advantaged than others, but the consensus, the gut feeling that we're doing something together. We're not opposed, we're not at loggerheads constantly - both sides. I have seen many seeds of discontent, malice, anxiety, not knowing, being planted. I see them being fertilized with politics. That crop will grow; all you have to do is put a little water on it and give it some sunlight. It'll grow and we will have to reap the harvest, whatever it is, because we will be forced to by the constitutional finality.

There will be no recourse. We'll be stuck with it whether we like it or not. I beg you, come to your senses. Use logic, feel what the people feel. Search for it, ask for it, go out, walk amongst them, see what you feel. If you don't feel anything, you're all very insensitive. I wouldn't attempt to comment on any portions of this bill in respect to legal implications, but I listened to a person that I never had much respect for, that was Mr. Sid Green. That man is six-foot-six and he's growing.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Mr. Krawchuk? Does Mr. Krawchuk wish to answer any questions?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Krawchuk, you just gave us a very powerful presentation and I have a couple of questions. I realize and understand what you said, but I wonder if you could answer a couple of questions. One is, you

and I come from a group which is of neither English nor French descent, a fairly large group in Manitoba and in Canada, and I wonder if you would indicate, because you're obviously quite upset and distressed with this legislation and its effect on the province, in your judgment, what effect you think this legislation will have on, first of all, the Ukrainian, German, Polish, etc. communities, and secondly, all Manitobans?

MR. A. KRAWCHUK: You phrase the question by saying German, Ukrainian and other ethnic origins, I would prefer not to use that term. I would just say other Canadians that prefer to speak a language other than a common language that we're used to using. What they would feel about it would be difficult for me to speak on their behalf; that would be an individual choice to each his own.

But again I come back to the point that I say it's the gut feeling. What do the people feel, regardless of what language they speak? It makes no difference. I have yet to meet a person in Manitoba that I couldn't converse with. I have yet to meet a person in Manitoba that I couldn't converse with, even if he just landed here two or three months ago. If I sincerely tried, I found a way to converse with him. It might not be totally fluent but we understood each other.

MR. R. DOERN: If I could just ask you to elaborate again, and I realize you indicated this, but you said this was the first time you ever came into this building.

MR. A. KRAWCHUK: Yes.

MR. R. DOERN: And did you come out of a sense of frustration or anger or did you come because the government, in your judgment, isn't listening to the people and you came to tell the government what you think and what other people that you've spoken to think?

MR. A. KRAWCHUK: I came to this building to let the Legislative Chamber hear what I had to say; it wasn't to one government or to the opposition. I was disgusted with what I saw; I was disgusted with what I heard. I saw no progress; I saw badgering back and forth.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Krawchuk, would you like to answer any further questions? Are there any further questions for Mr. Krawchuk?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Krawchuk, just one general question. May I ask whether you're a Winnipeg resident?

MR. A. KRAWCHUK: I live in Winnipeg but we farm in the Fisher Branch district.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Krawchuk.

Mrs. Lois Edie.

MRS. L. EDIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen present, and fellow members and citizens of Manitoba gathered here this afternoon, in my opening remarks, I would like to commend the Government of Manitoba for some of the actions it has taken in this House in assisting the citizens of the community. As I work a great deal with women's organizations, I would like to thank you for what you have done in the area of wife abuse, and I am looking forward to what you will be doing in the area of pornography and other very serious concerns which take place within our society today which are causing considerable emotional distress within our Manitoba community.

Now, today, we address Bill 115, An Act respecting the Operations of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. A review of history: in 1870 The Manitoba Act gave the western colony two languages, English and French; 1890 - to facilitate the needs of this western province, The Manitoba Act was changed to all English; then in 1976, a gentleman from St. Boniface, known as the Georges Forest incident, came forward with his personal dissatisfaction and was able to take this to the Secretary of State in Ottawa and the Supreme Court of Canada. Now, this gentleman, it is said and it has been researched, received financial assistance to achieve his goals.

I would like to ask the question of this committee: how many other citizens in Manitoba have been so privileged with this issue?

In 1980, the Supreme Court of Canada established the rights of the French people in the Legislature and courts of Manitoba. I don't think the citizens of Manitoba really understand that, but it has been said by a number of the leaders within this last week again, and I'm quite convinced this is a fact. So what are we doing here today?

Now, in 1883, in May, with the Franco-Manitoban Society our government has continued negotiations for a new batch of laws including the entrenchment in the Manitoba Constitution of French. Now, we realize that this is a very important matter for the people of this province. As it is the first constitutional issue, we feel that the time has been very very restricted and very limited for an issue of this importance. We also realize that there is no referendum to the people of the Province of Manitoba, that there is nothing in our Constitution federally or provincially to say that there must be or that there must not be. Now, my question is: why is there not? Possibly this is something that should be considered for the Manitoba Constitution.

Now, it has been ignored, the tool of referendum to the public. As a democratic tool which has served successfully in the past, we recommend that it be used again, and it is with this concern of entrenchment of French in the provincial constitution at this time in the Province of Manitoba that I have taken the opportunity to address you today.

Why, ladies and gentlemen, do you wish to use closure on a very important matter, our Constitution? Using a majority vote in the House, not a free vote, within your party, when your own government party - and I refer now to the New Democratic Party, under its party constitution directs its own members that it must have a two-third majority vote of the membership in order to change the Constitution within its own organization. This also applies to our Federal Constitution.

Now, this resolution to declare Manitoba officially bilingual is regressive at this time, and I would repeat that, but I don't think it's necessary. I don't wish to further give examples, because we have been reading the community of Manitoba. Have you? Closure eight hours plus a vote is normally used when government is secure, when they believe that their actions, that of the government, reflect the actions of the people of Manitoba.

Public hearings are a fine example. Why aren't we using more of these before we have closure so that we have an accurate reading of this situation.

Now, negotiations re: the French language, the French fact, in Manitoba have taken place. This is research and I want to share it with you. I'm going to refer now to the address by the Honourable Serge Joyal to the annual meeting of the Société franco-manitobaine, March 19, 1983. The community research which has taken place has brought this out of the woodwork. "Negotiations re the French language in Manitoba: negotiations have been taking place between seven groups, the Manitoba Provincial Government, Mr. Robert of the Franco-Manitoban Society, the Province of New Brunswick, the Federal Government and two groups from Quebec." Noticeably absent is any other organization from the people of Manitoba. Why?

"No. 2, representing the people of the Province of Manitoba there has been no white paper for the people to discuss in forum, and we are discussing historic changes which citizens are attempting to address today, with I would say a lack of information and a lack of opportunity." Why are citizens not getting the accurate information and why this lack of opportunity?

"No. 3, community development agencies working on behalf of the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Secretary of State in Ottawa." In Manitoba communities, why?

"No. 4, large budget which is available, and this is of the Canadian taxpayer dollars through the Secretary of State, the Honourable Serge Joyal, to the French communities in Manitoba and to the medium and to other mediums, to the Franco-Manitoban societies and government circles in Manitoba."

Now, I'd like to refer to the address of the Honourable Serge Joyal, Secretary of State, Ottawa, which I mentioned a few minutes ago, in March, 1983. I'm going to refer to this, people, because I feel that this is something that more of us should know a little more about.

I'm quoting him, "You now hold the key to restoring equal status of French in Manitoba. The SFM has begun discussion with the Manitoba Government in an attempt to extend the protection contained in Section 23 to all public services available to the Francophone public. This is a critical moment. It is a chance that will not come again."

Support from the Secretary of State Department, those in office, when this gentleman was sworn in office by the Governor-General and he was asked, what are his goals, he said "to reaffirm the French fact in Canada."

Page 4. "Financial support to all citizens," - this is another goal - "Wishing to apply Sections 16 to 23 of the new Constitution," - and this is the French language rights. To quote this gentleman, "It is these provinces

that the Francophone community in Manitoba should focus on in its negotiations with the Attorney-General of Manitoba."

Page 5. "If you're given texts, study them." Now this gentleman is speaking in Manitoba to the Franco-Manitoban Society. "If you wish to make progress do the necessary lobbying, so that Manitoba will adopt Sections 16 to 22 of the Canadian Constitution. We have fought long enough to get this for it to be worth the price and I can assure you in this regard, and I say this publicly, that the Canadian Government is far from being indifferent to such an initiative since you may well set an example for Ontario. It may seem somewhat strange for the light suddenly to appear in the West for our friends in Ontario, but I think that you will really have blazed a trail that can only be useful to other provinces. I can assure you that in this undertaking, I can guarantee you the support of my Cabinet colleagues and necessary funding."

I quote again: "I place such importance on this that when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled on French language rights in Manitoba, the Department of the Secretary of State immediately got in touch with the provincial authorities to offer them all necessary technical and financial assistance with translation so as to institute the necessary legal services to comply with the letter and spirit of Manitoba's Constitution Act. So you have nothing to fear, and I say this to my friends in the Manitoba Government, you have nothing to fear. The Canadian Government can give you the necessary assistance if you wish to adopt the constitutional objectives we have entrenched. We have done this in the case of education and shall continue to do so." And I quote again: "We must not play the fool too long, however."

Then we go on with our objectives. "I'm even happier because in the next few years we will be needing very clear ideas on what we want to do in Manitoba, you as users of services and we in the Federal Government. On my way here as I was making up a list of the kind of objectives you should have over the next few years, I realized that the task is so monumental that I wonder if you would ever manage to finish what has to be done."

"The first thing obviously, I said to myself, is to guarantee the interpretation of Section 23 for Francophones. That is already under way. Then it is necessary to get agreements on entrenching Section 23 in the Canadian Charter of Rights, and that appears to be already under way. Then Section 23 must be made compulsory in the new Constitution, and that appears to be under way."

"Then we must see that the Francophone community is given control over French schools and on the issues of Francophone control over French schools lies in the heart of the controversy in Ontario. But I must tell you that should it become necessary, should it become inevitable, you can count on the Federal Government for support. However, I urge you to make this objective one of your top priorities because all French communities in Canada have to contend with this problem: in British Columbia, in Alberta, in Saskatchewan, in Nova Scotia, in Ontario, in Prince Edward Island and in Newfoundland. This is a key issue in the interpretation of the right to French education in Canada. Please take notice. And I must tell you it is crucial to all future courses of action. Please take notice."

"Then I said to myself, Franco-Manitobans will have to find adequate funding for French education in Manitoba. That is already taking place in some areas. Then it will be necessary to ensure that the intercultural committee that is to be organized respects the interests of Franco-Manitobans. There are two official languages in Canada, ladies and gentlemen, and there are two official languages in Manitoba too.

"I think we must draw the appropriate conclusion from these facts. I think you understand what I mean. That is crucial as well. We have to learn to reconcile the equal status of the two languages in Canada with the needs of other cultural communities that make up the country. That's important. It's paramount. And in this province and the western provinces in particular, it's a fundamental issue whose facets and implications we are going to have to discuss in the coming months. And it won't be easy, believe me. I am counting on you to lay the foundation for the status that the French language must have in this province, Manitoba.

"Another very important area is the development of a cable television network which would link French-Canadian cities. We were just speaking of the future. I am to meet with my Cabinet colleagues sometime during the next few weeks to obtain approval for renewal of funding for programs for official language groups, and I intend to make cable television one of the key objectives for the next five years. It is essential that there be a cable television network to link Francophone centres throughout the country, and not originated in the studios on Dorchester Street in Montreal, if you please.

"Next, it is imperative that we improve the cultural infrastructure available to Francophones. In this area, it is important to develop a network of French language libraries across the province. This again, in my opinion, is essential in fostering the need felt by every individual to be part of a large current and to be able to share the resources that represent French culture with a large number of people, not only in Canada, but all around the world.

"You must also actively support your bilingual representatives on municipal councils. Everyone also thinks of the province in terms of the Provincial Government, but there is another level of government which is also extremely important, the Municipal Government. This is the level with which you come into contact every day. When you leave your home and step out onto the sidewalk you are on municipal territory, as you well know. This level of government is very important because if you wish to develop a French lifestyle, all the elected agencies representing us must reflect the concerns that we have in a linguistic community. This again, in my view, is a very important element.

"Similarly, you must ensure that there is a better representative of Francophones in educational areas. This also seems to me to be of vital importance. As you know, there is even a Congress under way right at this moment at which representatives of school boards and the Government of Manitoba are discussing their representative degrees of autonomy. There must be a similar discussion at the level of the various populations grouped within these school boards.

"Above all, the economic basis of the Franco-Manitoban community must be strengthened. Yesterday,

I had the opportunity of meeting representatives of a movement which is growing up around the idea of developing the city centre of St. Boniface as well. I believe the Department of Secretary of State has already given funds to a group of your fellow citizens, who are with us today I might add, to hire a person to organize this movement in order to give it the force it needs to become involved in the revitalization of the city centre."

Page 12: "There are two other important elements which I would like to emphasize. The first is increasing the presence of women. My department is responsible for progress involvements improving the status of women. I would also suggest to you that women can be very valuable tools in lobbying and making things happen within the community. I must say to you that it is imperative that the Franco-Manitoban Society count on the most active possible participation of women.

"Also of vital importance in my opinion are our young people. Within the next few moments I will be announcing the Federal Government's plan to help groups of young people."

HON. A. MACKLING: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. Mackling, on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that Mrs. Edie wants to make her point and I don't interfere with her doing that, but if it's a lengthy extract from a speech, then I think it would be better just to table it and refer to that speech because, quite frankly, we don't want to be hearing about Mr. Joyal's views. We want to hear the witness's views.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern, to the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we listened to the lecture from Professor Kear. I think he spoke at some length, historically. Mrs. Edie is quoting more recent history, Serge Joyal, the mastermind of official bilingualism in Canada and the Prime Minister's right-hand man. I think it's perfectly appropriate that she quote and she can quote at length. It's her 40 minutes. I think she's as relevant and as direct as many speakers before the committee.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, simply to support what Mr. Doern has said, there is possibly no other federal official that has more directly intervened in this question before us, and he is doing so officially in his capacity as Secretary of State. He has supplied tax dollars with respect to the advancement of the language package before us and I think it's entirely appropriate that we know and hear of what that Federal Cabinet Minister, who has obviously a mission in life with respect to the language proposal before us and to some extent is author of the proposal before us. It certainly is germane to the committee's consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman, to the same point.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a brief question. Did we lay down any rules as to what people

were going to be able to do with their 40 minutes? I understood that Mr. Mackling's original motion was 40 minutes inclusive, which was to cover the presentation and any questions. He didn't say anything about content or reference material or source material or quotes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's been quite a bit of latitude which has been granted to members of the public in presenting their opinions. Whether those opinions are theirs or they're quoting other people, it's really up to them. If it's not totally specific to the bill, that still would be relatively in order. I have given a lot of latitude to members of the public and I am more rigorous in enforcing the rules of relevance on members of the committee rather than the public.

MRS. L. EDIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will conclude my remarks shortly but I feel the content of the person who is directing the actions which are creating so much distress within our community at the present time, it's rather important that everyone is aware of them.

One of the concerns and one of my very deep concerns is that the community at large has not been well-informed of the activities and the thinkings of this particular gentleman, who is very much directing indirectly, the activities which appear to be taking place within our province at the present time.

So I will conclude. "This ethnic group which we refer to, continue to tell others of French origin that we want the place which is ours by right because we built this country. There's no inference to all of the large contribution of the other cultures of this province. So by attempting to restore the status of French language in Manitoba legislation and institutions, you are simply reflecting the historical truth; and the Canadian Government's responsibility and all this is to lend you a hand to give you both financial and political support, and I do not hesitate to say this because a minority needs political support. We agree. Also a majority needs political support and a political voice in order to bring pressure to bear in whatever area is necessary.

"In closing, what I, as Canada's Secretary of State, am asking you to do, is persevere. It's that simple. Do not give up for you have everything needed to serve as a model for the advancement of French in many other provinces and this is of paramount importance. You did not fail when the question was put three years ago. Keep up the good work. We will be there to support you."

Now I have used this, Mr. Chairman, in order to share information with persons present, which I wonder if everyone has been privileged to acquire this information. I think it's quite important when we're addressing this very serious topic, that we have accurate information.

Now addressing Bill 115 to establishment of Language Services Advisory Council and having read your act I feel there are too many powers for the Minister. In the institution, it encompasses a very large spectrum of Manitoba's population and it sets out that people, in order to be employed, must be bilingual and there is great concern within the population of this province at the present time that there will be many job opportunities lost by many of the citizens who are not bilingual. The Language Services Advisory Council, is it really necessary at this present time?

There is little representation of the multicultural Manitoba community and why I ask, do we have four representatives from the bargaining agents of the civil servants? That's a ratio of four out of 13. If you take that population-wise, that means that you are looking at a considerable large number, about one-third of the population.

Presiding officer - there's no public input into the choice of this office. It's done within those chosen to participate on the Advisory Council.

The ombudsman, he has too much power in my opinion, and his term of office should be limited to five years. By doing so it would give the citizens the right of more freedom within - someone who you've given a considerable amount of power.

I would like to mention in conversation to some people from Quebec - and I do have communication across Canada - the ombudsman is not looked upon with favour by some of the citizens of Quebec. Then as I was writing this out, someone made the remark, the Manitoba violation of its own Constitution is a fallacy in my mind. I don't feel that we have violated the Constitution in Manitoba. As citizens and the Government of the Day in 1980, they addressed the problem of the French language in Manitoba and with time all citizens will be enriched for those who take the opportunity to take the other language. But I say to you at the present time the community is not ready to have a two-language situation. There are not enough citizens who are bilingual in these two languages.

Regulation 32, in my mind, is dictatorial and the repeal that concerns me very much is No. 34, back page, "An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in regard to statutes, being Chapter 3 of the Statutes of Manitoba 1980, is repealed." Gentlemen, I would like to know why.

Another thought, refused to assimilate. I don't think the French-Canadian people have refused to assimilate at all. Initially I was born in a Saskatchewan community of French and English and the people there got along very well, but there was very much control by the Roman Catholic Church in that community for that segment of our population. As a result many of those people didn't think for themselves, to put it straight, but today we have Germans and French marrying, we have English and French marrying, and I don't feel that the French-Canadians have been badly done by in the past in Manitoba. I do feel that they have been privileged to be in Manitoba, rather than Quebec, for in Quebec I have women friends who have not been able to speak English. They haven't been allowed to. I can't say that for any French woman in Manitoba or any youth.

Quebec's influence in Canada is strong, and I think we must address this. When you go to Ottawa you realize, if you are in government there, the strength of the influence of the Province of Quebec in our Federal Government. So let's be aware of it and let's address it.

In summary, I would like to see more responsible press. I think the citizens of Manitoba deserve this. More time for the people of Manitoba to decide that when this is such a very important matter, public knowledge of government negotiations with the Secretary of State and the Franco-Manitobans. I think the citizens of Manitoba deserve this. They have a right.

Other Canadians that prefer to speak a language other than English, should it be imperative for them to

learn French? And what is the deal with Ottawa? That's the bottom line. I'd like to know, what is the trade-off? There has to be one. So many dollars have come into Manitoba by the Secretary of State, for Manitoba to act in a certain fashion so it will be easier for this gentleman to act in Ottawa. What is the trade-off? Very often there's trade offs, and the citizens are not often the winners. Frustration, anger of citizens of Manitoba, with little progress and a decreasing receptiveness on the part of our present government is today's reading. I think we're on January 27, 1984.

Thank you for your time and your patience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a few minutes remaining. Are there any questions for Mrs. Edie?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mrs. Edie, you called for a referendum or a free vote in the earlier part of your remarks. Did you vote in the plebiscite in the fall?

MRS. L. EDIE: In our part we weren't allowed to. The decision was made by the R.M. of Springfield not to have a vote. A number of the citizens were upset about it, but that was what took place there.

MR. R. DOERN: I was wondering what your reaction was to the government the day after the plebiscite, when Mr. Penner announced that in spite of the results the government was going to proceed.

MRS. L. EDIE: Well, I recognize because I have held public office and it's not always easy to make snap judgments. I think our press are very hard on you people who carry public responsibility. Sometimes you need to have a little longer to get a more accurate reading of the situation. But, again I will repeat, I feel the press are doing a very poor job of informing the population of Manitoba.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm not sure whether you answered my question. My question was: what was your reaction to Mr. Penner's statement? Mr. Penner said that in spite of the results of the plebiscite the government would proceed. I'm asking you what your opinion was of his comment? You're saying he answered too quickly?

MRS. L. EDIE: Well, I made a general statement but I was going to give a specific response to you and my reaction to Mr. Penner was, well that's a person in public office. He hasn't had time to evaluate the situation.

MR. R. DOERN: Okay, thank you. Another question, you made an appeal several times for more time in regard to this issue. Is this because you want a healing process? Is it because you want more information or more dialogue? What is the basis of your argument that more time is required or desirable?

MRS. L. EDIE: Well, my time slot is not 87, it would be maybe 2,000, and I'll tell you why, because our educational system in my opinion has not developed enough people with the skills in a bilingual frame to enable enough people to participate in what will be necessary if we become a totally bilingual Canada.

Today we have examples where there are people who cannot get positions because they do not speak French. We also have examples of people who are bilingual in offices where it's not even used. But the directive, if from Ottawa, is that you must be bilingual if you wish to have this position. It would be interesting to do a stats right now to see how many people that directive really affects in Canada. We have it here now.

MR. R. DOERN: Then you're not dead against the provision of services in the French language. Are you arguing that this should take place only over a long period of time?

MRS. L. EDIE: What I am concerned about is that having read our Secretary of State's speech that he has come to Manitoba. In my opinion, he has directed the Franco-Manitoban to take the type of action which he feels Manitoba should have. I would like to repeat. In Ottawa, you in Manitoba are visualized as a colony. You're not looked upon as a province and I have been in conversation and I have asked that question, and I asked the question why, as I did a number of times in this presentation.

MR. R. DOERN: Just on that point, may I ask who you were speaking to? Was it a person of some rank or authority?

MRS. L. EDIE: Well, I've been with the Council of the Status of Women, and I've been fortunate in that - for your information - I have not publicly addressed any political party because I work for women's organizations, for those things which I feel will provide growth for the home and the community development. I feel that as a private citizen, if we have the opportunities to do this, there is a huge piece of work to be done. So when I come forward publicly which I very seldom do, it is because I am deeply concerned about a situation.

MR. R. DOERN: To date - you live in Springfield; I don't - what effect would you say this legislation and debate has had within your own community in the last six to eight months?

MRS. L. EDIE: It's within the last month that the citizens have become quite upset. Then again, I relate this to lack of information. But for the committee's information, a meeting was held last night, and many of the citizens were present. A number throughout the community had done research on this subject, and they left the meeting requesting Mr. Anstett and the government to withdraw Bill 115, and also to withdraw the resolution to entrench French in the Constitution of Manitoba at this present time. Those of us who read the community feel that this would be rather a devastating form of action to take place at this present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern, there are only a couple of minutes left. Mr. Enns would like to have a question.

MR. R. DOERN: I'll just ask one more then. You also made reference to the fact that Mr. Joyal has set one of his targets as the municipalities of Canada. You realize

that this legislation specifically excludes municipalities and school boards. Do you think that is a sufficient safeguard, or do you believe that it is only a matter of time before the pressure will go on to the municipalities, and then they too will fall to official bilingualism?

MRS. L. EDIE: My personal opinion, it's just a matter of time. I think the strategy here is that you have got to stop the entrenchment right now until the Canadian citizens are better educated in languages, namely, our two official languages. I think that's very very important that stops here.

Secondly, I don't think it is good to extend the services at the present time. You are, in my opinion, just accepting the decisions made for you by the Secretary of State in Ottawa, and you are putting them into act in Manitoba right now.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns, one quick question.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask just on one subject this question to Mrs. Edie. I particularly want to do so, because you have been among the few in making presentations to draw the distinction between doing something like passing a bill or, I might describe it as, more ordinary business and a constitutional amendment. I think you reminded honourable members opposite that their own Constitution calls for a two-thirds majority to do so, and I think it's common practice in most organizations who will conduct their ordinary business on a simple majority but most organizations, when it comes to making changes to their own Constitutions, whether it's a community organization or, I'm sure, maybe some of the organizations you belong to, have that requirement, because they recognize the fundamental difference in doing day-to-day business as compared to making fundamental changes to the Constitution.

Are you satisfied in that - by the way, that's a problem that we have tried to communicate with some difficulty through the media to the people of Manitoba - are you satisfied that a growing number of people that you can speak for in your area, in your neighbourhood are understanding the difference between the two, the constitutional part of this package as compared to the bill that we're dealing with, for instance?

MRS. L. EDIE: There are few people who realize that there are two issues here.

MR. H. ENNS: But you would agree with me that it is a very important difference.

MRS. L. EDIE: It's a very important difference.

MR. H. ENNS: Particularly made more so because of the very specific steps that have to be taken to ever revert or change or modify a constitutional amendment, making it virtually impossible for it to be initiated by Manitoba.

MRS. L. EDIE: How many people realize that in the Constitution of Canada, Quebec has a veto? I think that's a very important fact.

I would like to invite more people to attend the House if ever they're in Ottawa. I think, as a citizen of Canada, that's a responsibility today, but it is also a citizen's right to be well-informed. On that point, I feel very strongly. I am not saying that I haven't been informed, but I am saying that I have not been informed with the degree of accuracy that I would like to have been.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mrs. Edie, the time has expired.

MRS. L. EDIE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next person on my list is Mr. Arthur Doering, Mr. Arthur Doering; Mr. Roy Dubbin. Mr. Doering.

MR. A. DOERING: Mr. Chairman, standing committee members, and citizens of Manitoba, I have my concerns on Bill 115. I have nothing. I spent two-and-a-half hours last night, trying to bring something up that I thought would bring light into the Province of Manitoba.

Last fall, October 5th, we had nominations for reeves and councils throughout the province. My first concern on my trip and around the province was long before this bill, but on the bill that there was going to be changes in the act.

I have been before this committee on the Assessment Review. Just by luck or by chance, I happened to be the furthest away from Winnipeg, I presume, and I was called first on the carpet. I found it much easier when you didn't know when you were going to be there than I have right now, to be honest. So you'll have to excuse me.

I also must be excused that I've had phlebitis for two years and I've got low sugar count so, if I do fall over, just give me a little sugar and I can go again. So with that I would like to proceed.

With all due concern, I'm very very concerned on this bill and my reasons I will try and follow through is on notes only. I could not see my way to find a report. I'm just going to go through it according to Bill 115. I hope the Chair won't put closure on my report before I'm through like I've seen in the last couple of days in this House. I'm very very disturbed. I'm a gentlemen of 60 years old and I've been in this House since I was old enough to understand, after school, I've seen many hours in the Legislature up in the gallery listening to the people in the House and I respect each and every one of them. But the carryings-on in the last couple of days - it gives you food for thought and frightens the whole Province of Manitoba.

When I look down off that gallery and see the carryings-on such that was going on in the last two days, it's a disgrace to the Province of Manitoba. I've been fighting for 15 years, without a lie. I went to the court, the Supreme Court, and to this day for 15 years, they say you got a right. I've lost my right as a citizen of Manitoba and as such I want the public to hear what I have to say.

This bill should have been thrown out before it was ever printed and I'm going to just, for clarification, from Page 5 where it starts with the ombudsman to the last

page of this and it might as well have been thrown out for all the good it is. I'm not a lawyer and I don't pretend to be one, but when I read what I see here, it took me three occasions when you talk of an ombudsman. They appoint an ombudsman here with all the powers for what? The last paragraph, the Minister has the power. Am I right or wrong in how I interpret it?

I would also like to say the ombudsman on three occasions I had to approach him before he would take action. I looked at this one paragraph, "if he may do so." If it's a trivial matter. I don't know what you call trivial. I have tried for Mr. Schreyer's time. I see people on this side of the House who are in the House, before or after and year after year in the last 15 years, but when I came in the other day, I was appalled at the way things were going. I always thought when I stood for reeve or councillor in my municipality, that when I put my name as a candidate, the trust is put in me, as responsible to the citizens, whether they vote for me or represent me or not, I have the obligation under the act, to treat each and every one equal. I don't care what language they speak, whether it be Indian or Metis, I've stood side by side to each and every one.

In 1944 I joined the active army. I was rejected, not on account of my nonability. I had a broken arm when I was 16 years when the team ran away with the wagon. That was my only disability. They said go home and farm and I've done it ever since, but in the last two years what I see happening to farming, we're wasting time here on a measly piece of paper here where the whole Manitoba unemployment all around is a disgrace.

The other night I sat and watched TV and I sat there and I was half asleep. I was tired from the trip in. I turned on the TV and all of a sudden somebody won \$14 million. The first thing the next morning I says, wouldn't that have been a lot nicer if they'd have given \$14 to 1 million unemployed, only \$14 each, had they spent that \$14 in only Canada, it would have recycled 14 million times over. They give it to one person that doesn't need it and will never use it as long as I live and even the next generation. I'm very appalled to see something like 6/49, ever since I was going through there, it was supposed to be for one year for Centennial. It was such a money-making scheme for somebody that they're still doing it but there's no money for unemployment, there's no money for nobody else, but when a bingo or a 6/49 comes up, it's a disgrace to society. Excuse me - I don't like using any slang words or nothing and I don't intend to. And this bill in my experience is not a very nice one as you all know. I've tried for 15 years and still trying. Mr. Mackling knows, I know. I won't divulge it because it's still in committee and under study and I will respect each and everyone for that.

Further on the commission for clarification, will the ombudsman or whoever is appointed, are we going to use the one already in power or are we going to appoint another one? We have an ombudsman in Manitoba now. He did a wonderful job, I must say. It took him several years to do it. I have a copy here that was not exact, but it was put by Val Werier in the Winnipeg Free Press, the 21st, 1980. I don't want to read it out, I think everybody has seen it. If not, it's in the Free Press and if anybody wants it, it's open for the public. The ombudsman clearly says, in the last paragraph, "It was a poor show all around. The Town of Grandview

ignored the law and the rights of farmer Jones." I'm farmer Jones. I want to carry on here. It says, "The Director of Water Resources, Mr. Maltby, wants to make certain the provisions were strictly complied with in the future," and so the Director of Water Resources wrote the letter to the Grandview secretary, August 15th, "I must forewarn you that the town must hereafter strictly adhere to the terms and conditions of the licence. I shall thereupon recommend to my Minister that the licence be cancelled." Nothing has been done to this day.

The ombudsman does his duty and after the ombudsman does his duty, it's the same as here. He takes it to the Minister and that's where it ends. The Minister has the power under The Municipal Act, also under The Water Rights Act, not only the Minister of Water Resources, or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, but also the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'm just sorry that Mr. Andy Anstett isn't in because he was at my house this fall and I wished he could have been here to hear my representation.

The act states the Minister, if there's a request put before the Legislature by the ombudsman or through The Municipal Act, the Minister has the power to make an order to whoever he pleases by a certain time and have it removed. If it's not done, somebody else can do it and then it'll be put to the owner that owns the land against his taxes. I'm in 100 percent in agreement but nothing gets done.

Now they come out with a bill giving the Ombudsman not one - if I would have known this bill was here - I didn't know until I left - I would have brought the Ombudsman's bill. I also have it. But when I picked this one up yesterday, it flabbergasted me. The biggest part of it on Page 4, after all the statutes on the quorum, "Six council members constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting council business."

"Advisory status only - no advice, decision or recommendation of the council is binding on the minister or any other person affected by the advice . . . "So what's the use of going through all the rigamarole, driving in, going out, making presentations, and then you end up with that clause? What's the point of me spending hour after hour trying to make a brief that's understandable and doing my farming at the same time and trying to protect my rights, and then they stroke it out with one stroke of the pen. Then they follow it on Pages 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, all with ombudsman control. The rest is only one left and four in before it. I say, let's take a look at it, not once, but twice.

The other day, I just happened before I left - my son and my grandchildren happened to go to Blue Lake in the Duck Mountains. They said, Grandpa, what's the matter? When you used to take us fishing, you used to catch a lot of fish. I says, well I guess I'll have to answer to that, but I didn't know an answer for them. I said, I'll have to tell you when I get back. I am waiting for a report.

That report, I don't know if Mr. Mackling has had a copy, but I have been fighting for the Municipality of Grandview, the Municipality of Gilbert Plains, the Municipality of Dauphin and all through the region under the watershed. Grandview just so happens to be not in the watershed. For the reference of the public, before I moved to Grandview I used to help winter fish on

Lake Dauphin. I don't think any of you have a copy. Mr. Mackling might. There is our fishing population: dogeye, tullibee, now pike and walleye.

From 1931-1981, it's totally disappeared. It really startles me. Now when I get back, I'll be able to tell my grandson and daughter I'm going to show you now what happened to the fish, why we didn't get any last Sunday before left for Winnipeg. I am going to be proud of it.

As for Mr. Andy Anstett, I'm very appreciative that he came in. He was at my house last fall on a committee hearing, and I appreciate it. This is why I'm not bringing nothing to do on the committee until it's brought out to the public. I'll be fair. Is that fine?

Now my concern is, when I look at this - I have been on two or three meetings on the Rail Commission, and I said to Mr. Gilson that made the first report, if I'd have had this - I had said, just like Lake Dauphin. I fished it. I know where the fish are and where they aren't. Now I said, the farming is going the same way. I have been a farmer all my life since I was tall enough to walk behind the plough and harrows in my bare feet. I am a family of nine. My father couldn't afford a pair of shoes. It makes you really wonder what is happening to our farming and fishing, and now we come up with a bill on rights to Canadians. I am a Canadian first and Manitoban second, as I stated in the beginning of my paragraph, and I will stay that way until they lay me at rest.

I would like to make a note of caution. I caution each and every one on this hearing to hear my voice and beware - it's not a threat - of these kinds of bills. Every study, we will lose our freedom to speak. I am hoping and praying that after this bill, if it isn't thrown out or if it does go through, I hate to see the day. Today, I have the freedom to come up here and speak to you members of Cabinet and Chair. I'm hoping the day doesn't come in my time that my children or your children or our grandchildren have not the right to come before a podium and speak for what they believe in. This is what I'm afraid of. I think it should be of deep concern to each and every one of us.

Because if this bill goes through as it's written, there is nothing stopping the Cabinet on the side of the majority to make a rule in the House and go and tell this side, we over-ruled, we are going to pass it, and have closure. If you make closure on this bill, what are you going to do if you make a bill to say, let's stop them guys from telling us. Let's make closure on freedom of speech. I hope it never happens. This is my concern, not for myself so much as my children and their grandchildren.

I hope you take it to heed, because as soon as we get two different groups we're going to be fighting. I stood side-by-side through this province. I have been a registered guide since I was 20-some years old. I have gone from the furthest to the east to Beresford Lake. I have been north as far as Grass Island. I have been to The Pas. I've been right to the Rockies. I'm proud it's still Canada, because when I went out there I had the right. Eight years ago, I could go and buy a licence in Saskatchewan, Manitoba. It didn't matter if I had a form in before, or have it on a draw. You had the privilege, freedom of choice. Go where you pleased, to the east, to the west, to the north, to the south in the boundaries of Canada, not just Manitoba.

In closing, I would just like to say, the language for all of North America is Canada and the United States. You'll notice that the emblem - or when I walked in the Legislature here - the buffalo, the beaver, the eagle and all our waterways have no boundaries. They're only imaginary. They were God-created, and they will stay as God has built them. I hope and pray that we will start looking after them, because they're being totally ruined by this kind of pollution, call it what you like.

I drove in here. No matter what we do, it's salt, salt, salt. It's just like a cancer already, no matter whether it's your car or your vehicles. I get in here and my car is like I whitewashed it. I say, oh my God, do we need all that? Where is that salt going? I think it should be more of concern than a bill.

Now I picked up the paper the other morning, and all the Flyer buses in Vancouver - this genius mind come up. The motors, everything worked 100 percent, but as soon as that salt got in, low and behold! Now there is a monstrosity, for whom? This is my concern. Let's start looking after our rivers and streams because this salt is what is causing this fishing pollution and furthermore from the Red to the north, to the east, to the west, they're using it from coast to coast. I think we all understand that quite plainly, and it's time we took more time in looking after stuff like that than spending - this is ridiculous!

I'm going to cut my brief shorter than I expected, so I'm just going to skip over some here. Maybe there are questions.

I'd like one note to Mr. Penner who is not present, but I was very pleased - in the Co-operator some three, four weeks ago or maybe a month - I meant to bring it but I forgot. Mr. Penner was in the Co-operator. I have one here but not the one with the picture, with a little girl from Flin Flon, about the same age as my grandchild. They put it on the commission stating a plaque for - I think it was the Law Reform Commission, something to do with the law. The little girl puts up a plaque, very nicely put, very short and sweet: "Human rights, because we are all human." And I still think we are all human, I hope we are because there is the little girl, I don't know her age. He gave her a plaque. But I hope that Mr. Penner with the same pen - take off the "ner" - does not legislate what he did in the House on January 1st, and then turns around and with a stroke of the same pen says, no, you don't need to wear your seatbelt until April 1st. I said how in the world are you going to tell this little girl when she says to me, as a grandfather, why didn't you have to wear it and all of a sudden we all have to wear it, at whose expense?

Do you realize what it's going to cost, not the ones who are wealthy and rich, but the ones who are out there on unemployment, to get in that car and have to on April 1st, go and buy a \$60, \$70, \$80 or \$100 safety seat to put in that car? They can't afford it, and they're going to go down the road without it. Then what happens? Well, either the courts are full or else we'll have more unemployed. It's ridiculous and a disgrace to society. Why do we elect people?

I always had the understanding when I would ever run for a member, council or otherwise, my duty is for the people that I should represent if I'm elected. If the majority rules, please, for Heaven's sake, look twice before you leap. I've done it ever since I started farming.

If I hadn't of, I would have been down the drain. I'm established and I'm going down the drain.

I might be the only one out from the Dauphin area, I don't know, I think I'm the furthest out. I'm proud to be here, to try and do my very best, for the people in the northwest region.

I can see what's happening with the Crow. I don't know whether I'm in order with this or not, but I'd like to speak on the Crow . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, we've covered seat belts and fish levels in Lake Dauphin, but the Crow might be appropriate at another place. We're really specifically concerned with Bill 115.

MR. A. DOERING: Well, this is what I'm getting at. That's what I was afraid of in my remark when I said I hope you don't make closure, and this is what it looks like to me. The tactics used in the last two days in this House is disgraceful and unconstitutional. I'm 60 years old, and I haven't seen it in this House. — (Interjection)

The point is you got me off the subject that I was going to say. I finished off in here on this little girl's statement. If they won't allow me to talk on the Crow, maybe they'll make closure, if I talk on the Crow. I hope they don't. Am I open for a speech on the Crow or not? It's just short.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rules of the committee are that we make our comments relevant to the subject before the consideration, which is the bill. If in some way the Crow is relevant to Bill 115, you may speak on the Crow, but you should make that connection.

MR. A. DOERING: I have the understanding here that a citizen of the Province of Manitoba is not under the jurisdiction of the House. Maybe I'm wrong, that's why I'm stating I hope they don't move closure, that I haven't got the right to come up forward to the podium and speak my right. It'll be a sad day when that happens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can always put it to the committee if you wish to test the will of the committee whether you should speak on the Crow.

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The rules of the committee are quite specific that we're supposed to be addressing concerns as related to Bill 115, and I don't quite see, where we have given this gentleman a great deal of latitude, perhaps too much latitude relating to a number of different issues. I wish he would continue with his presentation but as it relates to Bill 115, Sir. The committee is called to hear presentations on Bill 115, not to hear on the Crow. We had Crow presentations over a year ago, and they were very beneficial for us, as getting our position across; unfortunately it didn't succeed with the Federal Government. But the point very clearly on these committees and the rules for the committee are to address, to hear public presentations on the subject matter before the committee which is Bill 115, Sir, with all due respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would appear that the committee does not wish to give leave then to speak on the Crow.

Could you make your presentation specific to the bill before us?

MR. A. DOERING: I admit I'm not that well qualified in, I might say, it's not actually Crow. The Crow is passed, I'm not on the Crow, only on the condition. The Fork River, north of Dauphin, it's got to do not with the region as a whole, but in bills, whether it's part of this, I'll try and work it in with it.

MR. H. ENNS: Maybe we could find out if the Crow is bilingual.

MR. A. DOERING: It's not, the Crow was passed. My concern is, several meetings along - but I'm just going to say for the North region that they passed - Mr. Axworthy put a bulletin out now that they're going to pay federal taxpayers' money - \$3.-some million to upgrade the rail. That's fine, with taxpayers' money, but then I, as a farmer, had to turn around, took my rights away under the old Crow rate - this is what I'm talking about rights. They took the rights that I had, this is why I asked if I could speak on the Crow, because the rights they took away from me, they put \$13 a ton on January 1st. When the Federal Government is pumping in taxpayers' money to look after it now, I'm going to pay \$13 a ton. Where's the money going? Back to me as a farmer? That is taking my rights and these are the rights that I am discussing. It is rights that have been taken away. We thought that was for perpetuity; they took it away. I hope that this bill, if it is passed, is not for perpetuity.

That's why I was talking about the Crow, not what the Crow did, only as a light to show the rights they took away from me as a citizen of Manitoba. I thought that was for perpetuity. They didn't take the money from the railroad, but they certainly took it away from the farmer. I'm sorry to see the day that we'll be begging the young farmers to come back on the farm, which is the backbone of Manitoba, fishing, farming. Take the rights away, and we've got nothing left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a few minutes remaining. Are there any questions for Mr. Doering?

A MEMBER: I don't think Mr. Doering's finished his presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you finished your presentation, Mr. Doering?

MR. A. DOERING: Just in closing here on the human rights, because we're human, first as a Canadian, second as a Manitoban, I think we're all Canadians. As such, when we approach Ukrainian people - it just so happens my father was German. My mother was Polish-German. I don't know what I would be . . .

A MEMBER: Irish.

MR. A. DOERING: It could be Irish. I haven't figured that one out yet. So when I went to sleep last night, I don't know whether it was a fairy-tale or just I got back to Adam and Eve in the beginning. I says, Adam and Eve, God created them. They had Cain and Abel.

But all of a sudden, Cain went to Eve and said - I think you all know. We all swore on a bible. I see in this House when the members were sworn on a bible. I swore on a bible. I don't think none of us don't know what a bible is. Cain just says, Eve, where do I get my wife from? I'll leave the question mark. So I'm open for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Doering? Seeing none, Mr. Doering, I would like to thank you for taking the time to come here today.

MR. A. DOERING: Thank you, Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reg Dubbin.
Mr. Taras Lasko.

MR. T. LASKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, people of the Province of Manitoba. I am a Canadian first, of Ukrainian descent. With this Bill 115, I believe that Bill 115 should be scrapped. The government was not elected on this bill. That was not their platform. Now they have this bill in the House. They try and force closure on this bill. I don't think they should be able to force closure on such a bill which wasn't their platform. If it was on the economy or anything else, I can see it.

We have seen this hassle since last spring - that's about a year now in this House - about the language bill. There are more important things than the language bill. What is happening now - I cannot apply for a government job because I am getting too old, but it is making hardship for my children and the next generations. It is also dictatorial to force a language on me. We have one language. Let's stick with that one language. All the other languages are equal. I don't care whether it's French or what.

We do not have to go by what Mr. Trudeau says or Mr. Joyal. Quebec is not part of the Constitution. Trudeau is not part of Canada. He is from Quebec. So is Joyal. Now they aren't going to dictate to us what language we are going to speak in Manitoba. Why is he depriving me of speaking Ukrainian or any other language? Why should this be forced on me, French, or on anybody?

I also have to say this. I am being deprived of saying anything, because I will be called a bigot or a rednecked herring. I would also like to see the Minister that made this statement make a public apology for making this kind of a statement.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Lasko? Seeing none then, Mr. Lasko, I would like to thank you for coming tonight. Order please.

Mr. E.W. Hilger.

MR. E. HILGER: Mr. Chairman, members of the House, I want to thank you for having this opportunity to speak to you. I will not go into any detail regarding Bill 115. It has been pretty well documented here today that Manitobans in general are opposed to it.

What my concern is, is the whole procedure that is being used. It seems to me, before we prepare Bill 115, we should first have clarification of Section 23 of The

Manitoba Act which, incidentally, we were in error by not living with it since 1890.

Now the real question that comes to mind here to me is this: we now in Canada have a Constitution. We are talking Constitution. Let's live by our Constitution that we have in Canada. We have one province in Canada who is not a party to the Constitution, and they are calling the shots here. What business have they got even sitting in the federal House, I ask? I ask the party in power and I ask the opposition. Why should we not address this problem first? Let's not make the error of 1890 again by jumping headlong into a constitutional issue before the federal constitutional issue is settled.

All we are doing here now is setting the grounds for what we hear all about in South Africa, apartheid, two groups of people. Why are we doing this? I have never heard the word "apartheid" mentioned, but I see it every day now. Has not the government got the message of the Festival du Voyageur, which was not attended last year and went bankrupt? Doesn't that tell you something? Can't you get the message?

I am a little noisy here today, because I'm angry. To be quite frank with you, I have been sitting around for months, listening to all this business going on. I would like to see the air cleared on the federal Constitution before we go any further. Table this thing.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Mr. Hilger from members of the committee?

Mr. Enns. Mr. Hilger, do you wish to answer any questions?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Hilger, I don't know, were you present earlier on in the afternoon when a Mr. Prince was making a presentation?

MR. E. HILGER: Yes, I was.

MR. H. ENNS: Your position, your call for living up to our Constitution in many ways embraces what Mr. Prince was saying.

MR. E. HILGER: Well, we have a Constitution. There was a ruling by the High Court of Canada for the purpose of courts and the Legislatures that we are a bilingual country. There's no denying that as far as I'm concerned. Why do we have to have a government in Canada now approve a reaffirmation of the Manitoba Constitution when, in fact, the Government of Canada is not a legal government under the Constitution? If Quebec wants to have members in the House, let them be a party to the Constitution, otherwise stay out. They signed themselves out of Canada. They may regard us as a colony. Quebec today in fact is nothing more than a protectorate of Canada, but they're calling the shots. My gosh, why don't you send your bill to the United States to get it approved? It's the same thing, or maybe you'd rather send it to the Kremlin, same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. E. HILGER: Any further questions? I'm not a constitutional lawyer, but boy, I sure wish I was.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to engage in any provocation with Mr. Hilger, but I would have to, as information, indicate to you that our Canadian Constitution contains an opt-out clause and that of course has been exercised with Quebec, so your statement is . . .

MR. E. HILGER: So they opted out of Canada but they're still running it.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . so your statement, with respect to the constitutionality of the situation is not quite accurate, but I want to refer to just one or two questions specific to Manitoba. You are aware we have a Manitoba Act. The rights under that Manitoba Act were arbitrarily taken away in 1890 . . .

MR. E. HILGER: Correct.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and that was finally put right in by the Forest case in 1979 by the Supreme Court. In your mind that puts us back to Square One, where we are living here in Manitoba as the Constitution provided, at the time the province was enacted. Is that not a correct statement?

MR. E. HILGER: Yes and I've never had the opportunity to look at an Act Respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in regard to Manitoba statutes, being Chapter 3 of the Statutes of Manitoba. I've never had an opportunity to read this, so if I said anything about that I wouldn't know what I was talking about there at all. I suppose this is supposed to supersede Chapter 3 of the Statutes of Manitoba?

MR. H. ENNS: It is supposed to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please - Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Not the bill, the . . .

MR. E. HILGER: Right. Now one of the things that concerns me a little bit here too, is the translation between English and French. We've got written across the top of the act here, "An Act Respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act." Then we get down to the French section and it says the "application." Now application is a dual word. I might point out to you people that I'm already bilingual.

Since William the Conqueror's time in England, he attempted to make England, French. All he succeeded in doing was doubling the size of the English language, and any person who speaks English today, cannot speak English without already speaking 50 percent French, which has been Anglo-Saxonized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Hilger.

Order please. Mr. J. Hay.

MR. J. HAY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to say very much, but I've got a few things on my mind. I'm damn

mad at the way things are going in Manitoba and I've been in Manitoba since I was a kid. I lived in with the people up in Swan River, which were French, English, German, Swedes and all. We got along fine together. We may, as kids, have called one "Frenchie" or something else, but why in the name of goodness have we, in the NDP Government, come along and put us into this position? I'm damned ashamed of our province right today. And I swore to God if this is going on, I will have to move out of the damn province, the same as the English is moving out of Quebec.

We're not English. We're Canadians. Let's face it, we're Canadians. You know I'm telling you it's a disgrace to the Manitoba Government the way things have been going in this Parliament in the last while, and we have not an educated man in this parliament, even if he is a lawyer, the way they've been carrying on.

I'm not a Conservative, but this side of the House have been working for the people of Manitoba, but this one is against it, and they're being paid or being paid somewhere, by someone, are being paid by Ottawa. When do we have to have a group of Frenchmen telling us what we are going to do? No way and I'm telling you, if I had anything to do - and I may go farther than this. I think, across the way there should ask the House to dissolve and let's have a vote on the matter, because we have 70 percent against this thing.

It's been proven that the people of Manitoba don't want it, but this side of the House foreclosed and will not allow any more - we're going to put it through and the thing is the same thing. You take a piece of board, you start prying on it. The first thing we go on, I said this years ago. I've worked in Quebec. I have worked in Quebec. I've worked all the way across Canada in my job. The trouble with Quebec, if I wanted to go back farther, I can go right back where Quebec started from. It was run by the church before the war. When they come into the service, the government, and not only that, the Quebec people were against the serviceman. They were conscripted into the services. Not all of them but 90 percent of them.

Then the government brought them in and taught them some education. The reason why they didn't have an education, the church told them to raise big families. There were families down there, 7 to 12 people. They couldn't afford to send kids to universities. They couldn't send them to church or anywhere else. So then after the war, the government paid for a few.

We're having the same problem with the Indians right today, the same problem. Why isn't the Indian language brought into this House? Because we've got a group in Ottawa that are paying the bill, and we and you and the rest of us, are paying the bill through your taxes. I'm a Scotchman and I'm against the goddamn thing like that. I have no use for it and I think you people, the whole lot of you, could be doing a hell of a lot more for this province than what we're going through this province right now.

Now, Mr. Anstett, I had a word with him and I'll get a hold of him again in the hallway and I'll say what I think. It's a good job my dad wasn't here because he would help anybody, he could help anyone, but by God, if he was here, I tell you, he'd turn this place upside down.

Now the same with the French . . . there's no guarantee, the thing I see in the ombudsman - you got

to be a Frenchman to get the job in there, because you've got to be bilingual. There are boys today I know that's got university education that's in the Federal Government. They can't go any higher because they're not bilingual. This is going to happen right here in this House of Manitoba.

It's the same as putting the pinch bar behind the board. We'll pry it a little bit. Next year or a couple of years from now, we'll pry a little bit more and in a few more years, we'll have the board off and then we'll have the control, then we have dictatorship. I fought in this war for dictatorship - against it. I spoke to a man from Germany. He got up here and I'm telling you he's a hell of a lot better educated than some of you people here.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Mr. Hay?

The next person on my list is Elizabeth Fleming; Mr. Tom Fuddy; Mr. W.J. Hutton.

That concludes my list. I'm prepared to go back and read the names of people who have been called before but have not been available.

Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I have seen one person who is from outside the city, who was called last night, but was absent. I think we may wish to avoid calling those people back for a possible subsequent meeting. Call the rural out-of-town people first again, in case we can finish some of those today so they don't have to come back, just as we did last night. I see Mr. Loewen from the R.M. of Hanover is here if you want to know where to start, but you may want to go through the list and call all the rural.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will have a bit of a problem discerning who is rural and who is urban from the list I have.

Mr. Loewen. Could you identify yourself, please?

MR. J. LOEWEN: John Loewen, Reeve of the R.M. of Hanover.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. J. LOEWEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for this opportunity to address this committee. We already addressed the committee and the hearings in the fall of last year. I addressed the committee in Ste. Anne; our feelings haven't changed. I should perhaps tell you a little bit about us.

We are from the Rural Municipality of Hanover; we have 7.5 thousand people living in our municipality. We are surrounded and get along fine with the predominantly French municipalities of Ste. Anne, La Broquerie, Ritchot, DeSalaberry and Tache. I think we have some understanding of the feelings of the people of Manitoba and how we wish to conduct our society. We abhor what is happening to the social fabric of Manitoba at the present time, and we are convinced that the root of the problem is this government's action in persisting with a bill that is dividing the people of this province as they have never been divided before.

I call this government to task and I ask you, where is the Premier of this province? Where is he? Is he conducting business in his own office? I see his sacrificial lamb is here, and I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Anstett. I consider him to be one of the shining lights in the government, but he's just put on the block, as I see it, and I hope he has the courage to do what he has to do. Just chuck the whole thing; that's the only sensible solution to this issue. There is no way out of this mess except chucking this whole issue.

It's dividing the people; it's dividing the communities. It's turning brother against brother, sister against sister, families are split. We have so much intermarriage, we see it in our communities. Mr. Anstett knows that. We have so much intermarriage and we get along fine. But if the mother is French and the father is non-French, where are we at? Will they go to a French School? Will they go to an English School? We are trading segregation.

Our neighbours to the south, whom we like to condemn for the things they do, decried that segregation was wrong and they instituted integration, to integrate the blacks and the whites. It may not have been successful all the time, but that's the choice they need and that's the course they pursue. But we are; as I said before, we see it already. We have children coming into local schools from schools where they have been learning French and if I haven't said it, I should say it, we get along well. I consider myself to be a great friend of many French-speaking people, and I would protect their right in every instance to speak the language of their choice. We feel Bill 23 guarantees that; it has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada. It is a fact and we're willing to live with that fact.

I think if we could just drop this monstrosity that we have before us now we could live with that fact and get back to this kind of relationship between the people of Manitoba like we have been used to having. Evolution dictates what language we speak and evolution takes times. This thing has been rushed through and it'll create bad feelings that will persist. I don't know how long and I don't know when they will die.

I wonder what has happened to democracy. When I started school, I learned to speak English. I could not speak English before I went to school. I remember one of the things I learned when I started school. One of them was this little rhyme about the policeman in the square. To him a king or millionaire is just the same as you or I. I know that is not always true, but I also heard that democracy meant that there was rule of the people, by the people, and for the people. Where have we gone? I don't understand this mess.

It is obvious that the majority, by far the majority of the people of Manitoba are dead set against what is happening here and still we have the elected representatives in whom the people of Manitoba put their trust going directly against the wishes of the people of Manitoba. For what? We do not understand what; the answer is unclear. We just cannot fathom the depths of this type of reasoning. Where is it coming from? What is the reason? Why?

What about the people in your constituency? They elected you; they put their trust in you. Are you representing them? Who are you representing? - I ask you in all sincerity. Give it some thought. Or are we

lackeys of the Federal Government? I don't think we should be; we are living in a democratic society. We have a right, we have an obligation, we have a duty to express our views and to govern ourselves as the majority of the people in Manitoba wish to be governed as far as we're able to.

Apparently according to some, it was mentioned here today that the majority of Manitobans are not well enough educated I suppose. They were called too ignorant to evaluate a situation of this gravity to make an intelligent decision. Well, I suggest to you if that's the case, perhaps we should institute a system where every Manitoban who is eligible to vote has to have a university degree; that's their next step, an intelligence test or whatever. It just boggles the mind. How can somebody come up here and say that without turning red and without being booed out of the hall? I can't believe it. I have a lot of respect for historians, but when they come up with statements like that! Democracy is ruled by the people in my opinion. The government is established by the people and the government should be listening to the people. You know, I'm very upset about this matter as you well know.

A remark I heard from our Premier and I take great exception to this. He compares this issue to the issue of whether we should have the privilege of buying your insurance from a government agency or somebody else. I think it's sacrilege to compare the two issues. We're dealing with the Constitution; we're dealing with the guts of Manitoba in the future. To compare the two is downright irresponsible in my view.

Council passed a resolution Wednesday night, and asked our secretary to write a draft and write a letter to the Premier of the province. Really my purpose here today is to read that letter. I have been in a bit of a preamble here today until now. The letter is addressed to Mr. Howard Pawley. There is a carbon copy to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Hon. Andy Anstett, and the respective MLA's representing our municipality which is Emerson and La Verendrye, and a copy to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

The letter goes: "Dear Mr. Pawley. The Council of the Rural Municipality of Hanover is deeply concerned about your government's persistent efforts in attempting to expand French language services in Manitoba, and the entrenchment of these rights and privileges in the Constitution to which the majority of the people of Manitoba are opposed.

"At a recent meeting and in a final effort to prevent this from happening, council has agreed to re-establish its previous position on this matter. Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed by the Council of the Rural Municipality of Hanover on June 8, 1983, in which council feels that bilingualism is discriminating against the majority of the people in Manitoba, and that the democratic way of determining whether or not the province should be bilingual would be by way of a free vote of the people of the province.

"Also enclosed is a copy of a brief respecting the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which was presented on behalf of our municipality at the hearing held for the purpose at Ste. Anne, Manitoba on September 27 of 1983. In this brief, council indicates that it is satisfied with Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870, and that we do not wish to see any increase or decrease in the rights of Canadians of either French or English origin.

"Mr. Premier, the Council of the Rural Municipality of Hanover has not changed its position on this matter since June of 1983, and feels that it is the duty of an elected government in a democratic society to abide by the wishes of the vast majority of the people in Manitoba, and that there is yet time for your government to respond to those wishes by withholding passage of Bill No. 115.

"Respectfully submitted by Charles Teetaert, Secretary-Treasurer."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Loewen?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Loewen, I think all of us can't help but be impressed by the brief but, nonetheless, very appropriate presentation that you made. I say appropriate, because Hanover is uniquely situated as pertains to the question that is before us, both the question of interaction between the Francophone community in Manitoba with others. I want to ask this question advisedly, because I am concerned not to contribute to what I believe regretfully the government is contributing to.

People in Hanover, the people that you represent in that municipality have, I think if I understood you rightly, managed to work out a good working relationship with your Francophone neighbours, your municipalities that you listed over the years that you have had some experience with. Is that not the case?

MR. J. LOEWEN: Yes, that's right.

MR. H. ENNS: The question that I regretfully ask you, have you been able to determine as Reeve of Hanover living in that part of Manitoba a deterioration in the relationship as it exists between municipalities, neighbours, friends and people that you come in contact with in the Municipality of Hanover and your surrounding municipalities?

MR. J. LOEWEN: Mr. Enns, as far as in between municipalities, no. I don't think so. I guess that's because most municipalities are represented by very responsible people but, as far as individuals go, some of the remarks I hear are abhorrent. I would not want to repeat them. These are things that we used to hear maybe rarely, but you hear people saying them now that you would never have dreamt of hearing them from two or three years ago.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?
Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the presenter, the Reeve, whether his experience which he outlined to the committee as one of having learned to speak English when he started school, his experience therefore as a son of a non-English background, non-English origin, learning English when he went to school, could be summed up as a philosophy that recognizes English, not as a language of race in

Manitoba but as a language of Manitobans, as a working language - not a language of race at all, but one in which persons of all different origins and backgrounds have come to a community in society. Would that be a fair paraphrase of your experience, sir?

MR. J. LOEWEN: I think, yes. Very briefly, I think we recognize language as being a medium of communication and not of ethnic background or race or whatever is your perception of language.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you for that answer. I think it's important that kind of specific observation be on the record from somebody who has experienced the exposure to the English language that you have, and has gone through the experiences that you have gone through from your cultural background. I think it's important that kind of observation be on the record, sir.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have just one question for Reeve Loewen, and that is, as someone who grew up speaking another language and has more or less assimilated into English society in the province, I'm wondering why he cannot understand or why he does not have any feelings for people of the other official language of this province being able to receive services in their own language. In other words, why his neighbouring municipalities - what is so terrible if this bill goes through and they receive services in the French language? Why are you so much against the French people being able to be served by the Provincial Government, not by your municipality - by the Provincial Government - in their own language?

MR. J. LOEWEN: I did not say that.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, you're against the bill, and that's the basis of the bill.

MR. J. LOEWEN: The bill is not needed. It's redundant. The services can be provided, and without aggravating 90 percent of the people of Manitoba, and the services can be provided.

MR. D. SCOTT: How is this going to aggravate the people with the services being provided? I can't understand why you have such an antipathy and you were expressing a great deal of emotion here, which surprised me today actually, as to why you would be fighting so strongly against a bill that provides for and is basically an enabling legislation giving direction to the government of how the languages shall be served or how the people shall be served.

MR. J. LOEWEN: I did not make a single remark against the principle of providing French services to French-speaking people where required, not a single one. I would advise you, Mr. Scott, to go out in the streets and talk to the people and, I can tell you, you will understand why we're against it, because of what it's

doing to the people of Manitoba, that's why we are against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Seeing none then, Mr. Loewen, I would like to thank you for coming today.

Order please, order please. The time is 5:30. What is the will of the committee?

Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I think members had agreed that if there were any people from out of town, if it's the will of the committee to hear those, it's not going to take too long. I certainly don't want to sit well into the supper hour or anything like that, but if there are people from out of town for whom it would be inconvenient to come back Monday or perhaps there are others for whom it would be inconvenient to come back Monday, then we could hear them. Committee would reconvene at 10:00 a.m. Monday, that's what we agreed to yesterday. But if there are some, we certainly want to give them an opportunity to be heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with allowing people to be heard. I want to put one point on the record though, that it shouldn't be misunderstood that representations have been cut off. It's my understanding that people have been attempting to call the Clerk's Office last evening and today and, because there is no staff on hand, many people have been unable to put their name on the list. So it's not in any way closed, that others can have their names placed on the list for Monday then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other out-of-town people here today who wish to be heard?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just prior to making that decision, I know that there may well be other representations, as I expect there will be considerably more. I think we sat a full day today, Saturday, and I would ask the committee to consider the normal adjournment hour at 5:30, with resumption at 10:00 o'clock on Monday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I agree, but if there is someone from out of town that wants to give us five minutes, shouldn't we hear them? Is there anybody from out of town?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any out-of-town people who wish to make a presentation?

A WITNESS: I am from out of town but I prefer to wait until Monday.

HON. A. MACKLING: Okay, very well, thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case, committee is adjourned and will reconvene at 10:00 a.m. Monday.