



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. 52 - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 3 OCTOBER, 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

Monday, 3 October, 1983

TIME — 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Mackling, Penner and Storie
Messrs. Anstett, Ashton, Brown, Graham,
Harapiak, Lecuyer, Nordman, and Mrs. Oleson.

WITNESSES: Professor A.R. Kear, Private Citizen

Mr. Gordon W. Pollon, Private Citizen

Mr. Michael Kibzey, Private Citizen

Dr. Neil G. McDonald, Manitoba 23

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Proposed Resolution to amend Section 23
of The Manitoba Act

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee, come to order. I understand the Clerk has received the resignation of Mr. Parasiuk from the committee, and the substitute therefore is Mr. Lecuyer. Could I have a motion to that effect, please?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harapiak. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The first name on our list this afternoon is Bohdanka Dutka, Ukrainian Students' Club, University of Manitoba. Ms. Dutka, please.

Michael Kiedyk, Mr. Michael Kiedyk, please; Mr. George Rykman; Don Mclvor, Don Mclvor, please; Ferdinand Guiboche.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I noticed Mr. Mclvor was here all morning. I don't know whether there is any intention of his part to be here this afternoon or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mclvor spoke to me, he was one of the individuals who asked if he could have a specific time and I told him that was something only the committee could decide. He indicated he would be back later today. I don't know if he meant this afternoon or this evening.

Ferdinand Guiboche, Israel Ludwig, S. Stephansson.
Professor Kear.

MR. A. KEAR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for the opportunity for presenting this brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you wait one moment until the copies are distributed?

MR. A. KEAR: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. A. KEAR: This presentation will consist of three parts. The first will be wholly oral; second, the written portion which you have in your hands; and concluding by a short oral statement.

I have belonged to no political party; I belong to no political party; I intend to belong to no political party. I make these three statements explicitly and clearly so that my objectivity with regard to political parties is clear to all concerned.

My approach, therefore, is non-partisan. If I make remarks in my representation that are deemed by members of political parties to be injurious to their political party this is unintentional and is a reflection only of historical fact, and I hope it does not express any prejudice on my part.

I speak as a political scientist, teaching and doing research at the University of Manitoba, but I should make it very clear that I do not in any way represent the University of Manitoba.

I do speak as a member of la Société franco-manitobaine, of which I have been a member since 1969, but I do not represent nor speak for la Société Franco-Manitobaine.

My first language is English et ma deuxième est la langue française. Je suis compétent dans les deux langues au Canada.

May I emphasize that I have been welcomed by la Société franco-manitobaine as a participating member in the whole range of their activities. On no occasion have I ever been subjected to any form of invidious discrimination, because my first language has not been French, while engaging in the activities of la Société franco-manitobaine.

I fully support the position of la Société franco-manitobaine regarding Article 23 agreement of May 17, 1983. The reason I welcome the extension of French Language Services is simply because the character of government has changed markedly since 1870. The government today, regardless of the political party temporarily in office, provides many more services than were even dreamed of in 1870 when Manitoba entered Canada - health and welfare services, consumer services, protection of human rights and all the rest. What we accept today as normal were not accepted as normal in 1870. It appears to me only reasonable that a broader range of services be provided in French to our French-speaking fellow citizens in the same way that this broader range of services is provided to English-speaking citizens.

I don't need to remind this committee that our French-speaking fellow citizens are also taxpayers. I urge that the constitutional mistake of 1890, in abolishing French

language rights in Manitoba, be corrected. Manitoba has acted unconstitutionally for far too long. The sooner it ceases acting unconstitutionally is to be welcomed, and I would welcome the adoption of the May 17th agreement without any amendments at all.

Today's debate in Manitoba is not simply a question affecting Manitobans, it is a national question, all Canada is watching. And I need only point out that this last weekend I was in Kingston, Ontario, where both English- and French-speaking people were curious to what was taking place in Manitoba. Therefore, I hope and I expect that this Legislature shall rise to the occasion.

The judgment of the Fathers of Confederation in 1867, in putting French and English on the same level of equality, is a wise judgment and a wise judgment based on practical political experience. Indeed, if that basis of equality had been fully implemented there would be no Parti Quebecois today and our fellow French-speaking citizens would be content and happy partners in a unique experiment on the world. Need I point out that Canada is the only country that has the combination of two languages, English and French. Indeed, this happy circumstance makes Canada all the better. The quality of treatment that was discussed and set forth in 1867 was extended to Manitoba when this province joined Canada in 1870. Equality of treatment shall be applied in Manitoba today to members of both linguistic groups.

This presentation is perhaps different from those you have already heard. The approach is designed to recall to our attention the attitudes of some Fathers of Confederation in the 1860s concerning minority rights, in general, and Francophones, in particular.

This presentation is based on some quotations from John A. Macdonald and George Etienne Cartier. John A. Macdonald's remarks reflect a man's thinking resulting from many years of political experience in the life of the Province of Canada. He knew the problems and he also knew the solutions. He was, above all, a moderate man who was concerned with a workable viable political system. He had accepted French-speaking colleagues in his party in the governments that he formed before 1867 and on the governments he formed after 1867.

Cartier, who I shall also quote in a few moments, was one of the members of Macdonald's Cabinet who helped negotiate Manitoba's entry into Canada in 1870. So what we're referring to, or what the leading figures of what we now call the Fathers of Confederation were thinking.

How can our political system be workable if a linguistic minority always feels aggrieved? I would repeat the word "always" to demonstrate the necessity of finding solutions acceptable to the minority. The challenge in our system is the relationship between the permanent linguistic majority and the permanent linguistic minority - and I might just repeat that statement because I think it's central to our issue to the debate today. The challenge in our system is the relationship between the permanent linguistic majority and the permanent linguistic minority.

Now one of the rules that we operate by, in the democratic society, is that the majority rules and that the minority has rights, and one of those rights of the minority is to continue to exist. We also accept, as part

of the democratic process, the alternation of political parties, so that from time to time the majority of public opinion can change, and that's so that public opinion may be continued to be exercised by the majority party. There is, as you know, an alteration of political parties in power.

The operation of a democratic society changes, however, when we talk about linguistic groups. What happens here is that the permanent linguistic minority never has a chance to form a linguistic majority. The linguistic minority of Quebec has been a permanent linguistic minority since 1867 and it'll never become the permanent linguistic majority able to exercise political power, and the same applies to the French-speaking element here in Manitoba. What then can the permanent linguistic minority do when it knows it'll always remain the permanent linguistic minority? The question then is how to deal justly with a permanent linguistic minority.

Before going too much further, I wish to correct an important historical fact that Dr. Potter uttered before lunch. When we look at the history of the Province of Canada, when the Province of Canada was established by the Government of Great Britain by the active union in 1840, it abolished the use of the French language in the Government of the Province of Canada. But by 1848, by the operation of political parties here in the Province of Canada, English and French were once again on a basis of equality. This was an action taken by the Parliament of the Province of Canada, so we have had equality of the two languages before 1867 which, as you know, were continued in The British North America Act in 1867.

Part of this debate that we're into today concerns also those many thousands of Canadians, and I assume probably thousands of Manitoba, who signed petitions just prior to the Quebec referendum in 1980, in which they suggested that it would be a mistake for Quebec to leave Canada. Well, are these same people who signed these petitions for the Quebec referendum, now refusing to extend French language rights today? Has their position towards French-speaking Canadians changed from wanting them to remain in Canada in 1980 to today, only three short years later. Is it because Quebec is far away, the referendum is over, and Manitoba is near at hand? I should point out to you, as you probably already know, that the next provincial election in Quebec is going to be fought on the question of independence and Mr. Levesque has made that very clear on many occasions.

What can be said about the political support given our three national parties? If we look at the history of the Liberal Party all of its leaders since Edward Blake have alternated between English and French. The Liberal Party has been able to accommodate both Anglophone and Francophone sentiment within that party and one of their techniques has been their choice of national leader. The Conservative Party - never once since 1867 has the Conservative Party ever had a Francophone leader. Indeed in Quebec, the Conservative Party is known as "Le Parti des Anglais," the English party.

With respect to the NDP, never once has it gained a seat in the Province of Quebec. I would suspect, part of the problem of the NDP in the Province of Quebec is that it hasn't yet come to grips with the reality of

language and culture. These facts reflect on the character of our parties, but also the way our political system operates.

The worst possible reason that I could advance for doing what I am recommending is for purely partisan purposes. I see this is the worst possible argument because it then reduces the argument to the lowest possible level. What I would suggest is that this legislature do the constitutional thing, and that all three parties that are represented, two of them or represented in the Manitoba House, look to their futures in the Canadian political system. Political expediency is a terrible argument and I don't like to use it, but it is there.

I do believe that parties represented in Manitoba can gain support in Quebec and elsewhere if they do the right thing, and not only among Francophones but also among Anglophones.

I would like to turn now to the written portion of the brief which you have in front of you. Now initially, this was a longer paper which I gave en Francais to La Société-historique de Saint-Boniface and Le Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain in 1980. What I have done is extract a portion of this to reflect particular statements on that occasion.

Turn to what is numbered in front of you, Page 7. We're referring to the - I'm sure you're familiar with the process of the Charlottetown Conference of 1864, the Quebec Conference of 1864. It was at Quebec where all the major political constitutional questions were decided then, and many of these questions have remained unchanged ever since. Indeed, at Quebec, there was a discussion about the French language and the English language. Quebec Resolution No. 46 was adopted and reads as follows:

"Both the English and French languages may be employed in the General Parliament and in its proceedings and in the Local Legislature of Lower Canada, which is (today's Quebec), and also in the Federal Courts and in the Courts of Lower Canada (today's Quebec)."

You know that this was translated into Section 133 of The British North America Act in 1867.

When the Quebec resolutions were being debated and the Legislature of the Province of Canada, better known as the Confederation Debates, John A. Macdonald had the following to say in 1865.

"I have very great pleasure in answering the question put to me by my honourable friend from the county of Quebec. I may state that the meaning of one of the resolutions adopted by the (Quebec) Conference is this, that the rights of the French-Canadian members as to the status of their language in the Federal Legislature shall be precisely the same as they now are in the present Legislature in every possible respect. I have still further pleasure in stating that the moment this was mentioned in the Conference - meaning the Quebec Conference - the members of the deputation from the Lower (Maritime) Provinces unanimously stated that it was right and just, and without one dissentient voice gave their adhesion to the reasonableness of the proposition that the status of the French language, as regards the procedure in Parliament, the printing of measures, and

everything of that kind, should be precisely as it is in this Legislature (of the Province of Canada). (Hear, hear.)"

Here's Macdonald speaking, reflecting what took place in the Quebec Conference and the decision taken there. Later on Macdonald went on, "I desire to say that I agree with my honourable friend that, as it stands just now, the majority govern; but in order to cure this, it was agreed at the Quebec Conference to embody this provision in The BNA Act (Hear, hear). This was proposed by the Canadian Government, for fear an accident might arise subsequently," and I wish to underline this comment "for fear an accident might arise subsequently." An academic footnote is that they were writing a constitution, they were conscious that they wanted something that was going to last. "It was assented to by the deputation from each province" - New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, PEI, Newfoundland, Upper and Lower Canada. "It was assented to by the deputation from each province that the use of the French language should form one of the principles upon which the Confederation should be established, and that its use, as at present, should be guaranteed by the Imperial Act."

Later on, during the same Confederation debates of 1865, Cartier, the great French-Canadian leader, said as follows:

"Now, when we were united together, if union were attained, we would form a political nationality with which neither the national origin, nor the religion of any individual would interfere. It was lamented by some that we had this diversity of races, and hopes were expressed that this distinctive feature would cease. The idea of unity of races was utopian - it was impossible." Again, if I might, an academic footnote, the Fathers then used the word "race" the way we use today "ethnic groups", so don't read into it more than what's really there. "Dissimilarity, in fact, appeared to be the order of the physical world and of the moral world, as well as in the political world. But with regard to the objection based on this fact, to the effect that a great nation could not be formed because Lower Canada was in great part French and Catholic, and Upper Canada was British and Protestant, and the Lower Provinces were mixed" - the Lower Provinces meaning the Maritime Provinces - "it was futile and worthless in the extreme. Look, for instance, at the United Kingdom, inhabited as it were by three great races. (Hear, hear.) Had the diversity of races impeded the glory, the progress, the wealth of England? Of the glories of the Senate, the field, and the ocean, of the successes of trade and commerce, how much was contributed by the combined talents, energy, and courage of the three races together? (Cheers.) In our own Federation, we should have Catholic and Protestant, English, French, Irish and Scotch, and each by his efforts and his success would increase the prosperity and glory of the new Confederacy. (Hear, hear.) He viewed the diversity of races in British North American in this way: we were of different races, not for the purpose of warring against each other, but in order to compete and emulate for the general welfare. We could not do away with the distinctions of race. We could not legislate for the disappearance of the French-Canadians from American soil, but British and French-Canadians alike could appreciate and understand their

position relative to each other. They were placed like great families beside each other, and their contact produced a healthy spirit of emulation. It was a benefit rather than otherwise that we had a diversity of races. Of course, the difficulty, it would be said, would be to deal fairly by the minority."

Needless to say, this is the problem - I prefer to use the word "challenge" - this is the challenge that we face here in the Province of Manitoba.

On Page 12 of the Xerox copy, I am referring to Cartier again, and the next time you're out on the grass of the Legislative Building you can see his statue - stops at the Woodsworth Building - and on that statue are the following words by Cartier, "May the new Province of Manitoba always speak to the inhabitants of the Northwest the language of reason, truth and justice."

We should also note - I'm translating the next sentence - that The Manitoba Act of 1870 was ratified by the Imperial Parliament in 1871, so as to avoid any possibility that The Manitoba Act was unconstitutional as far as the Parliament of Canada is concerned. If you turn to what is Page 13, in the material you have with you, towards the bottom of the page, you will recall that in the 1960's there was a considerable political debate taking place in the Province of Quebec which led in part to the establishment of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the coming to power of Mr. Trudeau and so on. On October 2nd, 1968, Mr. Trudeau was present at the unveiling of the monument to Riel in Regina and on that occasion, Mr. Trudeau spoke as follows:

"For me this is the lesson of Louis Riel. For me this is the reason we are here. A democratic society and system of government, while among the grandest of human concepts, are among the most difficult to implement. In a democracy, it is all too easy for the majority to forget the rights of the minority and for a remote and powerful government to ignore its protests."

Of course, he's referring here to the circumstances of 1885 in northwest Saskatchewan.

"It is all too easy, should disturbances erupt to crush them in the name of law and order. We must never forget that in the long run, a democracy is judged by the way the majority treats the minority."

I wish to emphasize this point because this is the challenge that we all face.

"We must never forget that in the long run a majority is judged by the way a majority treats the minority. Louis Riel's battle is not yet won."

Now, I'd like to conclude with some oral comments that are not included with your written statement.

We all know that the social fabric of Manitoba is changing before our very eyes. While the Francophone population is seeking equal treatment with, from, and by the Anglophone population, other groups are coming forth, seeking the same thing the Francophones seek. The Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages recently formed of representatives of various linguistic groups, 23 in number, has been formed in the last 10 days. What is at stake here? Either Manitoba accepts bilingualism in a multicultural society or we give up the ghost and become a carbon copy of the melting pot society of the United States.

I need hardly remind us that Canadians of all linguistic backgrounds have always rejected the American way and the American melting pot. Let us then be true to our instinct for fair play. The choice is becoming clear. Either we accept official bilingualism in a multicultural society or we try to live with the unreality of a unilingual English only Manitoba. A unilingual Manitoba is an impossibility. It has ever been since 1870 and will be increasingly impossible in the future.

But non-Anglophones now constitute Manitoba's majority. We now have a new permanent linguistic majority. The tables have turned since 1890. I urge this committee and this Legislature to take the high road by doing two things: First, correct the constitutional injustice of 93 years standing to our Francophone fellow citizens by adopting the May 17, 1983, agreement without any alteration. Second, prepare for the future by establishing official bilingualism in a multicultural society.

Thank you.

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

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in Professor Kear's opening statement. He says he does not belong to a political party and he does not intend to belong to any political party. I would like him to further elaborate on that particular theme and say just exactly how does he feel that he is going to be of a part of decision-making, if he does not belong to a political party?

MR. A. KEAR: Very simply. I have the very specific purpose of not belonging to any political party, because I feel therefore I can be more objective in looking at the policies or attitudes of any political party; and secondly, by not belonging to any political party, this does not deny me the right to vote and I don't need to say that how I vote is in the secret of the ballot box.

MR. A. BROWN: On Page 8 of your brief you strongly stated that you would like to see the rights of minorities observed and you are alluding to the effect that the French community in Manitoba is a minority. I wonder, could I have your comment on what is happening in Quebec in a very similar situation, where it's the French majority over there that is not prepared to give any rights to the English minority whatsoever.

MR. A. KEAR: When Bill 101 was adopted, I believe that it was a mistake and I still believe it is a mistake. We cannot deal with permanent linguistic majorities by the brute votes of a majority. That principle doesn't work. The practical way it doesn't work is simply that what you create in the long run is an aggrieved minority. How do you resolve the problem of an aggrieved minority, if all you do is use brute majority votes against them? That's not the way to create a tolerant peaceful happy society. That's not the way that all our citizens can be made to feel as participants, and indeed equal participants. The mistake the P.Q. made in Bill 101 is the same mistake that Manitoba made in 1890. It's unacceptable. It just doesn't work.

MR. A. BROWN: On Page 9 of your brief, you say and I quote, "Look, for instance, at the United Kingdom, inhabited as it were by three great races. Had the diversity of races impeded the glory, the progress, the wealth of England?" Professor Kear, among those three great races there were three different languages spoken, yet England has adopted to speak only in one language. Now you seem to say that England has solved the problem and that you are really condoning what England has done, yet at the same time, you are advocating something else, whether it's two other languages in Canada. Can you tell me where you draw the distinction between England and Canada?

MR. A. KEAR: Very simply. I'm quoting Cartier. I'm not speaking for myself and Cartier on this occasion was speaking in English to the Legislature of the Province of Canada in 1865. This is Cartier, a French-speaking Canadian, who was looking to England as a model for how things should be done in this country. Vis-a-vis, as I understand, the intent of your question, how does Great Britain handle the presence of more than one language? Gaelic is still used in Scotland and Gaelic is still used in Wales. If you want to understand a little bit of the Scottish Nationalist Movement, it's because the Gaelic language has been down-played in Scotland. There's been a similar movement in Wales, not as strong, but for the re-introduction of the teaching of the Welsh language in the schools and in the universities in Wales, and this has been very successfully introduced. The British are accommodating two languages other than English.

MR. A. BROWN: So in other words, Professor Kear, what you are saying that in England, the fact that they are using one common language over there has been very successful?

MR. A. KEAR: But other languages continue to exist and the other languages just will not go away and the more that we emphasize majority rule and that the majority language must govern, the more that social problems are created, not resolved.

MR. A. BROWN: Professor Kear, you made a brief reference to other minority groups within Manitoba and 55 percent of Manitobans are of other linguistic persuasions other than English or French. If I heard you correctly, you seem to think that it really is English and French only that come into question in Manitoba. I wonder, could you elaborate on this and do you think that these people, other linguistic persuasions should have any rights, as far as their language is concerned in Manitoba?

MR. A. KEAR: I do not deny that this is a simple question that you're asking. One way I can respond is to list for you the language groups represented at the founding conference on the 24th of September of the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages: Arab, Bengali, Chinese, Gaelic, Greek, German, Gujuarte - that's probably not pronounced correctly, it's G-U-J-U-A-R-T-E, the language of India, Tamil, Hebrew, Hungarian, Icelandic, Italian, Korean, Ukrainian, Polish, Punjabi, Spanish, Urdu, Portuguese,

Vietnamese, Yiddish and Filipino. All these groups voluntarily came together and on the 24th of September created the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages. I believe that these people have not only come together to - and they have said so publicly - defend the rights of Francophones, but now they want similar treatment from the Government of Manitoba.

MR. A. BROWN: You are correct. I believe there is about 32 different linguistic persuasions within the Province of Manitoba. If I understand correctly, Professor Kear, then you are opposed to what this organization is promoting, that each one of them have linguistic rights within Manitoba.

MR. A. KEAR: It depends how you define linguistic rights. Are you going to put them in the Constitution or do you have rights created by law? There's a difference. There's a distinction.

MR. A. BROWN: I'm speaking about the rights as what this group determines who are asking that their rights be embodied within the amendment that is before us.

MR. A. KEAR: That is not what they want, as I understand it. My understanding is that what they're after is that their languages be taught in the school system. As I understand it, their intention is not that their languages be included in the Constitution.

MR. A. BROWN: Professor Kear, from the way that I understand it, their rights would not be entrenched, however their rights would be mentioned to this effect, that 50 percent of the daily curriculum within the school system could be focused towards whatever linguistic persuasion that that particular group was involved with. Do you, Professor Kear, see this as something that is almost impossible to attain within any society?

MR. A. KEAR: No, I'm not saying that and I must qualify my comments by saying that I'm not familiar with all the details of this group wants. I'm familiar with the principle of what they want. How are you going to deny them what they want? Their argument, and I'm sure you're familiar with their argument, they see that if the Francophone rights are attacked, their rights are potentially under attack. For this reason, as I understand what they're doing, they have come out in favour of French language rights because they want the same thing.

MR. A. BROWN: That's fine, thank you.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Kear, just on that last point. Do you accept that argument that if the rights of Francophones are not expanded or increased there is a danger that the other linguistic groups will then lose ground?

MR. A. KEAR: That's a very good question. What these people want is not going to go away. It's an issue that you, as members of the House, are going to have to deal with. I can't predict the future. All I can say is that this kind of question is not going to disappear.

MR. R. DOERN: Does the reverse hold, that if French language rights are extended, then multilingual rights should also be extended in direct proportion?

MR. A. KEAR: Now you are dealing with the practicalities. I think this is a question that we're not going to settle this afternoon. It's a question that you people will solve when bills are brought before the House in the future, and indeed in the operation in particular of the Department of Education. I can't answer your question on the technical sense.

MR. R. DOERN: You seem to have a great concern about French-speaking Manitobans, but you seem to ignore two other large linguistic minorities, the Ukrainian-speaking and German-speaking. Do you not have any appreciation for their position as the second and third-largest groups in the province?

MR. A. KEAR: I could also point out, Mr. Doern, that you read your newspaper during my presentation; that you did not pay very close attention to my presentation.

MR. R. DOERN: Answer the question. I was listening to your brief.

MR. A. KEAR: I think it's rather difficult to listen to my brief when you're reading a newspaper.

MR. R. DOERN: That's very interesting, but would you answer the question of whether you have no appreciation . . .

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Point of order, it's perfectly all right to insist on an answer to a question, but no member appearing before this committee has to answer a question. I would suggest that Mr. Doern's questions are repetitive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. Mr. Doern, do you have a further line of questioning?

MR. R. DOERN: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask Professor Kear whether it would not be the case that official multilingualism could follow from your views; that perhaps the logical extension of the position you're putting is that all languages should be entrenched in the Constitution, and equivalent grants provided.

MR. A. KEAR: I didn't say that, Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm asking you whether that might logically follow from your position.

MR. A. KEAR: That may be, but I cannot predict the future. I know that under Manitoba's Constitution, there are two languages currently with equal status. I know that under Canada's Constitution, there are two languages with equal status. These are facts that I know. I cannot predict the future.

MR. R. DOERN: Is it your position that the other linguistic minorities in Manitoba, that their rights are

inextricably tied up with the rights of French-speaking people?

MR. A. KEAR: I'm saying that the Manitoba Association for Promotion of Ancestral Languages takes this position.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you?

MR. A. KEAR: What they want is equal treatment. Now how would you, as a Legislature, grant equal treatment? I understand from your position, Mr. Doern, from the news media - and I could be incorrect - that you are opposed to equality of treatment between English and French.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Professor Kear, it's not in order to ask questions of members on the committee.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am simply attempting to ask Professor Kear whether - as a preamble to my question, you have put forward an argument and you've quoted this new association, formed only 10 days ago, that they have argued, and you seem to support that view, that all of these rights are dependent upon one another. You put it in the negative sense that, if the French-speaking community lost some rights, the rights of these other groups would also follow.

My question to you is: do you believe that, or did you just cite that as an example of some kind? You appear to support that position.

MR. A. KEAR: I'm saying two things. I cannot predict the future, but what I am also suggesting is a tolerance amongst all groups in Manitoba is one way to get political peace in this province. Tolerance is not easy. Tolerance is easy to say in words, but very difficult to put into practice.

MR. R. DOERN: If rights were extended and entrenched for French-speaking Manitobans, do you think that would have any impact on the other linguistic groups?

MR. A. KEAR: These other linguistic groups seem to think so. Indeed French and English has been entrenched in Manitoba's Constitution since 1870, and that's not going to be taken away.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you think that will have an impact on the German, Ukrainian, Polish, Icelandic . . .

MR. A. KEAR: These people by coming together to form this group seem to believe so.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you also think that if linguistic rights and services are extended for Francophones, that they should, in fact, also be extended for the other groups?

MR. A. KEAR: I keep repeating, I cannot predict the future. This is a question that you're going to have to deal with.

MR. R. DOERN: None of us can predict the future, but is it in your judgment that this should happen, or do you support that happening?

MR. A. KEAR: I support the position of la Société franco-manitobaine, of which I am a member.

MR. R. DOERN: I see. Then on Page 13 of your brief, you quote Mr. Trudeau's speech at the Riel Monument in Regina in 1968. There are two particular quotes in there. "Democracy is judged by the way the majority treats the minority," And, "It's all too easy for the majority to forget the rights of the minority."

Do you only understand that in the linguistic sense, or do you understand that in the political sense, for example, the way Eastern Canada has often treated Western Canada?

MR. A. KEAR: The issue we're dealing with is linguistic rights in Manitoba. That is what Article 23 is all about.

MR. R. DOERN: You also quoted the Prime Minister as saying that, "It's all too easy, should disturbances erupt, to crush them in the name of law and order." I was wondering whether you were disappointed when the Prime Minister introduced The War Measures Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. That's . . .

MR. A. KEAR: Do I have the right to refuse to answer a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you don't have the right, because the question's out of order. Further questions, Mr. Doern?

MR. R. DOERN: I would simply ask you, Professor Kear, you seem to hold up Prime Minister Trudeau in your brief on Page 13 as a wonderful Canadian who is concerned about the rights of minorities. I'm asking you whether you think that his actions in office have borne that belief out, or whether you have been disappointed in his actions in office?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question's out of order. Further question, Mr. Doern?

Further questions? Mr. Penner.
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Professor Kear, Professor Kear, in your remarks, you made various references to this MAPAL organization that was founded 10 days ago, the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages. They held, as I understand it, an organization meeting some 10 days ago. Were you at that meeting?

MR. A. KEAR: No.

MR. H. GRAHAM: You say that you are a member of the Societe Franco-Manitoban. Do you know if they were represented at that meeting?

MR. A. KEAR: I have no idea. My source of information is the material published in La Liberté, a French language weekly published in St. Boniface.

MR. H. GRAHAM: That's all I wanted to ask.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members for Professor Kear? Seeing none, Professor Kear, thank you very much for your presentation here.

MR. A. KEAR: I without reservations support the May 17th agreement without subsequent amendments.
Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
Dr. Rey Pagtakhan. Rey Pagtakhan. I don't know if I'm pronouncing that correctly.
Gordon W. Pollon.

MR. G. POLLON: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, you can all relax now, there's no formal presentation. I'm a private citizen; my remarks are addressed to all of you.

I have been told that the members of the government pretty well laid it on the line that, regardless of what happened, they were going to proceed with the legislation. Now, in spite of what I said, that I didn't have any notes to hand around, I've got one or two comments on record, if you don't mind.

First of all, I'm getting sick and tired of being called a bigot and redneck. I have never called anyone a bigot or redneck for the simple reason that the people who call other people bigots and rednecks appear to be the largest of all. That's a fact.

It's pretty important for me to stand up here against all you gentlemen. I was nervous, you know.

A MEMBER: Relax.

MR. G. POLLON: Sooner or later I will.

First of all, to entrench anything, even though the experts talk about entrenchment and they say that it has to be, to me it's the most undemocratic thing that I can think of. Can you honestly believe that I think that Trudeau or Pawley or Desjardins or the Queen of England or whoever could lay down the law that's going to be binding on our grandchildren and their grandchildren? Nothing is forever. As a matter of fact, what little I've heard, the majority of the comments have been living in the past. They say, history. Well, quite frankly, I think that's what it is - history. I think that we should think about today.

Somebody said something about the new organization wanting ancestral rights, linguistic rights. I was trying to check the other day just what that meant. There is a certain letter on my historical background which leaves me to believe that we started in Italy, went to France, then to England and then to Canada; that's on my father's side. On my mother's side, I believe it's Irish and Scotch. I married a woman whose mother was Swedish. Now, would you like to take four or five minutes and tell me what my son is?

MR. R. DOERN: Canadian.

MR. G. POLLON: You know Riel had the right idea. Few people understand what Riel really was after; he

fought for the rights of Manitoba. He was dead set against the interference from Ottawa. There's no doubt about it, read your history. As a matter of fact for simple reading - pardon me, don't tell Eric Wells I said simple reading - but good reading, is Eric Well's book on "Winnipeg and the New West." Read it, you'll be amazed.

Now, no one likes the various ethnic groups, the minority groups, and I certainly am a minority. I don't think there is a majority group in Manitoba, I don't think so. If you know one, Mr. Chairman, I could stand to be interrupted and someone tell me. Is it Scotch, is it English, is it German, Ukrainian? I don't think there's 55 or 60 percent, I think we're all in the same boat.

I also believe that these imports from the east, taken with those dissidents in Manitoba, representing what they think - it's a French group in Manitoba - are very very few in number. I really believe that the average Franco-Manitoban does not want to be created as looking like a super race. I've gone through sections of the community. It was my pleasure to go to the Somerset-Notre Dame area and propose a toast for one in our office who was French, and she married a Ukrainian.

Now, of course, I know and you know there's one way to get around people assimilating themselves, moving from one part of the country to another. You can always create a ghetto if you want, but I refuse to believe that the French people in Manitoba are in a ghetto; I absolutely refuse to believe that. I was out to Notre Dame, Somerset, not long ago, stopped and had coffee, did a little shopping, talked to people, delightful people. I've got excellent friends in Montreal and quite frankly I'm going to tell you something else.

I know that when you get 4 or 5 million people, in this case French people in Quebec, they have a right for their destiny. I'm also going to tell you in my opinion that this group of French-Canadian members of our federal Cabinet in my opinion - you may differ - have no right to tell me what to do in Manitoba. You see, I'm one of these average people that just happen to be talking. I think I'm talking for at least 950,000 people in Manitoba; as a matter of fact, I could probably enlarge that.

I really don't know, Mr. Chairman, how difficult it must have been for you to sit here and listen to written speeches, speech after another speech, because there is a lot of repetition. People, as far as I'm concerned, are living in the past.

Now, what's Trudeau going to do next? He's trying to do something in Ontario. Do you think he's going to get very far in Saskatchewan or Alberta? Do you, as representatives of the government, want to drive me to Saskatchewan? By the way, that's where I was born, but I like Manitoba. It's a great place, except for some tough winter months, falls, summers and springs are ideal, and the people are good.

I don't know of any single person, whether he or she be French or German or Ukrainian, that can't come to live on my street, and as far as I know I can go and live on their street. They could start up a business. They can erect a store I think on any street, any town in Manitoba, and they can put the sign up in French if they want, or in Chinese, or in Swedish. I doubt very much if I'm wrong. I think we have a freedom here that's better than anything I can think of. The only thing

we have in common and the best thing, included in that freedom is a common language. I can go to anyplace where there is a predominant Mennonite group or a Jewish community and I can talk to them.

I absolutely refuse to believe that anybody in this room, or Mr. Pawley, or Mr. Desjardins, or anybody else, can bring before this group a Franco-Manitoban, 25 years of age, born and raised in Manitoba, who can't speak English. By the year 2000, old people like myself would be here and, by the natural assimilation, would just pass on.

The unfortunate thing is, as far as I'm concerned, the present legislation put forward by the present government does not take into the consideration the majority feelings of the population. You see, I believe firmly that if the Constitution is going to be a millstone around our neck for any other reason, as well as this problem, change it, because we live in a different time.

You talk about your reading the newspaper, the Chairman just yawned. I had to get that crack in, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. DOERN: It's on the record now.

MR. G. POLLON: You mean this is being recorded? I told you to sit back and relax, there are no notes to look at. Probably the media and the fellow in there is enjoying the few brief minutes.

You know, Mr. Penner is a neighbour of mine; he lives right across the street. I should really have gone and knocked on the door and talked to him about it, but I guess he has a lot of problems. I can understand it. If I was in his position, I wouldn't be too happy about people knocking on the door. Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to ramble.

I do want to tell you again that I really think if I had my way I would have a very simple plebiscite or referendum for the people of Manitoba and say, "Do you want Manitoba to be bilingual"? Don't hang us on the Constitution, don't hang us on what was done in 1870 or 1890, whatever the technical date was. We've got to progress; you have got to live in the future. If you think it's going to be a problem, as it is right now, wait until another 50 years. What are you going to do, change the Constitution?

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, ladies, forgive the rambling. Thanks for the water and there can't be any questions, it's so informal.

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

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Pollon, I'm very intrigued by your presentation, because I detect in your presentation a concern that comes from the heart, an attempt on your part to express your own feelings on an issue that probably you are very surprised to see occur in Manitoba. I would like to ask you, Mr. Pollon, if you have ever appeared before a legislative committee of the Province of Manitoba at any previous time in your life?

MR. G. POLLON: No. The only committee I ever appeared before - I'm not too sure it's the same as

this one - we had a committee on jurisdiction. It had to do with the printing trades, but I appeared on behalf of our company, but that was entirely different. It would just to outline our contract against the other contracts. The answer really I think is no.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Pollon, could you tell me what prompted you to appear before this committee at this particular time?

MR. G. POLLON: I think I would like to believe that I'm an ordinary Manitoba citizen interested in Manitoba. The sad part is that there are not enough other people. I was distressed to find private citizen after private citizen not here, but I understand that because obligations do fill their time, so that's really what prompted me.

First of all, years and years ago I was president of what they called the Greater Winnipeg Young Mens' Liberal Club and I was a Liberal all my life, until I voted for Trudeau the first time. I now am a card-carrying member of the Conservative Party. The minute they get out of line, I'll do the same thing.

A DELEGATE: Walk carefully, Harry.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. G. POLLON: I'm sorry, Mr. Penner made a remark.

MR. H. GRAHAM: It was not my intention to . . .

MR. G. POLLON: I don't think Mr. Penner should back off the remark. I'm sorry, I didn't hear him.

HON. R. PENNER: No, I said just wait, just listen for Mr. Mulroney . . .

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: It was not my intention to ask you how you voted or what party you belong to, or anything of that nature; that belongs quite properly in a person's own private domain. But in your remarks, I detected a real concern on your part about the direction that the present Prime Minister of Canada is leading our country with respect to language use and language rights. Was I correct in that?

MR. G. POLLON: Very definitely, very definitely.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Pollon, do you believe that the Prime Minister is continuing in that direction and he is going to continue to put forward a bilingual policy for the whole of Canada by attacking probably the weakest governments first?

MR. G. POLLON: No doubt about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Mr. Storie, on a point of order.

HON. J. STORIE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I recognize that Mr. Graham would like to take the opportunity to have a card-carrying member expound on the weaknesses of the Liberal Party. I think we should try and focus our discussion on the amendment that's before the committee.

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

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes. That's why I asked the question about this particular government. I was trying to get away from the Conservative aspect and get back to the NDP aspect of it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Are you finished, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: And I would like to put that question again to Mr. Pollon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that questions describing a national conspiracy theory to the Liberals and its application in Manitoba flow directly from Mr. Pollon's brief. Perhaps you could rephrase the question.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Pollon, you are expressing your concern that the change in language policy that is presently before the Manitoba Assembly is a question that will vitally affect Manitobans for years to come. Is that correct?

MR. G. POLLON: Very definitely and particularly in the near future.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Pollon, were you concerned when the Province of New Brunswick declared that they would be the first officially bilingual province in Canada?

MR. G. POLLON: I don't think I'm qualified to comment on New Brunswick. They're a different province, and even though Mr. Trudeau and the influences down East are trying to make Canada bilingual, I view that in my opinion as something which I shouldn't comment any more than, for instance, I think there's a parallel here. I was told the reason that my No. 51 didn't come up this morning was somebody, a Dr. Potter, was here from Montreal. Now what does a person from Montreal got to do with the Province of Manitoba? So I don't want to comment too much on New Brunswick, and I don't think that she should have commented too much on Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that this line of questioning flows directly from the brief.
Mr. Graham, please proceed.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Pollon. Would you — (Interjection) — no, I'm sincere,

I want to get an opinion of an honest Manitoban - be in favour then, Mr. Pollon, of Manitoba adopting a Made-in-Manitoba bilingual policy, even though it does not maybe meet the needs or the desires of a Federal Government? Do you think that Manitoba should have the right to determine its own policy on bilingualism?

MR. G. POLLON: Mr. Chairman, I think that Manitobans should have the right to decide and declare what they want on language rights. If you took that, you wouldn't even mention the word "bilingual." You wouldn't even mention it, if you were starting from scratch.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, you're probably getting down to the point I wanted. If you think that Manitoba has the right to do that, do you think it would be only fitting and proper that the province consult with local municipal governments, that the province take time and consult with every interested group in Manitoba, that the province take time to study the implications of all the various proposals that are put before them?

MR. G. POLLON: I'm not too sure that I agree that Manitoba - you say, "should" have the right. I'm not too sure if they have the right technically under the Constitution, but they should have under the proper Constitution. The government is elected to do those things that they think and the government, when thrown out of office, being replaced by another government, they should do the things that the people want.

I've heard the comment made that the present government should be allowed to do this sort of thing, but then the present government is bringing in legislation which is going to prevent future governments from making changes, and that's the sad part — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think it's important to have this because it's important that we hear from the voice of Manitoba's citizens.

Mr. Pollon, it took the Federal Government some 13 years to entrench in our Constitution an official bilingual policy. Do you think it is fair that this province is asking us to make that kind of decision in seven months?

MR. G. POLLON: No. I think that I would like to approach - of course, I can't approach your question, can I? The fact that the government took 13 years is because the Government of Canada does not represent Canada, it stops short at Kenora or thereabouts. Now you know perfectly well, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Canada is made up of representatives from Canada east of that boundary. No wonder it took 13 years.

I'm not too sure if I've answered your question, I think I was trying to think too hard of what the implication of the question was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham, further questions for clarification of the brief?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government finally moved with the consensus of most

Canadians. Do you think the province should move ahead on a constitutional amendment without consensus occurring?

MR. G. POLLON: There is always a price for leadership, and maybe it's about time that Manitobans stood up. Maybe they should do that. Maybe they should just say, look, what we want is something for Manitoba. I'm sure that it would apply for Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I'll admit defeat and pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Just a couple of questions, Mr. Pollon. You made a number of remarks about the role of the Federal Government in regard to the deal or agreement. Are you saying that they have been too influential in this deal, or are you saying they're calling the shots?

MR. G. POLLON: It could be a combination of both. Isn't that a fact, they are certainly ploughing thousands of dollars into it?

MR. R. DOERN: Where do you see them pouring thousands or millions of dollars into it?

MR. G. POLLON: Well I guess, a small amount which would maybe be 100,000 would be the subsidization of the lawsuit regarding the traffic ticket. That's only an example.

MR. R. DOERN: Right. One of the points that the government has made all along is that private citizens have the right to appear before this committee. You're one of the few who have. Do you think that the average person is likely to find it within himself to come and appear before this committee, or do you think it's necessary for another vehicle for the expression of public opinion?

MR. G. POLLON: I think I made no doubt in my mind that a simple referendum - don't get tied up with any extended verbiage, what not - to the Manitoba citizens, do you or do you not want Manitoba to be bilingual? In that way, they would have the vehicle for expressing themselves.

I came down here, and I was 110th or certainly 100th on the list, that was I don't know how many weeks ago. I came back, and I see private citizen after private citizen just not being here and I can understand that. They haven't got the time off, they haven't got the expertise of an association behind them where they have paid secretaries, typing staff, etc., etc.

MR. R. DOERN: So you're saying that whereas thousands of people will vote in a plebiscite, very few will come forward because of the nature of this, or the lack of familiarity, or the sort of foreboding presence of coming before the committee might scare a lot of people off.

MR. G. POLLON: I guess it scared hell out of me, and I guess I have to agree that - yeah, thousands. Certainly

thousands would turn out for a plebiscite or a referendum, as against coming up here.

MR. R. DOERN: Can you understand the argument which has been advanced, I think, by some government spokesmen and by some newspaper people that a referendum or a plebiscite is undemocratic? Does that make any sense to you?

MR. G. POLLON: Well I don't think because they say it's undemocratic, it doesn't mean that I think it is. How else do you get the voice of the people?

MR. R. DOERN: Further questions for clarification of the brief?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: My final question is, having had this experience, will you come back some day and give us your views on some other questions?

MR. G. POLLON: I would like to be a little more sure of myself in making a presentation, and have the time to have secretarial assistance. I can't type.

MR. R. DOERN: Apply for a government grant.

MR. G. POLLON: I'm telling you, if the Canada Council would give me some of the money they throw around I could organize a few experts on this thing, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions from members?
Mr. Ashton.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to prolong the questioning here, especially following the line of questioning where members seem to be wanting to say what they think about the issue rather than what witnesses feel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question please?

MR. S. ASHTON: I ask you as a bottom line, do I understand you correctly in that you're saying that you're basically seeing no need for French services in Manitoba at this point in time? Is that your basic objection?

MR. G. POLLON: If there is a group of people any place that want their services in French, that's fine. If they want it in Notre Dame or whatever they say, that's fine. If the Ukrainians in - what's a good city, town? Beausejour, okay. If they want it, that's fine, but the entrenchment of the French language for somebody in Oak Bank or in Clanwilliam when there's probably not a person of French extract there, that to me is just not right.

MR. S. ASHTON: The government has attempted to account for that by saying that there would be services provided where there is significant demand. Now do you agree with that or do you feel, for example, that the Provincial Government shouldn't be providing any services in French? What do you think is the best way of approaching it?

MR. G. POLLON: I can't ask you questions, I understand that. I didn't think it was a significant number for one person in Winnipeg to demand a parking ticket, I didn't think it was a significant number. So that means if they accept that, then somebody in Clanwilliam can go in and say, I want my ticket in French.

MR. S. ASHTON: So, in other words, you're basically saying that if it's some local area which wants to provide service in French they should, but not, say, in the City of Winnipeg or other such areas.

MR. G. POLLON: If it's demanded. Anytime you get a small - no, I've got to back up, I was going to use the word "ghetto," but a small group, another word for it, a very small minority that would like to do this, that's fine. In other words, they set up an interpretation centre; there's nothing wrong with that. Have an officer there that can interpret and translate for them.

MR. S. ASHTON: So do you think if we could overcome the problem you mentioned with significant demand, that would solve some of your concerns, or would you still have a concern about providing that kind of service?

MR. G. POLLON: I would say, if there's a community that really couldn't communicate well in English, that the government were well within their rights to put up an office, translation, interpreter, because sooner or later it's going to disappear anyway, but that's an isolated case, where you need a translator, we need an interpreter. If somebody gets in trouble with a farmer a few miles down the road and he can't understand the summons and he's 70 years old, almost as old as I am, then I think that's okay; no problem at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members for Mr. Pollon? Seeing none, Mr. Pollon, thank you very much for coming forward today.

MR. G. POLLON: Thank you very much, I'll come back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A. Warkentin, J.G. Russel, C.J. Wenaas, Remi Smith, Lucien Loiselle, Riel Teffaine, Léo Teillet, Guy Savoie.
Mike Kibzey.

MR. M. KIBZEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislative Committee. My subject is the proposed amendment to Article 23 of The Manitoba act.

Mr. Chairman, and this is the way I feel: Manitoba, you're the bond that binds our great Dominion, east to west, from foam to foam. That used to be our anthem in Manitoba. We sang it every morning in Gilbert Plains. Why it disappeared, I don't know, but I believe in it.

My name is Michael Kibzey, Veteran RCAF service overseas, World War II.

The hearing taking place this month is the cornerstone of our democratic foundation of Manitoba and Canada. The future of our children and their children are at stake in decisions taking place now. In short, are the ethnic people to be relegated to third-class status? Is this the payment for service in fighting for our country?

The amendment to Article 23 will lay the roots for divisiveness for centuries to come. At the present,

families which have intermarried will suffer. Is this the torch to throw to our children? Definitely not!

We are told by the Franco-Manitoban Society and their cohorts that the rights of minorities will be protected in the event the French language is implemented. The facts don't bear the truth. Where, in 1965, was the French support when the battle to have Ukrainian language a credit at the University of Manitoba. At the Legislature of Manitoba, the MLAs, Edward Schreyer, who is now the Governor-General and John Tanchuk, deceased from Emerson, a Liberal MLA, fought and convinced that the Ukrainians should be a credit. They won and Ukrainian became a language credit.

As a Ukrainian veteran of World World II overseas and honoured to represent the RCAF veterans at the Governor General's Investiture of January 22, 1979, I am proud to be associated with Ukrainian veterans who fought in World War II. They fought and died for democracy and freedom.

Ukrainian-Canadian participation during World War II was the greatest per capita racial group in Canada. We cannot pass off and ignore this contribution to the glory of Canada.

I protest in the strongest vein the NDP, many who disregard and show disrespect to veterans and their families, and this is a fact; and the group or singular people to speak for the Ukrainian people here in Manitoba. It is their democratic right to speak, but not to purport to represent Ukrainians. I refer to Messrs. Terry Prychitko, Myran Spolsky and Dr. Neil McDonald. They have the right to discuss, but they cannot commit the Ukrainians. I'm not committing the Ukrainians, they can speak for themselves, but veterans, yes.

May it be understood that there were three waves of immigrants to Canada. The first and second generation built and fought for this country and laid the foundation. They lived in sod houses to build it. After World War II, the waves that came did not suffer, but were aided in every way. Now we find that many of them consider themselves superior.

The NDP government is directly responsible for this impasse. At Trudeau's bidding and Joyal as his Lieutenant, financed by public treasury, are doing everything to pit brother against brother and sister against sister. This within the basic framework of many Manitoba families.

As one reads and listens to the hearings of the proceedings that are taking place in Morris, Dauphin, Brandon, Thompson and Ste. Rose du Lac, the resounding effect has been far-reaching and pervasive, that one is left with wonder what is happening to our Canadian unity, when the seeds of this French issue to entrench French in the Constitution. Saskatchewan, Alberta, B.C. and the rest of Canada are watching and awaiting the results of Manitoba.

The people must be heard and not have an imposition by political expediency. Mayor William Norrie, Al Skowron and W. Chornopyski are absolutely right in having the people heard in this referendum. To do otherwise is to bow to dictatorship. During the last campaign this Manitoba 23 was not an issue, now it is.

The NDP have not a mandate to implement, but must hear what the vote will be and call an election. The people will decide and decide they shall, democracy

must prevail - and by that I'll refer to a referendum of Winnipeg. Mayor Norrie, by virtue of NDP abrogation, is now leading a referendum and the people of Winnipeg will decide, along with the rest of the people, which course we're going to take and the majority will have a bearing on what will happen in the future.

Getting back to trust, we had some of the people saying that the French can be trusted. Well, I had experience in Ottawa for seven years. Our company, Lucas Construction, along with five other companies, on the Great Slave Lake railway, that's from Pine Point, Hay River to Rome, Alberta. That was the railway that was built by CN for CPR, for Cominco. Our company took a bath of roughly \$3.5 million, Ginter lost and the rest of the people. Now we took those claims to the Federal Government because we couldn't afford lawyers. I initiated those claims, along with some of my friends; Schreyer was one of the people helping us in the House of Commons and Hazen Argue in the Senate. Now this is a fact and it's in Hansard.

Just giving you an example of the trust that we had, during the course of our work to get a hearing by the Transport Committee, of which CN was deadly opposed, we had a situation, an impasse, where you have 20 members, just like on this committee; 11 of them are Liberals and the rest opposition. The Chairman and vice-Chairman are Liberals. It happened that they pulled out three western members of the Liberal Committee and one of them was A.B. Osler here in Winnipeg, Ab Douglas from Assiniboia and Pat Mahoney a vice-chairman of, at that time, Calgary South. They supplanted them with the Eastern Liberals to knock us out, not to have the vote. Jack Horner, by the way, was the chairman of the Conservative Caucus. They boycotted that caucus because of this impasse. Two of the members were brought back and the other refused to come back. We had a concurrence of the committee; we won a vote, and that's taking the term of seven years.

It went to the House of Commons, it was concurred by the House of Commons. For a year-and-a half, we were playing with judges and C.N. vetoed. Our eminent retired judge, Judge Freedman, vetoed him because they were afraid of what Judge Freedman would decide. We felt that Judge Freedman is one of the most honest judges you can deal with and who eventually - an impasse of a year fighting with judges - we had the "godfather" Trudeau appointed, by Order-in-Council, Chief Justice Trites.

As a result, we got our rear ends beat, and we didn't get a cent. On top of that, we haven't even seen the results of the hearings. Now, that is the way Trudeau operates, Order-in-Council.

Furthermore, just an example, talking about justice, you will hear the federal, the cheats, in the Canadian Industrial Renewal Board, you don't have one person that is other than French Canadian, and this is dated April, May, June, 1983. These are people who are appointed to this board.

As a result, I feel that the only way we can have any democratic, shall we say, presentation of our feelings is to have a referendum in Winnipeg at the same time as Brandon, whenever they have their referendum.

Any questions, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kibzey. Questions from members for Mr. Kibzey?

Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question appears out of the first paragraph in Mr. Kibzey's brief in which I quote: "In short are the ethnic people to be relegated to third class status? Is this the payment for service in fighting for our country?" I was just wondering, Mr. Kibzey, when you were making this reference to third class status, who would you then determine to be the second class?

MR. M. KIBZEY: I'm referring to the people other than the French and English. It would relegate to myself as a veteran and my children.

MR. A. BROWN: On the paragraph right after that you say that Article 23 will lay the roots for divisiveness for centuries to come. Are you experiencing that divisiveness at the present time amongst the Ukrainian community?

MR. M. KIBZEY: There is divisiveness, yes, at the present time.

MR. A. BROWN: Do you think that there is going to be more divisiveness amongst the Ukrainian community and also other ethnic communities as a result of the proposal that was made the other day where other ethnic languages are also going to be receiving some rights as to 50 percent of education, other than English or French?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The question deals with material introduced in another brief presented to the committee and was not referred to by Mr. Kibzey and for that reason is an extraneous line of questioning to his brief. Do you have another question, Mr. Brown?

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I think that this question is rather important because that particular thing, which was sanctioned we understand by a Cabinet Minister within the government, and I would really like to hear Mr. Kibzey's views on that particular article.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, Mr. Brown, you can find another way of questioning Mr. Kibzey on his concerns regarding ethnic organizations within the province, which he did raise in his brief. But certainly direct reference to material contained in another brief to which no reference was made in his brief would be out of order.

Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, you mentioned that Article 23 presents some roots for divisiveness for centuries to come. Is Article 23 the only concern that you have or are there other concerns?

MR. M. KIBZEY: Mr. Brown, Manitoba 23, I'm in favour of it as it stands; it's the amendment that I'm dead against. The amendment will create divisiveness. If it is a statute, you can change it, one government can change it, but not, there's a word for it - the entrenchment. If this amendment is entrenched, that's

where the divisiveness will come in of our province and our country.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you. I believe those are the questions that I had, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Further questions for Mr. Kibzey from members of the committee?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: On Page 2 of your brief, Mr. Kibzey, again you seem to contend that the government proposals are causing disunity, yet it's the intention of the government to cause unity. They think, in fact, that this is going to result in greater unity. What is your observation on that?

MR. M. KIBZEY: Which paragraph are you referring to?

MR. R. DOERN: Well, the one that starts out, as one reads and listens and so on. You said the resounding effect has been far reaching and pervasive, that one is left with wonder at what is happening to our Canadian unity.

MR. M. KIBZEY: Yes, I see that. I absolutely believe that the government, bringing this amendment through the backdoor with the help of Trudeau, or at Trudeau's bidding, is definitely going to split the families wide open, the people that are intermarried. They are having problems now. What is going to happen to our children? There is no way under the circumstances that we can, shall we say, condone this action. The present government is supposed to be democratic, but this is dictatorship of the first magnitude.

MR. R. DOERN: So your concern is partly the legislation and partly the deal or the manner in which the government has handled the matter.

MR. M. KIBZEY: I don't agree with the way they handled the legislation and I don't agree with the deal that they're pulling off.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you also say that the government should call an election and do you recall any discussion of this issue during the last election campaign?

MR. M. KIBZEY: There was no mention that during the campaign because, gentlemen, I was at that campaign and there was no mention at that campaign on this issue, and I remember I was sitting here when Mr. Green was here. He said that as a result this piece of legislation that has been, shall we say, foisted on the Canadian public or primarily Manitoba is a political fraud perpetrated by the NDP Government.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you also recall the campaign slogan of the government "we listen"?

MR. M. KIBZEY: Not only we listen, but Howard Pawley said, "My door is going to be open to the public."

They've got an iron door and an iron curtain there. I should know, I got Schreyer into the party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.
Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: The other point I wanted to ask you about is at the top of Page 2, you make reference to Messrs. Terry Prychitko, Myron Spolsky and Dr. Neil McDonald . . .

MR. M. KIBZEY: . . . (Ukrainian spoken) . . . we should look into . . .

MR. R. DOERN: . . . these people claim to speak and claim to represent the Ukrainian Canadian community. Do they, No. 1; and secondly, if they don't, who do you think does?

MR. M. KIBZEY: . . . (Ukrainian spoken) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Kibzey, your questions are coming from Mr. Doern, please ignore the others.

MR. R. DOERN: There are other questions coming from the Member for Flin Flon.

MR. M. KIBZEY: There's an interjection here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's for me to control, not for you to control. Mr. Doern's question.
Mr. Kibzey.

MR. M. KIBZEY: Repeat the question, please.

MR. R. DOERN: Terry Prychitko, Myron Spolsky and others claim to be speaking for Ukrainian Canadians. Are they speaking for themselves or are they speaking for Ukrainian Canadians?

MR. M. KIBZEY: They have the right to speak for themselves. They have the right to get involved in anything they want, but I don't like, what we call, Trudeau-Pawley lackeys. We're pretending that they represent the Ukrainians, because we have Ukrainians that can speak for themselves.

MR. R. DOERN: Whom do you think speaks for the Ukrainian Canadians, either organizations, or . . . ?

MR. M. KIBZEY: There are organizations. There is the National Federation; we didn't hear from them at all. Nobody mentioned them, that's one of the them. They have the left group.

We had, by the way, what's her name, speaking? Was it Fletcher?

MR. R. DOERN: Paula Fletcher.

MR. M. KIBZEY: Paula Fletcher, well, as far I'm concerned she has the right to speak, but she's way out of line. It's people like that, it's their democratic right, but I feel that we have other Ukrainians that could speak on behalf of the Ukrainians and on behalf of

other groups, but I don't like these, what we call, cooked-up ad hoc committees, especially the one we had 10 days ago.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you respect the position of the Ukrainian-Canadian Business and Professional Mens' Club?

MR. M. KIBZEY: I absolutely do. My first duty as the Governor-General's aide in '79 was to oversee a dinner between the Ukrainian Professional Businessmen's Association at the Winnipeg Inn, which is now the Westin. You have what we call the very good class of people, many of them really do represent Ukrainians, some of them, there are other people, they disagree, but as a whole they are a consensus of good Ukrainian stock.

MR. R. DOERN: Given your background and your assessment of the Ukrainian-Canadian community and your support of a plebiscite or referendum, what percentage of Ukrainian-Canadians do you think will vote to have the government withdraw its proposals?

MR. M. KIBZEY: I wouldn't be, shall we say, facetious or overbearing on that point. I have talked to people just in the country, and everyone of them on Saturday including Mayor Juba, who supports Norrie, if I may say so, they are definitely for the referendum.

MR. R. DOERN: So you think that in lieu of an election, the Provincial Government should very carefully examine and assess the results of public referendums and plebiscites.

MR. M. KIBZEY: Not only that. In the event the referendum goes in favour, I feel the Provincial Government should resign and call an election.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Kibzey? Seeing none, Mr. Kibzey, thank you very much . . .

MR. M. KIBZEY: Mr. Chairman, just one second before I go, may it be understood that before I joined the service, my father had a coal mine at Estevan, Saskatchewan. He had three sons that went in the Services. None of them stayed back. You know, mining was an essential industry.

Also, I am an honorary member of Local 7606, United Mine Workers of America. I don't like the unions maneuvering, which they do maneuver, and by virtue of affiliate membership control the party called the NDP directly. I know for a fact, because at this party convention, I was national strategy chairman, where I defeated Al Mackling for the chairmanship.

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

Tom Cohoe, Tom Cohoe. Mario Sosa, Mario Sosa. Ron Nash, Ron Nash. Neil McDonald, Manitoba 23.

DR. N. McDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you wait until the briefs are distributed please?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, H. Harapiak: Proceed, Mr. McDonald.

DR. N. McDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the last few weeks, several individuals representing a significant number of ethnocultural groups and associations in this province became vitally concerned about the opposition being expressed towards the proposed amendment to Article 23 of The Manitoba Act. These individuals and groups formed a loose coalition in an attempt to co-ordinate a positive response to the proposed amendments. Calling itself Manitoba 23, the group has since sought to widen its base of support and to serve an informational and mediating role in what has now become increasingly an intemperate debate. It is important to note that Manitoba 23 has never purported to represent each and every ethnocultural group in this province or the membership of these groups. It is a coalition of the leadership of these groups and of interested individuals. Today, I am acting as the spokesperson for this group.

In this brief, Manitoba 23 does not intend to review the legal and historical arguments associated with this issue. These arguments have been very well articulated in several briefs to this committee. We want to say, however, that Manitoba 23 supports the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as presented in the Legislature by the Attorney-General on July 4, 1983, with the exception of the amendment 23.7(1)(b) tabled on September 6, 1983 with reference to municipalities and school boards.

Manitoba 23 considers the original amendment to be a matter of justice. It is our view that when the Greenway Government of 1890 passed The Official Language Act of Manitoba making English the sole official language of this province, a gross miscarriage of justice was perpetrated on all the citizens of this province. The first affected were, of course, the French-speaking residents of Manitoba who had confidence in the written constitutional guarantees of their government, but suddenly discovered that their language was now without status in the Manitoba Legislature and courts.

The second group affected were the English-speaking people of this province. Three generations have now been raised in the mistaken concept that English was the sole official language of Manitoba, and that any recognition of the French fact in this province was either a privilege accorded by a majority or a courtesy accorded by the government. This fact has been all too evident during these hearings.

Finally, all other ethnocultural groups were indirectly affected by the 1890 decision, and directly so by the 1916 revision of The Education Act which made English the sole official language of instruction in Manitoba.

Manitoba 23, therefore, supports fully the July 4 amendments to Article 23 of The Manitoba Act as a matter of justice to all Manitobans. It is our conviction that no elected person or citizen should tolerate or encourage the government to let an injustice stand. This situation is a classic illustration of the axiom that justice delayed for one is justice denied for all.

After the aboriginal peoples, the French were the first immigrants to settle in this country, followed by the Loyalists and the British, followed yet again by the peoples of many other lands. In the late 1800's and the early 1900's, the evidence shows that Canadians had a certain vision of its immigrants. They were seen by many as "drawers of water and hewers of wood." From these earlier times too, there grew up the notion that the most favoured immigrants were those who were most easily assimilated into the Anglo-Celtic mainstream. The unassimilated, it was argued, were a threat to national unity. Indeed the 1916 law abolishing other languages of instruction was seen as an attempt to prevent the so-called Balkanization of Manitoba. There is no evidence, however, to suggest that the 1896 Laurier-Greenway compromise did not work.

Today, Canadians hold a different vision of their country. Recognition of ethnicity is an important and valued component of this vision. We have come to realize that it is possible to be a good productive Canadian while maintaining a specific cultural identity as well as the language of one's heritage. The amendments to Article 23 reinforce this concept for Franco-Manitobans. The freedom to choose the language you wish to live in must be supported by our government. If the French language, which had constitutional guarantees, is diminished in government, what hope can we have that other cultural identities and language can develop in this province?

People have asked why this province should encourage the use of languages other than English. In our view, languages are a valuable resource in our "global village" and they must be exploited in the same way government, business and industry would exploit any other resource. Money spent on languages and language-training therefore, should not be viewed as deficits. When properly managed, these skills can be transformed easily into credits. More than 40 languages are spoken in this province. It is not too difficult to imagine, for example, the advantage of this resource if the Manitoba and Canadian business communities use the languages of host countries in business arrangements. Manitoba 23 believes that the past assessment of immigrants and their languages was wrong. It is opportune now to move beyond the folk and museum aspects of our heritage languages; it is time to develop a climate of mutual trust and respect where different languages and cultures can thrive and serve a much more useful purpose in our society. National and international trade is but one example; there are others.

In summary, therefore, the position of Manitoba 23 is first, that on the grounds of justice alone, the government should proceed with the proposed constitutional amendments on the French language as soon as is reasonably possible. Indeed, Manitoba 23 would strongly urge that the proposed legislation be debated and passed before the present slate of referenda on this issue are held. This is consistent with our view that it is contrary to our parliamentary traditions that minority rights be the subject of public plebiscites.

Second, on the grounds of history, the multicultural reality in this province, and for practical reasons, for example economic, Manitoba 23 supports the motion endorsed by the board of the recently established

Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages. The motion calls for an amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to take advantage of the constitutional option permitting the use of languages other than French and English as languages of instruction in the school. This amendment would guarantee instruction in heritage languages, thus giving practical expression to Section 27 of the Charter of Rights which reads:

This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians.

The new amendment would read as follows:

Every resident in every school division in Manitoba shall have the right to have his or her child receive his or her primary and secondary education in English and/or French and in any other language, provided, however, that the right to receive his or her education in a language in addition to English and/or French shall only occur when there is a sufficient number of children located in a school division which warrants the provision to them, out of public funds, of such education, including the necessary educational facilities and transportation.

That's our brief, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: Thank you very much, Dr. McDonald. Questions for Dr. McDonald from members of the committee? Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Dr. McDonald, there's been a great deal of activity from your organization since its formation and there's been a number of advertisements in our local papers, I think some outside of Winnipeg, by my calculation at least \$10,000 worth. You have a headquarters; you have buttons; you have an ad agency working for you. You may or may not have money for travel throughout the province to present briefs. Can you indicate what your budget is at this time or for this particular campaign?

DR. N. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the question is none of the member's business.

MR. M. KIBZEY: It is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. McDonald, it may not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Was that you Mr. Kibzey?

MR. M. KIBZEY: It is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you please leave the committee room? This is about the tenth time today I've called to your attention your interjections.

MR. M. KIBZEY: The truth is the truth, and you deny it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kibzey, silence please. Your departure immediately is appreciated and expected,

without comment. I would ask for the committee's guidance, if the committee wishes to tolerate that kind of activity from the gallery.

MR. R. DOERN: Let's proceed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think kind of behaviour of the gallery is acceptable to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will entertain a motion for reference of the behaviour to the Speaker for whatever action is required. Moved by Mr. Lecuyer that Mr. Kibzey's behaviour be referred to the Speaker as behaviour unbecoming in the gallery. Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, if we're going to do that for one individual, I would suggest that if you're going to refer the matter of spontaneous actions by the members of the public to the Speaker for reference, that you refer all matters where there has been public expression referred to the Speaker. I don't think it's fair to take one single case and refer it. If you're going to refer it, I suggest you refer every instance to the Speaker, where there has been public expression. I well recall, Mr. Chairman, where members of the audience sang, clapped and cheered, and indeed forced the committee to accept a certain member to be heard at a specific time. Now I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the committee tread very carefully with referring matters of public expression to the Speaker for interpretation and action, unless you refer all matters to the Speaker for reflection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that one has to consider these things in light of the knowledge you have of the individuals concerned from time to time, and I think that in all probability sufficient concern was expressed by the Chairman and hopefully this kind of conduct will not happen again. Should the individual appear before a committee again and make any comment that was ill-advised, I think that would be the basis of sufficient concern to do something. I think that we have to exhibit a little bit of tolerance here. The last remark was very provocative, but I think that probably the wise course of action is to not make anything more of this than has been made of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I agree that, you know, there are spontaneous eruptions and there is a natural reaction of the audience, or the people who are listening to these presentations. I don't think this is a good suggestion; namely, to refer this to the Speaker. I mean for what purpose and with what discipline or what powers in relation to a citizen cheering or booing somebody on the committee. I don't think any useful purpose will be served by that and I just suggest that we simply go on and hope that there won't be any reoccurrences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, it was because of the fact that the person in question was making a disparaging remark in regard to your ruling, but I think a point has been made. Having done so, I will withdraw my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion? The Chair wishes to make a statement with regard to the issue at hand. It has been suggested by some members that the demonstration by Mr. Kibzey is comparable to further and other demonstrations in this committee. The Chair rejects that comparison utterly and completely.

Mr. Kibzey has been the sole member of the gallery who has repeatedly, despite warning, since the resumption of our hearings in Winnipeg last Wednesday interjected statements, comments from the gallery. The Chair has asked the gallery to restrain from applause repeatedly, and has met with reasonable success, both here and at some of the rural hearings.

Perhaps there's not as much success in Ste. Anne as some members would have liked, but I'm sure all members appreciated the Chair's position in that respect.

Certainly the repeated interjections from Mr. Kibzey have been singular in their presence. No other member of the gallery has behaved that way, and that is why the Chair ordered him to remove himself from this committee room. I think members on both sides can appreciate that his behaviour has been singular, and has departed substantially from the behaviour demonstrated by everyone else here.

Further questions for Mr. McDonald?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. McDonald, I think there are a lot of people in the community who wonder about the apparent richness of your organization. You seem to have been able to begin from Day One with funds to undertake extensive newspaper ads, to have a headquarters, to have buttons, to have an ad agency, to appear or have people appear around the province, because money seems to be no object.

I am simply asking you, not just for myself, but on the part of other people who are citizens, there is a certain mystery and intrigue about Manitoba 23. I have heard reference to a phantom . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . organization. I'm simply asking you, what is your budget and what is your source of funds?

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

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, you have repeatedly asked the members to ask questions for clarification of the brief. I think that the Member for Elmwood is once again straying from that direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I can't accept the point of order as being valid. Questions repeatedly have been

asked of organizations regarding their funding and their membership. It has also been repeatedly said that organizations are free to choose to answer or not to answer those questions. Mr. McDonald has said he does not wish to answer the question. I would appreciate it, Mr. Doern, if you would pursue another line of questioning.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. McDonald said . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's been ruled on.

MR. R. DOERN: Well I want to ask Mr. McDonald this . . .

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

MR. R. DOERN: My questions were not identical, Mr. Chairman. I asked a question, and I was given an answer, words to the effect that this was a question from me. I am suggesting to Mr. McDonald that if he has nothing to hide, he should be able to indicate to the people of this province where his group gets its funding from, and what the budget of your group is. I assume that this is nothing to be ashamed of. I'm asking you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The use of phrases such as "hide" and "ashamed of" are argumentative. The question regarding funding and budget has already been replied to in the form of he's not prepared to answer the question. Would you pursue a different line of questioning, Mr. Doern?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want to indicate to you that I am asking Mr. McDonald whether he will answer a question that is being asked by many more people than myself. Why don't you allow me to ask him the question. He may answer it, and he may not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you ask the question clearly, concisely, without argumentative statements or innuendo contained therein?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: What is your annual budget, or your budget for this campaign?

DR. N. McDONALD: I'll repeat. It is none of the honourable member's business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: What is the source of your funding? Is there any Federal Government money coming into your organization from out of province?

DR. N. McDONALD: It's none of the honourable member's business.

MR. R. DOERN: Have you received contributions from ethnic and multicultural groups in Manitoba or outside of Manitoba that receive government funding?

DR. N. McDONALD: It's none of the honourable member's business, quite frankly, and I would like to tell the member why I think it's none of his business.

We are a voluntary group and we have many people supporting us, but I made a determination when I came here today, or whenever I came, that I would make the issue of the French language issue the issue. I have sent letters to all caucuses. I have sent letters to all heads of parties, and we have a public office to which everybody has been invited. They can come and ask me those questions privately. I would only be too happy to answer them.

Now if Mr. Doern has had numerous requests about Manitoba 23 and its budgeting and if he has not had the good sense to refer them to me or to our executive or to our offices, well that's a problem that he has. But I do not want this committee to be distracted from the main issue. If he has his own ox to gore or private agenda, that's his business, but I will not be the sacrificial lamb for that.

MR. R. DOERN: Can you indicate to the committee that you just alluded to, how many members you have?

DR. N. McDONALD: I have given you a list. I've submitted to the committee a list of the groups that are presently supporting us. There are, I understand, at least three more groups from the black community who have submitted their names today as the groups. I cannot speak for individual members. I have never counted them, and I'm not very interested in counting them quite frankly.

MR. R. DOERN: Can you confirm that there are over 300 ethnic and cultural groups in Manitoba?

DR. N. McDONALD: I don't know what you mean, sir, by ethnic group.

MR. R. DOERN: Can you confirm that there are at least 300 ethnic, cultural, linguistic groups, clubs, associations in the province? Perhaps there are more than that, but at least 300.

DR. N. McDONALD: There is a fundamental distinction, Mr. Doern, between an ethnic group and an ethnic association. Can you tell me what you're asking?

MR. R. DOERN: How many ethnic associations, linguistic associations, etc., would you say there are in the province.

DR. N. McDONALD: I have no idea, and I don't think anybody in the province does. For example, I know that when I was a member of the Intercultural Council last year that we identified 268 Ukrainian associations. That's one group alone. I don't know. I don't think anybody could be able to answer that question for you.

MR. R. DOERN: Are you aware of the fact that the largest Ukrainian and German associations do not support your organization?

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

HON. R. PENNER: Yes. Again that's extraneous material, put to Mr. McDonald by Doern as if it were

a fact. There is nothing to support it, nothing before us that supports it. It is argumentative in that sense, and out of order.

MR. R. DOERN: That's not a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: It certainly is a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further contributions to the point of order?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there have been suggestions made that this phantom organization has extensive support in the ethnic community. I would like to explore the extent of that support with Mr. McDonald in terms of some of the larger ethnic groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have no objection from the Chair in exploring the bona fides of any organization, but certainly statements which purport to describe support or lack of support for the organization coming from a member don't contribute to that exploration. The purpose of questions is to seek clarification.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On that point of order. I think it's important to read Page 2 of the brief, where it says, ". . . calling itself Manitoba 23, the group has since sought to widen its base of support." It's contained right in his brief and I think that Mr. Doern's questions are in order and answers should be forthcoming.

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

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I raised no question about the right of Doern to ask questions . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Could I finish?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: If Penner is going to call me Doern, I'm going to call him Penner. I either want proper respect or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Doern, I will recognize you in due course. Mr. Penner has the floor on a point of order. Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: My point was that Doern put to the witness something stating it as a fact, with respect to which there is no basis in any material before this committee, or indeed anywhere else. He stated as a fact that there are certain organizations and he alluded to some German organizations which do not support your organization. To the best of my knowledge and belief, those organizations have made neither a statement of support or lack of support. It exists in the imagination of Doern and to put that as a premise and then ask the witness to respond, is clearly out of order. It's argumentative; it's misleading; it's misrepresenting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, Penner is being Penner. Penner is saying that there are no organizations on record. He obviously doesn't know what he's talking about. He isn't aware of the fact that the two largest German Canadian organizations are on record as not supporting the government; that there's going to be a Tri Club participation that is going to indicate that the Polish, Ukrainian and German business and professional men's clubs are not in favour of the government position. So Penner is simply expressing a personal viewpoint and being the devil's advocate or representing somebody else.

I'm simply saying to you is this, that I want to determine the extent of support of this organization among the ethnic communities. They have been misinterpreted by the media, it has been suggested and written in the media, for example, the German and the Ukrainian Canadian communities, and all we find out is that one person named Harry Schellenberg supports them and that one out of dozens and dozens and dozens of Ukrainian organizations support them. I want to know the extent of their support. I can't find out the extent of their financial support because they are afraid to reveal it, but I think this question is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: My point of order related to a premise that Doern stated to this witness, and he has consistently refused to deal with that. He now slides off the point by saying these organizations do not support the government's position. That may or may not be the case. I'll assume that it is the case for argument. The proposition that he put to this person was that these groups do not support Manitoba 23, and there is no basis on the record. I have seen the record for that statement. It was a misleading statement and hence misleads a person in answering. You put a false premise to a person who comes here to discuss a serious question and ask the person to respond to a false premise has to be out of order in my view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further contributions to the point of order?

MR. R. DOERN: It sounds like a debate to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It certainly did sound like a debate to me. The first point the Chair would like to make is that when members don't refer to themselves in the same fashion that the Chair does and it's been coming from both sides, but certainly Mr. Penner was one of the initiators. The term "Mr." or "Mrs." is normally prefixed to the names of members and only by that deference of respect do we maintain some modicum of order. We may move from calling them by their real names to other names very shortly if that kind of use continues. We all know we don't want that. So, I would ask members to treat each other with the respect that they would accord other members in the House regardless of how they may refer to each other outside of this committee or the Chamber.

I would also suggest, as I have in the past, and certainly the Chair can never be constantly vigilant in enforcing the rule, but it would be more proper to ask a straight question rather than a question containing an assumption.

I'll give Mr. Doern, in this case, perhaps some assistance from the Chair, by suggesting that if the question had been phrased: "Does X organization belong to or support Manitoba 23?" the question might be more appropriate than to say: "Is it true that such and such an organization does or does not?" That's the difference between a straight question and a leading question.

Granted the Chair can't catch all of them, and for those failings, I apologize to the committee, but I would suggest the questions which contain assumptions, innuendo, or in any way are leading, are questions which will cause points of order from time to time from both sides. If the Chair has to rule on all of them, we'll make no progress at all, and we'll spend 10 or 15 minutes debating every second or third question. I don't think that's why we're here. So I would ask the co-operation of all members in limiting the Chair's interjections, because the Chair has no desire to make these speeches once at every hearing because we've already held over 40 hearings and I've said it at least 40 times. I would appreciate the co-operation of all members.

Thank you.

Further questions? Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Would Mr. McDonald agree or recognize that the groups that he has supporting him from the German community are both small and only reflect a fragment of the organized German Canadian associations?

DR. N. McDONALD: So what? That doesn't interest me. It may well be true for all the groups.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you recognize that the Ukrainian Community Development Committee is only one? I think it's a subgroup or a sub subgroup, whatever, of the Canadian Ukrainian Committee, that it is only one fragment of the extensive Ukrainian organizations in the province?

DR. N. McDONALD: Mr. Doern, I respect human beings whether they belong to small groups or large groups and as I said at the opening of my brief, we are not interested in numbers, it's the position that we want to present. If the Ukrainian Community Development Committee was the only group that supported our executive, I would still be here, we'd still call ourselves Manitoba 23; we would still support entrenchment and extension of French services. I mean, that's irrelevant and if you want to discredit Manitoba 23, that's fine. It doesn't bother me in the least. All I'm saying is that we have a position here that we're trying to present and if you want to discredit me, or you have a private agenda or you want to gore some ox, fine. But I refuse to answer irrelevant questions.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just say in passing that questions on membership or funding are not irrelevant questions. You may not wish to answer this

question, but is it true that most of your leadership is either Federal Liberals or Provincial New Democrats.

DR. N. McDONALD: Mr. Doern, talking about irrelevant questions - I hate to acknowledge this, but the other day, we had a communist come into our office, but we had him exercised immediately. We ask people when they come in which political party they belong to and whether they've beaten their wives. Then if they answer yes to either question, we expel them.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you have any Provincial or Federal Progressive Conservatives in your association?

DR. N. McDONALD: No, but - well, I shouldn't say no, I'm not sure. But if they are they're very deceitful because when they come in the door they answer no.

MR. R. DOERN: What do these people do when they come in the door? Are they taking out memberships or signing up? I mean how do you ascertain your membership or your support? Are they filling out forms? Are you selling memberships? What is the connection here between citizens coming in and becoming members of Manitoba 23?

DR. N. McDONALD: I don't want to give silly answers. I could talk about birthmarks and so on.

MR. R. DOERN: You have been giving silly answers.

DR. N. McDONALD: But, I'm been given silly questions, so I'm in a very difficult position.

MR. R. DOERN: Why don't you try to answer the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDonald, the committee rules only apply to members. They do not limit the rights of witnesses to answer as they wish in committee.

DR. N. McDONALD: We do not ask people to sign. We have public meetings. Everybody is invited and we've had a number of meetings and generally we have anywhere from 25 to 35 to 40 people at our public hearings. We don't check people's political allegiance, their ethnic allegiance or any allegiances. It's an open meeting, anyone can come.

MR. R. DOERN: My final question is this: do you deny the receipt of federal and/or provincial funding?

DR. N. McDONALD: I have told you three times, that is none of your business.

MR. R. DOERN: It's the business of the public, they're paying for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Further questions, Mr. Doern?

MR. R. DOERN: They're paying for it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, any other members of the committee have questions for Dr. McDonald?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before asking any questions, I know that committee very rarely exercises its power, but I would like to ask Dr. McDonald to give testimony under oath.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you moving a motion, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes.

I would like to ask Dr. McDonald to give testimony under oath.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is in order. The committee has the power under its reference to compel testimony under oath. It has been moved by Mr. Graham to invoke that provision.

Debate on the motion, Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: Very briefly speaking for our caucus, we will oppose it vigorously. It is an insulting, demeaning exercise of political bias that has no place. It's distasteful. There has nothing that has been suggested in any of this witness' answers that could possibly give rise to that. He has exercised the right which he has told he has had, as have other witnesses, not to answer questions which he deemed to be irrelevant. That's his choice and certainly we will reject it and we will reject it having left a bad taste in our mouths.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion?
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: This committee has on many many occasions, allowed questions regarding the funding of various organizations to be asked at great length and we have always received answers. This, to my knowledge, is the first time that a person appearing before this committee has refused to give answers regarding questions of that nature, questions that have been asked of many many witnesses, and for that reason and that reason only, and I reject totally the implication left by the Attorney-general that it was for political bias. It has nothing to do with politics at all. It's trying to get information that is useful to this committee and I would ask that the motion, and plead with members of this committee to accept that, because the information that we need I think is vitally important and crucial to the information that is required by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize Mr. Ashton, Dr. McDonald would you mind having a seat while this motion is before the committee? It's an interruption in your brief. Mr. Ashton.

MR. S. ASHTON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I remember early on in this set of committee hearings, there were accusations made by some members that this was turning into an inquisition. I had thought that we had turned away from that inadvisable course, however, I think that motion that has just been placed before us, brings it right back to that. We're here to discuss the government's proposals in terms of French Language

Service, not the funding of an organization which is making a presentation before us. We're not here to discuss who supports that organization, who isn't supporting that organization. I'm sure members have ample opportunity to ask those kind of questions outside of this committee and I think that's really the place for it.

So I object to this motion on two grounds. One is that it's turned this into an inquisition, which I think is grossly unfair and insulting to the witnesses; and second of all, I object to it because it is totally irrelevant to the question before us. For God sakes, let's discuss the issue of French Language Service in Manitoba and not personal vendettas, witch hunts, or character assassinations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point made by Mr. Graham that other committee members or members appearing before this committee have been asked similar questions and have answered, the fact remains we've also said to all members appearing before this committee, that they were free to answer or not to answer any questions asked of them; and secondly, Dr. McDonald, in appearing here a while ago, stated that he purposely did not wish to answer that question because he did not consider it relevant to the presentation he was making and also said that any member of this committee who wished, could appear or go down their organization's office and get that information if they want it. I think that the point raised by Mr. Graham is therefore not a valid one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nordman.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that if this organization is being funded by the public purse then the delegation has the responsibility to answer that question. If he has not been funded by the public purse, then fine, no problem, but if he is receiving public monies then he has that responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for Virden, Mr. Graham, should reconsider the motion he makes, because as some of my colleagues in the Legislature have indicated, I think that we want to ensure that the general public is not intimidated or feels harassed in any way, in coming before a committee of the Legislature to give their views as to a policy decision that is being made. It may be that through their submissions or some questions that the strength of their submission may not be as significant to some members as would otherwise be the case if they gave full answers to every question that was put to them. I know that when I was a member of this committee, I heard people coming before the committee and indicating that they wanted to present a brief, but they wouldn't answer any questions. We heard those submissions. I think it's open for anyone coming here to make a presentation, and then decline to answer all questions, or decline to answer some questions.

The honourable members will have to accept that therefore the weight that is given, as it would be in a court of law to that kind of evidence, may not be as strong. Certainly the media may take note of that, as every other MLA will take note of it. But to insist that because someone hasn't given full answers, they then be interrogated as if they were in court will change the complexity, will change the use of a legislative committee, and will act as a dangerous precedent to inhibit the general public from coming forward and giving their views to a committee. Because they won't know when some member, dissatisfied - and if he's able to convince a majority of the Legislature, a majority of the committee - with the answer he gets, then we'll be able to cross-examine that witness on anything.

You know, that's the risk that the honourable member is placing before this committee, that kind of a precedent. I would rather that we not vote on it, but he withdraw it because that will weaken the strength of the committee process that we have in Manitoba, where we have not only committees like this but Law Amendments Committees, committees of the Legislature that deal with legislation. It gives the public an opportunity to come before that committee and not feel that they are going to be cross-examined and put under an oath in their testimony. That kind of procedure is reserved to the very unusual kind of inquiry that a legislative committee may be charged with, not this kind of routine policy submission that we have here.

So I implore the Honourable Member for Virden to withdraw and not ask us to vote on that, because even voting on it, I think, would weaken our tradition in this Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a list - Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of points. The Member for Thompson has expressed some concern about questions on funding and membership. He, I don't believe, has been on the committee very many times, but from the very beginning, from the first, Alliance Quebec answered these questions - and many other organizations. This is nothing new to this committee; it is not a new line of questioning.

Mr. Chairman, the suspicion is that Manitoba 23 is a government front. The suspicion is that this organization is getting money from the Federal Government through the Secretary of State, or from the Provincial Government through the Department of Cultural Affairs. This is an organization that sprang out of nowhere, like many other organizations that are springing up every day, like dandelions on the government lawn. These are all organizations that somehow or other just happen to be supporting the government position. Every few days, there's another one, a new one with a different name.

This one is the most interesting of all in that this organization is well-funded. It came in with a bang; it came in with half-page advertisements in the Free Press, in the Winnipeg Sun . . .

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order.

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

MR. R. DOERN: I'm on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: On the pretext . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Doern, I thought you were speaking to the motion.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, that's what I was doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not a point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: All right. I'm speaking on the motion then.

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

HON. R. PENNER: On the pretext of discussing the motion, Mr. Doern is engaging in a diatribe seeking to make his particular views with respect to this organization a matter of record before you've had an opportunity to rule, or before this committee has had a chance to vote on the motion. It's clearly out of order. He's clearly not speaking to the question which has been raised, a very simple motion that this witness be put under oath.

Incidentally, a motion which is made after the fact, a motion which is made after the man has presented his brief - Mr. McDonald has presented his brief and has responded to questions. It's probably out of order from that point of view as well, but I don't raise that as a new point. I am responding to the speech, the rhetoric of Mr. Doern which does not address the issue before this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not accept the point of order as being valid. There is a motion before the committee relating to testimony under oath by the witness before the committee.

If you wait one moment please, Mr. Doern, I'll turn the floor back to you.

The question before the committee is a motion to examine a witness under oath. That motion is in order at any time. It's completely within the committee's powers. The debate on the merits of that examination certainly can reflect on the question of whether or not it should be done with respect to a particular witness before the committee. For that reason, the debate on the merits of the motion would be in order.

Mr. Doern, please proceed.

MR. R. DOERN: Just a general point, Mr. McDonald has refused to answer questions concerning the membership, the extent of support and particularly the funding. I think that the committee, which has on many occasions and myself in particular, have asked questions, and I believe that in general those answers were always forthcoming.

One can only conclude that if one refuses to answer simple questions about membership or budget that there must be something to hide.

So I simply say that I am rather taken aback that Mr. McDonald won't answer those questions, but all that he is doing, in effect, is fuelling the suspicion that there is government money going into his organization directly from Ottawa, from Winnipeg, or indirectly

through certain ethnic organizations. He can allay those fears and he can shoot down that argument by simply answering a few questions. That's why I attempted a number of times to ask those questions, but in particular was the negative statement or the point made in the negative, which I made, was whether he would deny that he is receiving government funding. If he simply answers that question, then perhaps these other concerns will disappear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further debate on the motion?
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'll admit that maybe I was unduly concerned at the attitude taken by Mr. McDonald in reply to questions asked by Mr. Doern, but I listened to the very eloquent plea put forward by the Attorney-General. I have a concern for everybody that wants to appear before this committee, and it is certainly not my intention to try and unduly alarm anybody that wants to appear before this committee.

So I realize the traps. My motion was made in haste, and I would like to withdraw it at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Graham. The motion is withdrawn. No further speakers to the motion. Is there anyone else who would like to ask questions of Dr. McDonald?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes, I would like to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDonald, please come forward.
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Dr. McDonald, on Friday last, I believe you were slated to appear before this committee. At that particular time in the events of the committee, you asked that your name be taken off and replaced with the Ancestral Languages Group and you would take their place in the speaking order. Is there any close relationship between your group and the Ancestral Languages Group that would cause such a change to take place?

DR. N. McDONALD: No, I am not associated with MAPAL, but because of the position that our executive and our board took on their proposal, I thought that it would be better for them because they were the people that were directly associated with this motion, with respect to that amendment, that they would come forward and do the explaining and that we would come up after, because we supported that motion.

That motion was brought forward to our executive, as well, at our last meeting and we supported it. Now I would think the association, Mr. Graham, is one - if anybody who has worked in the ethnocultural community in Winnipeg, or indeed in Manitoba, one of the first realizations that they have is that it's a very incestuous community, in that, you know I'm on several boards and you go from one to the other and you see many of the same faces. For example, the Chairperson of MAPAL is Mr. Spolsky and he is also the treasurer of Manitoba 23. Mr. Rand also attends our meetings and he is on the executive of MAPAL as well. So I

suppose if that's what you mean, is there any overlap in the members of each group, the answer is yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So it would be perfectly normal then for people in your organization to know what the desires and the interests and the objectives of MAPAL were and you would be fully aware of their course of action and indeed you are appearing now to support their course of action. Is that correct?

DR. N. McDONALD: The latter observation is correct, yes. I could not say though and I would dare not say that I, for one, would know what's going on in all the ethnocultural associations in this city. I would not pretend that, and as I said at the beginning, I don't pretend that all those groups support us, or associations. But it is not unusual at all to know what other groups are doing.

I serve on several umbrella groups, such as the Manitoba Joint Refugee Co-ordinating Council. I serve on the Citizenship Council. I serve on many umbrella groups and I think I would have a fair knowledge of what goes on in the ethnic community.

MR. H. GRAHAM: When you serve on these various councils, is that all service without pay?

DR. N. McDONALD: Yes, sir, yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, I commend you, Dr. McDonald, for your tremendous interest in the ethnocultural community.

In your opening paragraph, you said that in calling itself Manitoba 23, the group has since sought to widen its base of support. Is that support a moral support or do you mean moral and financial?

DR. N. McDONALD: Well, what we have done, Mr. Graham, is that we have written as many ethnocultural associations we know that are around, and we have asked them for moral support for the main agenda that's associated with Manitoba 23. That's what we've asked them for. We've also said to them that if you want to give us financial support, that's fine, but we have not gone to any group and specifically asked for financial support, so what usually happens, the usual process is this.

For example, last Friday night I met with the Elim Tamil (phonetic) Society, which is the Sri Lankan group here in Manitoba and I met with some of the National Black Coalition, their Winnipeg Chapter and Fame, which is another black group. What we did, we explained our position and what we've asked them is to go back to their groups and get a motion of support for Manitoba 23 and the support of entrenchment and extension. That's all we've done. Many groups have come to us and told us that we have the group's support. We have refused to accept that. We asked them to go back to their groups and get a motion of support, and many individuals have come forward who belong to specific groups and we use the names of the individuals, but we don't use the group name.

In other words, if an individual comes forward and says that our group supports you, we won't accept that without signatures and without minutes that identifies

that or gives us evidence that a motion has been passed by their association. We've tried to be as honourable as possible and we certainly haven't tried to arm wrestle anybody's support. Most groups have come voluntarily to us.

I would like to point out, Mr. Graham, as well, that we have never pretended, never pretended, to be a massive organization. We are all volunteers. You know I spend three nights a week attending various ethnocultural - on a voluntary basis, not associated with Manitoba 23 and other groups. We have never pretended. We don't have the time to do that kind of organization and I still don't pretend and we have that specifically in the brief.

MR. H. GRAHAM: At the same time, I believe you indicated earlier there are some 30 or 40 individuals who are part of your organization that have attended your meetings. Are these all individuals or are some of there representing groups?

DR. N. McDONALD: They're both. Some come representing groups; some come just as individuals. For example, I would say that of the last three meetings, perhaps 120 people - and that may be on the outside, I'm not sure - but say in the range of 100 people, and I would say that of that group, each time that 40 to 50 percent of those would be faces I have never seen and probably people would walk in and give their names and address and say, I'll support you and may not show up at another meeting. So it's an ad hoc organization and there's a solid core of people. We do not ask people to keep coming back, there are no forms to sign, we just ask for an indication of their support.

MR. H. GRAHAM: You referred to the last three meetings. Now would those be on consecutive nights or would there be a couple of nights in between to allow the information to filter back to a society, or how closely spaced would those meetings be?

DR. N. McDONALD: They're at least a week apart and the last one was two weeks apart, because we attended the referendum debate at City Hall.

MR. H. GRAHAM: You indicate that there's been at least a week apart and you're referring to the last three and yet, you indicate that yours is a newly-formed group. Could you indicate when it was first formed?

DR. N. McDONALD: About mid-August.

MR. H. GRAHAM: About mid-August, and in that period of time you have held weekly meetings or has there been . . .

DR. N. McDONALD: We hold weekly meetings for our group, but our executive meets at least every second day.

MR. H. GRAHAM: And during that period of time, have you seen your organization slowly growing in size and growing in numbers, or has it sort of levelled off.

DR. N. McDONALD: No, as I pointed out earlier, it's growing. To my knowledge, three groups today indicated

that they've passed motions of support. So groupwise we're growing, yes, but you know that's not a major concern of mine, because organization and whatever, we just don't have the time to do it. Hopefully, I see it as an ad hoc group that will self-destruct in another couple of weeks when this legislation goes through the Legislature.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to enter into a debate with Dr. McDonald. It may not get through the Legislature in two weeks time.

DR. N. McDONALD: Well, I said hopefully, Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Dr. McDonald. You also indicated, Doctor, that you didn't want to take just the word of the person there saying that he represented this organization. You wanted them to go back to their organization and probably hold a meeting in that organization and then formally endorse. Could you indicate how many of the organizations have taken that step and have come back now with the formal endorsement that you have . . .

DR. N. McDONALD: I have given the Clerk a list, Sir, you should have them with my brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's appended to my copy, Mr. Graham, if you didn't get one.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, the list we have here is a coalition of organizations, groups and associations in support of the original resolution to amend Article 23. These member groups are the Ukrainian Community Development Committee, Canadians Parents for French of Manitoba, Manitoba Joint Refugee Co-ordinating council, Heritage Language Steering Committee, Manitoba Parents for German Education, United German School of North Kildonan, the Manitoba Chinese Fellowship, the Manitoba Metis Federation, the Korean Language School, The Chinese Canadian National Council of Winnipeg, the Chinese Canadian Community, the Institute of Chinese Language and Arts, the Manitoba Academy of Chinese Studies, the Irish Canadian National Committee, the Portuguese Association of Manitoba, B'Nai Brith, Elim Tamil Society of Manitoba, Forum for the Awareness of Minority Electorate, Magdaragat Phillipine Folk Arts Inc., U.S.T. Alumni Association, Inc., Magdaragat Family Services, Manitow Association of Filipino Teachers, Inc., Barangay Filipino Organizaton of Manitiba, Phillipine Seasons Television, Board of Jewish Education, Bayanihan Anak-Pawis Movement, The Sikh Society of Manitoba Inc., The Singh Sabha of Winnipeg Inc., The Nanaksar Satsang Sabha of Manitoba Inc., and the Jewish Community Council. All of these have taken your request back and they have all had their organization meetings and have passed their approval?

Is that correct?

DR. N. McDONALD: To my knowledge, Mr. Graham, before I left the office on Friday, I was here all day, I asked a person there to go through our correspondence and get the list of people who have indicated in a formal way their support for our group, and that's the list that

they came up with, and I'm not being at all devious in my response, that's how I drew up this list.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Dr. McDonald, you also indicated that some of them forwarded financial support and some did not. Can you indicate whether the Ukrainian Community Development Committee supported you financially?

DR. N. McDONALD: I refuse to answer those questions, Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can you indicate whether the Canadian Parents for French Manitoba supported you financially?

DR. N. McDONALD: I refuse to answer that question.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can you indicate whether the Manitoba Joint Refugee Coordinating Council supported you financially?

DR. N. McDONALD: I refuse to answer that question.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can you indicate whether Heritage Language Steering Committee supported you financially?

DR. N. McDONALD: None of the group on this list, do I intend to answer whether or not they have given financial help. Mr. Graham, my principle is that I would like this committee to be serious about the issue. You know, it's really degrading to me as a citizen of this province to come here and get that kind of filibustering. You know, it's degrading to me as an individual and I answered a lot of questions already, Mr. Graham, that I did not think were relevant to what the issue is. Personally I find that an affront to my personal integrity to take me in a Mickey Mouse thing through one by one in a list like this. It's not fair to me as a citizen, and I don't think it does yourself any favour as well.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Dr. McDonald, can you indicate whether The United German School of North Kildonan supported you financially?

DR. N. McDONALD: I find your questioning degrading and I refuse to indicate it.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can you indicate whether the Manitoba Chinese Fellowship supported you financially?

DR. N. McDONALD: I find that question degrading and abusive to my personal integrity and I refuse to answer.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it appears rather obvious that Dr. McDonald does not wish to answer any questions regarding the financial support that is awarded to his association. Is that correct, Dr. McDonald?

DR. N. McDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement in that I have responded to this question on countless times to the media. It's been on the print

media. It's been on the electronic media. All these questions about our finances are in the public forum. I came here, took the time from my work to talk about a very serious issue before the people in this province. It has nothing to do with whether French parents or Canadian parents for French or whoever have given us \$5.00, \$10.00 or \$1,000.00. I've made statements several times to the press on this, and I refuse to be distracted to the real issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions, Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In your brief, Dr. McDonald, you have indicated the group has since sought to widen its base of support?

DR. N. McDONALD: Yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I am attempting to try and find out what that support is, whether it is moral or financial. Can you indicate to me what financial support you have received from the widened base that you are attempting to seek?

DR. N. McDONALD: I refuse to answer that question because it's the same question you have asked me already.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I will then go back to the brief, seeing as how Dr. McDonald does not want to answer questions on that particular issue.

Can I then go back to the last page of his brief where he says, the motion calls for an amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, to take advantage of the constitutional option permitting the use of languages, other than French and English as languages of instruction. Dr. McDonald, where do you find the constitutional option that you refer to?

DR. N. McDONALD: That's my reading of Section 22 of the Charter of Rights.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Dr. McDonald, we are not amending Section 22 of The Charter of Rights. We are amending Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and I would ask you, if your group is not bringing extraneous material into the amendments that are presently before this committee with proposals such as you propose at this particular time?

DR. N. McDONALD: Yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Dr. McDonald, when you bring extraneous material into an effort to amend a Constitution, a Constitution that has stood for 113 years unamended, and you with your group that has met for the last several weeks and is just now slowly building your strength and you're asking us to consider seriously an amendment that you propose, a brand new concept that was only introduced by an organization which put forward a proposal last Friday which, by their own admission, they hadn't even drifted past their board of directors - it was put forward only by a steering committee of that group.

You are asking us seriously to consider an amendment of this magnitude at this time. Could you give us any

further information, any backup material that would assist us in making decisions of this magnitude?

DR. N. McDONALD: Yes, sir, I would be very glad to supply that. Manitoba, originally, had an act that allowed other ethnic groups in this province to be taught in their own language. We had several groups, including the Ukrainians and Germans and, of course, the French, who ran their own schools.

Mr. Graham, I would like to point out that there is not one shred of evidence, not one, that this did not work. In fact, the last report of the Department of Education of the Manitoba Government before 1916 - that is, in 1915 - said that one of the - I have the quote in my bag. I can give it to you directly, if you like.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Please do.

DR. N. McDONALD: I'll do that. It is the report to the Department of Education in - sorry it's 1913-14, sorry 1914-15. It says that, "The outlook . . . "and they're talking about bilingual teaching in German, Ukrainian and so on, "has never been so hopeful as it is at the present time. Our own secondary schools are beginning to furnish French, German and Ukrainian students. . . "It says here Ruthenian, but that was the way in which they referred to Ukrainian at the time, ". . . who are able not only to give efficient instruction in two languages, but to include the true spirit of Canadian patriotism."

Within a few months of that because of the war time and so on, it was considered that this was un-Canadian, that it was a threat to national unity and so on. But Dr. Reyes, who is a well-known Canadian western historian at the University of Manitoba - I consulted with him today, because he wrote this article about the 1916 legislation a couple of years ago. I asked him today, had he done any research that would change his mind about the interpretation of the act that allowed bilingual instruction? He said, no. In fact, he's stronger in his conviction.

There was no evidence to suggest that was a problem in the province whatsoever. I am basing my support or at least our support - we are basing our support for this thrust on the historical evidence.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I realize we're at 5:00, but I would like to ask one more question and then carry on at 7:30.

Dr. McDonald, by putting forward your position now on the ancestral language, some 32 of them in Manitoba, would that not seriously weaken the proper course that the Societe Franco-Manitoban is putting forward to enhance French Language Services in Manitoba? Note that I said "enhance" not "enshrine" because that has already been done.

DR. N. McDONALD: With due respect, sir, if that happens, it will be because of your party.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to carry on after 5:00 or when we meet again at 7:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDonald, are you able to come back at 7:30 this evening.

DR. N. McDONALD: Monday night, I teach. It's the only night in the week that I teach, but I have to be in the classroom at 7:00 unfortunately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the will of the committee to continue now then?

Mr. Graham, would you be amenable to continuing at this point?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, there was some information I was hoping to gather at the supper hour. We have been sitting here, day after day, from 10:00 in the morning till 10:30, 11:00 at night. Maybe we don't get the opportunity to read the newspapers and watch the television and listen to the radios that other people have. I was hoping to have that opportunity to do it.

DR. N. McDONALD: My apologies, Mr Graham, but with due respect, these are the kinds of substantial questions that I thought I might be asked from the beginning. I have been here since 10 to 4:00. For the most case, it's been nonsense-type questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the will of the committee? Do you wish to continue?

Mr. Graham, do you have further questions you wish to put now?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Not at this particular time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other members?

Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: One brief one, with some risk that the Chairman may be troubled by my going back at this area, do I understand you correctly, Dr.

McDonald, to indicate that questions in respect to funding are objected by you from members of this committee but was I correct in hearing that anyone attending any general meeting has this information available to them?

DR. N. McDONALD: Yes, absolutely.

HON. A. MACKLING: And the media has had that information available to them, as and when they've wanted it.

DR. N. McDONALD: Yes.

HON. A. MACKLING: Your objection was on the basis of principle, that you didn't want to be involved . . .

DR. N. McDONALD: Exactly.

HON. A. MACKLING: Okay, all right.

DR. N. McDONALD: For the same reason that you're in problems now with respect to my time. I didn't want to get into that, because it's a red herring in my view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions, Mr. Mackling? Further questions from other members of the committee? Seeing none, Dr. McDonald, I would like to extend the committee's regrets that you are unable to return this evening for further questions and, on behalf of the committee, would like to thank you very much for your presentation today.

DR. N. McDONALD: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being past our normal hour of adjournment, committee is adjourned and stands adjourned until 7:30 this evening.