



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. Peter Fox
Constituency of Concordia



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 13 - 10:00 a.m., THURSDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, 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, 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	Virten	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, 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

Thursday, 8 September, 1983

TIME — 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg

CHAIRMAN — Mr. P. Fox, Concordia

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Ms. Hemphill, Hon. Messrs. Mackling and Storie

Messrs. Eyler, Fox, Graham, Harapiak, Malinowski, Nordman and Sherman

WITNESSES: Dr. Yantay Tsai, Chinese Community

Mrs. Una Johnstone, Private Citizen

Mr. Sidney Green, Manitoba Progressive Party

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Proposed Resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: Committee come to order. Ladies and gentlemen, we have a quorum. Two administrative matters and some committee substitutions to attend to before we call Dr. Tsai to attend for further questioning by members.

I've discussed with members on both sides the position of the witness shown as No. 32, Dr. Steven Allen Scott, Constitutional lawyer from Montreal, who is available to attend the committee tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. It will require him flying in from Montreal, and as was requested for two groups for Tuesday morning, I would ask the committee to agree that he be given a specific time slot at 10:00 tomorrow morning to accommodate him because of the travel arrangements required. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The next item is the Clerk's office staff has very promptly made arrangements for simultaneous translation to be available here for 2:00 p.m. this afternoon. The only hitch in that arrangement is that the committee, to allow set up in this room, will have to adjourn at 12:00 today, rather than 12:30 p.m. Is that agreed? (Agreed) Thank you.

The Clerk has provided me with the resignations of myself, Mr. Lecuyer, Mr. Plohman and Mr. Uskiw. I understand the replacements for those four are to be Mr. Fox, Mr. Harapiak, Mr. Mackling and Ms. Hemphill. May I have a motion to that effect? — (Interjection) — Moved by Mr. Storie. Thank you Mr. Storie. Is that agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

I'll ask the Clerk to take the Chair to supervise the election of your Chairman.

MADAM CLERK, Ms. C. DePape: The Chair is accepting nominations for the Chairman of the committee. Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: I move that Peter Fox be Chairman.

MADAM CLERK: Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, Mr. Fox would you please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Fox: Thank you. The committee will now proceed with the presentation we adjourned last evening and it's Dr. Tsai please. I believe Mr. Sherman was questioning at that time. Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Dr. Tsai and I wish to thank Dr. Tsai for making himself available to resume this stage of the committee's study. We had just sort of barely got started with him last night, but it no doubt is of some inconvenience to him to be back this morning and I want to register my thanks and appreciation for that.

Dr. Tsai, I think when we reached the hour of adjournment last night you and I had exchanged a question and answer or two on the point made in the fourth paragraph of your brief in which you say that you believe that to deprive the Francophone community of its legitimate rights on the basis of its being a minority constitutes a serious threat to all minority citizen groups. I don't mean to go over that ground because I asked you for clarification on that thesis last night and you offered it to me. I would like to go on from there, Mr. Chairman, and ask Dr. Tsai whether, as a spokesman for and representative of a major ethnocultural community in our community, he can tell me and tell this committee whether compatriots of his in a cultural and ethnic sense have fears about minority rights in our society in Manitoba, whether there is an existing and a constant fear and anxiety among our minority ethnic groups insofar as the maintenance and preservation of their rights is concerned. Does our society seem oppressive where minority rights are concerned? I wonder if Dr. Tsai could just explore that point with me for a moment.

DR. Y. TSAI: Mr. Chairman, once again I have to ask your indulgence because of my laryngitis. It wasn't because last night was too much, it was simply because I have this bad cold for the last few days.

I'm so glad, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable gentleman, Mr. Sherman, raised that particular issue because as you know that is one of our main concerns.

For the benefit of those who were not here last night, I want to restate that the Chinese community view the whole issue and several perspectives and therefore we see clearly three important elements: one, is the restoration of justice; secondly, is the provision of service; and thirdly, is the protection of minority rights.

Honourable Mr. Sherman specifically asks about what we as a community fears about minority rights and his question was whether we still feel, have some kind of anxiety about further oppressions. At the moment, I would say absolutely honestly, I cannot say that there

is any concrete evidence of oppression at this very point. The very fact that both the Federal Government and the Provincial Government have promoted quite vigorously in the areas of heritage language teaching, in the areas of cultural enrichment programs and so on, it makes it much easier now for some of our ethnocultural minority groups to progress in some extent what we have been trying to endeavour to preserve our cultural identity, but we feel that isn't quite enough. At the moment we seem to be always at the mercy of the policies that may be changing from time to time, and we are particularly anxious or worried that in case the government changes, there is a very distinct possibility that some of these policies may be altered, and I cannot really detect which way it'll be altered. But based on the experience we have had for the last one-and-a-quarter centuries in Canada we have a lot of grounds to be anxious, to be nervous about.

As I pointed out last night even though we came and contributed quite significantly to the building of this nation it was, in fact, eight years right after Confederation that our citizens were deprived of their voting rights. In fact, it was the time between the passage of The Manitoba Act, and the abrogation of the linguistic . . . French language rights in 1890 within those 20 years that there were numerous, numerous accumulating and restrictive legislation and laws passed in those dark ages against the Chinese because in those days the Chinese were not treated as equal human beings simply because we are a very visible minority.

Even now, Mr. Chairman through you, even as recently as four or five years ago, Chinese-Canadian students were not recognized as Canadians. They were being treated in a very important public media in CTV programs as foreigners because they look foreign, because they don't carry a white Anglo-Saxon face. Now that is not something that a government can do but is something that we feel very much within our psyche, our mentalities. Unless the leaders of the government see to it that there is proper protection of these minority rights then once again we are going to be at the hands, or at the mercy, of a lot of social political pressures.

Back to your original questions there's no, shall we say, a set policy in terms of the government trying to oppress the inner minorities but we fear unless the government allows the building of that kind of atmosphere, in our society at large, that danger is always there, and particularly in hard economic times. I think the first ones that are going to suffer will be the minorities, and among those minorities it's the visible minority that's going to suffer the most. This is the reason why we feel so strongly about this entire issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank Dr. Tsai for that answer.

I'd like to ask him with respect, Mr. Chairman, and I want to assure Dr. Tsai that I ask this question with respect, and because it bears on another question which I would ask him which would help me better understand the problem. I ask Dr. Tsai, Mr. Chairman, whether he is a native born Canadian, or whether he emigrated to Manitoba, and to Canada?

DR. Y. TSAI: I immigrated.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have never had the experience of emigrating to another country, or immigrating into another country, and I can conceive that's a pretty traumatic step for anybody to take and it would be fraught with all kinds of anxieties and emotions of a variety of kinds. Would Dr. Tsai say that the feelings in the immigrant southeast Asian community, or the immigrant community from any part of the world on a point like this, would be different from the feelings held by the Canadian born members of that ethno-cultural group? That is to say, would those southeast Asians, who are now first-generation or second-generation Canadians, feel differently about this issue than Dr. Tsai and his compatriots do?

DR. Y. TSAI: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a very complicated question. I will try to answer as best I could. Even though I am an immigrant which later on became a citizen, but because of my own background, perhaps my perspectives would be quite different from those who are born here or those who came later on as refugees, because again they had a different set of experience and their feelings and so on. But I will hasten to add that our brief was also signed by one or two other organizations, the members of which represents largely the local-born Chinese Canadians. I could name the organizations such as Chinese Canadian International Council; I could name organizations such as the Winnipeg Canadian Citizens Association, and so on. Those are groups, the members of which are not immigrants as recent as the Indo-Chinese although the Indo-Chinese Association who are also supporting our position.

Furthermore, I will say that it will be probably unfair to use my own personal experience to speak for the rest of the immigrant populations of the Chinese origin, because I consider myself specially privileged because of my educational background and perhaps because of my profession. I did not encounter as much resistance or discrimination, or shall we say, hardship that some of the other new immigrants who, perhaps may not be as fortunate as I was and be able to attain the degree of education or perhaps the kind of information I was lucky to have. So therefore, I think it's probably not relevant as to how I personally feel. As a person I would say it's more important how the whole Chinese community feel as a group, as a minority group and I already mentioned the historical reasons for those rather nervous, anxious feelings.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just two more questions, Mr. Chairman. One is, could Dr. Tsai comment on whether the Indo-Chinese community or the southeast Asian community or that part of it that he knows, was concerned about the question of minority rights in Manitoba, and respect for minority rights in Manitoba on an ongoing basis and on a basis that originated with their coming to Manitoba, or did this particular resolution, this initiative proposed by the government with respect to French Language Services, focus that concern? In fact did it cause that concern?

DR. Y. TSAI: Mr. Chairman, I guess the Indo-Chinese as a group, again you have to put them in the proper

perspectives. These are the group of refugees who have suffered so tremendously in their own native places, as in Southeast Asia, so anything better than that to them is high heaven. They would have absolutely no reason to complain at all. But, because you should recognize that the group I'm representing here is the ethnic Chinese from Vietnam - I'm not talking about the native Vietnamese from Vietnam - they themselves have also been subjected to a lot of discrimination as a minority in Vietnam. So, when they come to Canada, the comparison is absolutely staggering to them and they are nothing but grateful for the opportunity to be here. I would say it takes a lot of courage and conviction for them actually to come up and sign this position statement, because many of them, as you may well be aware in that particular part of the world the democratic procedures have not been a regular habit of those societies and many of them would be terrified to actually appear in front of officials. The very fact that they come out and support this just shows how deeply they fear for the protection of that little bit of minority rights that they may have at the moment.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I'm aware of the courage involved, Dr. Tsai. I was in Vietnam and I was in Vietnam during the war, so I'm fully aware of the courage involved here. What I'm just trying to get at, your and my concept and dream of and vision of Manitoba, and I'm trying to identify whether there are threats to minority rights in the Province of Manitoba in the view of your compatriots.

My final question, Mr. Chairman, is to ask Dr. Tsai whether he can enlighten me as to the, I guess, the extent of the Southeast Asian community and the Indo-Chinese community that would be represented by the groups whose spokesmen have signed this particular brief. That is to say - and I ask this question out of ignorance, perhaps I should know, but I don't know - whether this list of associations and boards and groups and organizations represents a majority of those organizations that exist in the Indo-Chinese and Southeast Asian community in Winnipeg and in Manitoba or whether it is just a small fraction?

DR. Y. TSAI: Mr. Chairman, again I think it's important to realize that the Chinese community, although it is commonly referred to as China Town, you will see that the residents of Chinese descent are really scattered over the province and the China Town area represents a very very small, perhaps only just serves a simple focus where people go and shop and dine and socialize. It is very difficult because of the fact that we don't have, even at the moment, where there is a meeting place for all the Chinese to actually gather under one roof and it makes it extremely difficult to actually gather all the Chinese together and discuss this. So the only way we could do it is seek out these organizations, and to get the views input into this, and it is up to the organization or presidents and executives to then pass on a message to their membership. Especially about the Indo-Chinese Association, there is only one Indo-Chinese Association, which represents the ethnic Chinese from Vietnam and they have a membership of, last I heard it was, something like 400.

Now if you have 400 people that are actually waiting to join an association from this particular immigrant

refugee population, that is a very, very significant group, because as I have mentioned many of them are afraid to actually get involved.

We had a community meeting shortly after that July 14th Informational Meeting at the International Inn and their leaders were there. In fact, they were very, very alarmed by the tone, and perhaps the undertone, of some of the arguments presented at that meeting, and that really give further credence, or perhaps evidence, for them, say they had to come out and say something. For that reason I would say, that particular organization surely represents a majority of the Indo-Chinese group.

Now, insofar as the Chinese community at large. I already mentioned last night, that the last time, in April, when there was the Inter-Cultural Council, I think about 22 organizations registered to attend that meeting. There were two of those meetings which were defunct because they were ad hoc committees and so on, so that means that there are around 20. Out of this 20, we got 18 groups come out. Now that gives you an idea of what kind of majority we have in terms of the Chinese community.

You may wonder how come there's one single most well-known organization which is not represented here - that's the Chinese Benevolent Association. Unfortunately, their leader Mr. Hung Lee is ill because of a personal problem and they have not had a chance to attend either our meeting or to hold a meeting of their own, but many of the board members happen to also meet members of the boards of other organizations. They have not only come out and signed, they also attended subsequent informational meetings in, for example, Manitoba 23, which is, as you may be aware of the group that is really trying to be fair and be honourable, and be reasonable to look at the issue from a very objective non-partisan view, and we have had members of that organization come out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank Dr. Tsai for this very worthwhile exchange. Thank you.

DR. Y. TSAI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Chair and the committee for allowing me this opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you go, Mr. Storie.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Tsai just one final question.

I think that over the last couple of days the questions, particularly from some members of the committee, have tried to frame the support of this particular amendment in the context of fear for their own particular rights. My reading of the comments that have been made by, particularly representatives of minority groups, have been that they support this in principle rather than out of fear. I wondered if you'd comment on that.

DR. Y. TSAI: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, as clearly stated in my brief there we really support the intent and the principle behind this whole proposal. The reason I mention the anxiety and so on is simply just to give

the members of this committee a better understanding to see how minority groups feel, what the feeling are in terms of protecting minority rights. That was the only purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Storie.

HON. J. STORIE: One follow-up, perhaps you could give us your comments and the views of the particular group that you represent. With respect to the amendment, the entrenchment of rights of a specific minority, I think that it is tended to be ignored in the minds of some people that the specific group that we're talking about have a historical place in our society that tends to be ignored with respect to other minorities.

DR. Y. TSAI: Mr. Chairman, I believe honestly there were differences of interpretations or different ideas on what is the best way to protect minority rights and I fully respect the leader of the Conservative Party in saying that entrenching is not the best way. Of course, we happen to feel differently. We feel that it is the best way insofar as our minority groups are concerned. I could only say this, if there was entrenchment of minority rights or protection of the Charter of Rights in the original BNA, there would be no infamous Chinese Exclusion Act of 1923, there wouldn't be the imposition of a head tax on the Chinese at that time. There certainly wouldn't be any legal ground for any of those statutes to stand, to strip the Chinese of their right to vote, even though they pay taxes; they carry out all the other responsibilities of any other citizen.

HON. J. STORIE: That's all of my questions. I'd like to thank Dr. Tsai for his presentation and I only wish that there were more people that could have heard the presentation that he made. I think the depth of conviction and his experiences have, I think, added certainly to our understanding of the importance of this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Dr. Tsai?

On behalf of the committee, I'd like to thank Dr. Tsai for his presentation and representation. Thank you very much.

MR. Y. TSAI: Thank You, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Johnstone. Proceed, Mrs. Johnstone. There's a brief coming around, it's being distributed. Kindly proceed, Mrs. Johnstone.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislative Committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to air my views on the proposed amendment to The Manitoba Act 1870. I also would like to express my thanks to Mr. George Forest for histrionics last night that made it possible for me to speak a little sooner.

Since Mr. Pawley and Mr. Penner have stated publicly that the Amendment "23.1 English and French are the official languages of Manitoba" will remain regardless of the opposition of the people of Manitoba, it would appear that this is almost an exercise in futility, but I press on in spite of it.

I'm a fourth generation Canadian. My great-grandfather and great-grandmother arrived in Montreal in 1832 after being shipwrecked in the Straits of Belle Isle where they lost all their possessions. They had sailed from Scotland and they took up residence in Montreal where my great-grandfather became a well-known contractor, building not only public buildings in Montreal, but railways and a canal, one known as the Lachine Canal. Therefore, I can state unequivocally that I am a Canadian.

The public school I attended from Grade 1 to 6 was the old Gladstone School at Corydon and Osborne. The children with whom I grew up and attended school were of a number of different nationalities and on the playground we were all Canadians - not hyphenated Canadians such as French-Canadian, English-Canadian, Italian-Canadian, etc. The governments, both provincial and federal, are now encouraging the hyphenization of the ethnic groups and are using it to entrench bilingualism as an official language here in Manitoba thus making a French-speaking province despite the denials of Mr. Pawley and Mr. Penner.

This has encouraged Mr. Myron Spolsky and Professor Neil McDonald to mobilize the ethnic groups under the heading, "Hopefully it will be a defusion in support of the government's proposed extended French Language Services." This encourages the ethnic groups to jump in saying that now their rights are going to be protected, but protected from what? They just see this as an opportunity to obtain funding for their language classes to ride on the coat-tails of the Francophone rights. Not everyone of ethnic origin agrees with this however.

I have been worried for some time at the cost to Canada, the provinces and the school districts, to say nothing of the taxpayer, to have the French Immersion classes in schools instituted. I checked with my Fort Garry School Board to find out the cost to the taxpayers of Fort Garry to have a French Immersion school there. These are the figures:

The cost from June to December of 1982 was - \$382,427.00

Grants for extraordinary expenses - this included French texts which are more expensive and transportation was - \$137,309.00

The cost to the taxpayers in addition to regular assessment was - \$245,118.00.

The parents there agreed to pay money towards the transportation costs in order to obtain the French Immersion classes. However, now I believe they want out of this arrangement and it's before the Human Rights Commission at the moment. They seem to be emulating Deiter Brock, are they not?

The St. James-Assiniboia School District has a similar cost difference and they are:

Cost 1982 - \$310,531

Grants - \$197,755

Additional cost to the taxpayer - \$112,786.00.

If you project the costs of granting other language classes which may or may not be subsidized by the Federal Government, you will see school taxes soar beyond the capabilities of the taxpayer to pay. This the "me too" syndrome gone wild.

This is indeed different to what the Chinese residents of Fort Garry have done. The school district provides them with a classroom on Saturday mornings where

they have their own teachers who teach the Chinese language, history and culture. They asked for no other assistance than the classroom which was there anyway, unused on Saturday morning. This is most commendable and they certainly show other ethnic communities how they could and should keep their language and culture alive within their own groups.

It is frightening that the human rights conferred on Canadians by The Canada Act 1982, can become the monster that will destroy Canada. The reversal of the 1890 act in 1980, which re-established The Manitoba Act of 1870, has returned the Francophone rights to them, but now they want more than the original rights that were given in 1870. The present government is now aiding and abetting them in their demands using scare tactics on the people of Manitoba, that they are saving us money and the Federal Government will pay for translation of laws, etc., into French, if we will just allow this amendment to go through. We, the people, are very much aware that this money comes out of our pockets, be it provincial or federal.

I asked Lloyd Axworthy's office if they could obtain the figures from the Federal Government of what the total cost to the Canadian people has been to date on the implementation of French language in the Federal Government and its Crown corporations. Guess what? They said they could not obtain this information but that I should write to the Prime Minister's office. However, there was a partial answer to this in the Free Press of Saturday, September 3rd just past, which announced "the Federal Official Language Program for minority groups" would receive \$123 million over the next five years. Known as the Official Language Communities Program, Mr. Serge Joyal, our most generous Secretary of State, says the objective of this program is and I quote: "To encourage and assist the official language minorities at national, provincial and community levels, to establish and maintain their institutions, to develop their organizations and to participate in their language and social, educational, cultural and economic life of Canadian society." Mr. Chairman, is this a bribe or isn't it? Note the words "official language minorities." What does that really mean? Are all ethnic groups now official to the Federal Government?

Obviously no one will ever know the full cost to Canadians in human lives, human hopes, fears, money and jobs. It is so astronomical that they would not dare to try and find out what the total cost is. Think what a better society we could have today if this money had been spent on health, education, medical research, jobs and retraining, etc. My question is: did all the ethnic people come to Canada to be Canadians or to become, with the assistance of the Federal Government, ethnic pockets of republics across Canada?

Along this line of economy, I would like to quote from an article I found in the Free Press of January 19, 1876 and it says this:

"The Globe is in possession of information which removes all doubt of this measure being carried this session. It is then remarked that 'although it may be proper in such matters as a change of the Constitution to submit the policy for the adoption of the people, there is no reason to fear that they will reverse the decision of their representatives.'

"The Globe concludes the article under consideration as follows. 'But beyond abolition of the Council a very

important economy may be affected by ceasing to print all public records in two languages. The few French gentlemen who have occasion to examine the statutes of journals are not only capable of examining them alike in English or French, but the English statute being the text of the courts, they naturally make use of the documents by which their business is to be regulated. To comply with the letter of a law, which had the facts be known, would never have been enacted in its present form, many thousands of dollars from the treasury, which could ill spare the number of cents, were taken to print a mass of documents to be immediately relegated to the undisturbed dust of a Winnipeg attic."

It is therefore obvious to any thinking person that the changes that have taken place with regard to the French language here in Manitoba, were a matter of economic expediency with the changing economic conditions and the population changes since 1870. So, in my estimation, the Franco-Manitoban Society, the Liberal cabinet and caucus, as well as the NDP government here, are trying to rewrite history.

It would appear that Manitoba 23 does not necessarily begin to speak for all the people of different ethnic origin. When Peter Warren asked Mr. Robert of the Franco-Manitoban Society, "How many members do you have?" he could or would not answer him. By the same token, how many members does Manitoba 23 represent? By the same token, I could say I represent the Scottish society and speak for all the Scots in Manitoba, even though I have never been a member. The committee should not take all these people who represent themselves as speaking for particular ethnic groups at face value. If they do, it is known as "cooking the books." I speak for myself, but hopefully, also for all those who are too timid or too intimidated to speak out.

It is by this means that the Franco-Manitoban Society has claimed to speak for all French-speaking people in Manitoba and it seems to me that they have succeeded in making others, but not all of the ethnic groups, as paranoid as themselves. We are almost back to the pre-1896 Manitoba School Act when - I may be incorrect on this, it might be 1916 but I'm not sure - when each ethnic group had its own school. From my reading of those times, education was a mishmash. So the intent of the government and educators at that time was to raise the standard of education, so it would be the best in the country for every child in Manitoba, regardless of race or creed. The English language would be the common denominator for all. These men were far-sighted, not racist, because where would some of our outstanding ethnic citizens who have become judges, senators, doctors, lawyers, etc., be today without this common denominator? There is no disputing the fact that this 1890 act was not passed in order to denigrate the French-speaking people of this province, as the Franco-Manitoban society would have us believe, but so that the boys and girls of this province would be able to compete with the rest of the English-speaking world. You only have to look at the map of the world in the early 1900s to see the extent of the British Empire. Though that has changed now, the English language has become the language that is used throughout the world today in commerce, aviation, science and now computers.

The BNA Act of 1867 gave the French people the right to speak their own language and receive public

services in their language where needed. This, nobody denies is their right. But to perpetuate in Manitoba what the Federal Government has done to the federal services and Crown corporations, by having The Manitoba Act and the Constitution of Canada 1981 amended to make Manitoba a bilingual province, is not only unethical but a colossal mistake, as well as the method being undemocratic. If this amendment is entrenched, we, the citizens, will have no further control through our legislative representatives but will be ruled by the courts. And since to quote "the law is an ass," do we want this to happen? I sincerely hope not.

Another bogeyman raised was that if Manitoba does not entrench the French language here, the Anglophone community of Quebec would suffer. This is an untruth, and it was pointed out by John Picton of the Toronto Star, in the Free Press, of July 30, 1983 entitled "Big Brothers hot on the trail of words." He shows to what absurd lengths that the Commission de Surveillance de Langue Française will go to stop the use of the English language in business in Quebec.

A few examples are: changing office files in an office; the signs on inter-office mail baskets; inter-office memos; and to top it off - asking to have the keys on a word processor changed to eliminate English words. Computers do not speak French. Out of fear of reprisals one store owner removed the exit sign from his back door.

Another article by Frank Walker, in the Free Press, of May 19, 1983 says - "Quebec's avenging priests" detailing the absurd lengths that are gone to make Quebec a French only province even to the extent of endangering lives.

Mr. Pawley and Mr. Penner say that this could not happen here but it could eventually with the entrenchment of French bilingual rights into The Manitoba Act. The trips to the court would be endless. So in Quebec, the majority ruled and have decided to obliterate the English language there, but here we are in a process of allowing a minority to rule with no guarantees, that over the years, the same thing could not happen to the English language here. Already English-speaking parents in Manitoba are fearful that if their children do not speak French they will not be able to seek work in the Provincial and Federal services or Crown Corporations.

With the hue and cry for French Immersion classes, and now the other ethnic groups wanting their language classes, we are going to have a generation of children who are illiterate in not one language, but in two, three or more. Just ask the universities about this. It was bad enough before French Immersion but now it will become a linguistic jungle.

In short, what it comes down to is "are we going to allow a minority to rule the majority" which was certainly never envisaged by our Fathers of Confederation? Are we going to allow Canada to be nibbled away, province by province, until Canada is a French state? I say no, no, no. We should bury the bitternesses of past injustices, real or imagined, and retain the English language as the common denominator language of work, both national, and international, and provincial with each ethnic group keeping its own language, culture, and creeds as their birth rights but let us all for now and evermore be Canadians.

Again thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege of speaking my piece and I repeat that the French language

rights are already entrenched in the Constitution of Canada 1981, and it should not be changed. I repeat again, let us all be just Canadians, not hyphenated Canadians.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mrs. Johnston. Are there any questions? Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions.

It seems to me that one of your main points - there are many that you made and many excellent points - but one of your main points is your concern about the costs of language instruction and making Manitoba officially bilingual and translating documents, etc. Is that one of your basic objections to this type of legislation?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Basically, yes. I think with the economy the way it is today that we cannot afford to be doing all of these things.

MR. R. DOERN: Have you ever appeared before any school boards, or other bodies? And have you ever had the unhappy experience of fighting for your position, which is legitimate, and yet been called a bigot or worse?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No, fortunately I haven't been called a bigot. And I have never really appeared before a committee like this in my life before.

MR. R. DOERN: The people that you talk to, and associate with, do they have a concern about the costs of the federal program, and the potential costs of the provincial program?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Yes, I think most of them have that as well as the other reasons that I've cited.

MR. R. DOERN: Are you aware of the fact that in addition to the 123 million that Mr. Joyal is going to sprinkle among all the other language groups in the next five years, that the Federal Government provides some \$192 million per year for bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: That was a figure that I was trying to get but time was kind of short, and I knew if I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister I might get it by Christmas - if I got the figures.

MR. R. DOERN: And you also seem to indicate that you think that the various ethnic groups, and of course there's only some being represented here, and only some of the leaders are appearing here, but that they have been sold a bill of goods. Namely they have been sold on this concept that by supporting French Language Services that they are going to get services themselves.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I have a feeling that some of the groups certainly are going along on this basis of, to some extent, if they don't go along with it maybe their rights will be abrogated.

MR. R. DOERN: You also expressed a concern on Page 4, that a great deal of time, and energy, and money, and effort is being spent on language training in Canada, and that this will detract from our position in the world, in the sense of competing with other nations like the United States where there are not two official languages. Looking at your brief you say - the money could be better spent on health, education, medical research, jobs, and retraining and so on. Do you think that this sort of program detracts from our international position or our competitive position?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Johnstone could you just speak up a little so we can get you better.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Oh I'm sorry.

I would be inclined to think that it would hurt our competitive position in world trade.

MR. R. DOERN: You say that you speak out for some of those who are too timid, or too intimidated to speak out. Why do you think people are intimidated from speaking out on this issue?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well, it's hearsay to some extent I admit. But I understand that in one particular ethnic group that they're sort of hindered by the opinions of their other ethnic members that, you know, you better not speak out.

MR. R. DOERN: A final question, Mr. Chairman.

You mention some concern, and you deplore the fact that the Quebec Government has their language police that run around looking at violations of language rights, or services, or privileges, or whatever they are, violations of the acts of the Quebec Legislature. Many of us are familiar with the completely stupid instance of these police going into - perhaps you have the article there - there was a famous instance of a calorie calendar in the back of some store or department that had been put on the wall in English and it was in an area that was populated by French-Canadian women. It was their calendar. It was in the back of the store. The language police and inspectors came and told them they had to remove it. The women were quite upset about this and annoyed and I'm saying, do you think that a similar situation could arise here, namely to enforce the act, that we might wind up with a language police force in Manitoba to enforce this type of legislation?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well it's entirely possible. I think it's a possibility. I would hope it wouldn't happen, but I mean anything can happen these days.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to thank Mrs. Johnstone for coming and having the courage to present her views and I hope that more citizens like her will also attend. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Eyler.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Johnstone, on Page 1 of your brief you refer to a statement by Mr. Pawley and Mr. Penner that Section 23.1 English and French are the official languages of

Manitoba, will remain, regardless of the opposition of the people of Manitoba. Are you familiar with Bill 2 of 1980, an act respecting the operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in regard to statutes, which says in Clause 1, "In this act official language means the English language or the French language."

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No, I wasn't aware of that particular statute.

MR. P. EYLER: So you weren't aware that in 1980 an act of the Legislature declared English and French the official languages with respect to Section 23?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: That was the one that in 1981, when 1870 was put back in the books.

MR. P. EYLER: In our proposed amendment to Section 23, we state, the current amendments reads something to the effect, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, as set out in Section 23, 23.1 and 23.2 to 23.8 or .9, I believe it is. In view of the fact that the official language status of English and French is restricted in that clause to the provisions of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, how is it that you see the official status of French affecting the use of French outside of the provisions of Section 23?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I'm not quite sure. Section 23, it quotes that English and French are allowed. Well I am saying I have no objections to it being used. I'm just saying that I'm objecting to the province being designated a bilingual province. I mean I'm not questioning - I stated there unequivocally that the French have their rights and I have no objection to them having their rights. I'm objecting to just that one - Section 23.1.

MR. P. EYLER: Well perhaps I don't understand exactly what you mean then. Are you saying then, you believe that by declaring Manitoba a bilingual province, everybody has to speak English and French?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No and I'm not saying that everybody has to at this point, but I mean the fact is that once it is declared as this, then over a period of years - I'm not saying it's going to happen tomorrow - but over a period of years, through the courts if this is passed, you're going to end up with a great deal more French all through the province in businesses and everything else.

MR. P. EYLER: Well presumably, if these expansions of French language speaking, if this is going to take place through the courts, there would be some appeal to a constitutional or a legal basis. What legal basis in the proposed revisions to Section 23 do you see, which could be used as grounds for expanding the use of French language in Manitoba, beyond what has been set out?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I don't quite understand that question, please.

MR. P. EYLER: If you're going to take something to court you have to have a reason to take it to court.

There has to be some law that has been broken. There has to be a legal basis to take something to court. I'm just asking what legal basis do you think there would be in the proposed amendments to Section 23 which would allow the expansion beyond those which are envisioned in 23?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well I can envision, if this is passed, that there could be concerted efforts on the part of some members of the French community, sort of arranging to go in and demanding services, and then if the person who is not there at the time that could do their business, they'd go trotting off to the courts with it. I mean this has happened twice now, so I mean I can envision that it could happen a lot, if it goes through.

MR. P. EYLER: You refer a few times to the cost of French language programs such as bilingual education, I believe I heard. Did you make reference to the translation of documents as well?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I beg your pardon?

MR. P. EYLER: Were you referring to the cost of translation of documents and legislation as well?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Yes, I mentioned the cost as far as translation in all of those things.

MR. P. EYLER: So you're concerned then about the cost of translating the legislation as well?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Yes, I am.

MR. P. EYLER: Does that mean then that you wish to see Section 23 struck out entirely?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No, I'm saying I think the language rights of the Francophone community that were given to them in 1870 should be continued. I'm not saying they mustn't. I'm saying that every ethnic group in the province has the right, and also I would say the obligation, to retain their own language. If a group has let their language slide, then I mean why should the rest of Canada pay for that?

MR. P. EYLER: Section 23 specifically states that the legislation of Manitoba is to be in English and French. You're aware of that?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I'm saying that the only thing that I am fundamentally objecting to - I mean I didn't study all the other provisions - I did look at them and I did study them to some extent, but not to the extent that I was prepared to come here and say, I propose this is not any good, I propose something else. All I'm saying is, that's the one item that I object to.

MR. P. EYLER: Okay then I'll try to keep things more to a less constitutional, less legalistic basis. You are, I take it, opposed to government assistance to any of the cultural minorities, whether they be French or German or Jewish or Ukrainian, insofar as maintaining their national identities, their ethnic identities?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well I sort of feel that as far as other languages are concerned, I guess I'm of the old school, let's face it. When I grew up, if I wanted to take piano lessons or learn to swim or anything like that, my parents paid for it. They didn't go to the public purse and say, gee, my child wants to be able to play the French horn or something or some other instrument, will you pay for it? So, I admit that I'm an anachronism now.

MR. P. EYLER: Would that also extend then to government assistance to independent schools, are you opposed to that as well?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I didn't catch that.

MR. P. EYLER: Are you also opposed then to government assistance to independent schools?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well, I must admit there again, I'm an anachronism. My parents sent me to St. Mary's Academy. They paid for it. They didn't expect anybody else to pay for it. In the meantime, they were still paying their taxes and that was going to support the public school system, but they didn't object to that. That was their decision.

MR. P. EYLER: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Hemphill.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to first of all commend Mrs. Johnstone for having the courage to come. I think it is difficult to come publicly, first of all to do the thinking and to come publicly, and to speak and to be prepared to answer questions after you've done it. You don't know what the questions are going to be.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I'm finding out.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: You're finding out, yes. But I think that we hope that the committee is not too intimidating and people like yourself, who are ordinary citizens, will feel comfortable enough to come and say what you think and to respond to the questions.

I was interested in the points she made about education for an obvious reason and that has to do with both my interest and my responsibilities. But I wanted to talk to you about the two areas: one, you were concerned about costs; and the other, you were concerned about the watering down, I think, of the education system, as I understand what you were saying.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Yes.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I would like to make comment on one point and you were saying that you went to St. Mary's Academy and that your parents were prepared to pay for that and expected that they would pay and that was the choice they made. I guess I would only like to say on behalf of a lot of parents in Manitoba who care as much about their child's education as your

parents did, that you maybe were a little bit lucky, too, in that they could afford to make that choice.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I admit that.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Many people don't have that option.

There are two areas, in terms of the watering down, the course was tighter, curriculum was tighter and some of the things that are in place now weren't in place then.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Back in 1920.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: We didn't ask when, but language is one of them. I'm wondering if you have heard, because you've obviously done a lot of thinking and some reading on this issue, if you've heard any of the information that has come out from studies that have done studies on the learning of second language and heritage language and their effect on the student's ability to handle the other courses? Have you heard of that?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Actually I haven't. I understand when I was checking into this because I had heard of an instance that I checked into. It was with reference to some students being allowed to have their books at an exam. It was sort of thought at the time that it was from the French Immersion group coming, but I discovered afterwards that it wasn't that, that these students were a little backward and had been allowed to do this.

I also learned that the group who are in Pembina Crest now that this year is the first year that the French Immersion children are going to be going over into Vincent Massey. So, it's somewhat early for that. I based my remarks on having talked to a university professor about the students going into university and not being able to read and what not so that I'm just sort of projecting that and saying that if this has taken place with them just learning English, what is it going to be if they're going to be trying to learn . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's interesting, I don't have the quote here . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt, I wonder if the members of the committee would co-operate and address their questions through the Chair and give me a chance to announce who is going to speak. I also ask the witness to speak a little louder, otherwise we won't get it on tape. So I'd like to have the questions addressed through the Chair.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I'm afraid I can't yell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but just speak up a bit. Ms. Hemphill.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if Mrs. Johnstone would be interested then in hearing some of the results of some very comprehensive studies that have taken place in areas where heritage language has been in place longer than the ones she mentioned

that give us really important information, because the question is an important one? Is it going to be at the expense of other learning? And we wouldn't want to do that.

But, would she be interested in learning and knowing, because I think she would, that what we have learned is that children who take heritage language programs do as well in other subjects as do other children, that they do as well in English as do other children who are not taking heritage language and it has a very strong feeling on identity, which you might understand is a positive feeling about who you are and that has an effect on your ability to learn? If you don't feel good about yourself, it's not just your brain that affects how able you are to learn but it's how good you feel about yourself and how confident you feel about who and what you are. The heritage language programs actually have an effect on children's ability to learn.

So, I think you will find that interesting because we have information that shows that when we do bring these programs into the schools, it is not at the effect of other learning. In fact, it helps enhance other learning. You know perhaps that we only use 20 percent of our brains.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I beg your pardon.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Human beings only use about 20 percent of our brains. We have great capacity that we never use. — (Interjection) — You use 30 percent.

Are you a teacher? I mean with your interest in education.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No, I'm just sort of interested in most things, that's all.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm wondering - when she raised two questions, the watering down of the program was one of the concerns and the other was the cost - if Mrs. Johnstone is aware of the way education is funded today and I won't go into the complexity of it, but the basic principle being about the province carrying about 80 percent of the costs of the programs, the Provincial Government, and the local government carrying about 20 percent. And that the reason for that is so that local communities can bring in programs that are important to the parents and to the community and that they vary from area to area where some concentrate on music, some concentrate on language, if there are high and large numbers of populations. But many of those programs require both community, parental, and school board support. They are the taxpayers that you are concerned about. So, I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether she was aware that many of these programs that are brought in are brought in with and on behalf of the communities that are paying those taxes and that our system is built, we have built into it, a combination of local community and provincial cost-sharing in the education costs.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I see. Well, that's very good. I would like to see that report on . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: On the results of heritage language, I'll be glad to give it to you.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mrs. Johnstone, are you familiar with the contents of Article 23 of The Manitoba Act as they now stand?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I read them, but I don't remember them in detail.

MR. G. LECUYER: From your understanding of that, of Article 23, as it now stands, do you feel that this article at the time it was passed in 1870 made English and French the official languages of Manitoba?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: That's a point that I was saying, the only thing that I object to is having it stated and entrenched, that Manitoba is an official bilingual province. I mean all the other rights and that sort of thing that were in that act I go along with.

MR. G. LECUYER: That's what I'm asking you, Mrs. Johnstone. Do you feel that as the act was passed in 1870 that is exactly what it contains? Is it your understanding of Article 23 as it was passed in 1870 that it was making English and French the official languages of Manitoba?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No. The article read that English and French may be used in the courts and by Legislatures.

MR. G. LECUYER: How do you explain then, Mrs. Johnstone, that in 1890 the Government of Manitoba passed an act which was called an Official Languages Act thereby making . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would suggest that the members try to maintain the parameters of questioning within clarification issues. I don't see how a witness can determine what was the thought of someone else some 90 years ago. So I would ask for the co-operation of the members to stay within clarification questions.

MR. G. LECUYER: With all respect, Mr. Chairman, I'm asking the witness' understanding of it, not to interpret it.

Do you feel that was not exactly what was recognized by passing in 1890 The Official Languages Act making English the official language of Manitoba?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: My feeling, as I say it's not a feeling, I don't know, I wasn't there then, maybe you were. I feel that it was quite clearly stated that French and English may be used. In other words, they were to get along together and not sort of start and have one side fighting the other on the subject. I imagine at that time too, that there was a greater intermingling of the people of a very small community, and I think that that statement was made so that each one of them felt comfortable.

MR. G. LECUYER: Do you feel, Mrs. Johnstone, that Manitobans have a right to services in English?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I still maintain that English is the common denominator language.

MR. G. LECUYER: Then you do feel that they should have a right to services in English?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Can I put it this way. We have ethnic groups, we have ethnic stores and everything like that. I'm sure that if I was French and went in and spoke to some of these people I wouldn't be served. Therefore, I think English, as a language of a common denominator, is essential for commerce and business.

MR. G. LECUYER: I wasn't referring to English as a working language in Manitoba, I was referring to services from government. Do you feel that these services from government in English are our right?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I didn't quite catch that. Do I believe if a service is in what?

MR. G. LECUYER: The services that a government can provide are our right in English?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: No, I think that, as I said before, the French have this right that goes back to 1870 and that these rights, where needs warrant, I think that's your working phrase for any of these things: if a need is there. Now it just depends on how many people decide that they're going to have to have these needs or to make an issue of it.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mrs. Johnstone, how do you propose that the various ethnic groups protect - and it seems to me that if I heard you correctly awhile ago, as far as you are concerned they are to blame and they should retain their heritage language and culture. In fact, if they don't, if they allow that slipping, they really are to blame. But if there is no assistance of any form in a society where all functions in one language - that of English - how do you suggest that they are going to go about doing just that, maintaining their heritage and their culture?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I think the home and their own cultural group are the areas where they should concentrate keeping their language and their culture alive.

MR. G. LECUYER: Do you not agree, Mrs. Johnstone, by the same token, where all the media are in English and all of their daily transactions are in English, that perhaps this will become very difficult?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: You mean that it would become difficult for them to retain their languages?

MR. G. LECUYER: Yes, and their culture.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: But that is up to them. I mean, you retain your language and you learn these things at home. You learn about your history from your parents and their parents and that sort of thing. To me - this may be off course - I think the parents today are expecting and demanding too much of the schools.

MR. G. LECUYER: You may see it, Mrs. Johnstone, that way, but perhaps the people of the various ethnic communities will, by the same token, say that as time passes the parents' culture and language becomes diluted therefore it becomes very difficult for them to pass it on to their children.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well, I think if people feel strongly enough about these things, and have that sense of identity - that's your word - with their own culture, and feel that it is important to retain it they're going to retain it, and they're going to keep it in the family, and amongst the people that they associate with.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mrs. Johnstone, you made a point a number of times in your brief of hyphenated Canadians and being Canadian means abiding by the common denominator. Do you feel that being Canadian means to be English? In other words what I'm asking is - would you prefer Canada to be, in regards to culture and language, to apply the same kind of policy as exists in the United States?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: This, of course, is this mosaic thing that's being sort of peddled around now. I think that what the groups here have done as far as Folklorama and all that sort of thing are excellent. I think it's good but I think that fundamentally as an individual you stand up and say - I'm a Canadian, I'm not tagged with a culture but that I am a Canadian. You see what I mean? I would think there's a tendency with people coming over to this country, and clinging to their languages, which is good in that, but I think they don't identify themselves as a Canadian quickly enough.

If I may just make a comment - there was a lady spoke on Beefs and Bouquets this morning, she was from Yugoslavia, and she said that she wished that the ethnic groups would get down to being Canadians.

MR. G. LECUYER: In your mind what does that mean?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I beg your pardon.

MR. G. LECUYER: What does that mean? Would you be more specific as what you mean by that?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well, it means what I've been saying - that these groups are sort of splintering so that unless they sort of identify with being a Canadian, and not with a splintered group of an ethnic group, I mean they're never going to be Canadians. They're never going to feel like a Canadian. This is what I'm getting at. I mean it's an identity. I mean everybody's saying we haven't got a Canadian identity. Well we're never going to have it if we don't start thinking about being Canadians.

MR. G. LECUYER: In one sentence, in your brief, you're saying that this NDP Government here are trying to rewrite history. Would you clarify what you mean by that?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: It was based more or less on changing history and bringing in the amendments.

MR. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry, Mrs. Johnstone, I don't know that I heard you correctly but how do you see these amendments as rewriting history?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Well I answered that. I said that it is rewriting history. You rewrite history every time you change the Constitution or change and make amendments to it.

MR. G. LECUYER: By that do you mean that it's changing it? That this is going against what history of this province . . .

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: History evolves, and the rewriting of the Constitution, rewriting the amendments is rewriting history.

MR. G. LECUYER: Awhile ago in answer to one other question you said - you felt that the learning of a number of other languages in Manitoba, if I interpret correctly, you felt was harmful to Canada in her international relations. Why do you say that or on what grounds do you say that?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I didn't quite get the first part of that question.

MR. G. LECUYER: In reply to a previous question awhile ago you said - that it was your feeling that the fact that these various cultural identities in Manitoba existed, and that numerous heritages languages were being maintained, that perhaps in some way that was being harmful to Canada in its international relations. How do you see that?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I didn't say that. I didn't say that retaining the heritage language was being harmful. I said the fact that English was the language of commerce and it's international, scientific, anything, you name it. English is the predominant language that is now used throughout the business world. That's what I'm saying. I'm not saying that these people shouldn't retain their language. You're putting words in my mouth. I'm saying that they have every right to retain it but they retain it by their own efforts in the home.

MR. G. LECUYER: I was referring to a question that Mr. Doern asked you awhile ago, and you did reply, yes, when he asked you whether you saw this as harmful to our international relations in commerce basically.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Yes.

MR. G. LECUYER: You feel that it is harmful?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Yes, I feel that - well I think it's happening here now with products coming in from the United States. There's some products that don't want the expense of having different labels.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mrs. Johnstone, I presume that you are aware Canada has trading relations with other countries of Europe and it has to abide by the same guidelines or rules, or whatever you call them, that

other countries of Europe also export to the United States, or the Far East, etc., and they also abide.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I can't say categorically it's so, but I think you would probably find that these trading nations, in other countries, are very much aware of the fact that if they're trading with English-speaking countries they use the English language.

MR. G. LECUYER: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Johnstone, on Page 7 on your brief and I quote, "We should bury the bitterness of past injustices, real or imagined, and retain the English language as the common denominator language of the workplace, both national and international, with each ethnic group keeping its own language, cultural and creeds as their birthright, but let us all for now and evermore be Canadians."

Now obviously you must have discussed this with your friends. Would you say that your friends feel the same way about that statement as the way you feel?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: As far as the French language or the economics?

MR. A. BROWN: As far as language is concerned.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I would say that neighbours and friends are of the same feeling - that we should not be designated officially a bilingual province.

MR. A. BROWN: Is there a feeling amongst your neighbours and yourself that maybe we are proceeding a little too quickly with a change in the Constitution and at the present time there is an overreaction by the government?

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: I would say they definitely feel that way and I think most of us are worried that because of it, it has engendered a lot of fears, both on the ethnic groups, and I would say, on the English-speaking people.

MR. A. BROWN: I want to thank you Mrs. Johnstone for coming out. I hope that more people like yourself are going to come forward and express themselves. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Mrs. Johnstone? Thank you very much Mrs. Johnstone for coming forward.

MRS. U. JOHNSTONE: Thank you for your courteous attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our next presentation is Mr. Sidney Green.

MR. S. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that you will note that I am here on behalf of the Manitoba Progressive Party, which you did not indicate, which has been indicated with respect to all of the other

speakers. I wish to indicate that the Manitoba Progressive Party received approximately 10,000 votes in the last election and my representation on their behalf, on behalf of the party should reflect a wider representation than a single person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm sorry Mr. Green. I didn't mention it. It just escaped me for the moment.

MR. S. GREEN: It's called a Freudian error, Mr. Chairman. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I am here and wish to make my position clear right at the outset and I also wish to make it clear that I am by no means not partisan. I don't know of anybody who would have a contribution to make who could be non-partisan about this issue. So I am very partisan. I am very much in favour of the extension of bilingualism in the Province of Manitoba. I am very much, if not more opposed to the government proposal and to the amendments which they are making to Section 23. I am in favour of retaining Section 23 and may I qualify that, Mr. Chairman, and members by saying that only because it's there - if I was there in 1870, I might have written something different, but to the extent I am bound by a constitutional position - which I don't like to be, as you well know - I am in favour of retaining the present constitutional position, because it is much superior to the constitutional position that is now being proposed by the government.

So if there are people in the Province of Manitoba who are interested in retaining 23 and if there is a "Retain 23 Group", I wish to associate with all of those who wish to retain 23. I am very much in favour of it and I adopt the language of the Attorney-General. In 1870 we made a deal and I believe in keeping the deal and the deal was 23 and I don't know why a government is now trying to change that deal and undo what we said at that time.

I also, Mr. Chairman, believe that the government position on this question has set back bilingualism in the province at least a minimum of 50 years and possibly more, and that this setback is possibly irretrievable but there may be a way of retrieving it and I'm going to suggest that way at the end of my remarks.

Now there are two views, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the bilingual character of Canada. One view, largely represented by Mr. Trudeau, is that one has to guarantee some modicum, which is as yet undefined and which is continually a problem, of rights for French-speaking people throughout the country and English-speaking people throughout the country and I want to underline that, because that is largely his position. The position of the Federal Government is mostly to maintain the rights of English-speaking people in the Province of Quebec, not to maintain the rights of French-speaking in the Province of Manitoba and that is the Trudeau bilingual position and has been - and much as I am opposed to it, Mr. Chairman, I will never call it a bigoted position, or a position which is aimed at creating divisiveness between groups.

The second position, which I have espoused not recently, not because of the government proposal, but in every year that I was a member of the NDP, is, that in order for Canada to be bilingual there has to be a place in Canada, which is as French as Manitoba and

Saskatchewan and Alberta are English. The only place where that is possible is the Province of Quebec. If Quebec does not have the future of being as French as Manitoba is English, or as Saskatchewan is English, then bilingualism, over many many years, and this is a peculiar thing because Mr. Lecuyer said, how do you retain a language without the government enshrining it officially and giving money to it?

I was in St-Pierre-Jolys il y a deux ans et tout le monde là parle français sans garantis constitutionnels et les juifs ont gardé leur langue pendant cent années sans garantis constitutionnels et sans la soutenance d'un gouvernement, so Mr. Chairman, si on ne comprend pas malheureusement de mal, je ne répète pas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is a place in Canada where French is spoken as the living language and where one, in order to survive, has to be able to speak French, then Canada will be bilingual. If there is no place in Canada where one has a necessity of speaking French to survive, to earn a living, to become prominent, to be a politician, to be in power in other respects, then whatever constitutional amendments you have, French will not be part of a bilingual Canada and Canada will not be bilingual. It doesn't matter what the Constitution says, surely you have learned that from the 1870 Constitution which attempted to guarantee French rights in this province and for 100 years that guarantee was not fulfilled.

Now, that being the case, Mr. Chairman, I want to compare the government approach to bilingualism and the approach which was taken by a very bilingually-oriented government who nobody here can accuse of being racist or bigoted. That was the government that I was proud to be a member of, the government of Mr. Schreyer between 1969 and 1977, to whom all of these proposals were made and all rejected. It was proposed to the Schreyer government that we recognize la Société Franco-Manitobaine as being the porte-parole de Franco-Manitobains.

They wanted us to regard them as speaking for all French-Canadians in the Province of Manitoba and we said, no. We said you are a group that is a very worthwhile group that speaks for French people but we don't recognize you as their bargaining agent, we don't recognize you as their spokesman and we don't say that if we make a deal with you, it's binding on George Forest or anybody else because it's not. This deal that is proposed as a means of solving a constitutional case is silly because any person in the Province of Manitoba, French or English, once you entrench, can make that a case of his. It could be Joe Borowski; it could be Sid Green; it could be Sterling Lyon; it could be Monsieur Lecuyer, it could be anybody. The fact that you have a deal with la Société Franco-Manitobaine does not foreclose that court case.

What happened, Mr. Chairman - and my partisanship shows - because I said between 1969 and 1979, when I entered the Legislature in 1966, the then Roblin administration had proposed what at that time was a revolutionary position. It said that French may be used as a language of instruction in the schools, up until that it couldn't be used as a language of instruction in the schools.

I don't know why I'm concerned with my credentials but I note, Mr. Chairman, because I'm opposed to the

government position, I'm branded in La Liberté, which is a French newspaper in this province as being on the side of bigots and people who are opposed to minority rights.

Mr. Chairman, here's what I said in 1966 before this came up, and this is legislation permitting French to be used as a language of instruction:

"Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. I don't support it in its apparently limited objective. I think that it would be of great benefit to all of us in this province if we were able to speak Canadian . . .", I never said French and I never said English. As far as I'm concerned to speak Canadian is to be able to speak the official languages of this country which are Canadian.

In order for this country to be truly bilingual, we should stop talking as if French was a minority language and la Société Franco-Manitobaine doesn't want it to be regarded as a minority language and all this pandering and the suggestion that it's going to help all minorities because French is made an official language is not what they want. They want true status as French and English being the majority languages of this country and the others are minority languages, not the French language. Canadian or Canadian is French and English.

I remember in my early years people would come back from the Province of Quebec and say to me that the people there don't even know how to speak English. This would be an abhorrent thing for me, that people in Canada couldn't speak English.

I made my first trip to Quebec in approximately 1960, and when I got to Quebec I ran into the very experience which had been related to me. But it never occurred to me or at least the impact on myself as an individual was not that they couldn't speak English. The impact on me was that I can't speak the Canadian language. These people are living in Canada, speaking what they think is Canadian and what they have a right to think is Canadian and I can't communicate with them.

I think that one of the fundamental problems of our times is that two people speaking Canadian can't communicate with one another. I, Mr. Chairman, have to lay blame on the government which brought me up in Canada and didn't teach me to speak Canadian. They taught me to speak half Canadian, but they didn't teach me to speak Canadian.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, and I'm making an effort to correct what I consider to be a defect, I hope to be able to speak Canadian in the hopefully near future. I admit that it's a problem especially for a person who is older, but I hope it will happen. A ce moment-là, je ne pouvais pas parler le Français, mais j'ai fait une promesse à tout le monde et à moi-même que je serais capable dans le futur et vous avez maintenant l'opportunité de juger si j'ai gardé mes promesses et j'ai pas fait des promesses à la Société Franco-Manitobaine que j'ai pas gardées - pas comme le gouvernement actuel du Manitoba. Et même, les syndicats. I support this bill because I think it has tremendous potential. I think its objectives are limited. I wasn't in favour of stopping there.

I support it as a member of an ethnic minority group because I think that it gives to the ethnic minority groups a long-time insurance that they will live in a country where mutual tolerance, respect and an opportunity for them to contribute what they are able to contribute

by virtue of their background because they are living in a country which recognizes that homogeneity is not the desired end, that there are different languages and different people and the very basic characteristic of our country and our province provides that.

I didn't make that up this year. I didn't make it up as a result of listening to some of the government propaganda. In 1969, we were fighting an election in the middle of Mr. Trudeau legislating on the Official Languages bill. I didn't happen to like the bill but, in my view, it was a bill that we had to support because it was stressing bilingualism in the country. I said at that time, and Mr. Mackling was there, it was Ed Schreyer's nomination, that one of the reasons that we have to support this type of legislation is that it underlines the character of Canada as not being the home of a homogeneous culture and that was the best kind of nationalism. It is almost a reverse nationalism because it doesn't aspire to some type of stereotype prototype. That was something that we have by accident, not because we're smart; we just happened to have it.

Members of the NDP phoned Mr. Schreyer and told him, get Sid Green off that kick, it's costing us votes. Ed Schreyer said no way, and Rhéal Teffaine, who is not here today but I'm putting it on the record, La Société Franco-Manitobaine told me, if I said that, I would lose the election in Inkster. I didn't lose the election and the NDP came to power, and we continued those things which the Roblin administration started, with respect to language and there were no bigots in the Province of Manitoba to oppose them. Suddenly, the NDP has found bigots climbing out of the woodwork. They weren't there and they are not there, but every time the NDP gets into a problem they shout bigotry. Somebody says that they are incapable, by background and experience from running the province, which happens to be true, they say bigotry. Bigotry!

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is now the case in the Province of Manitoba - and by the way, in 1970 we passed a piece of legislation known as The City of Winnipeg Act. Part 3 of The City of Winnipeg Act says, "In this part, historic St. Boniface means that part of St. Vital Community Committee, etc." But it says, "Official languages of Canada. Persons who are able to communicate in the two official languages of Canada, English and French, shall be available at the City Central Offices." This was passed as a bill: "Official Languages of Canada - services shall be available."

Did Mr. Doern resign from the cabinet? Did he speak against the bill? Was there all kinds of uproar about it because we described it? No, because it was a statute, Mr. Chairman. And Mr. Eyer, apparently - I hope I'm wrong, doesn't recognize the difference between a statute and a constitutional amendment, because he asked a young lady, in 1980 a statute enacted by Mr. Lyon's government - and I had forgotten that one - said that where official languages are referred to, it means French and English, and there wasn't an uproar, because there was no entrenchment.

If somebody went to court and got out of that statute a wrong interpretation, all that Mr. Lyon would have to do or any other future Legislature, and that's important - because would you let Mr. Lyon and his government legislate for all time? But that's what you want to do. You think you're so smart that you can pass, not only

what you want to do today, but that it should be binding on every future democratically-elected government in the Province of Manitoba. That's how smart you are.

In The Public Schools Act, Mr. Chairman, it says, "Subject, as hereinafter provided in this section, English and French being the two languages to which reference is made in The British North America Act, are the languages of instruction in the school" - English and French. The fact is, that the parents of any 23 students can go to a school division and demand instruction in English. They can go to a school division where classes are conducted entirely in French, and they can demand it in English, and they can demand it in French, and they have done it and they have been upheld by the courts.

Interestingly enough, to those who say that this is designed, and I'll read to you what you people have been saying - which I'm sure you don't even know about - that this is designated to protect people whose first language is French. That's false. The 23 parents who applied in Swan River to have the language of instruction in French were all Anglophones, who want their children to be educated in the two languages of this country. If French is an official language, it doesn't belong to those of French origin; in the same way as English does not belong to those of English origin. Do not the Francophones refer to all of us who speak English as Anglophones? But they don't somehow refer to a French-speaking person, who speaks French and English, as a Francophone. A Francophone is a person of French origin.

The Quebecois say that the Quebecois are people of French origin in Quebec. An English person happens to learn to speak French, he's an English person who speaks French, he's not a Quebecois, he's not a Francophone. So I'm identified by an Anglophone - I'm not perfect by any means in the language of French. I can't speak it as well as I speak English, but the day that I become perfect, am I a Francophone? And if I am a Francophone, am I represented by La Société Franco-Manitobaine? I say no.

In the same way, and I put this on the record, Mr. Chairman, there will be a Jewish organization here, speaking. They don't represent me. They're a group of Jewish citizens who are very prominent people and I respect them in every way. They don't represent me on political questions and we never discussed this in a political way. We have no formal forum which is binding on anybody which does it. The same way with the Chinese community. Which Ukrainian organization represents the Ukrainian on this question?

The government had a problem. They said we can't get this through. There's too much trouble. Let's get all these organizations come and say they want it, and those who are coming and say they want it, they are for bilingualism. They're for bilingualism because they say that this recognition of French language maybe means recognition of the German language and the Jewish language and the Polish language. It doesn't. It doesn't and I have always known that to be the case. I came to an English, French-speaking country and there is no way that German or Russian or Ukrainian or Yiddish, or any other language in this country, has the status of French and English and La Société Franco-Manitobaine doesn't want it to have.

They are seeking to have the French language on the scale of the English language and that is their right

to do. I don't argue on that, but I do argue that there is some suggestion that this equates all of the other ethnic minorities, because the French are not an ethnic minority. French in Canada is exactly the same as English in Canada. The numbers are smaller, but the official status in accordance with Canada, is equal and in Manitoba we tried to reflect our Canadian nationalism by pursuing those objectives. It's in The City of Winnipeg Act; it's in The Public Schools Act; it's in the act that Mr. Lyon passed, and I was in the House and he made a speech about pursuing 23 and we are required, by law, to accept the sincerity of his speech. I accepted it even without the law because I'm not always concerned with what is legal, I'm concerned with what is right. We accepted it and now it's being referred to as some type of bigoted position on the part of the Lyon administration. They were merely going to pursue - as a matter of fact, it's not. You know they talk both ways. They now refer to it as, look, Lyon was doing it, why can't we?

But if that government was doing it, it was doing it by means of statute and by saying that whatever 23 requires of us - and that's a big problem and we really don't know and we'll never know because once you have a Constitution, Mr. Lecuyer, once you have a Constitution and once a person's rights are determined by the courts, not by the Legislature, you don't know what somebody is going to dream of to take to court. Anything that you've been told by your Attorney-General that this will stop court cases, is, with respect, either a lie or coming from the mouth of a fool, or both, because it will not. There is more room for court cases under the new legislation than there is under the old legislation. Once we're stuck with it, I wish none of it was there, and then we would be considering doing what is good and what the people of Manitoba will profit by, rather than what we have to do in order to abide by a court decision, we would do that.

But that's not what has happened, Mr. Chairman, and I indicate the Schreyer administration had all of these points to consider. We were approached by La Société Franco-Manitobaine. We were asked to recognize them as the official spokesman. We didn't. Were we bigots? We were told to repeal the section that subsequently was repealed by the courts. We said we wouldn't, but we said let's forget about what the law says, we want to do things, and we did them. Was that the acts of bigots? That's what we did and we didn't recognize, we didn't make an agreement with a private organization, as to what the Constitution will say.

One thing you do, when you make those agreements or seek those endorsements, you have a problem. Endorsements could be withdrawn, as is now being threatened, and then who governs? The government or the person who made the endorsement? They will do it all the time. If once you tell people that by threatening us, we will change things to do it your way, you induce the threats.

I say, Mr. Chairman, and I was at the meeting at the International Inn, and I indicated at that time that I would deal with some of the legal questions, but the most important question - I sat in that audience for a 20-minute talk by the Attorney-General. I did not hear one good word about bilingualism. Not a good word. There was nothing said that it's wonderful to have a

population, that not only is fluent in more than one language, but that it also has an enduring basic characteristic that it engrains, not teaches, but that you grow up with respect for other people. Not one word was said.

What was said was - we have this case, you see, and there's this guy Bilodeau suing us to upset a parking ticket. One of the grounds is that the statute is not in English, and if we don't do this, there'll be no laws in the Province of Manitoba, or there could be no laws in the Province of Manitoba. Since I'm so worried about that suggestion, we have made a very good deal. We only have to translate certain laws. So is he in favour of bilingualism or against it? I mean if he's limiting the amount of laws that you have to have in French, is that a pro for bilingualism? It indicates you want to do the reverse, and we won't have to do this, and we won't have to do this. We've made a deal with La Société Franco-Manitobaine, which really gets us off the hook on bilingualism, to which we are now committed by 23. So who's departing from it? I heard the Attorney-General say yesterday that was not their position, that Mr. Lyon was misrepresenting the position.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter dated June 27th, sent out by Howard Pawley, Premier of this province. He said, "In my respectful view, your resolution proceeds under a misunderstanding. The province has not reached an accord with the Federal Government to have Manitoba declared a bilingual province." I thought Mr. Lecuyer said that's what it is. I read here in Section 23, English and French are the official languages in Manitoba. He writes, "In my respectful view . . . the province has not reached an accord with the Federal Government to have Manitoba declared a bilingual province." Isn't it a good thing? Why doesn't he tell them, yes, we have done this. Bilingualism is wonderful. Who is appealing to the bigots? Who is doing it?

Then he says, and he doesn't say it's a side issue, he starts with it, saying that the governments considered this kind of court case. Two leading constitutional lawyers said that it was possible that the Supreme Court could decide that all Manitoba laws were invalid. If this happens it would mean legal chaos, in effect. In effect Manitoba would have no laws. They have legal chaos with laws, but he's saying that we will have legal chaos if there are no laws. I'm not sure. I used to think that these things are clear-cut but, you know, to have no laws - "Tis a consummation," Mr. Chairman, as Hamlet said - "devoutly to be wished." Maybe people would then govern themselves, on the basis that there's nobody telling them what to do, and that they have to be responsible. However, this is what he said. I'm not sure that we can't live with that situation if it ever came about, which it wouldn't.

But, Mr. Pawley didn't say that was a side issue. He used the term, Mr. Chairman, and he described other things in the agreement - I'm not intending to undo them, but he started with that and then said, most importantly. So that's the principle thing. All our laws which were passed in one language only will now be valid and we will not be faced with the possibility of legal chaos. Is that a side issue? Most importantly that was the issue, that was the reason for bringing forth this bill, that all the laws will be valid.

Well, Mr. Chairman you know, you can never predict what a court will say. I've been in court, I believe, more

often than anybody in this Legislature. Probably as much as most of them put together. They say peculiar things sometimes. So I can't say what they would say, but I am prepared to live with what they would say on that question, rather than give them a whole bunch of other things, which is done by this legislation. If you look, Mr. Chairman, at the material which it bothers me to look at every time I see it, because I paid for it - there is no government that has used a public purse

more to pursue its own political position than this administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Green, the committee agreed to adjourn at 12:00. You will have 10 minutes on your presentation when we return at 2:00 o'clock.

I would ask the public and everyone to clear the room as quickly as possible, so that we can set up the translation services during the recess.

Thank you very much.
Committee adjourn.