



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. A. Anstett
Constituency of Springfield



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 43 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 28 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	Virden	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 AND ELECTIONS

Wednesday, 28 September, 1983

TIME — 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Lyon and Penner
Messrs. Anstett, Brown, Fox, Graham,
Lecuyer, Malinowski, Nordman and Scott

WITNESSES: Ms. Alice Richmond, Private Citizen
Mayor Elmer Greenslade, Manitoba
Association of Urban Municipalities
Mr. Fred Debrecen, Private Citizen
Mr. Ian MacPherson, Private Citizen
Dr. A.E. DeLeysac, Président-général de la
Société Canadienne du français à l'universitaire

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Proposed Resolution to amend Section 23
of The Manitoba Act.

* * * *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, P. Fox: Committee will come to order. Our first - Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: I wonder if I could raise a matter with the committee.

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham, your point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Is there a quorum?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: That's right, that's right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown is counting too.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just raise a point with you and the committee, I know what the problems are involved in calling people who are not at the committee at that point in time, but I was asked by Ms. Richmond to make this point. She was here this morning. She has attended the committee a number of times - I think this is her third time - in the expectation of being called. This is her third appearance; she's been here since 10 o'clock. She assumed that the committee met until 12 o'clock, and she consequently

left on that assumption. I think at 12:20, her name and Reverend Hutton's were called and neither were present, so the committee moved on from there.

I was wondering whether in view of that the committee would be willing to hear from her at this time. She has a short two-page brief that she wants to present. She can speak for herself, but I simply raise this at her suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: Further discussion from honourable members?

Mr. Graham.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've recognized Mr. Graham.
Mr. Nordman.

MR. R. NORDMAN: If the lady in question was here and was under the impression that we were breaking at 12 o'clock and she left just prior to that and it's a short brief, then I would see no reason why we couldn't accommodate her at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Chair certainly has no objection to the committee accommodating anyone on the list. I would express one reservation, that to date consideration has only been given to special needs, usually associated at the rural hearings for mayors or reeves with other council meetings which they had to attend, or people coming from out of province. I express this concern to the committee, not wanting to prejudice the committee's decision, but exercising the caution that if we start providing for each individual request for special consideration, the list very quickly could mean nothing.

I ask the committee if they wish to consider this request, to consider the implications and to consider whether or not they will then want to entertain similar requests. If the committee tells me this is the only one they wish to consider, then I have no reservations whatsoever, but I am concerned about opening the doors.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this committee for a long time and other committees of the Legislature. I have found the members of the Legislature, regardless of what committee they're sitting on, have always done their utmost to accommodate the public. I think it's a fairly consistent policy that has been practised without ever establishing precedents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, simply that I think that what I wanted to indicate is that we should go along with the request on a special request basis, not as a regular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: On the same point. There is a distinction and we ought to note it for the record that it was a genuine mistake of fact by the witness, and it's on that basis and that basis only that we're making this exception.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
Alice Richmond, please.

MS. A. RICHMOND: Thank you very much for giving me this second chance. My name is Alice Richmond and I am a bigot; in fact, I am a red-necked bigot. I accept this appellation, not in the way Webster's Dictionary defines a bigot, but in the way it is applied today to anyone who opposes the entrenchment of the French language in the Manitoba Constitution.

Why do I object? First, because I do not buy the two founding nations' myth, especially as it applies to Manitoba today. In August, in Winnipeg, we celebrate Folklorama, a festival of nations, and brag about all our ethnic groups and what they have contributed to our province. I believe there were over 40 pavilions this year. Wouldn't it be great if they all demanded that their language be printed on the cornflake boxes? I'm sure we can think of better ways to spend our tax dollars and foster unity at the same time.

I object because of the cost. Right now, every item I put in my grocery basket costs more because it must have the French language on it. Our school taxes have escalated because students have to be bussed to and from Immersion classes, and our federal tax money is being used to pay court costs of certain individuals to promote bilingualism.

I object mostly because of the dissension it is causing, at every level of government, in our Armed Forces, our Civil Service, our places of work, our schools and even in our homes.

I'm aware of what the acts of 1870 and 1890 proclaimed as law, but this is 1983. Surely we can pass a new law that applies to the situation as it is now. Is there any one of you who does not know of some law that has been repealed because it no longer applied? It was too stringent, too hard to enforce or had just outgrown its original intent. How about prohibition? Hanging? Or go back a little further, throwing people in prison because they couldn't pay their debts? There wouldn't be many of us left to vote for or against anything if that one was still on the books.

What I'm trying to say is let's grow up; let's face facts. What was fair in 1870 is not fair today. We have more Germans, Ukrainians, Poles and Icelanders in Manitoba; all of whom have accepted English as their second language. Then we have Frenchmen. Why then, for 4 or 5 percent of the population, are we being asked to give the French language equal billing with English? I suggest we're being conned by Mr. Trudeau and his cohorts.

We've been told that entrenchment is necessary to preserve the French culture. All I can say is that the French culture must be pretty flimsy if it cannot be preserved without government assistance. Consider the Jewish people, they've been shoved from pillar to post for 2,000 years, but have managed to retain their culture without government assistance.

When I went to school, in what was then called Brooklands, there were only two of us in the class whose mother tongue was English. My father wanted me to learn to do the Highland Fling. He didn't go to the principal of the school and insist that the 37 other Ukrainian, Polish and German children be taught it; he paid to send me to dancing school and thus preserved part of his culture without government help. Incidentally, a number of the kids in that same class spent Saturday mornings at their churches learning the language and culture of their parents, again, without government assistance.

In closing I repeat, I know I will be labelled as a bigot, but bigotry is not a criminal offence, blackmail is; and if you can tell me what other name can be used for the actions of the Federal Liberals and the Franco-Manitoban Society, perhaps, you will be able to change my point of view.

Thank you again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Ms. Richmond. Questions by honourable members? — (Interjection) —

MS. A. RICHMOND: I'm a bigot. I don't change my view unless you can add to that last question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Richmond, questions aren't intended to ask you to change your view. The purpose of questions is to clarify any of your remarks, if there are any questions.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Two questions, Ms. Richmond. I gather then that you accept that word which is taken as derogatory, namely, the word "bigot," because you feel that it has lost its original meaning.

MS. A. RICHMOND: It has in this instance, yes.

MR. R. DOERN: And so how do you understand it? You understand it to mean one who does not support the government?

MS. A. RICHMOND: Exactly.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Ms. Richmond? Seeing none, thank you very much for your presentation Ms. Richmond.

Dr. Vedanand, National Association of Canadians of Origins in India, Dr. Vedanand; Raymond Hébert, Raymond Hébert; Mayor Elmer Greenslade, Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, Mayor Greenslade.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Elmer Greenslade and I speak to you as President of the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities. Our association has not been in assembly since the Provincial Government announced their intentions to extend French Language Services, therefore, our members were polled by mail and then a follow-up of phone calls to arrive at our position. Our survey shows that 8 percent are in favour, and 58 percent are opposed to the Manitoba Government's proposal.

The reasons for opposing the proposal are:

1. The cost; at a time when it is most difficult to keep up with costs of essential services, such as, sewer and water, roads and streets, and social services, we are being asked to consider the extension of a service that very few, if any, Manitobans really need.

2. The presently indefinite and ultimately unpredictable parameters of this service, and the associated costs.

Manitobans are people made up of many ethnic backgrounds who live together with a great deal of harmony. We believe that the present activities regarding this issue are destroying this harmony. If Manitobans decide service and business should, or must, be conducted in either French or English, or both, then surely these languages must be taught throughout our school system. This would bring, through evolution, a society bilingual in French and English, and everyone would have equal opportunity for gainful employment. If this progression to bilingual status is not acceptable, then let us rely on the justice of the courts.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mayor Greenslade. Questions by honourable members?

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I have two or three questions to Mayor Greenslade. One has to do with the figure that you gave, you indicated that 57 percent or 58 percent of the members opposed the government's position. First of all, am I right, looking at the list - I have the list dated August the 15, 1983 - that that is 50 percent of the number, but actually only 6 percent of the population. It excludes, for example, the City of Winnipeg is not included.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That is right, the City of Winnipeg, but we look upon each urban centre as a member. We think of them as being equal partners in our association, and that's why those numbers are as they are.

HON. R. PENNER: I appreciate that, and I'm not disputing that when you use 57 percent, it was 57 percent of the number of municipalities belonging to the Association, but it only represents 6 percent of the population of the province.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't know whether that would be correct or not. I guess we would have to apply some arithmetic to come with up with that conclusion. Certainly we're all aware of the fact that something in excess of half the people live in the City of Winnipeg, we're all aware of that. But then, when you get to talk about the other outlying urban centres, I don't know whether the end result would be as you have calculated. Maybe you have put some calculation to this, I haven't.

HON. R. PENNER: Again with respect to the position of the Association, the 57 percent, in terms of number of Association members who oppose, oppose for different reasons; that is, they don't all oppose for the same reason.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That's right, I suppose. We feel that this presentation I have made has explained, or

is the major concern that has been expressed to us. As I've mentioned, we have not been in an assembly, so we have not been in a face-to-face situation, so the communication has, as I state, been done through mail and through phone calls. It restricts, I suppose, a certain amount of communication, but this is the general overriding rule of why people have voted as they have.

HON. R. PENNER: The issue of costs?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That's the main concern, plus that there is not a need for it as they feel then.

HON. R. PENNER: I raise that question because I have before me a resolution from the City of Portage la Prairie signed by yourself which reads: RESOLVED THAT the Council of the City of Portage . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm putting this as a preamble to a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you're introducing additional information. Mayor Greenslade is not here representing the City of Portage la Prairie, but rather the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities. Perhaps if you ask Mayor Greenslade - if I can be helpful, Mr. Penner, in terms of following our procedure - whether or not he wishes to answer questions with regard to the City of Portage and, if he replies in the affirmative, whether or not they passed a resolution, and then what the contents of that resolution are, you might get to the same point. But by allowing you to read it into the record, I'm then allowing you to do something that other members of the committee have been asked to refrain from doing.

HON. R. PENNER: With respect, Mr. Chairman, this seems to be contrary to your former ruling about reading into the record matters that are a matter of record to be a preamble to a question. It did flow from . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: In answer to the point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, this is to the point of order. That did flow from Mayor Greenslade's, speaking for the municipalities, said that the main concern was cost and I now wanted to put an example to him where that was not a concern expressed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham to the same point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, to the same point of order. I think that I, as a member of this committee, do not object to the use of that information by the Attorney-General. After all, he is the key figure in this whole negotiation process and I think he deserves special privileges. I would like to see him have that special privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As your Chair, I am not prepared to grant special privileges to any member of this

committee, and I don't think they're being asked for. I have to suggest to the committee that the reading into the record, as has been done, of the contents of the September 6th proposed amendments, or of the actual motion, has never been denied as preamble to questions, but the reading into the record of other material, which has not been referred to in the brief, would certainly not seem to be appropriate to me. I am at the guidance of the committee if the committee wishes to allow that kind of questioning, but that would be a departure from the previous guidance I have received. I think it's clear to honourable members how they can arrive at the same point. Those members who have been skillful in their questioning have had no trouble abiding by my guidance.

HON. R. PENNER: I accept your ruling and I'll ask the question differently.

Is it not a fact, Mayor Greenslade that the City of Portage la Prairie in its resolution based its opposition purely and exclusively on the concern about the matter affecting municipalities and school divisions?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I suppose that is true in our case, but I tend to think that I am here representing the Urban Association and I guess I'd prefer not to get into what each individual association member feels about the matter because I have difficulty in speaking for each individual one. Certainly I think the resolution from the City of Portage la Prairie explains our council's view on the matter.

HON. R. PENNER: And that was the concern about municipalities being covered?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That's right.

HON. R. PENNER: Right. You're now aware of one of the proposed amendments tabled on September 6th which specifically, in terms, excludes municipalities and school boards?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I've heard that statement from the beginning, I guess, but I guess that people keep suggesting to me, we wonder where this will get to in the final analysis really, and I guess there's that concern. Whether that's justified or not, I'm not prepared to say, but that has been expressed to us on many occasions, so that is the concern that members do have.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm not quite clear about that answer. Would it not be the case, if I can clarify your last answer, that if you have a constitutional provision, and these can't be changed very easily, which specifically excludes municipalities and school boards and says that, "excluding municipalities and school boards," it means excluding municipalities and school boards?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I suppose, but I think that members tend to wonder whether things are etched in stone. While that may be the situation of today, will it be tomorrow? I don't know. This concern has been expressed to me and, whether it's justified or not, I can't say that.

HON. R. PENNER: You are aware, are you not, of the difference between a constitutional provision and a statutory provision?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't pretend to be as knowledgeable about those things as many of you around this table, that's for sure.

HON. R. PENNER: That may be so. I wouldn't for a moment believe that. My question still remains, Mr. Greenslade, are you aware of the difference between something that's in a constitution and something that's just in an ordinary law?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I suppose that I have a general understanding of that; whether I have a detailed understanding of that, I'm not sure.

HON. R. PENNER: Is it your understanding that constitutions cannot be changed easily, whereas ordinary laws can be changed much more easily?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Yes, I understand that point.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you. Now you said, near the conclusion, "Let us rely on the justices." Are you referring to the Supreme Court of Canada in the Bilodeau case when you make . . .

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That's right in this particular instance.

HON. R. PENNER: Would you please tell me what your understanding of the issue before the Supreme Court is in the Bilodeau case?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't know as I could answer that question.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm a little puzzled. You did say, "Let us rely on the justices." I assumed that you knew what the case was about.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't think that it necessarily hinges on this alone. As we understand it, we are satisfying the desire, shall we say, or the goals of certain governments and certain organizations to satisfy their need of today. While this plan may do that, we are concerned about the Bilodeau's, the other organizations and associations of tomorrow and the next day and 10 years down the road. So while we talk about relying on the justice of the courts, we think of this as an ongoing thing, and not just tying it to one particular court case of the moment. So we think that, in general terms, this is what we're talking about; that the courts can deal with these matters.

HON. R. PENNER: You're content to leave matters of this kind to be resolved by the courts?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Well, we think it's the best option that is before us at this moment.

HON. R. PENNER: That would include, would it - you may clarify - letting the courts be the ones to protect French Language Services, guarantee the French Language Services?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I presume so. I'm like a lot of other people, I wonder why these laws and these

agreements must be followed year after year. I think, in terms of 100 years, why we cannot adjust some of these constitutional matters or laws, or whatever you wish to call them, and why we have to resort back to 1867 and 1890 and so on and so forth? It seems to me that society is changing. I think we have to stay up-to-date with some of our thinking. I think we have had certain situations where it appears there is special status for certain people, and I think this tends to be outdated. I think we're all Canadians; I really think that we can all surely do our business or social activities with the one language, I personally feel that. So I tend to think that we should be able to adjust and modify and change some of these rules, regulations and laws of longstanding that really don't quite fit today's society.

HON. R. PENNER: If that is to be done, is it to be done by the political process or by the courts?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I would prefer it, actually, to be done by the political system myself.

HON. R. PENNER: Because I understood you to say, let's leave it to the courts. Now you've got me confused.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Well, the situation that is before us today, I don't accept the idea that this province of ours is going to be thrown into chaos. I think if this is what we have to do then I say, in this particular instance, let the courts decide.

HON. R. PENNER: In this particular instance?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Right.

HON. R. PENNER: That's what I thought you had said and we got off into talking about the judicial system generally. So, let me come back to that one point and I had asked you - because you did say, in this particular instance let the courts decide - if you knew what the issue was that the court would have to decide, and I think your answer was that you didn't know.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Well, I don't pretend to know all the details, I think I have an overview.

HON. R. PENNER: Could you tell me what your overview is?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't know whether I could put it into words at this particular moment or not.

HON. R. PENNER: One of the matters before the Supreme Court is whether or not The Summary Convictions Act being passed in one language only is valid. Do you know what The Summary Conviction Act is? Are you aware that every law in the Province of Manitoba . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: All right, I'll ask the question differently.

How are your municipal by-laws enforced? Through what act are they enforced?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Our municipal by-laws?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I look upon The Municipal Act as being our authority.

HON. R. PENNER: You're not aware that they're enforced through The Summary Convictions Act?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I'm afraid not.

HON. R. PENNER: If you knew that, would you still say, let the court decide and maybe rule The Summary Conviction Act invalid?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I think you're getting into an area that's beyond my understanding.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Greenslade, Mr. Greenslade, I believe in your statement you said that there were some 57 percent or 58 percent of your organization opposed were to this and, in previous questioning from the Attorney-General, he said that represented only 6 percent. Can you tell the committee whether your brief and the information that you have was forwarded to the Attorney-General prior to this meeting of the Standing Committee of the Legislature?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: This paper I'm reading today?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: No, it wasn't.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could you tell me how Mr. Penner would suddenly arrive at a figure of 6 percent as being the percentage of the population that were opposed to the position of 58 percent of your membership?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I couldn't answer that because, as I indicated, I have done arithmetic to arrive at that, and I really wouldn't know where he has come up with his figures. Certainly I can't state that is only 6 percent, and that's why I doubted that perhaps that is accurate. I wouldn't know, really.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General has just said to me, here you are, Harry, read it for yourself. Has Mr. Penner got some information that is not available to other members of the committee, then, with respect to the information you have given to this committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. I'm not sure that Mr. Greenslade is in a position to answer a question regarding what information Mr. Penner has. As to the previous question he indicated he didn't know how Mr. Penner arrived at his calculations. I think those questions might be more appropriately addressed to Mr. Penner at the conclusion of the public hearings,

but perhaps Mr. Graham can clarify for Mr. Greenslade whether information has been supplied to Mr. Penner.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, that was the very purpose of my first question, because I am a member of this committee and so is Mr. Penner, but apparently he seems to have some information that is not available to me, and I would like to know what information he has that is not available to other members of the committee, and that was why I asked Mr. Greenslade if he had provided some information to the Attorney-General that was not provided to other members of the committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Penner, to the point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order, I was referring to a document circulated by the association itself to all mayors and councillors listing the municipalities who opposed and those who were non-committal or had no position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order, but I'm sure committee members appreciate having that information to clarify the question.

Further questions, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Greenslade, since you are the President of the Union of Urban Municipalities, can you tell me which urban municipality Mr. Penner is either a mayor or a reeve of that would provide him with that kind of information?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't know whether I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Greenslade, I think the question was facetious. Unless you have a reply in kind, it might not be appropriate to engage in that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I don't think it is the Chairman's prerogative to decide whether a question is facetious or not. I asked it in full sincerity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham, I stand corrected. It's certainly quite possible that your question was not intended to be facetious, and I accept your admonition. Mr. Greenslade, can you answer the question?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: What was your question, again, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I just wondered if you could tell me which municipality of your organization Mr. Penner belongs to, whether he is a reeve or a councillor, because he informed the committee that this information was circulated to all mayors and councillors of your organization. I did not receive that kind of information.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I can't give a definite answer to that, because I simply don't know where Mr. Penner lives. I guess I assumed he lived in the City of Winnipeg, and the City of Winnipeg is a member of our Association.

But whether, in fact, Mr. Penner does live in the City of Winnipeg, I really couldn't say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Greenslade, you have stated that your organization has not held an annual meeting, or a meeting that has had the opportunity to deal with this question that is before us today since your last annual meeting. Would you consider the issue that is before us today, namely, the amendment of the Constitution of the Province of Manitoba and the Constitution of Canada, sufficiently important to call a meeting of your organization to deal with that specific question?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Our annual meeting is coming up in December, and I think you must realize that our . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Sorry to interrupt, Mayor Greenslade. Would those who are carrying on personal conversations and interrupting the proceedings please do so outside of the committee room?

Please proceed.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Well our Association, as you well know, is spread about the province in very far-reaching distances. When you think, we have Thompson, we have Flin Flon, and so it is difficult for us to get our membership together. We get it together at our semi-annual meeting, and unfortunately, this was held in the early part of May, just ahead of the announcement being made, and we do not get together again until fall. Normally, we get together in October, and this could have been discussed at that particular time; however, with it being an election year, avoiding the annual meeting of the UMM, their session which is in November, ours through necessity, had to be put back till December. So certainly it will be discussed in December, that's for certain. We would have liked to have been together as an organization earlier but, because of distances and the cost associated with getting together, we have not done so. We are sorry that the timetable was such as it was, but that's the way it was and that's the way we had to live with it.

So, as I've said before, we haven't had this opportunity to be face to face on the matter and discuss it, and have dialogue on the matter, it's been done through mail and telephone. This isn't the best way, but it was the only way we felt we had available to us.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Mr. Greenslade, Mr. Greenslade, amendments to constitutions occur very rarely in a person's lifetime. Would you think it would be important that when a Government of the Province of Manitoba is contemplating a change to the Constitution of the Province of Manitoba that they would consult with the municipal governments of the Province of Manitoba, who are the governments that are closest to the people? Do you think it would be important that the government should dialogue closely with them before they make any change in the Constitution that affects everybody in the province?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Yes, I do. I think that it's important. I think that the municipal government is the government that is closest to the people. I think that the people communicate with us perhaps a little more easily, because we're accessible, because we meet one another on the streets each day. I think that we get the vibrations, shall we say, from the people much more quickly and on a personal basis than either of the senior governments do. I think that it would be good to communicate with us on this before decisions were made, however, it was suggested to us that it really didn't affect us and, therefore, it wasn't thought to have been necessary.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Greenslade, you have said that the government suggested to you that it didn't affect you and it wasn't necessary to communicate with you. Has the government had any other communication with you on this very important subject?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I am not aware of it. The person that's head of our office is here, and whether there is any further information that could be brought from that source or not, I'm not sure but, to my knowledge, there has been no direct contact made.

I know that we were in the Legislative Building, I think, the afternoon of the day that Mr. Penner made the announcement in the House and he came in and spoke to us. Our Association was there, the UMM was there, and he explained to us the announcement and what had taken place. There was the question as to why we had not been brought into the matter previous to the announcement, but his answer was that he felt that it didn't affect municipal governments or school boards and, therefore, that was not felt to have been necessary to do so.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Subsequent to that meeting in Mr. Penner's office at which he felt it wasn't necessary to have any further communication with your Association on this matter, has there been any request by your organization, or any member of your organization, for further dialogue on the matter?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't know whether that's yes or no. I couldn't really answer that question.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Greenslade, do you think the matter is of sufficient importance to have further dialogue between the municipal level of government and the provincial level of government.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Yes, I do. I think that people of municipal governments perhaps feel that many times they are ignored in matters that senior governments take upon themselves. We think we're an important part of the governing of the people of Manitoba and Canada, and we do feel that we would like to have greater input into some of the decisions that are made.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Greenslade, you have indicated that you have a semi-annual meeting of your organization coming up in the near future. Would it be your hope that the government would not proceed with this matter until they have had the opportunity, say, at

that meeting, to have further dialogue with you and the members of your organization.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I'm sure that our members would be very pleased to have that happen because, as I said before, we are widely spread throughout the province. We don't get together and we do appreciate, at our annual meeting, to have members of government there to explain to us what is taking place. Certainly this is a very important matter to all of us as Manitobans, and we'd be very pleased to have this opportunity to communicate on the matter.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Greenslade, I want to thank him for the opportunity of answering some of the questions that I have as a member of this committee. I wish his organization well in their deliberations which, I'm sure, are in the interests of all Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Graham. Further questions by members?
Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mayor Greenslade, you indicated that, if I have the figures right, 8 percent of your organization favoured the government proposals; 58 percent opposed; therefore, about 34 percent were undecided. Has there been any further polling taken, or have any of those undecided municipalities indicated their preference at this time?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: We, first of all, did our polling by mail, and there were those who didn't respond, didn't answer. So, therefore, we followed it up with phone calls to make sure that we had made contact and had contact with each and every member. So we've had a reply from all of them.

Those who have remained undecided, we have communicated with our members, again, suggesting that if they have special feelings on the matter that they would avail themselves of these hearings wherever they may be and express their own municipality's concerns at the location closest to their city, town or village.

MR. R. DOERN: So of those who declared, nearly 90 percent were opposed?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That would be about right, yes.

MR. R. DOERN: Was that based upon the passage of resolutions that were then forwarded to your organization or forwarded to the government?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: No, we simply - I think the question was put in the framework of: Do you support or are you opposed to the government's proposal on the extension of the French language question?

MR. R. DOERN: Did a number of those municipalities pass resolutions on the question?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I believe so. Yes, I know that a number have.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you have any numbers or examples of those who did.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I couldn't give you any, Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Mayor, you also gave the objections to official bilingualism. I wrote down two - cost and lack of need. Were there other reasons given, as well, or what were the most frequent additional reasons?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Those are the main reasons of it all. Trying to summarize the total membership into a reasonable length commentary, that's what it boils down to.

MR. R. DOERN: You also talked about vibrations from the people that are picked up by municipal councillors and mayors and so on. What is the man on the street saying to you? We hear roughly what your organizations say, what the elected representative say; what are the men in the street, the man on the street saying to you?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I guess the most common statement that I have passed on to me is that it is all so unnecessary. I think that many look upon Manitoba as a province of people of many different ethnic backgrounds, and many people have talked about how you look at places, such as, Gimli and you find the Icelandic, Scandinavian people there; you look at places, such as, Dauphin where you find Ukrainian people and people associated with that background; you look in the southern part of your province and we find Belgian people communities, we find French communities, we find German communities.

We find that these peoples in their different communities have learned to live together so well. I, personally, find that some of the French communities around our city, when you travel there, you go in there to perhaps buy some gas or buy an ice cream cone, or whatever it may be, you immediately find that the people there are speaking French but, when you go in to ask for whatever you require, you're served in English. It's very politely served, and everything works out so nicely. We have a harmony between the different ethnic peoples. I think it's so precious, I think that what we are doing is destroying this harmony.

I think that is so regrettable, and it is those sort of social, human feelings that are being expressed to me, along with the fact that it is costing us a lot of money, and Heaven knows how far the costs will go.

MR. R. DOERN: So just on your last point, there is also concern about this expanding or extending, in terms of, to the municipal level, or to more and more services, or more and more demands.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: That's right.

MR. R. DOERN: You also said in your statement earlier that the legislation is destroying our harmony, or words to that effect. Do you believe that in the withdrawal of this legislation, if it were not proceeded with, that harmony and good feeling would return?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I think that there has been a certain amount of harm already taken place, but I think

that people would gradually move back in the same attitudes towards one another. I would think, in a matter of time, that the upset we are presently experiencing would dissipate, and we'd get back into a harmonious relationship with one another again.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my final question is this. What members of your organization are holding plebiscites; I gather, Winnipeg, Brandon and Thompson. Are there additional member associations that are planning plebiscites at this time?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I haven't heard of others.

MR. R. DOERN: Is Portage la Prairie planning one, or have you taken a decision?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: We have taken a decision not to hold one.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First off, Elmer, I would like to welcome you to the committee. It can be a bit of a bear pit, I guess, at times, but nothing is meant individually, I can assure you, from anything that comes from yourself or anyone else who appears before the committee.

I've got a list here of the people on your poll, sir, and I'd like to go through some of them and if you could confirm whether or not they are non-committal or not, and this is on the basis of the 57 percent figure that you gave of being in opposition. In Brandon, our second largest city, was that not non-committal?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: The City of Brandon is not presently a member of our association.

MR. D. SCOTT: It's not a member of the association, but yet you polled them.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: What's that?

MR. D. SCOTT: But you polled them, you asked them?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I'm not sure whether our office did or not, really.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have - The Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, a poll of August 15th, opinion poll on Extension of French Language Services in Manitoba that shows Brandon as being non-committal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott, I have some difficulty then if you're asking questions to which you already know the answers. The purpose of questions is to provide information for clarification.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we've heard that 57 percent of the municipalities in Manitoba are opposed to the recognition of French Language Services or, from what I gather, the opinion

poll said the extension of French Language Services. I want to go through and show that some of the larger communities in the province were, in fact, either non-committal or supportive and that, on a basis of a 57 percent figure on population, it's just not there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Scott, based upon your latest remarks, you've clearly told me that it is your intention not to ask questions for clarification, but clearly that you want to go ahead and show something. The purpose of these hearings is to hear from the public and ask questions of clarification about what they say to the committee; it's not for members of the committee to demonstrate, clarify, debate or in any way provide information to the public or to each other. If you have questions for Mr. Greenslade which will assist you or the committee in understanding his presentation or the position of his association, I'll certainly be glad to entertain them, but certainly this is not an occasion for you to show.

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: With all due respect, when Mr. Penner was asking questions somewhat similar he wasn't ruled out of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: If the honourable member is challenging the Chair, there is only one way he can do that and that is by a formal motion. I would suggest that the Chair . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: With the way it's been going the Chair might welcome it.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . the Chair should be respected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take the member's comments as a direct challenge, but I would caution the member that he's certainly capable of phrasing his questions such that they seek clarification.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mayor Greenslade, would the communities of Winnipeg, Brandon, Thompson, The Pas, Portage la Prairie, Roblin-Russell, Stonewall, Gimli and Pinawa make up the vast majority as far as population goes of your member municipalities?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Those are certainly some of the larger ones. I don't know whether you've included Morden, Winkler, Carman and those communities or not.

MR. D. SCOTT: Carberry.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Steinbach.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, maybe I could ask what is the population of your member municipalities? Do you have any idea of that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, Mayor Greenslade.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: No, I couldn't answer that, but I think certainly the information is available to everyone who wishes to seek it out.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mayor Greenslade, you've said that you recognize a constitutional change as an exceptionally important event, perhaps a once-in-lifetime event I heard earlier, and I'm not sure if it was you or one of the members questioning. You've also said that your level of government is also a very important level of government and I would certainly like to concur with that. Do you not feel that when one is addressing such an important issue, from an organization as large as your own, that it would be appropriate to seek legal council on the ramifications of what is being proposed?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Would you repeat that please, Don?

MR. D. SCOTT: I'm asking Mayor Greenslade, since this is such an important issue, and I certainly agree with him that it is an exceptionally important issue for the future of Manitoba and the rights of citizens within Manitoba, that before or in making a presentation that it would seem judicious - maybe that's a poor choice of words - but to seek legal counsel to see the implications of what is being proposed as far as the constitutional amendment, and also maybe to come up with some alternatives based on that legal opinion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question please.

MR. D. SCOTT: That was the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was a question? Oh.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, shorter, did your association seek legal advice before making your presentation to this very important committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a nice short question, after two other tries. Maybe we could all learn from that, we won't waste the time of the committee or the delegations if we can make them nice and short and direct. Did you seek legal counsel, Mayor Greenslade?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: No, we did not seek legal counsel. We don't have those sort of finances that would allow us to do that. Perhaps if we could get a larger grant from the provincial government maybe we'd be able to.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Greenslade. I know it's difficult to say, funding aside, but when one is making a presentation on an issue that you obviously feel is so very important as we do, or we wouldn't be holding the hearings, that it would be wise to seek legal counsel to see what the ramifications of what the issue is before us and to learn such things as the implications of The Summary Convictions Act . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, order please. I think the member clearly knows the question is out of order. Do you have another question, Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, the final question then, Mr. Chairman, is dealing with harmony, and you've

mentioned in response to some questions, that you felt that there was some discord in society and that the harmony of our society has been hurt by the bringing forward of this issue. Do you mean, Sir, in that, that as long as a group of people within society, who have constitutional rights within that society, do not demand those rights then one has harmony; but if one demands those rights and it causes some discord that should be a matter of concern and we should go back to status quo and ignore those rights?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The question supplies the answer and then asks for a yes or no. If you want explanation of what Mayor Greenslade meant by harmony or whatever, the question should be direct and ask that question. Question's for clarification, not to supply answers and then ask for confirmation. Confirmation and clarification have two different meanings in the Chair's dictionary. Would you rephrase the question please?

MR. D. SCOTT: Do you feel, Mayor Greenslade, that when a minority's rights are denied and when that minority's rights are being corrected that it is a very positive reflection on our society if one drops the efforts to redress wrongs of the past?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I guess, simply spoken, we don't feel that there are any Manitobans who are being denied services and, perhaps I have a different interpretation from what you do, but I simply think that everyone - and I mean everyone - is entitled to equal services and equal status. I simply don't think that there are any particular groupings that have any particular denial being shown to them.

MR. D. SCOTT: That's all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to Mr. Greenslade is this that, at the conclusion of your remarks, the Attorney-General hastened to assure you that there were proposed amendments coming forward to the resolutions which would exclude municipalities and school boards. Does that in any way appease your concern about the resolution?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Well it's certainly helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't catch the answer, Mayor Greenslade.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: It would be helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Mayor Greenslade, are you aware that last night, when we were in Ste. Anne, there was a delegation that was speaking on this very issue, that were expressing concern that these proposed amendments were going too far; that at that time, another Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Health, namely, said that these were only proposed

amendments, thereby leaving the impression upon the people over there that they may not be concerned about the proposed amendments? Now would you have concerns?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I don't think I understand the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't sure I did either. I think members should not needed to be reminded that the shorter and more direct the question, the more easy it is to be understood by witnesses.

Mr. Penner, on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Your previous ruling re providing extraneous material to a witness comes into play here I would respectfully suggest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear all of the question, I must admit.

HON. R. PENNER: The question put a proposition about what another Minister of the Crown is alleged to have said at another hearing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I missed the question. I'll ask Mr. Brown to rephrase it, and perhaps he will avoid the problematic expressions.

Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General very definitely tried to reassure, today, the Mayor of Portage la Prairie and the President of the Urban Association of Municipalities, that he need not be concerned about the concerns which he was expressing because there was a proposed amendment which would exclude municipalities and school boards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, please.

MR. A. BROWN: The question is this; last night we heard from another Minister of the Crown at Ste. Anne who . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. That's not a question, that's further preamble. Do you have a direct question for Mayor Greenslade.

MR. A. BROWN: Yes. Mayor Greenslade, are you now concerned about the expression, or the assurance that the Attorney-General tried to give you, that municipalities and school boards would be excluded, when last night another Minister of the Crown at Ste. Anne said that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Mr. Brown, I think you know by now that after three attempts you're going to be called to order for trying to introduce information that occurred at another hearing or any other kind of extraneous material. I don't know what your final question is because I haven't heard it on three attempts, but I would appreciate it if you could just ask the question.

Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. A. BROWN: We have now heard from one Minister of the Crown last night saying at Ste. Anne that people need not be concerned about the proposed amendments, because they were only proposed amendments. Now we have another Minister of the Crown saying, today, that these are proposed amendments, and that we should not be concerned about excluding municipalities and school boards because they were covered by proposed amendments. Now there is concern, Mr. Chairman, when we have two ministers making conflicting statements; one assuring them it's only a proposed amendment, the next Minister leaving the impression that the proposed amendments are indeed going to take effect. Now this is indeed a concern, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the concern. I'm not completely sure it's a point of order, but I'll have to entertain it.

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, the member purports to quote someone at a hearing yesterday. Without the record before us, I am not prepared to accept that, indeed, I do not accept that as the statement made by the Minister of Health. That immediately indicates the kind of problem we get into by allowing extraneous material.

You called me to order just a few moments ago. I followed your ruling. You said that I could not quote something directly from a resolution passed by the witness' own municipality, and I accepted that ruling. The ruling, I think, should be applied uniformly. The member is trying to exploit some alleged difference between a proposed amendment and the proposed amendment, and that escapes me, but I really am raising the point of order about the introduction of extraneous material, particularly of this kind when there isn't even a record to verify that, indeed, was what was said. It's simply impermissible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Brown, could you ask your question without reference to differences of opinion, questions of debate, or other extraneous material which is not directly pertinent to clarification of the brief of the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, please?

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You said that you were somewhat appeased by the Attorney-General saying that the proposed amendment would exclude municipalities and school boards; would you be concerned if another member of the Cabinet stated otherwise?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I guess, I think that I have expressed our concern about what may happen in the future and, of course, this supports that concern that we have, that some are saying this and some are saying that, so what does the future hold? We are concerned, and we just don't like to be exposed to the possibilities.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Brown.
Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: Just one question for clarification, perhaps two questions. Mayor Greenslade, in answer to a question from Mr. Graham when he asked you whether, since the first meeting between yourself and other municipal officials, that you referred to - you told us about that meeting - whether or not - this was his question - there had been other requests. Your answer was that you couldn't remember.

To clarify that, was there not, in fact, a meeting between yourself and officials of your organization, the Premier, and myself, in the Cabinet Room?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Yes, we've had meetings certainly and we've discussed a number of subjects at those meetings.

HON. R. PENNER: Including this one?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I'm not sure.

HON. R. PENNER: You're not saying there wasn't such discussion?

MR. E. GREENSLADE: I didn't say there wasn't, I said I was not sure. We've discussed financial matters; we've discussed many items of concern and I'm not sure whether this was a topic of discussion or not.

HON. R. PENNER: If he's not sure, he's not sure, I can't pursue that and I won't pursue that any further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members of the committee? Seeing none, Mayor Greenslade, thank you very much for representing your association here today.

MR. E. GREENSLADE: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fred Debrecen, Mr. Fred Debrecen please.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: My name is Fred Debrecen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Debrecen, okay. Sir, before you start I would point out, I don't know if what you're wearing on your vest is intended as a display. Displays are not allowed in committees.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: It's very important to what I have to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well if it is part of what you have to say, then it is a display and it must be removed. Displays are not allowed in the committee.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: As long as you see it now, that's okay with me.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask for a clarification there. I guess there's displays and

displays. Are you telling me that a letter on a person's jacket or vest or sweater is regarded as a display?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't sure that it was and that's why I asked the question. Mr. Debreceen indicated that it was an important part of his presentation, which indicated then to me that it was a display related to the committee process, and that's what's forbidden. For members who were in Ste. Anne yesterday, they may recall that flags were ordered out of the room, banners, and all sorts of other paraphernalia, which reflected on the subject matter of the hearings. The only thing that has been allowed have been the small-type lapel buttons which have indicated positions on issues. Those have been allowed in the Agricultura hearings, in the Crow debate, things like that. Some members wear Manitoba pins, things like that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Some wear Trudeau roses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some wear Trudeau roses.

HON. R. PENNER: Wait a minute, that was given to me by the Winnipeg Rotary, I want the record to be clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But certainly anything which is directly related, and a display related to the presentation, has been forbidden, and I take it that the committee wants the Chair to continue that policy which has been established over a long period of time in committees?

Mr. Debreceen.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: Yes, even before I identify myself, in view of what Premier Pawley had to say to Trudeau, I want to say that this hearing is the most despicably dishonest political sham ever perpetrated in Manitoba. No matter what is said here, the New Communist Party of Manitoba intends to do what it wants to anyway.

My name is Fred Debreceen. I'm a native Winnipegger, a Native Manitoban and a native Canadian. I have been a very active worker in the New Democratic Party for many years and at all three levels of politics and in two provinces. I am a civil servant, or the equivalent thereof, in Manitoba. I speak English. The English language is the language of my forebearers, who were told that they would have to learn in their new chosen homeland. It is the working language of Canada they were told, and so they gave up their own language, and all other pretences, to a foreign culture and became Canadians, no matter what that designation may mean to some of you.

I am taking the liberty of speaking for all those Manitobans who recognize that the issue at hand is not one of language, but rather that the issue, pure and simple, is the French takeover of Canada, through bilingualism and multiculturalism. It is an insidious, invidious insurrection perpetrated by a French mob of racists, a new breed of Nazis. I take the liberty of speaking for those Manitobans unable to take time off to participate in this hearing; and for those Manitobans who feel they are incapable of making a public presentation; and for those Manitobans to whom this so-called hearing is but another NDP propaganda

platform; and for those Manitobans who are intimidated by the threat of future persecution by the Federal French fascist regime, especially by Revenue Canada and Manpower.

Some of you have no idea of how far the French fascists have penetrated your daily lives already. For example, a simple item like VIA Rail, the Oxford English Dictionary give but one pronunciation for the word V-I-A and that's via; and just listen to CBC Radio, the English network, when reference is made to a French, social, political or cultural organization, it is named in French; that is not bilingualism.

On the other hand, an English organization mentioned on the French CBC network has its name translated into French; that is not bilingualism. The truth is, as a man said who wrote the book, "Bilingual Today, French Tomorrow," the French fascist Federal Government has a head start already. Who are these French fascists, these French Nazis, these racists and bigots, these insurrectionists, these treasonists, seditionaries, these traitors?

Let's look back about 35 years to the days of the first meetings of the three wise men from the east, Marchand, Pelletier and Trudeau. Levesque also was a member, initially, of the team of insurrectionists and many people feel that he still is. They planned, in great detail, the overthrow of English Canada. They knew that disagreement and interpretation of The British North America Act regarding French language rights was the way and the means of achieving their racist goal, language and culture, divide and conquer; thus, multiculturalism and bilingualism.

Why not biculturalism? That would have upset the ethnics, some of whom believe that they are being granted rights here today, constitutional or otherwise, by this insidious bilingual movement. The Three Wise Men, a story that should be on the curriculum of every school, college and university in the country, the CBC produced a first-rate television documentary on the three wise men a few years back. It was broadcast once on CBC TV, and only once. The Federal Liberal French fascist regime has since swept all honest, unbiased reporting out of the CBC in a purge reminiscent of the Stalin days. Just listen to CBC news today - slanted, pro-French, pro-Liberal, dishonest. And the print media, here in Manitoba we have but one newspaper - forget about the Sun, it's merely the local Enquirer controlled from Quebec anyway - and the Free Press has a bronze plaque in the vestibule of its plant dedicating itself to the Liberal Party. Does anything else have to be said about newspaper propaganada in Manitoba? About French control?

The three wise men - if there was a way to get a videotape copy of that CBC documentary and distribute it throughout Manitoba you'd have a revolution on your hands. As a matter of fact, one concerned Manitoban said to me; if I had the position and the power and the capacity and the capability, I would call a revolution for Monday morning at 8:00 o'clock, bring your own weapons, and I'm serious, deadly serious, he added.

When a racist like George Forest presents himself before this hearing on an issue wrongly referred to as one of French language rights, knowing full well that every person in the room understands English, and himself able to speak English fluently, and boorishly insults all Manitoba with a laying on of his so-called

rights by speaking French only, one has to redefine the term bilingualism. It's a one-way street, isn't it? And all the signs on that one-way street are in French only. The three wise men, they've got it all sewn up now: a new flag, a new anthem, a racist Constitution, the forced abdication of the monarchy, the renaming of government departments and agencies to reflect French control, like Canada Post and VIA Rail.

Where are the three wise men now? One fell from grace; one was appointed to the Senate, where all bad politicians go; another was appointed Ambassador to France, where he could continue his traitor's activities with a foreign power that has, and does still interfere with Canada's affairs to its colonial offices in Quebec; and the third, of course, is a symbolic anti-Christ, the Prime Minister of Canada, a traitor that, in any other country but Canada, would have long since been deposed.

The Constitution. Trudeau's preamble spoke of two founding races. The French were mentioned first, the English second and, after much bickering, the aboriginals placed third, and the ethnics were referred to as guests. Those of us who are not of English or French extraction, have worked our fingers to the bone to build this country, only to end up being merely guests, ethnic guests at that. A man like John Diefenbaker will be recorded in history as a mere ethnic guest. Can you believe that this has happened in Canada? A racist Constitution that breaches a Charter of Rights, and a Charter of Rights that makes a mockery of the Constitution.

Just listen to Paul Hellyer's message to James Richardson, after Richardson walked out of Trudeau's Cabinet and the French Liberal Party. "Everyone knows you are deeply concerned about the proposals for the Constitution, Jim, and especially their effect on Canada's future. You don't like the concept of two nations or two founding races, but prefer to think of all Canadians as equal, regardless of language, a view shared by a lot of people. I know you are worried sick about Trudeau's plan to entrench language rights. To do that, and then give any one province, whether Ontario, Quebec or B.C., an absolute veto on any future change is just the kind of straightjacket we can't afford - even a Houdini couldn't get us out of it. And there is a veto, not that one is needed, for entrenchment is exactly that, entrenchment.

There is no provision for amendment on language rights. Any other amendment to the Constitution requires that at least one of the two provinces, Quebec or Ontario, must side with at least six other provinces. All eight other provinces together cannot muster up 50 percent of Canada's population to effect an amendment. No veto? Democratic, you say? And yet a mere 25 percent of Canada's population is taking over control of a country that all of us worked to build. In Manitoba, the French percentage is a mere 6 percent or less, of which only 2,000 or less are unilingually French and may, indeed, require the assistance of interpreters, but only 2,000. Democracy, you say?

Listen to this paraphrasing of a communication in Maclean's just this month. "The French Takeover of Canada. A relatively recent insurrection movement argues that all Frenchmen have a historical right to the ownership and control of this nation, and that any Frenchman in Canada has more territorial or national

rights in Canada than any other Canadian ethnic, including those who were born here and whose ancestors have lived here for generations. This is racism, pure and simple. Everyone who opposes racism has a moral obligation to oppose all forms of it, even if that means being called a bigot."

And from the American Telephony Magazine of May, 1978, under the heading Strength of Unity: The word 'united' is the most significant part of our country's name, and the most significant part of our history. When you think that Central and South American has a common language and also could have united, you realize what could have happened to the United States. You see, the commonality and universality of language is indispensable to national unity. The biblical story of the Tower of Babel makes it clear enough. God divided and dispersed the people through the means of imposed multilingualism.

And these excerpts from a letter by a resident of Dorval, Quebec. "I am Canadian, born and raised in Montreal. It matters little what name dictators use - Nazi, Communist or Parti Quebecois - a dictator, be it one person or a group such as Parti Quebecois, should be quickly dealt with before permanent damage is done to our country. Surely we haven't forgotten Hitler's regime in Germany. We Canadians - French, English, Ukrainian, German, Dutch, Italian, Oriental or whatever - do not want a little Hitler here in Quebec or in any part of Canada. A freedom for all cultures, but with one official language unite us all, for it's unity we need, not division. To unite, in one working language from coast to coast, English is accepted as a universal language; it is the language of trade and commerce, of international aviation, medicine, science and technical terminology. It is definitely the language of North America. French language and culture, like Italian, Japanese, Chinese, German, Ukrainian, Greek, or any other, should be preserved by those whose culture it is. It cannot and must not be shoved down the throats of others."

From a Winnipeg resident in January 1978, "We have all become aware of the feelings of Mr. George Forest who believes that, because a small minority in Manitoba speaks a second language, French, all the rest of us should contribute towards the expense of having thousands of official forms revised and expanded so that they are in French, as well as English. The presumption might well be that those of French descent can't speak English, but that, of course, is not true. If a process of assimilation is going on, isn't that exactly what should be happening? Are we not, all of us Canadians, regardless of whether we or our forefathers came from Britain, France, the Ukraine or elsewhere?"

And on July 1, 1980, from the Ottawa Citizen. "Today is Dominion Day, or is it Canada Day? In any case, it is truly a sad day for me, for today I do not feel like a Canadian. They are changing my status officially to that of an ethnic and I despair because it is impossible for me to be an ethnic. I do not know how to think, act or speak as an ethnic. Today I abhor Canada and all those who brought about a surrender to a racist, label-hanging, vocally and political powerful minority. There are two significant facts that have never been debated publicly during the French takeover.

Firstly, the refusal of the debilitated English in Canada to speak up as a group; and secondly, the despicable

greed of the French who waited until the English and the ethnics, including the Scots, Irish and Welsh, built this country into a viable and valuable nation before making their demands - to the vanquished go the spoils. I can no longer feel affection nor allegiance to a land that has cast me aside, that has insulted my birth, and deprived me of my birthright. Instead, I feel remorse and shame and an already deep-seeded hatred for the French. Thank you Canada, for nothing." That was from the Ottawa citizen.

From the Winnipeg Free Press of February 1978, under the heading, "Never Two Founding Nations: I believe James Richardson is right. The theory of two founding nations was invented by Lester B. Pearson. It is hard to understand how any intelligent person can claim that a French Canadian ought to be something better than a Canadian of Ukrainian origin. A claim like that just doesn't have any place in any democracy, not even in the peoples' democracy behind the Iron Curtain. In the Soviet Union there are no official two languages everywhere. In the territory of Soviet Ukraine, the official language is the Ukrainian language. If a Russian, living in Kiev, Ukraine, goes to the court there, he has to present his case in the Ukrainian language. If the Russian doesn't like his parking ticket written in the Ukrainian language, because he wants it like our George Forest does, he has only one choice. He may move himself to Moscow and enjoy his parking ticket in Russian there. French ought to be an official language in Quebec where French Canadians are in majority. English language should be an official language in the rest of Canada where English-speaking Canadians are in majority." End of communication.

And these comments from a Victoria, B.C. writer. "Ever since Mr. Pearson laid out the red carpet for Trudeau, Marchand and Pelletier we have had nothing but political headaches in Canada. Many of the English Canadians in Quebec supported the Trudeau bilingual program because of the educational value. Mr. Spicer, who spent hundreds of millions of dollars worth of taxpayers' money trying to sell and promote Trudeau's dream, became so frustrated with the government trying to bribe, browbeat and compel Canadians outside of Quebec to adopt this policy that he resigned. Belgium has tried for a couple of hundred years to unify their language. They have succeeded about as well as we have. Their problem is more simple than ours, both factions support the same church and are loyal to the monarchy. Since Trudeau came to power, he has turned neighbour against neighbour, province against province. Now he has the gall to be interested in Canadian unity. His slogan, 'A just society', turned out to be just for Quebec."

And Clare Hoye of The Sunday Sun, wrote in 1978 that, "The Liberal Leader and the NDP Leader in Ontario think the taxpayers should foot the bill to translate everything into French. That is what they are asking when they push for an official declaration of French as a second language in Ontario. Why blow untold millions making Hansard English and French when the likelihood of any department with a dozen or two Francophones getting any benefit at all, is extremely slim. Why declare French an official language, a declaration which Treasury officials cannot even guesstimate the costs of, when there is no way the government can deliver.

"Cassidy and Smith, because they are both bilingual and spent much of their lives in or adjacent to Quebec,

feel they have special qualifications to understand the needs of Quebecers. There's an arrogance in these men which says that people lacking their bilingual abilities cannot understand what Canada is all about. I don't believe that a person has to be born and raised in Montreal before he can be passionately Canadian, but then, since I am not bilingual, what the hell do I know."

And from a Thunder Bay reader of the Winnipeg Tribune. "Are we, as free Canadians, going to step back and give over this Canada of ours to a group of people who, in two wars, refused to fight for this land? Where does a single group of politicians have the right to barter our freedom for the power of the vote out of Quebec? Would the United States have allowed such a state of affairs, allowed them separate schools, language rights, their own culture, their own armed forces? Since we have had a full French Cabinet we have had nothing but grief and corruption. In the past 25 years it has been evident that Canada has been taken over by France, every move has been made to eliminate the power of the Queen."

This next news article may well give ideas to the French insurrectionists here, but here goes anyway. "Anti-French literature, pair sentenced over handbills, Windsor, Ontario. Two men who distributed anti-French Canadian literature were given two-years suspended sentences. Handbills distributed in Windsor and nearby LaSalle and Essex advocated the stamping out of what was called a subversive element, meaning French Canadians. The two men pleaded not guilty to wilfully promoting hatred against an identifiable race, namely, the French Canadians. The judge referred to the recent death of a former reeve. He was a French Canadian who took great pride in being French Canadian, who lived on the same homestead that his forefathers settled in the 1700's. I don't think he would have approved of your actions." So what? One Frenchman in our country, because he had forefathers here in the 1700's, is his reason to rule against freedom of speech and freedom of expression? If this isn't exactly like Nazi control, I don't know what is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Mr. Debrecen, I've been advised that you have a display on your back.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: Oh, sorry about that. It's that same terrible dirty word. Gee, I guess I'm forever labelled with it too. Mind you the Constitution did that to us but, fine, okay let us go on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: So what. One Frenchman in our country, because he had forefathers here in the 1700's, is reason to rule against freedom of speech and freedom of expression? If this isn't exactly like Nazi control, I don't know what is. In July 1977 - now we're going back quite a few years - a Winnipeg communication in the Tribune. "At the risk of being called a bigot, a French word probably coined for the purpose of shaming anyone who challenges French racial supremacy, I suggest that the French demand for language rights throughout Canada is a cover-up for

the well-planned takeover of our country. One need not be a mathematician to realize that all position of power and control in Canada will soon be held by the French, since the French-controlled Federal Government has decreed bilingualism a prerequisite to such positions.

"Almost all of the French in Canada are bilingual, whereas very few of the English-speaking peoples are bilingual, French/English that is. French has been an academic language in most of Canada, as opposed to a working language. Many Canadians of neither French nor English extraction have given up their mother tongues for the English language, the working language of Canada, only to find that the promise of peace and prosperity through the commonality of the English language has been withdrawn. A minority comprising about one-quarter of Canada's population is being allowed to impose its own brand of racial bigotry upon us.

"Language aside, the real threat is control of Canada by the French minority, and the rest of us wake up to what is happening, how shall we fight against the French-controlled Canadian Armed Forces, or the French-controlled RCMP? How shall we seek redress through French-controlled government bureaucracies and courts? Will Canada be ravaged by civil war with the demise of majority rule?"

Again, from the Tribune, "The Official Languages Act, mandatory bilingualism is the most disunited single piece of legislation ever enacted in Canada, and the most nationally important enactment upon which the people of this country were not consulted. If ever there were a time in Canadian history for the use of the public referendum it was when The Official Languages Act was being considered. The question of bilingualism would have been settled once and for all time. If a referendum were to be held today regarding bilingualism, the result would be a resounding nay. As it stands, our democratic system of representation by population has failed us and we have had imposed upon us the will and language of a minority." That was back in 1977. "The French in Manitoba are still lamenting their imagined demise through assimilation."

This is from the Tribune in 1978. "They have forgotten that in their early days in this land they almost eradicated the Indian population, not through genocidal massacres, but by breeding them to near extinction, and yet the French decry their fate a similar assimilation. They bemoan the effects of normal, healthy and ongoing social changes. However, of the 87,000 French people in Manitoba, only 39,000 or so, use the French language regularly and only 5,000 are unilingually French. That is Government of Manitoba Statistics 1971. More than half of the French population in Manitoba, even then, had already assimilated by choice. Is there another way? And the few who are now doing all the bellowing are, not only members of a minority ethnic group, but are members of a minority within a minority.

"Wouldn't it be wonderful if the French agitators in Manitoba rejoiced, instead of rebelled at the news that a majority of their own people have chosen to become Canadians? However, the dissidents insist on calling themselves French Canadians, or Franco-Manitobans, and throwing childish tantrums, insulting the rest of us and our beloved country with their petulant demands. Do the French believe that those of us who are neither

French nor English can be relegated to the former status of the American Negro, in bondage? Do they really claim, by virtue of being one of two founding races, that they are our landlords, were the wombs of our forebearers merely slave ships in disguise? Let the French not forget the sins of their ancestors, nor let them visit the bitterness of their lost battles upon the rest of us.

And in the Vancouver Herald, April 1980, an article from Winnipeg. "A madman in recent times convinced a number of his countrymen that they were of superior stock; indeed, that they were born of the master race. His followers were sent throughout the land to arouse others of like kind to agitate noisily and with indignant righteousness for their natural rights - rights as members of the master race to the power and the control of the nation. In the madding rush for power there were people of the nation who, being of other extraction and being frightened or indifferent or unknowing, were deceived and easily subdued and were deprived of heritage, language, customs, culture and birthright, and still they disbelieved. The nation's institutions of good repute and much trusted were infiltrated and were subverted. Control of the constabulary, the judiciary, the military, the body corporate, the body politic, and of education felt their racist subverters. The master race asserted its supremacy. Six million of one kind were put to death. Countless millions of others of many different origins died in the violent assault on the dignity and sanctity of human life. The rise of the master race was not merely a vendetta perpetrated against a specific people, its depraved lust for racial power brought death and ruination to all those who would not speak up against the egocentric racists and their ethnocentric racialism until there was nobody left to speak up, and all this in a democracy. It can happen again, it can happen now. Is it happening here?" Do you remember how they were forced to wear a yellow badge of the Star of David, much like this one of a lower case letter "e" to signify the lower class citizen, the ethnic.

Eric Wells wrote in the Trib, June 1979. "Unity petition is based on a falsehood. The statement under question is contained in the preamble to the petition and it reads. 'We fully recognize that when Canada was formed 112 years ago, the two cultural groups who agreed to Confederation also agreed to accept each others rights, dignities, and symbols of parenthood.' This statement refers to the French and English as the two founding groups of Canada, a plagiarized version from the terms for the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission set up in 1963. Before that date we Canadians paid more attention to facts. The Confederation Conferences at Charlottetown and Quebec were not conferences between an English-speaking group and a French-speaking one, resulting in a solemn compact between two races or nations. This interpretation is a modern Laurentian fantasy. The conferences out of which The British North America Act originated were conferences among delegates from the Colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. The Canadian delegates were the members of the Canadian Coalition Cabinet of 1864. They spoke for Canada as a whole; they did not divide on racial lines; there were no delegates there who had been chosen by a French Canadian or an English

Canadian race or nation. The Canadian delegates at these conferences spoke in any role but that of Canadians, they spoke as Conservatives or reformers."

And this response to Eric Well's article. "I have suffered much as a result of the denial of my birth and heritage by such as those who have perpetrated the founding racist myth and those would promote it. I am neither of English nor French extraction.

"I was born here in Winnipeg, but the two founding races myth is today denying me my indigenous rights. I am a Canadian, a natural Canadian, and only a Canadian. No nation but Canada has a claim on me, nor do I have a claim on any nation other than Canada, and that claim is now disputed. My birthright is Canadian; my heritage is Canadian. I have no interest in the land of my forefathers, the land they saw fit to leave and now, in the land of my birth, ethnocentric minorities, whose goal it is to impose those oppressive ethnocracy on a whole nation of peoples, have all but expatriated me. I resent being a guest of an aborted refugee from an alien womb. I resent paying rents and taxes to English and French racist landlords. It was the distorted demands of the French ethnic minority that robbed me of my national identity.

Another letter was in rebuttal to Eric Well's article, but one paragraph is enough to destroy the argument. The writer starts out with: "In his column of June 18th, Eric Wells denounces the preamble to the unity petition as a falsehood. Such intolerant self-assurance should not go unchallenged." And then the punch line. "It is true that the conferences of 1864 were not bilateral negotiations between two racial or cultural groups, but it would be absurd to contend that French-English relations were not very much on the minds of the founding fathers." Absurd for who? The writer.

And now on the question of what or who is a bigot. From the Trib in 1978, "The French have twisted the use of the word "bigot." A bigot is a person who obstinately holds to an opinion, belief, party, practice, creed or church to such an illiberal extent that his words and actions are conspicuously and aggravatingly intolerant and hypocritical. There is no group in Canada more deserving of the epithet than the French. The French originated the word bigot as a put-down for anyone who dares to challenge the superiority of the French race. The French continue today, even in the face of attempts to achieve worldwide union rights and racial equality, to obstinately hold to their belief in French racial supremacy. Is this belief not bigotry? The French are forcing their language and culture upon the rest of the peoples who built this nation. Is this not bigotry? The French insist on half ownership and in half the say in the running of this country of ours, even though they number less than one-quarter of the population. Is this not bigotry?"

The French have proclaimed their contempt for those of us who are not of their race, both in and out of Quebec, to the extent that, while the non-French of Quebec are being expatriated, Quebec itself plans to pull out of Confederation. Is this not bigotry? Are their words and actions not those of bigots, racists and racialists? In Canada, the word "bigot" can rightly and only be applied to the French, the originators of the word. Let's keep that in mind, and let's not be afraid to speak out and say it the way it really is, no matter how loudly they call us bigots. After all, we are of many

origins, beliefs, parties, practices, creeds and churches, and our many voices together can drown out the voice of the real bigots.

More recently, in the Winnipeg Sun just this month, "French supporters are dictators. Some people are under the impression that the French had their rights taken away, but this is not the case. If the NDP Government would publish The Manitoba Act of 1870, this issue would solve itself." The article states that the minority is at stake. Well what about the majority? Don't we have a say in this matter?

We, in Western Canada, have had enough legislation passed on us by the Federal Government that we did not have a vote on to last for generations to come. Bleeding hearts are going to lead Western Canada into a bloodshed, riots or even civil war if they aren't careful. Trudeau and his goons have pushed about as far as they can.

Under the heading, "Scrap French rights for unity's sake. After Wolfe's defeat of Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham, 1763, the English controlled Quebec, but sought to pacify French-Canadians in The Quebec Act of 1774 which guaranteed civil liberties and the retention of customs and institutions. Were the Fathers of Confederation too hasty and emotional when The British North America Act was signed? It looks that way today in our continual languages conflict in Canada. We have been a divided country since 1867 it seems. Should The Official Languages Act be amended?"

Fred Cleverley wrote. He wrote about the extension of bilingualism with a requirement for French extending into the private sector. I won't read all of that, I'm sure most of you have read his article. He speaks of particular Federal Government contracts for - and he mentioned the No Tariff Shop out at the airport where he said the contracts for the private sector would include the providing of bilingual services. It's even spelled out that such bilingual services would be provided within five minutes. So he points out quite emphatically, in his article, that there is no way that you're going to prevent or stop the insidious, cancerous spread of bilingualism, the French language specifically, into the private sector and into all corners of this province. That, as I end up here, is private enterprise.

Then in August, Cleverley wrote another article, "Why the big hurry about bilingualism?" He's just asking, why is it that this government, the Government of Manitoba, had such a secret arrangement with that small French group, which is not representative of the French in Manitoba, and with Trudeau, who is merely a traitor taking over this country. They won't tell us, they won't tell us what kind of an agreement it was. They won't lay it out, they won't spell it out to us.

So he wants to know, and he says, "If the NDP insist on pushing through this constitutional change it will deny itself office for as long as those now living can vote. It is a high price to pay for having to push through something that cannot be changed, cannot be discussed, except with an elite group in the province and must, for reasons known only to Penner and Pawley, become law before December 31st."

The following by a Winnipeg resident printed in the Winnipeg Sun, he says, "My family of four and our next door neighbour, a family of five, recently came back from a two-week tour of the interior of Quebec. Our neighbours were born in Quebec and speak French

fluently, and our communication was through our neighbours. We found Quebecers to be a warm and hospitable people. All the road signs and business signs are in French, and no English is allowed. It would be a shame if the Federal Government tried to change this way of life, and maybe for this reason they are keeping their nose out of the Quebec affairs.

"Why is the Federal Government sticking their nose into Manitoba's affairs? Is it because Manitoba has the weakest Provincial Government in its history? Is it because Manitoba is the only NDP Government at present that the Liberals can mate with?

"Manitoba is basically an English-speaking community and has been for the last 100 years, and it should remain so with absolutely no input from the Federal Government. Wake up, Manitobans. It does not matter what the Supreme Court or the politicians tell us, it is now up to all Manitobans to decide whether they want and can afford two official languages. I do not like things pushed down my throat, I like to feel at home in my own province.

"The role of our Federal Government should be to bring more unity to all parts of Canada, but for the last 15 years they have brought dissension to many parts, and they have made life more difficult for many Canadian citizens. I do not feel we should try to hold Canada together at any cost. Ontario and Quebec control the vote, and I'm tired of paying for this honour."

Under the heading, "The numbers game" in the *Globe and Mail*, they said, "Your Winnipeg reporter claims that the Société franco-manitobaine represents about 60,000 Franco-Manitobans. Statistics Canada in the 1981 census found only 31,040 Francophones in Manitoba.

"Last week, Quebec's Education Minister, Laurin, said, 'The battle for French language rights in Manitoba is an initial skirmish in what should be a campaign for practical adoption of French as a second working language.' Keep that in mind.

From a Swan River, Manitoba resident, "I do not agree. Once entrenched, it cannot be changed. We might be giving future generations something they do not want."

Serge Joyal runs around the country openly admitting that the French intention is to make Canada a French state. Trudeau for years has openly stated that he, in Canada, will preside over a commonwealth of French-speaking nations. He is on record as saying he is a Quebecer first, a Canadian second. Serge Joyal rants to the French in St. Boniface that the French built this country; it belongs to us. What have they built? Before the French Liberal Government ploughed billions of dollars of construction into Hull, Quebec across the river from Ottawa, Hull looked exactly like St. Boniface when viewed across the Red River from Winnipeg. This is the proof of their contribution to Canada?

The truth is, now that all of us non-French people have built the superstructures and infrastructures of this vast country, the French want to take it over, and under false pretences. The only visible French activity through the century has been the stepdancing and fiddling contest, reminding me much of the fable of a fiddling cricket and the industrious ant. However, the French are not begging for a share of the fruits of the labour of the ant; they are demanding, not a share, but all of it. The first time in the history of mankind

that a nation has been vanquished without so much as a single shot being fired.

Many years hence, history shall reveal that it was a yellow-bellied, spineless Englishman who sold this country out from under the real nation builders; yes, the English who not once have stood up as a people to protest the French takeover. Even more despicable, they invited their very own Queen to attend to the signing over of this country to the French, literally.

Then we have the Spolsky's, the Mathis's and others in this town who are deceiving Manitobans by pretending to represent various Manitoba ethnic communities. Let me tell you that I have more association with ethnics on the street, in the neighbourhood, in the pubs, in the workplace than these who spend their time with their own scheming kind planning propoganda campaigns for the NDP by the NDP.

Let me tell you that ethnics out there, for the great part, have no affiliation with any ethnic group. They consider themselves Canadian, and if they have retained some semblance of the culture of their forefathers, it is in the simple and private or family celebration of, for instance, Ukrainian Christmas on January 7th.

These ethnics, the majority, say, no, to special rights for the French. They know that such French rights will not open the door to ethnic rights, even if ethnic rights were desirable. Constitutionally, the French are not ethnic; they are a founding race, which is a blatant lie; and rights given to the French have no relationship whatsoever to the rights of other peoples of this land.

The French takeover is a deceit that should be destroyed now before we ethnics find ourselves relegated to an even lower status than that of mere guests. It happened in Germany in a democracy; they were called the master race. Here, they believe themselves to be the supreme race.

Richard Burton once said that his worldly experience revealed that the French believe that, if you are not French, you are nobody. That is the worst kind of racism. It is deplorable enough when a man accepts the differences of his neighbours, relatives and friends, generally, but still feels hatred for a specific group of people, but it is an abomination to believe that you and your kind are superior to all others.

The Official Language Act of Manitoba was passed by a majority government representing a very large majority, the English-speaking people in Manitoba at the time of the enactment. The Supreme Court of Canada, if it were not merely a subsidiary of the Federal Liberal Party, would not have ruled that Manitoba's Official Language Act was invalid, but instead would have found a way to simply advise Manitoba that it must progress the provincial legislation through Parliament for ratification. And in a democracy, which Canada no longer is, such ratification would be retroactive. The problem would have been solved; democracy, majority rule, would have been properly served.

And, most importantly, the tide of the French takeover would have been stemmed. But no, instead, the steam-roller presses on. In Ontario, the Francophone community is filing suit against the Simcoe County Board of Education and the Ontario Government for failing to provide certain educational service to the area's French-speaking members. And Ontario is not officially bilingual.

A news report two months ago stated that the federal French regime was paying tax dollars to a group of French people in a small town in Alberta, of all places, to agitate for French education services and promised that group all the money it needed to proceed all the way through the court system. Is Alberta officially bilingual? Does the French Constitution of Canada obligate Ontario and Alberta to provide bilingual services? The French takeover machine is really in motion and somehow we've got to stop it before we wind up the victims of another holocaust.

A letter to the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press last week said, in part, about the forthcoming referendum: "The results of such a referendum would not be binding on the Provincial Government, but the referendum offers an opportunity to find out how the public feels. If a large majority opposes entrenchment of bilingualism, that would give the Provincial Government, the Federal Government, the Society of French Manitobans and the Supreme Court of Canada a clear, quantitative indication of the degree of resentment that might follow." So what? Premier Pawley told Prime Minister Trudeau just last week that he intends to entrench bilingualism, no matter what we say here, no matter what the results of a referendum show, no matter how it destroys democracy or even how it destroys his own party. Why am I here, then? Because I'm a fighter, I refuse to just lay down and die.

And so, another Manitoban writes - and I'm just about at the end, Mr. Chairman. "The Provincial Government spent \$26,000 printing pamphlets to explain its policy on French Language Services. It distorted the facts. It is trying to buy or bribe us into accepting something that is no good to us or to Canada as a whole. George Forest received a grant of \$34,747 from the Federal Government to fight his non-bilingual traffic ticket. The pamphlet says that entrenching these language rights in our Constitution does not diminish the rights of others." This is not true, because it sets up one minority above others and creates resentments that will fuel the fires of separation in Western Canada.

Another letter says: "Myron Spolsky has stated that it would make it easier for other ethnic groups to introduce their languages if the French requests are met." He seems to have lost sight of the fact that the French are not in the same category as the rest of us. They are one of the so-called two founding races; we are immigrants, or descendants of immigrants. One need not be an economist to realize the financial havoc our already debt-burdened province would have to face if all 40 groups that participated in Folklorama would demand of the province their assumed language rights.

And yet Serge Joyal has the nerve to lie to this extent when he rebutted someone's statement last week that Manitoba's effort to entrench bilingualism was useless because Francophones make up only 4 percent to 8 percent of the provincial population. Joyal said, the Charter of Rights would have to be scrapped and the rights of Chinese, Ukrainian, Pakistanis and numerous other minorities would become subject to the will of the majority. What a crock! None of these has any specific ethnic rights now, nor in the past, nor in the future.

Another letter comments on interference in Manitoba affairs. "It is bad enough to have what surely must be a front for the Liberal Party, Alliance Quebec, interfere

with Manitoba legislation, and yet, weren't they the first to be heard at this hearing? What an insult to all Manitobans that you should hear aliens with very dubious motives first. We must stop this racist steam-roller. Is there a leader out there somewhere who can arouse the people to fight the French takeover? Please come forward wherever you are.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Debrecen. Any questions for Mr. Debrecen by members of the committee? Seeing none, Mr. Debrecen, thank you for your presentation.

MR. F. DEBRECEN: That's a good put-down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ian MacPherson.

MR. I. MacPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, honourable members of the committee. I would like to make a presentation regarding the bilingual issue. The Supreme Court ruling, known as Section 23, said the Legislature had to be bilingual, that anybody wanting a court trial in French must receive a French language court trial with a judge who understood French; that all laws passed by the Manitoba Legislature must be in both English and French.

The former government, under Premier Lyon, accepted the Supreme Court ruling. They installed a bilingual translation system in the Legislative Building, they appointed some French-speaking judges so that anyone wanting a court trial in French could receive it. They hired some translators to translate new laws and hired some translators to translate the old laws that were in English only. The former Conservative Government filled all the requirements of the Supreme Court ruling, we thought it was all settled.

When the new NDP Government was elected we all expected that Premier Pawley's government would just carry on where the former government left off in carrying out the terms of Section 23, the Supreme Court ruling, it was never mentioned at election time. Suddenly, Premier Pawley and Mr. Penner announced that they had signed an agreement with the Franco-Manitoban Society and Prime Minister Trudeau that Manitoba is going to become a bilingual province. French and English will have equal status, and French services would be provided in all government departments and Crown corporations.

Now, why was this done so quietly and secretly without giving any information to the public about what was going on? They claim that there's fear of the Bilodeau case, but Mr. Bilodeau has lost in the lower courts and will probably lose in the Supreme Court.

I am firmly opposed to any extension of French Language Rights beyond the original Section 23, the Supreme Court ruling. Quebec is going for all French. Why should we yield to French demands for more privileges? The more concessions English-speaking people make, the more demanding the French become.

Premier Pawley is modifying the wording but his promises mean nothing if someone challenges it in the courts. The fact that the law says English and French are official languages in Manitoba means that anything less can be challenged.

I will read you an article here by Eric Wells on CJOB. He says, "Since the Provincial Government announced its agreement with the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Federal Government on converting Manitoba into a two language province, it has become increasingly difficult to follow the discussions in any language. The confusion began with the Provincial Government's contention that, although Manitoba was to have two official languages, it would never become a bilingual province. This projected the language agreement into the realm of puzzle games beyond Trivial Pursuit.

"However, at least the Provincial Government has altered its posture somewhat in response to public bewilderment. It has offered to change the wording in the agreement, intending to clarify the areas of dual language services, but this proposal opens a new field of uncertainty. The language problem is becoming ever more perplexing and the government's proposal is riddled with contradictions.

"If Manitoba adopts two official languages, it will be the courts which will decide on how and when these languages are to be used. All government-imposed restrictions eventually would be challenged and decided in the courts. That is the curious aspect of the three-way language agreement. None of the parties to that agreement can promise anything in either language once these languages become official. "From there on, language service becomes strictly a legal matter, and the judges will decide what are the terms of the agreement."

In today's paper, we have this article, "Charter Erodes the Supremacy of Parliament. Once you start granting special concessions to the French there is no end to it, we have seen that at the federal level. Through the Official Languages Act, Canada has come under French control. This language law should definitely not be entrenched in Canada's Constitution.

In today's Free Press the judges ruled that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms overrules the supremacy of Parliament, what I just mentioned. Formerly, all Canadians were equals; now the French bilinguals are the elite group. People belonging to other ethnic groups will be unable to get government jobs, just the same as the English-speaking people, so ethnic groups who think that this French bilingualism will help them are mistaken. They will be second-class citizens, the same as English-speaking people. There is nothing wrong with knowing a second language; it should be encouraged, but we should just have one official language.

Another clipping of Eric Wells here I'll read to you. He claims that this original 1870 agreement was not carved in stone, that it was flexible. "In Manitoba's constitutional evolution, it is apparent, from the very beginning, that Manitobans regarded The Manitoba Act as a statute which could be amended by the Legislature to meet the changing conditions of the new province. In 1876, the elected members of the Legislature abolished the appointed Senate." You see, they had a Senate under The Manitoba Act of 1870. "Even though the original act specified that such a Senate would hold veto power over the MLA's elected by ballot. The Legislature voted to abolish the Senate; the Senate rejected it. The Legislature passed it again, the Senate realized public opinion was with the Legislature and the senators resigned." So that even though a Senate

was a part of the 1870 agreement, it shows it could be changed.

"The restrictions imposed by The Manitoba Act again became news in 1881. In that year, the borders of the new province were greatly expanded beyond the enclave of the Red River Settlement, then known as the postage-stamp province. In the enlarged area carved out of the Northwest Territories, thousands of new Manitobans appeared, and it was deemed unwise to impose Red River law upon them. Accordingly, when Manitoba expanded, the prevailing law which had existed in the new territories before their absorption was continued, and the Lieutenant-Governor was empowered to introduce Manitoba statutes slowly.

"Subsequent developments were soon to reveal that the newly acquired territories did not regard The Manitoba Act as binding. Soon to dominate the Legislature, the rural MLA's regarded The Manitoba Act as a curious relic to be ignored.

"We can see what happens once this French bilingualism starts; we saw by the Federal Government - now seven government departments in Ottawa are all French. The same thing could eventually happen here.

"Children who are learning heritage languages will be frozen out of government jobs the same as people who speak only English, and if they think that they are going to benefit through French bilingualism, they're mistaken. The airports at Vancouver and Winnipeg have been declared bilingual areas, and it's extended right down to the concessions and the car rental agencies. Once it starts there's no end to it, it just goes on and on.

"People belonging to other ethnic groups will be unable to get government jobs the same as the English-speaking people, so ethnic groups who think this French bilingualism will help them are mistaken. They will be second-class citizens, the same as the English-speaking people. There's nothing wrong with knowing a second language, it should be encouraged, but we should just have one official language.

I guess that concludes my presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacPherson. Questions for Mr. MacPherson from members of the committee?

MR. I. MacPHERSON: I'm a little hard of hearing. I'm afraid you'll have to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. MacPherson, for your presentation. There may be some questions from members of the committee. Any questions for Mr. MacPherson from members of the committee? Seeing no questions, thank you very much.

MR. I. MacPHERSON: I see one thing I forgot here, if you don't mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, go right ahead.

MR. I. MacPHERSON: For an example of what happens, we've seen happen with the Federal Government. This book, Bilingual Today, French Tomorrow, it's worth reading. At the time I thought a lot of the things that

he predicted were just a dream, but we can see it gradually unfolding. He said it would start at the federal level, work down to the provincial level, work down to the municipal level, and then be forced onto private industry and business, and we can see it happening already. The same as the concessions at the airport, even the car rental agencies. It's just the way it's predicted in this book. And this other book, *French Power*, explains how the French are gradually pushing their control over the whole country. I don't know whether these books are still available, but they're well worth reading. It's a real eye-opener to read these books. A lot of people don't realize how far this has gone, and if Manitoba accepts it, well, if I was a young person, I'd get out of Canada.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacPherson. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you very much for your presentation, sir.

Claire Toews; Juliette Blais; Kenneth Emberley; Bohdanka Dutka, Ukrainian Students' Club, University of Manitoba, Bohdanka Dutka; Dr. A. E. DeLeyssac, Dr. DeLeyssac, please.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Monsieur le président, messieurs les membres du comité.

Je vous sais gré, Messieurs . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham on a point of order. — (Interjection) — Mr. Graham raises a valid point. I had not reminded members of the public that radio receivers for French translation are available. As well, members may want to take a moment to put theirs on. If any members of the public would like to sign out radio receivers, they can do so with the technician behind the simultaneous translation booth. Dr. DeLeyssac, if you don't mind, we'll take a short recess in case anyone does want to get a receiver.

Committee is recessed for five minutes.

(SHORT RECESS)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Dr. DeLeyssac, would you please proceed.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Eh bien, Monsieur le président, messieurs les membres du comité.

Je vous sais gré, Messieurs, de m'accorder l'honneur de parler devant vous aujourd'hui. Permettez moi en cette occasion de faire appel à votre indulgence. Mes connaissances en droit constitutionnel ne sauraient rivaliser avec l'érudition de Monsieur le procureur général du Manitoba, ni avec sa compétence en la matière.

Dans le domaine de l'article 23 qui nous occupe en ce jour, l'histoire de la province canadienne du Manitoba n'est pas tellement complexe ni tellement longue qu'elle ne puisse être résumée au moyen de quelques dates importantes. Ce fut en effet dans l'année 1870, il y a de cela un peu plus d'un siècle, que la Constitution vint consacrer l'entrée du Manitoba dans la Confédération canadienne et assurer à ces habitants l'égalité de l'anglais et du français. Malgré ces garanties formelles, 1890 se signala par la violation de la

Constitution et le début de la persécution du français au Manitoba. Ce fut dans cette année-là qu'on abrogea purement et simplement l'article 23 qui énonçait les droits linguistiques des habitants.

En 1892 et 1909, deux jugements rendus séparément à Ste-Anne dans l'affaire Hébert, et à St-Boniface avec l'affaire Durreault par le juge Prud'Homme firent déclarer cette décision illégale. Mais en vain par un curieux effet du hasard, lesdits jugements furent égarés et ce n'est qu'en 1978 qu'on les retrouva. En 1916, le ministre de l'éducation parvenait à supprimer l'enseignement du français dans les écoles du Manitoba. Cette interdiction allait peser pendant plus de 40 ans. Nouvelle décision arbitraire en 1968, le français était rayé des conditions d'admission et des matières requises à l'université. Et malgré les interventions de notre société, il n'a pas été rétabli depuis.

Enfin, en 1979, un espoir surgit dans le cas Forest, devenu célèbre, la Cour suprême du Canada abolissait la décision inique de 1890 et rendait au français son rôle primitif. Il ne restait au procureur général du Manitoba qu'à faire appliquer la loi. Si cela avait été fait, nous ne serions pas ici aujourd'hui. Malheureusement, les . . . , les ajournements, les délais injustifiables firent que le gouvernement manitobain fut traduit une fois de plus en justice pour avoir failli à ces obligations. Ce fut l'affaire Bilodeau en 1981.

Il est évident qu'en assurant sa lourde charge de procureur général du Manitoba pour le parti néo-démocrate, M. Penner a hérité d'un dossier chargé et particulièrement ardu. Puisqu'il s'agissait de réparer les préjudices causés aux Franco-Manitobains en 1890, il devenait difficile de les traiter ouvertement en ennemis comme on avait fait par le passé.

Monsieur le procureur général l'a parfaitement compris et afin d'éviter un nouveau recours en Cour suprême, il a décidé très adroitement de négocier avec Me Bilodeau, non pas directement et principalement avec lui mais avec un tiers, en l'occurrence avec la Société franco-manitobaine dévouée à son parti et avec laquelle il lui était facile d'organiser des entretiens secrets.

En raison des hautes fonctions de Monsieur le procureur général, tout nous portait donc à croire au début de 1983 que l'application de l'article 23 trouverait en lui un puissant allié et que toute procédure intentée en Cour suprême s'avérerait parfaitement inutile. Peu de temps après son accession au poste de premier ministre du Manitoba, Monsieur Howard Pawley avait fait allusion à la noble tâche qui incombait à son procureur par quelques déclarations sans équivoque comme celle-ci. Je cite: "La langue française tient une place historique et constitutionnelle unique au Manitoba. La création du Manitoba en tant que province et son entrée dans la jeune Confédération ont été surtout l'oeuvre des habitants francophones. En conséquence, notre province est officiellement bilingue comme l'a récemment déclaré la Cour suprême. Howard Pawley, discours prononcé à Winnipeg le 21 mars 1982, traduit de l'anglais." Je cite Monsieur Pawley, I quote Mr. Pawley. "The French language has a unique historical and constitutional position in Manitoba. The creation of Manitoba as a separate province and its early admission to Confederation were largely the work of French-speaking residents. As a result this is an official bilingual province as the Supreme Court recently ruled. Signed Premier Pawley, March 21, 1982."

Mû par ces bons principes, les Canadiens français du Manitoba n'hésitèrent pas un seul instant à se prononcer pour ou contre le nouvel article 23 et les amendements qui avaient été rédigés en secret.

Réunis à St-Boniface le 21 mai 1983, ils votèrent à la quasi unanimité en faveur d'un article de loi que la SFM les exhortait à accepter en toute confiance. Quelle fut donc notre profonde surprise quand il y a quelque temps, nous lûmes ce qui suit dans la brochure intitulée "Constitutionally Speaking".

Le Manitoba ne va pas être bilingue. Le Manitoba ne fera pas du français une langue de travail dans la fonction publique. Un nombre restreint d'emplois, moins de 3 percent du total, exigera la connaissance du français pour satisfaire à la demande là où le nombre le justifie, un point c'est tout. Cet accord restreint s'applique seulement à des zones restreintes de la province où se trouve une population francophone en nombre significatif." Et je continue. La carte du Manitoba comprend certains endroits où il y a un nombre significatif de francophones. Ce sont dans ces lieux que les habitants pourraient adhérer volontairement au programme de service en langue française et que le gouvernement provincial pourrait offrir des services. Des services linguistiques supplémentaires là où la demande du public est significative. On exigera pas des municipalités ou des divisions scolaires qu'elles fassent partie du programme.

I quote, "Manitoba is not going bilingual. The Manitoba approach will not make French a language of work within the limited service. A limited number of jobs, less than 3 percent of the total, require French to serve the demand where numbers warrant, but that is it. The map of Manitoba shows those areas of the province where there are substantial numbers of Francophones. It is these areas that may voluntarily join the French Language Services Program, or where the Provincial Government may offer additional language service where there is significant public demand. No municipalities or school boards will be required to join."

Il est à peine nécessaire, Messieurs, de faire ressortir de ce qui précède la différence qui existe entre la déclaration faite le 21 mars 1982 par le premier ministre du Manitoba, "Notre province est officiellement bilingue." et celle du procureur général, "Le Manitoba ne va pas être bilingue.". Ce dernier ajoute par ailleurs que l'accord ne sera pas coûteux. Au contraire, il permet d'économiser, nous économisons ainsi des frais de traduction d'un million et demi et nous recevons deux millions trente-cinq soit une économie totale de près de quatre millions de dollars.

"Quite the opposite. . . . I quote the "Constitutionally Speaking." "Quite the opposite. We save money. So we save 1.5 million in translation, and we get 2.35 million with total benefit close to 4 millions."

Quels que soient les frais occasionnés ou les rabais à obtenir, vous conviendrez facilement, Messieurs, qu'ils ne compenseront jamais les préjudices subis en un siècle par les Canadiens français de cette province. Sur le plan culturel, imaginez un seul instant qu'on empêche vos enfants d'apprendre leur langage à l'école et qu'on supprime cette langue des conditions d'admission et des matières requises à l'université.

Lorsque le moment serait venu de faire valoir vos droits, accepteriez-vous que ceux-ci soient rétablis dans

telle ville mais pas dans la ville voisine et qu'ils soient moindres que ce qu'ils étaient à l'origine par analogie. Existerait-il deux catégories de Canadiens, deux catégories de Canadiens au Manitoba, l'une à St-Pierre l'autre à Brandon et faudrait-il considérer aussi le citoyen qui habite au centre de Winnipeg et celui qui réside aux alentours. Il est évident que dans notre province bilingue, il ne saurait être question d'imposer des mesures restrictives. Le Premier ministre du Manitoba l'a parfaitement saisi lorsque le 12 mars 1982, il déclarait aux Franco-Manitobains: "Vous n'avez plus à faire face à des lois restrictives, ni à l'indifférence ni même à l'hostilité du gouvernement comme cela a pu se produire par le passé".

I quote in English, "Your adversaries are no longer as they may have been at some point in history, restrictive legislation, government indifference or even hostility." Premier Pawley, March 21, 1982.

On ne saurait trop souligner que la crise actuelle a été causée non seulement par la violation de la Constitution en 1890 mais aussi par les dispositions prises contre l'enseignement du français ainsi que nous l'avons relaté plus haut. Il est impensable que de nos jours le français soit toujours supprimé des conditions d'admission et des matières requises à l'université ainsi d'ailleurs que les langues étrangères car on les passe après. Même si c'est une insulte à l'égard des jeunes Canadiens de suggérer qu'il soit en quelque sorte génétiquement ou culturellement inférieurs à la grande majorité des jeunes étudiants européens, asiatiques ou africains pour qui il est tout à fait normal de connaître une ou plusieurs langues.

"Even if it is insulting to young Canadians to suggest that somehow they are genetically or culturally inferior to the vast majority of young European or Asian or African university students for whom the knowledge of two or more languages is a fact of life."

Hors c'est précisément grâce aux jeunes, grâce à l'enseignement et non à l'obscurantisme que le bilinguisme pourra de nouveau reflourir en cette province et à travers tout le Canada. Dans cet esprit, la société canadienne du français à l'université que je préside, a entrepris une croisade pour faire rétablir les langues dans l'enseignement supérieur. Les réformes qu'elle préconise profiteraient tout aussi bien à nos étudiants qu'à nos fonctionnaires fédéraux ou provinciaux dont le rôle a acquis tant d'importance au cours des dernières années.

Nous n'ignorons pas, Messieurs, que vos collègues de l'Assemblée se sont toujours montrés septiques des piètres résultats obtenus par le gouvernement fédéral en matière de bilinguisme. Rappelons cependant que toute responsabilité sur l'enseignement des fonctionnaires ressortit non pas à l'administration fédérale mais entièrement à la législation provinciale. Vu le cratère exclusif de cette juridiction, nous demandions le 22 décembre 1982 au procureur général du Manitoba de bien vouloir faire rétablir les langues dans l'enseignement supérieur par voie de législation. N'ayant pas reçu de réponse de sa part, nous aimerions connaître les raisons de ce silence.

Je saisis cette occasion, Messieurs, pour vous rappeler certains propos violents tenus par Monsieur Doern, député NPD, contre la culture française. Le 20 juin 1983, vers 10h45, au cours d'une émission radiophonique organisée par Monsieur Warren à la

station CJOB, Monsieur Doern affirmait que si une institutrice quelconque se permettait un jour de conseiller à son enfant d'apprendre le français comme une certaine institutrice avait l'audace de le dire à une élève, il tirerait sur elle (I would shoot the teacher.)

Nous voudrions savoir si Monsieur le procureur général du Manitoba compte traduire Monsieur Doern en justice en vertu du code criminel.

Pour conclure, les membres de notre association reconnaissent que l'application immédiate de l'article 23 est susceptible de créer certaines difficultés techniques en raison de l'état actuel du système d'éducation. Nous proposons en conséquence que le français soit rétabli d'urgence dans l'enseignement supérieur, il serait alors possible d'accéder progressivement à l'application intégrale de l'article 23 sans les restrictions contenues dans les sections 23(7) et 23(8) selon un échéancier semblable à celui établi pour la traduction des lois, c'est-à-dire pour le 31 décembre 1993. Vu la faible population du Manitoba qui se monte à environ un million d'habitants, nous estimons que les frais occasionnés par les réformes proposées ne seraient pas supérieures aux dépenses envisagées dans "Constitutionally Speaking" et qu'à longue échéance ils apporteraient des avantages appréciables à la province du Manitoba.

Je vous remercie, Messieurs, de m'avoir écouté avec tant d'attention. J'ose espérer que cet exposé vous convaincra de l'importance que devra jouer l'enseignement dans l'application de l'article 23 de la Constitution. N'hésitez pas, je vous prie, à me poser toute question utile ou à me demander toute documentation complémentaire à ce sujet. Les membres de la Société canadienne du français à l'université et moi-même se feront un plaisir d'apporter leur concours à la réalisation de ce grand et noble projet. Je vous remercie. Je suis prêt à répondre aux questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. DeLeyssac. Questions from members of the committee?

Mr. Banman.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, you mention in your brief that one of the things that the Society is sort of working towards is the re-establishment or reinstating of the second languages at the university. It's my understanding - and I think you'd have maybe general support from a lot of or some other ethnic and cultural communities with regard to that, but it's my understanding, and I just wanted to clarify, that the second language meant that a person could either have French, German or several other languages, but that there was a requirement for a second language at university entrance.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Exactement. Pour entrer à l'université, n'est-ce pas, il fallait connaître un deuxième langage quel qu'il soit que ce soit le français, l'allemand, le russe, n'est-ce pas. Cette condition a été supprimée en 1968. Pour vous donner un exemple.

En 1968, il y avait environ 1,500 étudiants en première année à l'Université du Manitoba. Quand le français a été supprimé en 1968, les inscriptions sont tombées graduellement, n'est-ce pas, de 1,500, à 1,200, à 900

à 800, etc. jusqu'à environ 300 en 1980 ce qui prouve, n'est-ce pas, que la suppression du français à l'université ou la suppression des autres langues a eu un effet assez désastreux sur l'enseignement des langues.

MR. R. BANMAN: The point I wanted to make, and you did qualify the answer towards the end, that it wasn't only French that was dropped. It was not an act against the French language per se. It had to do with German, with Russian and with all the other languages and that we were all - someone of German extraction was involved in the same type of thing as happened to the Francophone community at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further question? No further question?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Dr. DeLeyssac, to follow up on that same question, was that done by law, or was that a policy of the university?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: C'est une décision qui été prise par le Sénat de l'Université du Manitoba. Il y a d'abord eu un comité d'examen, ce que l'on appelle en anglais une task force, un comité qui a examiné la situation pendant deux ans et après bien des délibérations, on a supprimé ce qu'on appelle en anglais "The language requirement", c'est-à-dire les conditions d'admission à l'université. Et ces conditions d'admission s'appliquaient bien entendu non seulement au français, comme je l'ai indiqué n'est-ce pas, mais aux autres langues qu'il s'agisse de toute langue qui vous intéresserait.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Are you in any way suggesting that perhaps we should be passing laws forcing universities to teach French?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Je ne pense pas qu'on puisse forcer l'université à enseigner le français. Est-ce qu'on force l'université à enseigner la géographie ou l'histoire. Non. Je constate simplement que le Canada est malheureusement l'un des seuls pays au monde où l'on n'a pas besoin d'une deuxième langue pour entrer à l'université. Et ce que je suggère qui pourrait améliorer la situation, tant sur le plan fédéral que sur le plan national, c'est que l'on rétablisse, que l'on réexamine la situation et que l'on essaie de rétablir les langues à l'université d'après les résultats que j'ai indiqués, n'est-ce pas, il est évident que la suppression des langues a non seulement nui à l'enseignement du français mais il a nui également à l'enseignement des autres langues.

Pour vous donner un petit exemple. A l'Université de Winnipeg, il y avait un département de latin. Quand l'université a décidé de supprimer les langues, eh bien voilà le département de latin a disparu. Eh bien voilà des faits qui se sont répétés et qui sont assez regrettables dans un pays aussi moderne que le nôtre et qui a des facilités vraiment supérieures à celles de certains autres pays.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Dr. DeLeyssac, we're dealing here with a specific problem that is amending a Manitoba statute - not a statute -

we're suggesting that the Constitution of Canada be amended to change The Manitoba Act. Could you tell us what this has to do with the teaching of French at the universities, if you want the universities to remain separate and independent from legislation? I fail to see the connection between the teaching of French in the universities, which is under the control of the university, and what we do in this particular committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, please.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Eh bien, c'est très facile, Messieurs. Pour qu'on puisse appliquer une loi, n'est-ce pas, pour qu'on puisse avoir des services en français, pour former des fonctionnaires, eh bien, il faut pouvoir les éduquer. Et c'est justement à ce point de vue-là que l'application de l'article 23 pourrait être étayé, pourrait avoir, pourrait être plus efficace. Pour vous donner un exemple. Regardons du côté du gouvernement fédéral. Vous êtes là, Messieurs de l'Assemblée, vous vous êtes plaints que l'histoire du bilinguisme fédéral était un fiasco et en effet, c'est un fiasco. Regardez les millions de dollars qui ont été dépensés. Mais alors ce qu'on oublie de dire c'est que pour former des fonctionnaires, il faut les instruire. Or comment peut-on instruire les fonctionnaires, si l'enseignement de la deuxième langue, des deux langues officielles n'est pas poursuivi dans les universités. Et c'est là que je veux en venir en parlant de l'article 23. Le rétablissement des langues bénéficierait non seulement aux étudiants aux jeunes gens qui désirent s'instruire mais aussi aux fonctionnaires provinciaux et aux fonctionnaires fédéraux parce que c'est en effet l'éducation qui dépend de la juridiction provinciale et non pas, mais pas du tout, de la juridiction fédérale. Et c'est ainsi, n'est-ce pas, que des millions de dollars ont été dépensés, j'ai déjà fait une étude à ce sujet-là. On a compté 250 millions de dollars par an sur le programme de développement du bilinguisme. Alors qu'il suffisait tout simplement dans les universités et dans les écoles de rétablir les langues de faire incorporer les langues dans le programme comme on le fait avec la géographie, l'histoire et autre chose. C'est en somme une suggestion assez simple mais qui je l'espère retiendra l'attention du comité.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Dr. DeLeysac, I would think that it is a problem that you have as head of the French Department at the university to convince the Senate of the validity of your case, rather than asking us, as legislators, to try and influence the Senate to do that. I think that's a responsibility that is yours and not ours. I would ask you if you are asking us to help you to try and influence the Senate to do what you are suggesting.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Ce que je suggère simplement, c'est le côté éducatif de la question. On ne saurait appliquer un article 23 sans parler d'enseignement et en ce qui concerne le Sénat, il y a une décision à prendre. N'oublions pas que il s'agit d'une province bilingue, M. Pawley l'a indiqué dans son discours, n'est-ce pas, le Manitoba est une province officiellement bilingue et il ressort presque automatiquement que le français devrait être rétabli à l'université et pourquoi

donc, pourquoi donc en parlais-je s'il n'y avait pas une loi. Il existe une loi, Messieurs, que vous connaissez très bien, c'est la loi sur l'Université du Manitoba et c'est à elle que je fais allusion, il s'agit également d'une question de persuasion, il s'agit de pouvoir coopérer que tous les corps administratifs de la province puissent coopérer dans cette question pour arriver à des résultats positifs et qui ne coûteraient pas des sommes énormes puisqu'il s'agirait simplement d'une question de réforme.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, to Dr. DeLeysac, I'm interested in his support of the proposition of re-introducing French and other languages as an admission requirement at the university. Indeed I've had a letter from Dr. DeLeysac on this point. I would be interested in hearing Dr. DeLeysac's opinion, following upon Mr. Graham's question, as to just how the entrenchment of an extension of Section 23 of French Language Services, how that becoming entrenched into the Constitution of Manitoba for the first time would really have any bearing upon this other topic, which I regard as worthwhile and well worth pursuing. How would the entrenchment help the cause for which your group is famous?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Et bien, c'est assez facile. Si on demande à un employé du gouvernement provincial où si on demande à un employé du gouvernement municipal, certains services en français, quelle sera sa réaction s'il ne comprend pas le français. Il sera sans doute un peu frustré, il dira "Oh écoutez", à la rigueur il dira "Eh bien, moi je parle anglais, allez voir à côté si j'y suis" ou quelque chose dans ce genre-là. Et bien, c'est une attitude, n'est-ce pas, qui est assez regrettable, qui dépend de l'éducation, à mon avis, et il s'agirait selon notre association, il s'agirait de penser à l'avenir, de penser à nos jeunes, ce sont eux, n'est-ce pas, qui seront intéressés à la question du bilinguisme, à la question d'apprendre une autre langue, qu'il s'agisse de la deuxième langue nationale ou d'un autre langue quelle qu'elle soit parce que en effet, il ne s'agit pas seulement comme je l'ai indiqué du français mais également des autres langues.

HON. S. LYON: You said, and I have no reason to doubt it, Dr. DeLeysac, that in 1968 the Senate of the University of Manitoba abolished the requirement that was certainly there when I was going to university and, I presume, for many many decades that an entrance requirement to the University of Manitoba would be to have one language other than English: French, German, Latin, whatever the case may be. Do you happen to know how long that academic requirement for admission had been in force?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: I'm not sure how long it was on the curriculum. It seems to me, it went on for a number of years. I haven't gone as far. I know that the decision taken in 1968 at University of Winnipeg - or Manitoba, sorry - and 1969 at University of Winnipeg.

HON. S. LYON: Is that - as you would describe it, a phenomenon - peculiar to Canada, or does that lack of a language requirement apply also to most of the major universities in the United States now?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Et bien, comme je l'ai indiqué, Monsieur Lyon, comme je l'ai indiqué dans mon petit discours. C'est un phénomène pour l'appeler ainsi que regarde malheureusement le Canada et les Etats-Unis, bien qu'aux Etats-Unis il y ait une loi passée il y a quelques années sur le bilinguisme. Je dois insister malheureusement que le Canada est l'un des seuls pays au monde où l'on a pas besoin d'une deuxième langue pour entrer à l'université. Vous avez donc à la sortie de l'université un docteur de l'université, n'est-ce pas, qui parle une langue et ce sont ces gens là, cette élite qui ira nous représenter à l'étranger et ira nous représenter dans les pays d'Afrique puisqu'il y a des ingénieurs, il y a des médecins, il y a des techniciens qui représentent le Canada. Et bien, ce sont ces gens-là, cette élite qui vont à l'étranger et avec des titres de docteur et qui malheureusement sont capables de s'exprimer seulement dans une langue, il y aurait évidemment des avantages à pouvoir être sur un pied d'égalité avec les autres pays, n'est-ce pas, nous ne vivons pas seulement dans un pays restreint, nous faisons partie du monde entier et l'influence du Canada à l'étranger est assez importante puisque nous avons des ingénieurs, n'est-ce pas, nous avons des gens qui sont des techniciens, particulièrement dans l'électronique qui est assez connu en Europe et en Afrique. Nous avons l'expérience médicale, pétrolière et voilà une des raisons qui demanderaient à l'élite de notre société, tout au moins, de pouvoir connaître une deuxième langue.

HON. S. LYON: I'm still interested in the first point, however, about how entrenchment of French Language Services is going to aid this altogether, I think, commendable cause on whose behalf you speak. Do you not find it rather ironic, Dr. DeLeYssac, that in the Province of Manitoba up to 1968 where there was no entrenchment or it was believed that the law did not support Section 23, where there was no entrenchment of limited bilingual services at all according to the law as we knew it then, the admission policy of the University of Manitoba with no entrenchment was more favourable to the French language than it is today, where you seek to have entrenchment to help French language instruction? Do you not see the irony of the situation?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Ce que je vois dans cette situation, et bien c'est une, il n'est pas question de, d'exiger, n'est-ce pas, d'une façon catégorique. C'est simplement une question de législation, de coopération à tous les niveaux, au niveau provincial, fédéral, municipal, scolaire, universitaire. Et sans spécifier l'article 23, je considère qu'on arrivera à des résultats, n'est-ce pas, supposons que nous ne parlions pas de l'article 23, et bien on arriverais à des résultats, tout simplement de bonne foi, en établissant ce système qui serait surtout éducatif, qui exigerait la coopération de tous, le Manitoba, n'est-ce pas, n'est qu'une partie assez faible du Canada. Il y a d'autres provinces. Personnellement, il y a l'Alberta, la Colombie-

Britannique, le Québec et c'est être un bon Canadien que de pouvoir s'intégrer dans ce bilinguisme et ce biculturalisme qui est typiquement canadien et que certains pays nous envient. Je visite souvent l'Europe pour des recherches ou autres et nous parlons, il m'est arrivé de parler à des Espagnols ou à des Allemands dans la langue de leur pays, il m'est arrivé de leur parler et beaucoup d'entre eux pensent: "Ah! Vous êtes bilingues au Canada.". C'est une chose qui n'est pas exacte, mais qui pourrait l'être si on s'efforçait d'encourager l'enseignement et de considérer les choses d'une façon positive ce qui entraînerait des dépenses assez minimes, si l'on veut, puisque les réformes ne coûtent pas les millions de dollars, n'est-ce pas, que le gouvernement fédéral a dépensé sans l'appui de l'éducation provinciale. Parce que j'insiste à ce point de vue, n'est-ce pas, l'éducation provinciale est la clef de la situation actuelle.

HON. S. LYON: But is it not clear, Dr. DeLeYssac, from the previous history of Manitoba where a second language was an admission requirement, certainly in the liberal Arts faculties in any event, that entrenchment is not needed in order for that to come about?

We did not have any entrenchment in 1965 or in 1945 when I went to university. Yet, in a community like Portage la Prairie, French was taught in the high schools. Latin was taught in the high schools. I believe even German was taught, without any benefit of entrenchment of any sort.

My point is that your cause . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. With respect, Mr. Lyon, I appreciate that you haven't been with the committee during the rural hearings, but Chair did receive direction from the hearings to restrict questions to questions of clarification. Your question at this point is entering into a debate of the answers you have received from Dr. DeLeYssac. I would appreciate it if you could make it more a question of clarification.

Mr. Graham, to the point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe Dr. DeLeYssac did mention in his brief that the teaching of French in the schools was removed in 1916, and stayed out of the schools for 40, 50 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham, I certainly allowed Mr. Lyon a fair amount of length so far as to pursue that question, because it did flow from the brief. But in the last question there, it was starting to become a bit of a debate and I think that's what the committee wants to avoid and I'm following the committee's direction. I'm sure Mr. Lyon can rephrase. Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: No, I'll just carry on, Mr. Chairman. Would you or would you not agree with the point, Dr. DeLeYssac, whether or not the Legislature of Manitoba passes this ill-starred venture of the Pawley Government, will have little or no effect upon the intellectual persuasiveness of the argument that you are making for language to be one of the qualities of admission - French, German, English, Ukrainian, whatever - for the University of Manitoba.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Well I don't disassociate the two arguments. If Manitoba is the bilingual province, it

seems as natural as it is in Switzerland, for instance, to have official languages taught at the university or at school and this is all I have to say in this respect.

HON. S. LYON: Is France a bilingual country?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: In France, they are mainly I would say multilingual. It's a multilingual country. You have German dialect in the east. You have a Brittany dialect in the west, in Brittany. You have Gascony language in the south that I still speak. You have the provincial Provence for language of Provence in the southeast, so in France or other countries, it is not uncommon to speak many languages within the country or outside.

HON. S. LYON: But France, just to make the point, Dr. DeLeysac was trying to say that Manitoba and Canada were unique and that they weren't biligual. Would you not say that most countries in the world, most major countries in the world are unilingual in the language of that country, whether it's Spain, you speak Spanish; in Italy you speak Italian, in France you speak French; in Britain you speak English and in Canada, up until 1968 or 1969 until The Official Languages Act was passed, essentially Canada was an English-speaking country with certain bilingual rights accorded by the Constitution to the people of Quebec and in the federal courts of the country and Parliament. Isn't that effectively true?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Et bien, je dirais que dans chaque pays, n'est-ce pas, il y a une langue principale, prenez la Hollande, par exemple. Dans la Hollande, on parle le hollandais. Beaucoup de gens parlent l'allemand aussi. Si on parle le hollandais, on parle allemand. Moi-même qui parle allemand, je peux très bien comprendre un hollandais. En Espagne, n'est-ce pas, vous avez des, d'autres langues, il y a des touristes qui viennent et si vous êtes Espagnol ou si vous parlez espagnol comme moi, par exemple, et bien, vous pourrez vous adressez à un Italien, n'est-ce pas, il n'y a pas de problème, ce sont des choses assez commune en Europe. Il y a donc dans l'enseignement européen, n'est-ce pas, une certaine place aux langues. Quand on entre à l'université ou ailleurs, c'est tout à fait une question obligatoire de comprendre un langue et de pouvoir entrer à l'université. Il n'y a pas seulement la question nationale, il y a aussi la question internationale dont nous avons déjà parlée.

HON. S. LYON: I think it's self-evident, but the language within the government service of France, of Spain, of Italy, of Great Britain, is the language of the country, whether it be English or Spanish or Italian. There is not a bilingual situation in the public service in France, as you are advocating in Manitoba . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. The purpose of questions is to clarify the brief submitted. We're now getting into areas that are flowing from answers and debate between the delegate and one of the honourable members. I am not sure that this serves to clarify the original presentation and we have been restricting our questions in that way. Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: I've asked the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the question is out of order. I would ask you, Mr. Lyon, to pursue a line of questioning that seeks clarification. I have allowed a fair amount of latitude and you have pursued it, but pursued it beyond the point of clarification of Dr. DeLeysac's brief.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I've been before these committees for 25 years. The purpose of the Chair is to serve the committee. We're not interested in your impression of what's in order or not in order, until such time as objection is taken. I've asked a legitimate question flowing out of statements made by Dr. DeLeysac. He has no objection to answering it except for your interference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lyon, with respect. The Chair is operating under specific direction from the committee that questions should be limited to questions for clarification of the material contained in the brief. That direction was given in Swan River, reinforced in Brandon and Ste. Anne, and until the committee orders otherwise, the Chair will do as the committee directs and the Chair expects all members to observe that direction.

Would you please proceed with your question, Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: I've asked the question of Dr. DeLeysac.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is out of order. Do you have another question?

HON. S. LYON: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I challenge the Chairman's ruling that the question is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ruling of the Chair. Sorry, Mr. Lyon, the rules require that you be a member of the committee to challenge the ruling.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on that point then, I would like to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham to the same point of order?

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, this is another point, Mr. Chairman. We have allowed unlimited substitution and I would like to substitute the name of Mr. Banman for Mr. Lyon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Clerk have Mr. Banman's resignation? I just have to initial it. Just one moment please.

HON. S. LYON: He's wasting more time. We could have had the question answered if you hadn't been so foolish.

HON. R. PENNER: It is no waste of time to uphold the Chair's ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has received the resignation of Mr. Banman. I understand that Mr. Lyon

has replaced Mr. Banman on the committee. Is that agreed?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I would make that a motion, if the committee agrees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

HON. S. LYON: Now, Mr. Chairman, we've wasted five minutes over a ruling that was childish and silly. I will go on to another line of questioning, and I hope there won't be undue interference in legitimate questioning of witnesses, from you or anybody else.

Dr. DeLeysac, you talked about Manitoba coming into Confederation as a bilingual province. What is your definition of bilingual in that sense, because I know there are many definitions of it about?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Bilingualism is simply the use of both languages, seen from the general point of view. As far as the technical or legal point of view, you're a lawyer, Mr. Lyon, I think you could define it better than I do.

HON. S. LYON: I'm interested really, Dr. DeLeysac, in your view, because you use the term, Manitoba came into Confederation as a bilingual province. There are those who would say that Manitoba came into Confederation with Section 23 as part of The Manitoba Act which made the use of French or English possible in the Legislature, in the courts, and the printing of the statutes mandatory. Now is that your definition of bilingual, or what is bilingual, or how would you describe it?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: I would say, on a legal point of view, yes. On the broader scope, it's something different.

Je pourrais dire qu'en ce qui concerne le bilinguisme dans une province, n'est-ce pas, en le considérant d'une façon générale, et bien il y a utilisation des deux langues. Tenez allez, disons à Zurich ou à Genève, n'est-ce pas, ou dans une ville bilingue. Et bien, on se sert des deux langues sans faire attention si vous venez de tel endroit ou bien de celui-là ou bien d'un autre. C'est une question qui a un côté juridique et qui a aussi à côté un sens général.

HON. S. LYON: I'm interested in your view of it, however, Doctor because this question has come to the committee's attention before with people saying, as you have said, that Manitoba was created as a bilingual province. Indeed, others have said Canada was created as a bilingual country. I have to ask the question then, well if Canada was a bilingual country from its inception in 1867, why then was it necessary for Mr. Trudeau to pass The Official Languages Act in 1968 or 1969? You can see the point I'm getting at. What does bilingual mean in that sense?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: It seems to be a personal opinion. Je dirais qu'il s'agit d'une question d'opinion personnelle. En ce qui concerne le Canada, en termes généraux, on parlait du Canada comme d'un pays bilingue. Au point de vue juridique, il a fallu évidemment,

établir une loi sur le bilinguisme pour la faire respecter et comme je l'ai indiqué dans ce rapport, nous avons vu à quel point l'application de cette loi est tombée, n'est-ce pas. Nous avons vu d'après certaines analyses que j'ai faites, les sommes astronomiques qui ont été dépensées par le gouvernement fédéral. Alors qu'il aurait simplement fallu penser à l'enseignement d'abord comme je l'ai indiqué souvent, n'est-ce pas, comment peut-on faire des employés, des fonctionnaires bilingues s'il n'y a pas cet enseignement pour les former. Et c'est là l'un des points importants dans l'application d'une loi sur le bilinguisme ou dans tout pays qui se dit bilingue.

HON. S. LYON: In the early part of your brief, you made comment to the effect, Dr. DeLeysac, that because, following upon the Forest case in 1979, the Government of the Day did not carry out the translations quickly enough that Mr. Bilodeau brought the case that is now before the Supreme Court. Do you know that for a fact, or is that just your opinion?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Et bien, je ne suis pas juriste, hein. Je ne suis pas juriste. Mais je sais qu'en 1979, avec la décision de la Cour suprême qui dans ce pays devrait avoir une certaine influence, j'étais d'opinion que les dispositions adéquates seraient prises non seulement au niveau provincial mais au niveau scolaire, au niveau universitaire et dans les administrations. Et l'on peut sans doute déplorer que cela ait pris tellement de temps. Je suggérerais dans ce cas, de voir l'avenir et c'est le but principal de mon exposé, de voir l'avenir essayer d'établir cette coopération de l'enseignement des écoles en pensant surtout à nos jeunes, n'est-ce pas, Monsieur le procureur général l'a bien vu puisqu'il a suggéré que les lois traduites pour le 31 décembre 1993 autrement dit pour traduire les lois, n'est-ce pas, on ne pouvait pas le faire du jour au lendemain comme cela et il me semble que la question de l'enseignement est assez similaire. On ne peut pas dire rétablissons le français on en parlera plus, il s'agit de penser à l'avenir et de considérer le rôle de l'enseignement parallèlement à l'article 23.

HON. S. LYON: So you acknowledge the fact that no government and, indeed, no court can order something to be done that can't be done overnight; that is, to translate statutes, to bring up-to-date the French translation of all of the statutes of Manitoba, is a physical impossibility unless there is a time span given in order to accomplish that task.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Exactement. C'est justement là où nous voulons en venir, n'est-ce pas, il ne s'agit pas de considérer les choses du jour au lendemain mais de voir l'avenir tant au point de vue juridique qu'au point de vue éducatif.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed any further, Mr. Lyon, we have passed our normal hour of adjournment. I wasn't sure whether you had fairly lengthy further questioning. We could ask Dr. DeLeysac if he can come back.

HON. S. LYON: I've got only one more question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

HON. S. LYON: You are aware, Dr. DeLeyssac, that Mr. Bilodeau's proposition, which is rather far-fetched, is that all of the laws of Manitoba passed since 1870 are invalid because they weren't translated into French. Do you agree with that proposition?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Et bien, il y a un problème, n'est-ce pas, n'étant pas juriste comme vous, Me Lyon, n'étant pas juriste comme vous, il m'est assez difficile de donner une réponse magique mais il est évident que la bonne volonté du gouvernement, la coopération des services et de bien d'autres facteurs pourraient nous permettre d'atteindre le but dans un avenir disons déterminé comme 1993, comme j'avais déjà suggéré.

HON. S. LYON: You are aware, Dr. DeLeyssac, that Mr. Bilodeau lost that proposition in the trial court and in the Manitoba Court of Appeal? It was rejected by those two courts — (Interjection) — No, he didn't. Forest won in both cases. You don't even know what happened.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Et bien, excusez-moi en ce, à ce point de vue-là, je n'ai pas amené mon expert juridique mais ce que je peux vous dire c'est qu'il y a eu une décision de la Cour suprême dans le cas Forest et il me semble qu'en on considère tous les facteurs en question, qu'en on considère la question du cas Blaikie au Québec, par exemple, qu'il y aurait intérêt,

n'est-ce pas à pouvoir appliquer la loi dans un délai assez convenable, à la satisfaction de tous. Et je n'exclurais pas évidemment la question de l'enseignement, vous m'excuserez peut-être d'en parler si souvent mais c'est un fait, n'est-ce pas, c'est un fait, comme j'ai cité il y a peu de temps. Quand on demande à un employé, n'est-ce pas, si c'était un jeune qui connaissait les deux langues ou même trois, il se ferait un plaisir de pouvoir répondre dans la langue de son pays. Comme je me fais un plaisir moi-même, n'est-ce pas, si je vois un Espagnol qui vient au Manitoba ou un Allemand et même un Français, n'est-ce pas, de l'aider dans la mesure du possible. C'est un plaisir, c'est une courtoisie qu'on étend aux autres personnes et quand il s'agit du Canada, c'est une courtoisie qu'on applique à ces concitoyens.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members of the committee? Seeing none, Dr. DeLeyssac, thank you very much for representing your organization here and making your presentation.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Je vous remercie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of adjournment having arrived, committee is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 7:30 this evening.

(Translation will appear in Appendix at end of all committee hearings.)