



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Ms. Myrna Phillips
Constituency of Wolseley



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 59 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 22 DECEMBER, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, 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, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Thursday, 22 December, 1983

TIME — 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON — Ms. Myrna Phillips, Wolseley

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Anstett, Bucklaschuk, Lecuyer,
Penner

Messrs. Brown, Filmon, Graham, Kovnats,
Nordman, Scott, Sherman

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Proposed Resolution to amend Section 23
of The Manitoba Act

APPENDIX:

Committee report as adopted on December
22, 1983

* * * *

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: I would like to call the committee to order, please. We have a quorum.
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Madam Chairperson, on a point of order, I believe it is traditional that we, from time to time, have changed members of this committee, and I would like to, at this time, move that Mr. Filmon replace Mr. Brown on this committee. I believe Mr. Brown's resignation is in the hands of the Clerk.

If I may, at the same time, I would like to table a petition that I received yesterday from several hundred people in the Pilot Mound-Crystal City-Clearwater part of Manitoba that have registered their opposition to the government's plans to proceed with the amendments to Bill 23.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Agreed?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Agreed.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: The business before the committee is the draft report tabled and moved by Mr. Anstett on Monday, November 21st. The question before the committee is: shall the report be adopted?

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Madam Chairperson, I am concerned that we are being asked to consider a report that appears not to address the subject that was considered and in fact the series of hearings that were held throughout the province during the months of September and October. I am surprised at the fact that the report doesn't seem

to make any reference to many of the briefs that were presented and the content of them.

More so than that, it doesn't make reference to a new proposal which has been released by the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the 15th of December. That new proposal was released, and I believe that it's intended to be debated in the Legislature in the new year. It is the subject of public discussion at the moment. It has, I believe, been circulated amongst many of the special interest groups who have participated in the whole debate on French Language Services. It certainly has been circulated to members of the opposition.

It represents a rather major shift, I believe, in the government's thinking on the French Language Services issue. It's not just an amendment, rather a major shift in direction. It involves de-entrenching of Sections 23.7 and 23.8 of the original proposal. It involves a proposed new bill, various other things that represent a fairly major change in direction on behalf of the government.

So I am concerned that this report, that we are to approve at committee, makes no reference to that. It does certainly, I think, beg the question as to whether or not the report is complete, and whether or not it is representative of all the various things that have happened since the committee began its hearings in early September.

As well, I am concerned that the report doesn't appear to acknowledge or take advice from the hundreds of people who appeared before the committee and the thousands more that they represented in the briefs that they presented to the committee. There were, as I am sure all members of committee and those who have read Hansard will agree, many thoughtful presentations that were well-researched and prepared. Other than the fact that they are referred to in a statistical sense in this report, the number of delegations and the number of written submissions listed here, I don't think that the report really fully reflects the opinions and the value of the presentations that were made.

The report appears to just simply give lip service to the whole process that the committee followed and, in fact, even the ultimate new proposal that was presented on the 15th of December takes account of only one of the briefs, one of the 300-odd briefs that were presented to committee. Only one is really acknowledged in that final proposal.

I am very concerned that this government has chosen not to seek the advice or the wisdom of the people who have legitimate concerns and came before the committee. In fact, I think it's obvious from the report and the new proposal that has been presented publicly that this whole thing was a perfunctory exercise. As we in the opposition suspected and said early on in this whole process, the government really didn't want to hold these hearings, only eventually gave in after substantial pressure in the Legislature and substantial debate. They were forced into it reluctantly, and they present us with this page-and-a-quarter report which is nothing more than window dressing. It simply gives

the appearance of concern for public opinion when none is really there.

I further express the thought that this report is lacking a good deal because it ignores entirely the plebiscites that were held throughout the province in the intervening months since the committee began its sitting; the fact that these plebiscites indicated in the City of Winnipeg 75 percent or 76 percent of the public opposed to the entrenchment of an expansion of French language rights in Manitoba; and the fact that throughout the province the percentage opposed to the proposal was even higher.

The government may say that's not germane to this committee report, but indeed it happened and it's relevant. I think that some mention should have been made of it, some account should have been taken of it, because it was a legitimate expression of public opinion on the matter. It occurred, as I say, during the interim and during the time leading up to and after the committee report. I don't think we can ignore it even though the government appears to have chosen to ignore it in its report.

As a matter of fact, if you look at the content of the report, Madam Chairperson, I think that report could have been written by someone who had no knowledge of what has transpired in Manitoba during these past few months. That report could have been written by someone who, in effect, went into a time capsule and was totally locked in space and knew nothing of what transpired. It could have been written, I suspect, before the committee hearings were held, because it really takes no account of the committee hearings, those hearings that most people in Manitoba felt were absolutely essential on an issue of such grave importance to all of Manitoba and to the future of Manitoba and the rights and the responsibilities of people in this province in future. It takes none of that into account. I suggest that it is totally lacking in so many different ways that we on the opposition side have grave concerns about it.

I suppose it could be argued that the government has taken into account the whole process of events, the plebiscites, the presentations and so on, by the new proposal that has surfaced as of the 15th of December, because they appear to have some desire to vastly change their direction on this. But if that is the case, why isn't it acknowledged in the report?

In many ways, the report is not only lacking, but it's fraudulent. As I say, it could have been written by someone who has no knowledge of what's gone on in Manitoba over the past while. I think it's an affront to the public and to the overall normal parliamentary process.

I might indicate that we, on the opposition, have an amendment to present with respect to this report because we're very surprised at the lack of acknowledgement that the Minister has shown, the new Minister of Municipal Affairs, in handling this whole issue. We're surprised with the lack of regard that he's shown for the public opinion on the matter, and we're very concerned that that expression of public opinion ought to be heard and ought to be represented in this report. So, Madam Chairman, I'd like to, at this point in time, move an amendment to the report and I have copies for committee. The amendment is as follows.

I move:

THAT the Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended by striking out all of the words after the word "submissions" in the sixth line thereof and substituting therefor the following:

Your committee has taken into consideration the many briefs that were presented at the hearings. After listening to the delegations which appeared and considering all briefs submitted, your committee has come to the conclusion that in the best interests of all of the people of Manitoba, the constitutional amendment to Section 23 should not proceed.

Your committee cannot make its report without reference to the plebiscites held on this question by the City of Winnipeg and various municipalities on October 26, 1983. The results of the Winnipeg plebiscite indicated that 76 percent of those voting were opposed to the government proceeding with an entrenched amendment. The combined results of the plebiscites indicated that well over three-quarters of the people of Manitoba who voted wanted the amendments to Section 23 withdrawn. Your committee is therefore unable to recommend proceeding with the entrenched amendment. The people of Manitoba simply do not want this amendment. To force it on them would undoubtedly result in further acrimony and divisiveness.

Since your committee last met, the government announced on December 15, 1983, further substantive amendments to the original proposal submitted to this committee, which said amendments are attached hereto as Schedule "A".

With respect to this new proposal, your committee has come to the further conclusion that it is not in the public interest to adopt it.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Madam Chairperson, I appreciate the motion raised by the Leader of the Opposition and its intent. I would however raise a point of order with regard to its admissibility. The provision which suggests that the report be amended, Paragraphs 2 and 3, would certainly normally, and I would not debate their admissibility, but because this committee had referred to it a specific reference by the House on August 18th, which did not include a specific government proposal on December 15th, nor provide for the committee to review that proposal or any other proposals that the opposition might make or that the government might make, for the committee to comment then in any way, as it does in the final paragraph on that resolution would appear in my opinion, Madam Chairperson, to render the amendment out of order.

It is not within the committee's mandate to deal with a matter which must be tabled, moved and debated in the Legislature when the Legislature reconvenes; and to introduce that material in the committee at this time, I would submit, would be out of order. I would submit it's out of order for at least two reasons and one that the subject matter of the resolution, not the detailed text and the clause by clause that relates to it, is before the committee, I would recommend for your consideration Beauchesne's Citation 621.(1) and 621.(2). 621.(1) reads: "A committee can only consider those matters which have been committed to it by the House." 621.(2) reads: "A committee is bound by, and is not at liberty to depart from, the Order of Reference."

I think further, Madam Chairperson, any suggestion that the new proposals which, as the Leader of the Opposition states, are substantial and different should be placed before the committee in fact abridges both the Citations I referred to from Beauchesne in terms of placing the text of amendments before the committee, and furthermore abridges our own Rules in Rule 87 which states: "Every Bill shall be read twice in the House before being referred to a Committee or amended." Since part of the proposal which is appended to this amendment as Schedule "A" is the draft of a bill which has not yet received first and second reading before the House, it is inappropriate to consider referring it by some amendment to a standing committee of the Legislature.

So I would submit on those grounds that the amendment is out of order, Madam Chairperson.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Are you suggesting the whole amendment is out of order? You spoke about Paragraphs 1 and 2.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Madam Chairperson, the amendment, as moved, includes a portion which I submit is out of order and that would then render the whole amendment inadmissible.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: To the same point of order. The motion which is before the committee, the operative part of the motion which is before the committee, is that your committee recommends that the Legislative Assembly proceed with a resolution to amend The Manitoba Act. This motion says the constitutional amendment to Section 23 should not proceed. It's a negative, of the motion that is before us, and as such is out of order clearly on that ground alone.

I think you're well aware, Madam Chairperson, of that rule. I'm not even so sure of the ability to amend reports from a committee of this kind, but I leave that question and concentrate only on the one question. I think it's clear and I don't think anybody could deny it who is familiar with the Rules of this House and these committees that you cannot move the exact negative of the main motion which is before the committee. You simply can't do it.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: Madam Chairman, the objections raised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs I think are specious, because of course the Minister of Municipal Affairs is trying to suggest that this committee, unlike any other committee with which I've been associated in this House for some time, is not able through some contortions of reasoning to acknowledge facts that exist. We don't have to write into the committee report that it is now 2:20 p.m. and that the sun is shining outside and that it is daytime; that's taken for granted. The people of Manitoba now don't have to speculate about what the government's intentions are. Those intentions have been made clear by a document which they circulated to the public on the 15th of December which is totally germane to and bears substantively upon the matter

that the Legislature referred to this committee. So for the Minister to suggest by some contortion of reasoning that the words used by the Leader of the Opposition in his amendment are somehow or other out of order is - well, it's a form of high hilarity, to say nothing of an abuse of the Rules of the House.

I rather think that there may be a little more substance to the objection that has been raised by the Attorney-General with respect to the question of negating. There may be some faint colour of right there that deserves consideration by you, but insofar as the submissions that were made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the committee can't acknowledge facts that are in the possession of all of us and which bear upon the responsibilities which the Legislature charged this committee with, that kind of reasoning, Madam Chairman, has no room even in a kindergarten, I would suggest.

So I think your task is a relatively clear one. The amendment that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition is relevant, germane to the matter in front of us. It takes account of matters that have happened with respect to this matter. It takes account of the fact that every time the government, by way of example, sends a bill to a committee and then, as is particularly the case with this government which doesn't have anything under control, has to move in with page after page after page of amendment. If the Minister of Municipal Affairs were correct in his submission that the committee can only consider the matter that is referred to it, why then where would the Law Amendments Committee be when it has a bill in front of it? This government, in its usual perverse and negligent way, comes forward with sheaves of amendments to it with no notice whatsoever and then proceeds to make those amendments.

All governments have made amendments to bills, matters referred to the committees before. The question of a report having amendments made to it, there can be no question about that. Reports are amended from time to time. They do contain expressions of fact that are germane to and bear upon the subject matter referred to the committee. Hence I suggest, with the greatest of respect, that the arguments raised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs have no substance to them whatsoever.

If you wish to give some consideration to something that might have some colour of right to it, then we might want to address ourselves to the argument that was raised by the Attorney-General. But otherwise, we haven't heard anything other than an attempt by an arrogant government to try to commit a further act of fraud, as the Leader of the Opposition said, upon the people of Manitoba and to indicate to the people of Manitoba that they don't know what they're up to. They show a contempt for this committee, for the Legislature of Manitoba - of course, they are a contemptible bunch - so what can we expect from them?

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Chairman, further to the arguments that were presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in which he claimed that it was not germane to refer to all of the various matters, that included the plebiscites, that included various other aspects of the whole debate on the entrenchment of

an amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, I'll refer to the original motion of the Attorney-General in the House in which it says, amongst other things:

"WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has proposed a resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which amendment concerns the translation of the statutes of Manitoba or some of them and the question of government services in French as well as the English language";

Then the second "WHEREAS" says that "The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba deems it advisable to hear the views of Manitobans on the subject matter of this Resolution."

The subject matter of this resolution, I submit to you, includes all of the various matters that are in this. They all pertain to the entrenchment and expansion of French language rights and the various other aspects that have been dealt with in committee. It refers to the briefs at the hearings that have not been taken into consideration. It refers to the subject matter of that proposed amendment to The Manitoba Act, Section 23.

That, I say to you, is germane to the topic and ought to be considered, and is certainly within the bounds of the subject matter that was referred to the committee and ought to be considered and accepted.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Madam Chairperson, I would like an opportunity to reply to the Leader of the Opposition regarding the form of the report and the content of the report, but I'll save that for debate on the report.

Speaking strictly to the point of order and the comments by other members on the point, I think it's clear from the comments of the former Leader of the Opposition that he has no refutation for the very clear arguments provided in Beauséjour to our dealing with the subject matter of the resolution. Since he does agree that there may be some substance to the Attorney-General's suggestion that the direct negative implied in Paragraph 2 of the proposed amendment, that the constitutional amendment to Section 23 should not proceed, I would draw to your attention, Madam Chairperson, Beauséjour Citation 436.(1). It is very applicable in terms of its language. "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order."

I would also direct your attention, Madam Chairperson, once again in view of the arguments that bills should be discussed in this committee which contains a resolution reference to Rule 87, the arguments that bills are amended in committee, sheaves of amendments, especially during the 1980 Session when the government didn't appear to have its House in order, have always been made in committee, but without question that was only after it received two readings in the House. If Mr. Filmon is willing, we would certainly welcome that opportunity to give that bill first and second reading and have it discussed in detail in committee, but that is for the Committee of the Whole House which gets that reference, not this committee.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. With respect to the objections raised by the Attorney-General

and the Minister of Municipal Affairs having to do with the thrust of the proposal contained in Paragraph 2 of the amendment proposed by my leader, Madam Chairman, let me ask what is the logic in the initial statement in Paragraph 4 of the Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections if indeed the statement in my leader's proposed amendment should be ruled invalid or non-viable?

In the opening sentence of Paragraph 4 of the so-called "report" of the standing committee, it states very clearly that your committee recommends that the Legislative Assembly proceed with a resolution to amend The Manitoba Act. Surely in the case of a report that has not been accepted - it's been moved but not accepted - it is perfectly valid for my leader and this party to move that the constitutional amendment to Section 23 should not proceed.

To argue that negatives a motion is not accurate, Madam Chairman. The referral motion said that the committee should consider these issues, listen to public representations and report back to the Legislature; that is the motion. No one here is suggesting that this committee do not report back to the Legislature. No one here is negating or proposing a negating of the motion at issue. What we are dealing with here is the development ostensibly of a report from the committee.

The government side has moved that it proceed with the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act. As the Minister of Municipal Affairs points out, the amendment negatives that proposal from the government. It does not negative the motion that is before this committee. The motion before this committee is to report back to the Legislature. So I suggest, Madam Chairman, that the arguments raised on this point by the Attorney-General and the Minister of Municipal Affairs are indeed red herrings, obscuring the basic issue.

If our motion is not valid, then the motion contained in the committee's ostensible report is not valid, because both of them direct this committee to do something in specific terms with respect to reporting back to the Legislature, and both are equally entitled to do that as majority and minority components of this committee.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I really am astonished at the speciousness of the last argument in particular.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I would expect you would be.

HON. R. PENNER: The subject matter was referred to, as has often been the case; the public was heard as directed; and the committee reports as is the case normally. The way in which the committee reports is on the basis of a motion made and of course carried by the committee and then the report. There therefore was a motion made and that motion is the sole item of business before the committee at this stage.

The amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition did not purport to be anything else except an amendment to the motion. So it's clear what we're talking about, there can't be any question about it. It is equally clear that when you have a statement, your committee recommends that the Legislative Assembly

proceed, and a motion in amendment that the constitutional amendment to Section 23 should not proceed, there could not possibly be any clearer negating of the main motion. The rest is window dressing to what is a public relations exercise, which I would have expected, and I take no exception to.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: I think most of us that have gone through the exercise on this important matter recognize that we are establishing rules all of our own and lead by the government might I say. This committee that has been charged by the Legislature to consider the issue has had an unparalleled number of hurdles to overcome. First of all, the original introduction of the resolution before us was one thing. We then have what is known as the September amendment that was put to us before this committee started sitting. We now have what I suppose could be called the December proposals.

HON. S. LYON: The December uprising.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, the December uprising, or the December recognition of the plebiscite or the will of the people of Manitoba perhaps.

Perhaps some understanding on the part of the government of the will of the people of Manitoba are contained in the December proposals, but even those - and I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs - are not carved in stone I believe he said. They can be changed and shifted and moved around.

So, Madam Chairperson, I honestly believe that what is being asked of this committee is to report back to the Legislature. Then under those circumstances, is it not only prudent to do as my leader suggested? It's in the best interests of all the people of Manitoba that the constitutional amendments to Section 23 should not proceed.

HON. A. ANSTETT: The member is clearly debating the amendment. I understand you're considering a point of order as to whether or not the amendment is admissible. I think that question should be settled before the member engages in debate.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Chairperson, then simply let me state that this committee has had two substantial changes or amendments placed before it prior to its considerations from the original introductions of this resolution. The issue before us is whether or not the amendments being proposed by my leader are now out of order. I suggest to you, Madam Chairperson, that that's not the case.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Chairperson, further to the discussion that's taking place, the operative part of this whole issue is whether or not the committee report back to the Legislature on the matter that was referred to it and, in reporting back, we have placed before the committee a number of reasons why the conclusion has to be arrived at that it is not in the public interest to proceed with an amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. That is the substance of this amended report that we are placing before the committee. It's

not a question of positive or negative; it's a question of accepting a different interpretation of what the committee heard and what was placed before it and what actions have taken place including the plebiscites, including the various briefs - none of which appear to have been taken into account in this whole thing.

All of that is the substance of arriving at a different conclusion having regard to the same process of events that have taken place over September, October, November and December now. I don't see any reason why the committee cannot debate and discuss that proposal as being an amendment to that which was presented to us by the government at this point in time. It's not a question of positive or negative at all, it's a question of placing a different conclusion on the same set of circumstances and information and with supportive information behind why that different conclusion ought to be arrived at.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Madam Chairperson, I think we're debating to some extent the amendment and the merits of the amendment. I think we should avoid that. Clearly, if members opposite do not like the conclusion of the draft report they have a simple solution. They know what the solution is. The Rules specifically provide it. They vote against it. To move a negative is clearly against the Rules. That's the point of order that's been raised by the Attorney-General.

The points of order I have raised address the reference to the committee and the appropriateness of the committee going beyond that reference and to allow, Madam Chairperson, speeches on the substance of the amendment, which we've been doing, I think is inappropriate. I would suggest, Madam Chairperson, that you should evaluate whether or not the amendment is admissible and rule on the points of order that have been raised.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Chairperson, that's a ridiculous argument to suggest that the only alternatives that this committee has is to vote for or against the report of committee. There is always the opportunity to amend it. That's always one other alternative and that's the alternative that we're facing right now and that is an amendment to the report as it exists.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Then come up with an admissible amendment.

MR. G. FILMON: Well this is, we submit, an admissible amendment. There's absolutely no reason why this isn't admissible. It reviews the same information, the same set of circumstances, that have been presented to the committee and the process of events that surround that, and it arrives at a different conclusion and that is, I submit, an acceptable way to amend this report.

HON. S. LYON: Madam Chairperson, what the spokesmen for the government seem to be overlooking is that this report must be read in its totality - both the report which they submitted to this committee at the last meeting of the committee and any proposed amendment to that report which anyone on the committee might choose to make.

Now if you look carefully at the draft report and then look at the amendment, which has been moved by the

Leader of the Opposition today, you will see that each one deals with the totality of the situation that this committee has been charged to review.

In the one instance, the government statement purports to say that they've found evidence to support a constitutional amendment. In the other case - which is something much more than just a negative - in the other case the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition gives reasons for this committee making a report which does not recommend entrenchment of any additions to Section 23. It then goes on further, Madam Chairperson, to lay before the committee matters that are not extraneous or illegitimate in any way for this committee to consider; namely, the further proposals that this government has been making to all and sundry, except to this committee, telling the world, but it won't tell this committee what the state of its mind is.

Now I realize that you have to be in a house of mirrors in order to find out what the state of mind of this government is at any one hour of the day but, in any event, given the poor material we have to work with, Madam Chairperson, I suggest that what the amendment does is to show and to put together, in its totality, a report which makes sense and isn't merely just a negative of the report that the government has presented.

My heavens, if we were to be restricted as the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Attorney-General are trying to suggest, if any committee of this House would be restricted only to voting against everything that the government brought in without trying to improve it, my God, this province would be in a sorry state; so I suggest that common sense, Madam Chairperson - not just the niggling interpretation and narrow mean interpretation of a procedural rule - broad common sense should be applied to this amendment in order that the committee will have before it some substantive matter to vote upon, which really does reflect not only the will of the people of Manitoba, but I dare say that if a number of members opposite were to search their consciences, if they have them, and their hearts, would find support among a number of those members. I dare say, Madam Chairperson, that the very fact of the existence of the document of December 15, the very fact of its existence, shows just how far the inner turmoil of the government caucus has gone to move them from that position started by the Attorney-General in May in which not a comma was going to be changed in a proposal, not a jot or a tittle, just propaganda meetings and so on.

So, Madam Chairperson, I merely say to you that we are not dealing with a simple negative here; we are dealing with the totality of an amendment to a report. Either draft, I should suggest, can stand on its own right. That is what you have to consider. If our amendment merely said that Section 23 should not be proceeded with, there might be some colour of right on which you could make a finding, because the rule upon which that argument exists is a well-known rule, as the Attorney-General states, and he, Madam Chairperson, isn't as familiar with the rules as perhaps he should be, but nonetheless I can tell him that is a well-known rule, but this goes beyond the negative.

The simple negating of the government's report gives other reasons. You must look at the government report in its totality; you must look at the amendment.

If the two totalities seem to be able to exist side by side, then I suggest, with the greatest of respect, that it's in order and, of course, if that so commends itself to you, you should quickly tell the Minister of Municipal Affairs that in this matter, as in so many others, he is wrong again.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson. First off, I would like to point that I don't think it's a breach of the Rules, but I think it's certainly an unusual procedure that an amendment be put forward to a committee, especially a committee that has travelled around as much as this one has, by a member who has never previously sat on a committee and never sat on any of the hearings that we went through for during the month of September in a number of communities.

It's most unusual that a person who was never a part of the proceeding would come in . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: On a point of order, Madam Chairperson.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I thought that members speaking, although there was some doubt with the immediate last speaker and now from this speaker that we were addressing the question of the admissibility of the amendment. We can beat around the mulberry bush and debate it, but I think the Rules are very clear. There is a difference of opinion.

Madam Chairperson, I would submit that further debate will not enhance your ability to make a ruling. You have the citations; you have the arguments from both sides. I think members are engaging in debate and that's not conducive to allowing you to make a decision.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Scott, did you wish to speak to the point of order?

MR. D. SCOTT: In continuation, Madam Chairperson, I think it is very clear that the committee's report, first off on the part of the proposed amendment by the opposition, makes reference to a plebiscite; I see nothing in the reference to the committee that we are to consider or to hold a plebiscite. We were to go out, we were to hold hearings to hear the public opinion of the people who wished to come forward and present at those hearings.

We did exactly that and what you are now doing is, you are coming with an amendment that goes beyond the reference to the committee and as well, as has been made several times previously, that totally attempts to negate, through an amendment which is out of order, the report of the committee. I'd suggest that rather than playing games and trying to play procedural games as the federal counterparts were doing earlier this week, that we get on with the business and proceed with the question as was moved last sitting to accept the committee's report.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Madam Chairperson, there is a great tendency to take umbrage with the remarks of the honourable member who has just recently spoke, but I think he knows the Rules of the House well enough that you don't make reference to the presence or absence of any member at any time. The Rules of the House also apply to committee.

Madam Chairperson, what we are dealing with is a report of the activities of a committee and the original report is one that ignored that completely. What you have here is an attempt by the opposition to bring into perspective and to make understandable a report which the government drafted and we are attempting to amend, consistent with the intent of the government.

It was the intent of the government for this committee to present a nil report, and we are just trying to clear that up for them, clear up the drafting of it, so we have drafted amendments which would make it much easier for the public to understand the intention of the government. The intention of the government is not to listen to people, to go through a charade of holding a whole bunch of hearings and do nothing with it; so we are trying to accommodate them by bringing in an amendment which would do exactly that and I suggest that the amendment is therefore in order.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Madam Chairperson, the proposed amendment by the Leader of the Opposition clearly makes reference to public opinion, both in regard to the briefs presented at the hearings and in regard to the paragraph in reference to the plebiscite. I regard both of those - I'm now responding to Mr. Scott - as important barometers of public opinion. The government dealt with, or was supposed to be responsible for dealing with, the briefs that were presented to the committee, 400 briefs over a month . . .

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Doern, are you speaking to the point of order, the admissibility of the amendment?

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, I am. I simply say this, that Mr. Scott questions whether or not it is in order to have a reference to the plebiscites in this amendment and it clearly is, because there was a great deal of discussion during the hearings on the question of plebiscites and referendums. There were repeated references to it. I personally asked many questions of many people and many opinions were given, both pro and con. So I simply say that this appears to be some improvement, however slight, over the government's report, which I think can be summed up in a single sentence - your committee was impressed with the interest shown and analysis of the subject matter demonstrated in many of the submissions. That sounds like the kind of comments that a Grade 6 teacher would put on an essay, but that's about what the government report consisted of. At least, this appears to be an attempt to enlarge the scope of those public hearings.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: It's very clear to me what we are dealing with. We do have a motion on the floor

that the report that was tabled on November 21st be adopted. In my opinion, this amendment is the direct opposite to that report.

In reference to Beauchesne 436, I rule the amendment out of order.

HON. S. LYON: Call the question.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: I ruled the motion to amend out of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Chairperson, with respect, I challenge your ruling.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Shall the Chair be sustained? All those opposed?

HON. S. LYON: Why don't we start off with all those in favour, and then all those opposed? That's usually the way we do it in a democracy.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: The motion on the floor is: shall the report be adopted? — (Interjections) — I did that one already.

HON. S. LYON: No, you haven't, you haven't called the question.

A MEMBER: You haven't called for yeas and nays.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: All right, I'll do it again then and keep you all happy.

All in favour . . .

A MEMBER: Of what?

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Of sustaining the Chair, sir.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Aye.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: All those opposed?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Nay.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: In my opinion, the ayes have it.

HON. S. LYON: Show of hands.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: All those in favour of sustaining the Chair?

MADAM CLERK, Ms. C. DePape: Six.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: All those opposed?

MADAM CLERK: Four.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: In my opinion, the Chair is sustained.

A MEMBER: Question.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: The question's been called. All those in favour . . .

A MEMBER: No, no, Madam Chairperson.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Madam Chairperson, I gather that we are now debating the government's original report. I must say that is a very sad document indeed. That government report was circulated, I guess, on November 22nd or 21st probably, and I must say that I was unable at that time to be present because I was up north in Thompson for a meeting. I could not believe my eyes when I received a copy and found out that after 30 days of hearings and after 400 briefs, 300 presentations to the committee and 100 written briefs that were submitted, that the government came up with a one-and-a-quarter page document.

I have to tell you in all sincerity that I expected a standard, traditional historic document, which probably would have been 40 or 50 or 100 pages long, attempting to make an analysis of what went on before that particular committee. If you read the page-and-a-quarter, and you read the actual reflections upon what the government thought or how the government summarized what went on before the committee, it came down to one sentence which I just referred to a few minutes ago - "Your committee was impressed with the interest shown and analysis of the subject matter demonstrated in many of the submissions."

You know, there are people around, teachers, adjudicators and so on, and when they are not sure of what to say in reference to somebody's performance, they say that was a sincere and interesting submission. That's what the government has said, isn't it? They have said that these were very sincere and very interesting briefs.

Madam Chairperson, I want to remind you that we sat here for a long time, and went around the province. I personally didn't attend the northern hearings, but I think I attended all the other ones and certainly attended all of the hearings in Winnipeg. There were long waits before this committee. There were people who came for days and sat around, waiting for their name to appear on a list. There was extensive questioning. There was debate which maybe should have taken place or shouldn't have taken place. There were some very outstanding submissions.

I mean, when I look, and I've spent about the past week reading what I consider to be the outstanding briefs that were presented, there are 1,200 pages here of submissions and questions. Who can boil that down into a one-page government document and a one-sentence analysis of all of this?

Madam Chairperson, I think it's an insult to the supporters of the government who took the time to prepare briefs and come out, people like Don Bailey and many others, Leo Robert, Georges Forest and many others, and people who came to oppose and question and challenge what the government position was.

I talked to one person from the media and they said that in their judgment the three outstanding briefs presented were Sid Green's, Herb Schulz's and Dr. Bill Shaw, who came from Montreal.

Madam Chairperson, we had people here who came from various cities, who in some instances were experts or claimed to be experts. We had Eric Maldoff who kicked off the debate. He came with his entourage and his federal financing and funding. We had Dr. Stephen Scott who didn't live up to his advance billing. Mr. Forest said, this was really something to look forward to, and I really was looking forward to it. Mr. Scott, who was, I think, a very personable and interesting and sincere person, did not live up to his advance billing. We had Joseph Magnet who came here and represented the SFM, and I ran into him in Ste. Anne. He also came back, I suppose, a number of times. I'm sure he didn't pay his own way, and he supported the government side and the SFM. We had Dr. Shaw, as I mentioned. Dr. Potter came from Montreal.

We had dozens and dozens and dozens of municipal men. I find that I have some sympathy for the Minister of Municipal Affairs who has to look at the people that he claims to represent or does, in fact, represent, the municipal organizations, the municipal people. One hundred and twenty-three of them passed resolutions, or 125 of them passed resolutions against the government proposals. They have just recently had their convention. They passed another amendment against the government position, and he has to try to both represent them and reflect their interests and at the same time sell and peddle the government plan which is becoming more and more difficult by the day if not by the month. So you had all those municipal people, you had dozens of individuals, you had all sorts of organizations that came, many of them were funded by the Provincial or Federal Government. You've had a number of French-speaking organizations; you had NDP members and members from other political parties; the SFM representatives; you had Manitoba 23 and many other groups that sprang up overnight like dandelions on the government lawn. You had hearings in the City of Winnipeg, in the rural areas, in the northern areas, in Ste. Anne, and all of this, Madam Chairperson, ignored by the government - all ignored by the government. A simple one-page document. Then the government says only a week ago, only a few days ago, the Minister, Mr. Anstett, says that he's going to bring in new legislation that will address the concerns of Manitobans.

Well, the question is, is the government addressing the concerns of Manitoba? Are they responding to the concerns of the people of Manitoba? They certainly didn't do so in the first round. They appear to be able to ignore what the public is telling them both in the public briefs, in the public hearings, in the public informational meetings. They ignore the resolutions passed by the municipal people; they ignore petitions which are circulating around the province.

The honourable member, Mr. Graham, presented one such petition today. I know there are many others. I know that there are people here today from Manitoba Grassroots who are circulating petitions. I know that there are other individuals who are circulating petitions.

I personally collected 175,000 signatures of people who oppose the government's proposals and the government is very nervous, as Mr. Scott exemplifies, about the plebiscites. 175,000 people, 175,000 people voted against the government plan, and only 50,000 voted for it. When you calculate that percentage, which

I did today, I get a figure of 77.77 repeater against. Almost 80 percent of the people of this province are on record as against the government plan. So, you know, it would be very interesting to know why the government cannot hear and will not listen to what the people are saying.

If the government says it's bringing in a new plan, a new bureaucracy, some tongue troopers and a language ombudsman - I don't want to get into this issue - but if they are, we're going to have tongue troopers running around like they do in Quebec stomping on signs and people, then I would like to know whether that is going to be put to the province and whether we're going to have public hearings on that new proposal. If that's a new proposal, it's going to be brought to the Legislature and to the people of Manitoba, then there should be public hearings on that. I think it would be interesting indeed to hear what the people said. I think some people will be more alarmed and more exercised than they were before.

So, Madam Chairman, I just want to say that one could read reams of material out of these briefs and out of the Hansard record in terms of what was said and what the government has failed to address. I want to give you just a couple of examples in the time allotted to me. There's a difference of opinion, you know, in the French-speaking community as to who represents French-speaking Manitobans, whether it's the SFM, whether it is the Association of Pro-Canadians or the Pro-Canadian Association represented by Mr. Prince, whether it is some other organizations or whether it's none of the above, because I know Mr. Lecuyer doesn't recognize Mr. Prince but he cannot deny that Mr. Prince represents a number of people in the community and 5,200 of them were ones who backed him up not too long ago when the SFM went off the deep end and decided to support separatism in the Quebec elections and decided to support Rene Levesque. In fact, it was pointed out that a number of the people who signed that petition were SFM members who were disillusioned with the leadership and voted against the leadership at that particular time. — (Interjection) — Possibly because he is an executive member of the organization, so he may be in a conflict of interest or he may be torn between the two positions.

Madam Chairman, Mr. Prince says that he represents an association - and I look at Page 100 here of his brief - which is shared by a vast majority of Manitobans of French expression who do not and cannot accept the Franco-Manitoban Society as representing the true identity of Canadians. He says that as far as he's concerned his organization doesn't want anything that Article 23 of The Manitoba Act doesn't give us we do not want, he says on Page 102. He says that any organization, on Page 103, that cannot support itself financially should not exist. That's a pretty good premise and one that I think has been referred to many times. Where are the references in this report? Where is even the counter? Where is the challenge? Where is the assessment of opinions that were put by Mr. Green? He appeared before this committee on September 8th; he made a very powerful brief. He claims in his brief, Page 208, that the government position on this question has set back bilingualism in the province at least a minimum of 50 years. Well, that's a statement that shouldn't go unchallenged.

He contends that he is for bilingualism, but not in the manner in which the government is introducing it. He also points out in his brief that when he was in the Schreyer administration that he and the government and the Premier would not deal or recognize with the Franco-Manitoban Society as being representative of French-speaking Manitobans. He said we didn't make an agreement with a private organization as to what the Constitution will say. Well, do remarks like that, are they to go unchallenged? Are they to be ignored in a document where you have 1,200 pages of presentations and questions and you have a couple of hundred words in response? What about - this one will interest Mr. Scott - Alice Richmond, I think he knows her.

MR. D. SCOTT: It doesn't interest me. I told her I did not want her vote.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, she's a constituent of Mr. Scott's and he said he told her he doesn't want her vote.

MR. D. SCOTT: I didn't want it; that was during the election. I didn't want it on my conscience.

MR. R. DOERN: She didn't want you as her representative, so you're tied on that account.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Madam Chairperson, in my remaining five minutes I will say this. She came before this committee and I remember her brief extremely well because I thought it was a pretty powerful brief and she's the one . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: She declared herself a bigot.

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, well it was a play on words. It was a play on words. Mr. Lecuyer calls everybody a bigot who doesn't support the government position and I've heard him in the House say that a couple of hundred times.

On Page 827, here's how Mrs. Richmond started out and I think it was a very good brief. She said, "Thank you very much for giving me this second chance. My name is Alice Richmond and I am a bigot; in fact I'm a red-neck bigot. I accept this appellation, not in the way Webster's Dictionary defines a bigot, but in the way it is applied today to anyone who opposes the entrenchment of the French language in the Manitoba Constitution."

Then she goes on and says she doesn't buy the two founding nations myth. She says she objects to the cost; she says she thinks it causes dissension; she says that surely we can have a new law or constitution for the 1980's, and she says, "We've been told entrenchment is necessary to preserve the French culture," and she says, "All I can say is the French culture must be very flimsy if it cannot be preserved without government assistance." She closed and said, "In closing I repeat I know I will be labelled as a bigot, but bigotry is not a criminal offence, blackmail is."

Finally, Madam Chairperson, I refer to Herb Schulz who came here and made a very powerful statement, so powerful indeed that he's been turfed out of the party. It seems to me that there should be some scope and room within a party, a government, an administration, for dissenting opinions, that not everyone should have to toe the line once the line is struck; and Mr. Schulz said, for example, at the beginning of his brief on 883, "I believe this government has undertaken something politically stupid, socially disruptive and totally unnecessary."

He also said that one wonders if the Société franco-manitobaine was called into being by cultural resurgence or by federal funding, and he says that we should focus on the future instead of directing our purposes. He talked about a morbid compulsion for social fragmentation and his concern that we are navel gazing and so on and so on and so on.

So, Madam Chairperson, I simply conclude on this point and say those are some of the briefs, those are some of the people who challenged the government, who stood up to the government, who questioned the government policy and the government just totally ignores them, ignores a couple of hundred briefs, hundreds of organizations, all the municipal men who were representing their areas, and in a cavalier fashion dismisses 175,000 voting Manitobans who said, no, we don't want this plan.

So I don't see how anybody, including the government members, and particularly the backbench members, can support this document, this so-called report. It doesn't make any sense and it is an insult both to the government supporters and the opponents of the government who took the time to prepare, to come here to present their ideas to the administration.

HON. G. LECUYER: On a point of order.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: What's your point of order?

HON. G. LECUYER: I didn't want to interrupt the previous speaker, but the previous speaker at one point there made the remark that I am currently a member of the executive of the SFM and that I may be perhaps in conflict. If he can stop navel gazing for a moment, I would like to remind him that I was a proud member of the executive of the SFM between March and July of 1972 and not now, and haven't been since.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: I just wanted to suggest that a disagreement between two members is not a point of order. It's not a point of order, Mr. Doern.

Mr. Penner.

HON. R. PENNER: I would like to address one of the primary questions which has been raised and that is the sufficiency of the report and in doing so I would like to preface my remarks by pointing out that part of the records of this committee are in fact all of the briefs which were presented in writing and all of the verbal remarks which were made as contained in Hansard; so that there is a complete public record of every word that was uttered.

Having said that, I want to make the following remark and I will take the question posed rhetorically by Mr.

Doern. He says, who can boil it down? Indeed that is the question. That is the question which we faced in looking at the question of how to report from this committee.

Let's take, as an example, the very excellent brief by Professor Bailey. It would have been an insult, in my view, and indeed prone to error to take Mr. Bailey's brief and to say, here's what Mr. Bailey said. No one could have said any better than Mr. Bailey what Mr. Bailey said and that is a document which is part of the record of this House.

I have been in the field of education and in dealing with editing long enough to know that the minute you begin to edit in the sense of boiling down, then you are prone to be injecting your own subjective view of what the writer or speaker said. It is no longer what the writer or speaker said; it is your version of what the writer or speaker said. Nor was it necessary, since all of these documents are part of the record of the House, for us to do that.

One then could look at an alternative approach; namely to take the submissions, the written and verbal submissions and say, in effect, that of these submissions, some 444, approximately 300 supported the position of the government. That would be the truth, but it would only be part of the truth, because many of them qualified their support in some way or another. So if we were to have done that and be honest - and that's what we attempted to do - you may disagree with the effect, but that's what we wanted to do, to do that we would have said, however, of these approximately 300 or whatever it was who supported us, here are some who had this qualification, here are some who had that qualification, here are some who had the third qualification; so that again would involve us in an interpretive quest which seemed to us to be unfair.

We were dealing with, one hoped, intelligent members of the committee; we will be dealing with, one hopes, intelligent members of the House who can read the record, who don't need, in that sense, our interpretation of what other people said or a summary, which is bound by its very nature to be incomplete. If one looks then, with these premises, and those were our premises - I have no hesitation in putting them on the table - we looked at the question of some more voluminous report. Those were our premises. What in fact do we say in the report? We say, I would submit with respect, far more than is attributed to this report by Mr. Doern or Mr. Lyon or others who have spoken.

First of all, we say that in the committee's view a political resolution of Manitoba's constitutional difficulties is preferable to a court-imposed solution. That's a very definite statement which, in our view, flows out of the majority of the submissions which were made.

"Your Committee recommends that the Legislative Assembly proceed with the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act." Indeed the majority, by far, of the submissions recommended that we proceed with the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act. They didn't all say that we should do it in one way or the other, but that was the vast bulk of those submissions which were made.

"Your committee also recommends that consideration be given to an amendment to Section 23.1." I would

say that approximately 90 percent of the submissions recommended that consideration be given to amendment to Section 23.1. Some wanted it strengthened; some wanted it eliminated; some wanted it qualified, but that statement is an accurate reflection of what came out of the submissions to the committee.

"It is recommended that the Assembly give consideration to an amendment to Section 23.5 to make it uniform with Section 23.4, so as to address concerns expressed with the delay period for the re-enactment of certain private and public municipal acts." Mr. Wehrle, who spoke specifically on behalf of St. Boniface Hospital and other clients who he represented, and speaking for some other lawyers - I think he was the only one that addressed this committee - but he raised a very important technical question. His one submission on that question has been addressed, or at least we are attempting to address it. So there was a responsiveness to another point raised before the committee.

"Your committee further recommends that Section 23.7 of the proposed resolution be reviewed so as to more explicitly delineate the responsibility of the Provincial Government with respect to the provision of communications . . . "etc. Indeed I would say that the vast majority of the submissions again that dealt with that issue - they all did not deal with that issue - indeed recommended in one way or another that we make this question of the government's responsibility in this area more definite.

Some were content to leave that provision in the resolution, but wanted some change in language. Some - for example, the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties - worried about the role of the court in relationship to that if it appeared in that way in the resolution.

So all of these certainly said, in effect, indeed almost in terms that the government should more explicitly delineate the responsibility of the government with respect to the delivery of services. Indeed the opposition said that, and this report is responsive to all of those submissions. Indeed it is responsive, I would say, to every submission that raised the question of 23.7 and 23.8.

"Your committee also recommends that consideration be given to the addition of a further subsection similar to Section 22 of The Constitution Act, 1982 which would provide protection for customary rights or privileges with respect to other languages." There were many many submissions that asked that that be done, and that statement accurately reflects that concern.

That's all I want to deal with now. I am not, Madam Chairperson, going to get into the substance of the question of the way in which, with respect to services and with respect to the constitutional problems which this province faces, they ought to be resolved. That will be done in the House. All I am saying, and it has to be said and I'll summarize, that it would have been, I think, a disservice to whether it was Mr. Bailey or Mr. Maldoff or Dr. Shaw or the other representative from the same organization or whoever, for anyone, whether it was myself or Mr. Anstett or the committee, to say, here's what they said. What they said is a matter of public record.

It would have been, I think, political chicanery for us to say, in our view, there was this overwhelming response to the government at committee, because

that's what we are bound to report as a committee, what we heard at committee, and just draw the numbers, our interpretation of what the numbers represent. We didn't want to do that. What we did is we reflected the concerns, and said that the government has to deal with those concerns. That's an honest report, and that is what's before this committee.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Just two brief comments on the substance of the report, and I asked the Clerk, so that there was no confusion, to provide members with that part of the report which is normally drafted by the Clerk, a listing of hearing locations and the individuals who presented briefs, and then append to that the draft report which comprises the whole motion to adopt the report, because there was some concern that the listing of people who have presented briefs to the committee did not appear. Clearly that is always part of the report of a committee and the list of the hearings, so I just want to put that to rest.

As well, the suggestion that the commitment to hold hearings by the government was something that was forced on the government last summer should be put to rest in terms of both the Premier's statement and the Attorney-General's statement in the House on June 27th and June 29th, respectively. The commitment on June 17th was to provide for public meetings at which the proposal could be explained with the caveat that no definitive decision had been reached on standing committee hearings, and that if they were necessary they would be considered — (Interjections) —

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please, order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Charleswood was not interrupted by me in his original remarks.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please, order please. Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I think clearly the committee process has been very valuable. Obviously, the government considers it to be of more value than the opposition, because the government has demonstrated a clear willingness to listen; whereas the opposition has demonstrated a willingness only to reject and not to try to find a solution. I think that's what is important. To suggest that the government took no account of the committee hearings, which the Leader of the Opposition suggested in his earlier remarks, doesn't take account of the points that Mr. Penner just made, and those were that the committee report specifically addresses the issues that were raised and, in my opinion - I certainly agree with the Attorney-General - every one of them are addressed in terms of the draft report.

I find it somewhat amazing that individuals who claim there was nothing in the report now find so much to talk about a month later, almost a month to the day that the report was distributed and it was suggested it wasn't worth debating because there was nothing in it. Now members suddenly find merit in debating it, because they have found something in it.

I think the report reflects accurately the committee process and, Madam Chairperson, that is why I

recommended it to the House or to the committee on November 21st. I see no reason to change that recommendation.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Filmon.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Chairperson. This is a report that, of course, brings the question forward, and I can't remember what movie it was in, but is that all there is? Is that all there really is? That's all I can ask when I see the report. The Minister says that we're saying an awful lot about a report that we had said that there was nothing to — (Interjection) — it's a song by Peggy Lee. Thank you for your reference. My pursuit of trivia has been answered by the Minister of Trivia.

HON. R. PENNER: Your party's pursuit of trivia has been crowned with success.

MR. G. FILMON: That's when we found the report — (Interjection) —

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please.
Mr. Filmon.

HON. S. LYON: Don't profane Christmas carols, please.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Chairman, the report obviously has nothing to say, and we are now discussing all the things that are not in the report, as opposed to what is in the report, all the things that ought to be in the report that are not in the report. We have good reason why the government chooses to say nothing about the hearings and chooses to ignore the opinions of Manitobans, because they are acting contrary to the opinions of the vast majority of Manitobans. They're acting contrary to the stated direct opinion of 76 percent of Winnipeg residents and almost 79 percent of non-Winnipeg residents, who responded in plebiscites saying that they were opposed to the entrenchment of an expansion of French language rights in the Constitution of Canada; that is, the proposal to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

The government both by virtue of its report and by virtue of the proposals that it has submitted publicly since that report has, in fact, indicated total disdain for that opinion. They do not intend to be guided by it, but they intend to rather push on despite the opinions of Manitobans - that's why we are discussing the inadequacy of the report - the obvious absence of reference to this strong expression of public opinion, and it's just another example of how the government has mishandled the whole issue right from Day One.

The fact that they started out going into uncharted waters, attempting to in some way make an issue for themselves, whether it be for future electioneering or to pay off a debt from the last election, they immediately went into uncharted waters at a time that there was no need to do anything whatsoever - no need to do anything whatsoever.

The Member for Inkster says about changing our minds on the issue. It is not we who are changing our minds on the issue, it's the government who day by day comes up with a new proposal. Of course, we're waiting to see what proposal they'll come up with next

week. Every day or two we get faced with a new proposal as the government again tries to find out what it's going to do on the matter. They are obviously in difficulty. They obviously have caused bitterness, divisiveness and acrimony in this province, the like of which has never been seen before, by opening up an area and a concern and an issue that was being dealt with fairly, was being dealt with both in the spirit and the intent of the rights of The Manitoba Act of 1870. Those rights were being restored, French-speaking Manitobans were appreciating the process and the progress that was being made towards it and yet the government had to try and get involved in some way and has totally, totally fouled up the whole issue.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs says that the government always intended to have public hearings on the issue, yet Hansard of June 17th will show that the Attorney-General said in response to a question in the Legislature that nothing could be changed, not one comma he said, because there was an agreement in place with other parties. Those parties presumably being the Government of Canada and the SFM.

Then it was only after that, only after tremendous pressure and debate in the House, questioning and pressure being put on by our side that eventually the government said that they would go to public hearings. Now, of course, it's obvious that the public hearings were a perfunctory exercise. There's nothing of substance that the government sees having come out of the public hearings. The Attorney-General tries to say that some of the statements take consideration of it, and he's hard pressed to try and demonstrate what he is saying, but the report is a fraud. The report is a fraud, because it leaves out all sorts of things that the government has since then - and it's only a matter of weeks after this report was presented that the government is now saying that it will de-entrench Section 23.7 and 23.8 entirely. That doesn't appear in this report.

All that the report says is your committee further recommends that Section 23.7 of the proposed resolution be reviewed. Now they've decided to de-entrench both it and Section 23.8. We're talking about totally different proposals than even those that were contemplated in this report and somehow both the Attorney-General and the Minister of Municipal Affairs are trying to justify their actions in this whole process.

All I say is that they've mishandled it in the past, that they continue to mishandle it, and that they are doing a total disservice to the public of Manitoba. They have argued that the further proposals that they have made are extraneous to this consideration and to this report and yet their report refers to things that were not referred to the committee, but presumably have come as a result of the wisdom they've gained since August, September and October, all the committee hearings - the plebiscite should have had some effect on them, one would presume, and yet they choose not to discuss it. They choose not to make it an issue to be the concern of the committee.

I say that therefore there is nothing here of substance to consider and that this report is an affront to all of Manitoba.

HON. S. LYON: Madam Chairperson, a few more words about this exercise that the government is having this

committee go through, which my leader has quite correctly characterized as being a form of fraud.

This committee is not making a meaningful report to the Legislature as it was charged to do. This committee is ignoring the fact that this government has engaged in more serpentine flip flops in the last two months than the usual desert wiggler snake that we see pictures of in the National Geographic Magazine.

As I said last time Madam Chairperson, if a government is in a conundrum and hasn't made up its mind, if it has the frankness and the forthrightness to make that statement, as indeed a month ago I admitted to them, if they had merely said the honest thing - and I realize that that's difficult for them to do - if they had said the honest thing that they were still working on substantive amendments and hadn't come up with this hacked-up fraudulent report, I think the government would be in better standing with the people today, but as it is, it's credibility is below zero, because the people of Manitoba can't believe this government. They can't believe this government in anything that it says or does.

Here was the government, Madam Chairperson, that started out in May of this year and those brave not-to-be forgotten words of the Attorney-General that he had intervened in this Bilodeau case and he had arrived at an agreement that was going to forestall the serious adverse effects that he and he alone could see from the Bilodeau case, and that the agreement was somehow or other already chiseled in stone, and that nobody could change anything in the agreement — (Interjection) — well he had also - my colleague reminds me, the deputy leader reminds me, he had also done some polling. We're still waiting to see the polling that the Attorney-General of Manitoba did, wherein 70 percent of the people of Manitoba, according to his poll - and he said this in the House so we must take it as being an honest statement by him - 70 percent of the people of Manitoba, he said, in his poll were in favour of the government's proposals.

We'd like to see that poll — (Interjection) — Oh yeah, he said that he would offer it to us Madam Chairperson. I don't know why the committee hasn't received that vital piece of information that shows us just how supportive the people of Manitoba are for the government's propositions.

But there he was back in May with his obedient little flock trundling along behind him saying, we're not going to change a word or a tittle of this agreement, it's etched in stone, we're saving the people of Manitoba from God knows what kind of sins and that's the way it is, and furthermore we're not having any committee hearings. That was debunked right away. I asked the question the very first day. It's all in Hansard. We don't need the puerile interpretations of the Minister of Municipal Affairs of what Hansard says. The record shows the statements he made here today to be not founded in fact, because in fact both the Premier and the Attorney-General refused public hearings through the committee process when they were asked by me and other people on our side of the House to have those public hearings. They were dragged kicking and screaming into these very public hearings which the Attorney-General now puts on his mask of thoughtfulness and says, we want to give careful consideration to all of the briefs that have been presented. All of the briefs that he didn't want to hear

in the first place he now wants to give careful consideration to.

Well, then the careful consideration that he gives, Madam Chairman, is manifested in a page-and-a-quarter report which says, we're going to go ahead and do as we thought in the first place; and that report, as we pass it here today, is fraudulent, because it doesn't even represent the current thinking of this government, if this government can be believed in anything that it says. Are we to believe, are the people of Manitoba to believe, that on December 15th that document that the "new Minister" circulated to the people of Manitoba, are we to believe that's a meaningful document? Because we don't see anything of it mentioned in here.

My leader has just pointed out, this report says, "Your committee further recommends that Section 23.7 of the proposed resolution be reviewed so as to more explicitly delineate the responsibilities of the Provincial Government with respect to the provision of communications and available services in English and French, and that a specific exclusion be provided with respect to this section for all municipalities and school boards."

Madam Chairman, we look at the review that this report talks about. This report says 23.7 is going to be reviewed. On December 15th the report that I think they handed out, and I think they mean to be true, said that they were going to take 23.7 out of the proposal altogether. That's some review; that's what I would call a real socialist review. Kill it; kill it. That's a socialist review, they wiped it out.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's the way they review oppositions.

HON. S. LYON: Madam Chairman . . .

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Madam Chairman, I merely point out that my honourable friends really don't know what they are about; they haven't known what they were about from the beginning of this exercise of agony through which they have put the people of Manitoba.

On the 6th of September, the Attorney-General walked into this committee and presented a whole series of amendments to the government's proposal which, of course, they didn't want debated in the House so he presents them here. Then, at the end of the committee hearings, we are presented with a report that doesn't talk about those amendments at all. Well, Madam Chairman, did they mean anything in the amendments that they presented on the 6th of September, or was that another piece of the usual fraud that we have come to expect from this government in its dealings with the Legislature and the people of Manitoba? No, and here they are, today, asking us to go through the motion of passing a report which doesn't reflect, if we can believe them, the current situation in Manitoba with respect to their intentions about constitutional amendment at all. — (Interjection) — The Minister says, for the record, Madam Chairman, "It absolutely does." I know what this government absolutely does and absolutely doesn't want. This

government absolutely does want to cut and run today. They want to get out of this committee so fast that you won't see anything but dust because they can't stand the heat of the committee.

That is why we are meeting here, Madam Chairman, about two days before Christmas at the behest of this bunch. We are meeting here because they want to cut and run like a bunch of scared rabbits. Not only do they want to cut and run, they want to leave a report behind that doesn't even represent what the committee heard, what the committee thinks, what the people of Manitoba want, what's in the public interest or, to add insult to injury, even what the government now intends to do. Not only is the report a fraud, Madam Chairman, the government's a fraud. It can't deal honestly with the people of Manitoba; it can't deal honestly with this committee.

Madam Chairman, we are facing a sorry day in this province when a collection of incompetents such as we face in this NDP Government today can cause the kind of division and hard feeling among our people that has never been evident in this province in this century. That, Madam Chairman, I think is going to be the lasting indictment against this crew of incompetents before they are kicked unceremoniously out of office when the election is called and when the Member for Tuxedo is installed as the new Premier and starts to put to right some of the damage that has been done by this collection of people.

So, Madam Chairman, what I say to them today is, they can use their majority, as they will, to get this piece of fraud which they're pleased to call a report through the committee, but they're not fooling anybody and, most of all, they are not fooling the people of Manitoba. I want to say that our Leader and our party will continue to speak for the people of Manitoba on this issue because the people of Manitoba know they can trust us. They know they can't trust the NDP on this issue anymore because they're a group of charlatans who have been playing fast and loose with the history, with the tradition of this province in the past and, indeed, with the future lives of young people in this province.

MR. G. LECUYER: You're an insult to history.

HON. S. LYON: The member from wherever says that I am an insult to history. Well, Madam Chairman, I will take my chances and my reputation and my integrity and stake them against his, or the whole collection of that group, any time, any day, any place by any historian other than one of the pinkos that they happen to haul before the committee to help them out once in a while who gives a distorted version of Manitoba history because it happens to suit what the current perambulations of this government are.

So I want the people of Manitoba to be clearly aware, as my Leader has said today, that we're not going to participate in this fraud without calling it what it is. We have seen all of the changes that this government has made. They are running like scared rabbits. What they're afraid of, Madam Chairman - and believe me when I say this - they are afraid, ultimately, of the verdict of the people which is going to be pronounced upon them, perhaps sooner than they think.

What they are more afraid of in the short term is having to debate anything in this committee that relates

to the facts of this situation. It is that kind of peculiar in-bred arrogance which has led them into this situation in the first place which has caused so much agony to the province, that kind of peculiar in-bred arrogance that these social engineers think that they can change the history, and the background, and the practice of this province to accord to some imagined improvement that they are going to make in the language situation in this province.

Madam Chairman, the difficult decisions with respect to language had to be taken in 1979 and 1980, and to their credit. I say that at that time when the bill was brought before the Legislature to give formal ratification to the re-introduction of Section 23, as ordered by the Supreme Court of Canada, my recollection is that the New Democratic Party in opposition voted for that, and that was the difficult decision that had to be made.

Madam Chairman, that, I may remind the Attorney-General, was before he joined their ranks, or half the ones that we see here, and that there were at that time in their caucus at least some who understood what obedience to the rule of law meant. Looking at the perambulations of the Attorney-General, with respect to the staying of proceedings on abortion cases, we are wondering if he knows nowadays what the rule of law really means, and if he can keep his long sticky fingers out of the manipulative process of criminal justice in this province. But that's another topic that we will be debating at good length when the House reconvenes.

So, Madam Chairman, I merely want to say today that we are not willingly participating in this fraud being perpetrated by this government, we are not willingly participating in it at all, because this report does not represent either what the committee heard, what the people of Manitoba want, or what is in the public interest of the people of Manitoba. This government is cutting and running, getting out from under as fast as they can. It wouldn't surprise me in the least if, as we sit here today, they are considering even further withdrawals from the position that is stated in their letter of December 15th wouldn't surprise me in the least and so, Madam — (Interjection) — the Member for Inkster says, what are we suggesting? We're suggesting that you be frank and forthright and, for a change, honest with the people of Manitoba as to what your real intentions are.

We say, Madam Chairman, that the government should start now on this fundamentally important issue being honest. We've had enough of the backroom politicking by this taudry caucus, we've had quite enough of that and the people of Manitoba don't want any more, they're sick to their stomachs. They're sick to their stomachs, Madam Chairman, with the exhibition of irresponsibility that this government has perpetrated while it fills temporarily the offices of public trusteeship in this province on an issue that is so fundamental.

I ask them to start acting like honest people; I ask them to start bearing up to their responsibilities to let the people of Manitoba know what their real intentions are. If there are to be further withdrawals of this bad piece of legislation that they introduced into the House last May, let's hear them. Let's hear them now so that this committee can do its honest and responsible job, and let's stop this smoke and mirrors, this shadow dancing that we've seen going on by this government.

We know, Madam Chairman, that there isn't much innate democracy in this party today. We, in this committee, have been witness to part of that tragedy that was made reference to by the Member for Elmwood, when a person who was a member of the NDP appeared before this committee and made statements against the position of the NDP he was called before the New Democratic Party's thought police just a week or so ago and was expelled from the party. I make no common cause with Herb Schulz, he's been a socialist all his life and will be, will continue to be. We will agree to disagree on most issues of a public nature but I say it is a tragedy when a political party, particularly a political party which holds itself out as fit to govern, has that kind of thought police system going on within its ranks so that it can expel from its ranks anybody who disagrees with it. That has a kind of totalitarian overtone to it, Madam Chairman, that the people of Manitoba are not going to ignore, they're not going to ignore . . .

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: They don't call it expelling it anymore; they call it reviewing.

HON. S. LYON: So, Madam Chairman, let there be no doubt that, as my leader has said, we on this side of the House know that this government is perpetrating a form of charade on the people of Manitoba.

As my leader has said, we're going to vote against this report because it isn't true, it doesn't represent what's going on in Manitoba and that's sufficient reason in itself. The fact that it is contrary to the public interest to do what this report says is even worse.

I call upon this government, if it has reflective moments at all, to reflect upon the damage that it has caused to the people of Manitoba since last May, and when it has reflected upon that I will suggest, Madam Chairman, that there is one clear cut, honourable course left, abandon these ill-starred proposals which have caused so much agony to our people, abandon these proposals and get back to the business of trying to run the public affairs of Manitoba, and not to destroy this province for which I, and my party, have a great deal of feeling. We would only hope that members of this presumed government would begin to have some feeling for their fellow citizens in this province.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: The question before the committee is the report as moved by Mr. Anstett on November 21st.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Madam Chairman, I want to respond to the Attorney-General who made comments about the difficulty of preparing a report, and I want to say, basically, that this is a constitutional amendment and although it may be a difficult task to pour over all of those pages, some 1,200 in length, that there have been many significant reports made in this province and in this country which had at least as difficult a task, if not more so.

The two that come readily to mind are the Carter Commission on Taxation which wasn't a short precis,

and the Hall Commission on Medicare which wasn't produced in 25 words or less. Those were . . . — (Interjection) — They're Royal Commissions, fine, but the point is that they were significant studies and this I take - and I assume the Minister of Municipal Affairs does - is an important and historic document, and that this joke which has been handed out in the committee, one-and-a-quarter pages long, in no way, shape or form reflects the substance of those particular hearings. So that if it takes the government - the government has the resources, the government has the staff - the government could have assigned this project to a team of people to go through the documents, to make extracts, to make comments, to make comparisons, to make analyses of it and they chose not to do that.

I would be very interested to hear from the Attorney-General whether any attempt was made by the government to make an extract from these 1,200 pages because my impression is that a meeting was probably called and somebody said; to hell with it, let's just whip up a one-page report and that will suffice. That strikes me as giving short shrift to a very important document.

I'm simply saying that there is so much in here that is just being totally ignored and being swept aside, and I cite one final example. Dr. Shaw came here - he presented, I think, one of the most interesting and important briefs of anybody who appeared before the committee - and he argued that language rights are the responsibility of the Federal Government and must not, and should not, be enacted by the provinces. He said that if we put this type of legislation into place we will help the P.Q. in terms of Bill 101 in the Province of Quebec, and he said that this is the worst thing that we could do.

Now the government argued from the beginning, and Mr. Maldoff put this argument, he put it to the caucuses of the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party and he put it to this committee. He said you have to legislate now to, first of all, save the English-speaking minority in Quebec and, secondly, to save the nation. That's one of the key arguments that has been put by the government, in terms of this legislation, as to why it should proceed; not a word on that, not one word countering what Dr. Shaw said.

I simply say, Madam Chairman, that I can't accept what the Attorney-General says. I don't believe that it isn't possible for a group of people to take the time - whether it's six months or a year, what's the rush - to put together a team of people to analyze these submissions and to produce a first-rate report, rather than a single page which just ignores everything and blythely suggests to the government that it proceed. I don't accept for a split second what the Attorney-General says and I think all that he is doing is giving credence to the view that the government didn't have any interest in the public hearings; wasn't prepared to listen to them; and that they were, in the view of the administration, they were held and they were simply called as a sham, that they were no more than a sham.

Well, I didn't take them as a sham, and the people who prepared the briefs didn't take them as a sham, and the members of this committee appeared to be genuinely interested in the results and in the submissions. I'm simply asking the Attorney-General that if he's sincere that he should delay this motion and set up a group and give them as an assignment

the task of carefully examining and analyzing the public briefs that were presented to the committee, some 400 in all.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: The question has been called. The question before the committee is the report as moved by Mr. Anstett on November 21st. All those in favour say aye.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Aye.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: All those opposed?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Nay.

MADAM CHAIRPERSON: In my opinion, the ayes have it.
Committee rise.

APPENDIX

COMMITTEE REPORT AS ADOPTED ON DECEMBER 22, 1983

By Resolution of the Legislature passed on August 18, 1983 which reads in part: "WHEREAS the Government of the Province of Manitoba has proposed a resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which amendment concerns the translation of the statutes of Manitoba or some of them and the question of government services in French as well as the English language; and WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba deems it advisable to hear the views of Manitobans on the subject matter of this Resolution;" your Committee met for organization on Thursday, August 18, 1983 at 3:00 p.m. and agreed to hold public hearings on dates and at locations as follows:

WINNIPEG — September 6, 7, 8 & 9, 1983
Room 255, Legislative Building
450 Broadway

THOMPSON — Monday, September 12, 1983
St. Joseph's Ukrainian Catholic
Parish Hall
340 Juniper Drive

SWAN RIVER — Wednesday, September 14, 1983
Legion Hall
6th Avenue N.

STE. ROSE — Friday, September 16, 1983
Ste. Rose Community Centre
on Gulf Street

BRANDON — Monday, September 19 and
Tuesday
September 20, 1983
Victoria Inn, Salon 1 and 2
3550 Victoria W.

MORDEN — Thursday, September 22, 1983
Community Hall
Second Street N.

ARBORG — Monday, September 26, 1983
Arborg Community Hall
North end of Ingolf Street

STE. ANNE — Tuesday, September 27, 1983
Legion Community Centre
Arena Road

Representations from organizations and private citizens were made as follows:

WINNIPEG, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Messrs. Eric Maldoff, Michael Goldbloom,
Geoffrey Chambers & Laurent Marcoux,
Alliance Québec.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Alliance Québec was continued.
Messrs. Léo Letourneau & Jean-Bernard
Lafontaine, Fédération des francophones hors
Québec,
Mr. Maurice Prince, Association des pro-
canadiens,
Professor Donald Bailey, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by Professor Bailey was continued.
Mr. Terry J. Prychitko, Ukrainian Community
Development Committee,
Mr. Danny Waldman, Manitoba Association for
Bilingual Education.

WINNIPEG, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Danny Waldman, Manitoba Association for
Bilingual Education,
Ms. Sybil Shack & Mr. Abe Arnold, Manitoba
Association for Rights and Liberties.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Manitoba Association for Rights
and Liberties was continued.
Mr. Ken Reddig, Concerned Mennonites Group.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by Concerned Mennonites Group
was continued.
Dr. Yantay Tsai, Chinese Community.

WINNIPEG, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Presentation by Dr. Yantay Tsai was continued.
Mrs. Una Johnstone, Private Citizen,
Mr. Sidney Green, Manitoba Progressive Party.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Mr. Sidney Green of the
Manitoba Progressive Party was continued.
Mr. Georges Forest, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Olivier Beaudette, Conseil de la coopérative
du Manitoba,
Mr. Michel Roy, Conseil Jeunesse provinciale,

Mr. Maurice Laberge, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gary Doer, Manitoba Government Employees
Association.

WINNIPEG, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. Stephen Scott, Professor of Constitutional
Law.

2:00 P.M.

Mr. Gary Doer, Manitoba Government Employees
Association,

Mr. Gilles Lesage, Société historique de St.
Boniface,

Mr. Raymond Clément, Alliance chorale.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Florent Arnaud, Danseurs de la Rivière
Rouge,

Mr. Raymond Poirier, Fédération provinciale des
comités des parents,

Mr. Paul Fort & Ms. Linda Asper, Educateurs
franco-manitobains,

Mr. Jean Taillefer, Private Citizen.

THOMPSON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Jack Brightnose, Private Citizen,
Mr. Guy Lacroix, Société franco-manitobaine,
Mr. Arvind Aggarwal, Manitoba 23.

2:00 P.M.

Ms. Farideda Dharamshi, Thompson Muslim
Association.

**SWAN RIVER, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14,
1983**

10:00 A.M.

Ms. Gwen Palmer, Swan Valley School Division,
Mr. Leonard Harapiak, Private Citizen,

Ms. Alice Allen, Private Citizen,
Ms. Allen also presented a brief on behalf of
Ms. Olga Wowchuk, Private Citizen,

Mr. Jim Robertson, Private Citizen,

Mr. Joe Beer, Private Citizen,

Ms. Madeleine Beaudry, Private Citizen,

Ms. Irène Garand, Société franco-manitobaine,
Reeve Harold L. Ellingson, R.M. of Swan River.

2:00 P.M.

Reeve J.M. McIntosh, R.M. of Minitonas,

Mr. Murray Wenstoeb, Private Citizen,

Ms. Liona Painchaud, Private Citizen,

Mr. Jack Fleming, Manitoba Metis Federation,
Inc.,

Mr. Fleming also presented a brief on behalf of
Manitoba 23,

Mr. Ken Fransoo, Private Citizen,

Mr. Ron Richards, Camperville Community
Council,

Mayor E.A. Hart, Village of Minitonas,

Mayor Fred Sigurdson, Town of Swan River,
Ms. Debbie Dilts, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Alice Allen, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ed Carrière, Private Citizen.

STE. ROSE, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Louis Molgat, Jolly Club and as a Private
Citizen,

Mr. Jacques Peloquin, Private Citizen,
Reeve Joe Van De Poele, R.M. of Ste. Rose and
as a Private Citizen,

Ms. Adeline Furkalo, Private Citizen,

Mr. André Saquet, Private Citizen,

Reeve Bjarni Sigurdson, LGD of Alonsa,

Mr. Daniel Boucher, Société franco-manitobaine,
Reeve Phillips, R.M. of Dauphin,

Mr. Gus Arnal, Private Citizen,

Ms. Alice Saquet, Private Citizen,

Mr. Ronald A. Simard, Private Citizen,

Father Tessier, Private Citizen,

Rev. Jack McLaughlin, Private Citizen,

Sister Mona Lewandowski, Private Citizen,

Ms. Isabelle Archambault, Private Citizen,

Mr. Arthur Milette, Private Citizen,

Ms. Gisèle L'Heureux, Private Citizen,

Mr. David Grey, Swan River Indian & Metis
Friendship Centre Inc.,

Mr. Louis Saquet, Club d'âge d'or de Laurier,

Ms. Rose-Anne Verley, Private Citizen,

Mr. Roy Laycock, Private Citizen,

Mr. René L. Maillard, Village of Ste. Rose,

Mr. Gilbert Rioux & Ms. Claudette Savard,
Commissaires d'écoles franco-manitobains,

Mr. G. Wachsmann, Private Citizen.

7:00 P.M.

Ms. Jeannine Archambault, Private Citizen,

Soeur Hélène St. Amant, Private Citizen,

Mr. Ovide Pelletier, Private Citizen,

Mr. Hervé Molgat, Private Citizen,

Ms. Claudette Gingras, Private Citizen.

BRANDON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Joseph E. Magnet, Société franco-
manitobaine,

Mr. Dennis Heeney, R.M. of Elton.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Mr. Dennis Heeney of the R.M.
of Elton was continued,

Reeve Manson L. Moir, Director, Western District,
Union of Manitoba Municipalities,

Reeve Art Cowan, R.M. of Cameron,

Mayor L.W. Waters, Town of Carberry,

Father Art Seaman, Private Citizen,

Reeve J.C. Ashcroft, R.M. of Birtle,

Ms. Hazel Allen, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Ernest Buhler, R.M. of Hamiota,

Mayor John Rankin, Mayor of Hamiota,
Reeve John Mitchell, R.M. of Rossburn,
Mayor Ken Carels, Town of Melita,
Mr. Mervin Tweed, R.M. of Brenda,
Reeve Kenneth Rapley, R.M. of Strathclair,
Reeve Sydney J. Lye, R.M. of Portage la Prairie,
Ms. Margaret Hammel, Group of Concerned
Citizens.

BRANDON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Rev. Michael Skrumedas, West-Man Multicultural
Council,
Mr. Aaron Berg, Private Citizen,
Reeve Einar Sigurdson, R.M. of Lakeview,
Gene Nerbas, Councillor, R.M. of Shellmouth.

1:30 P.M.

Ms. Maud Lelond, Private Citizen,
Reeve Barry Dixon, R.M. of Morton,
Mr. Ross C. Martin, Brandon & District Labour
Council,
Mayor G. McKinnon, Town of Virden,
Mr. Alfred Rogosin, Private Citizen,
Reeve Fred Kolesar, R.M. of Minto,
Mayor Omer Chartier, Village of St. Lazare,
Mrs. Lucille Chartier, Private Citizen,
Mr. Mathieu Deschambault, Private Citizen,
Reeve Willard McFarland, R.M. of Oakland,
Reeve Jack M. Hanlin, R.M. of Miniota,
Mr. Albert Hodson, Village of Elkhorn,
Ms. Janet Goertzen, Manitoba Metis Federation
(Southwest Region).

7:00 P.M.

Mr. W.H. Ryan, Grand Orange Lodge of Manitoba,
Mr. H.H. Young, Private Citizen,
Mr. David McConkey, Private Citizen,
Mr. Dave Campbell, Private Citizen,
Ms. Gail Campos, Private Citizen,
Reeve Allan M. Rose, R.M. of Whitewater,
Mr. Terry Penton, Private Citizen,
Reeve Albert Chapman, R.M. of Daly.

MORDEN, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. David Arnott, Private Citizen,
Reeve Henry D. Hildebrand, R.M. of Rhineland,
Mr. Bill Muirhead, Private Citizen,
Reeve Donald J. Alexander, R.M. of Thompson,
Reeve Dave Harms, R.M. of Pembina,
Mr. Gérald Grenier, Société franco-manitobaine.

2:00 P.M.

Mr. Bill Spencer, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ernie Sloane, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ted Dodd, United Church of Canada,
Mr. Albert St. Hilaire, R.M. of Montcalm,
Reeve Julius Petkau, R.M. of Grey,
Mr. Henri Bouvier, Village of St. Léon,
Mr. Eric Lansky, Private Citizen,
Reeve R. Ivan Stocks, R.M. of Roland.

7:30 P.M.

Ms. Anne Mc Eachern, Private Citizen,
Ms. Marie-Blanche Oliviero, Private Citizen,
Mr. Travis McCullough, Private Citizen,
Ms. Adéline Fillion, Community of St. Joseph,
Mr. George Henderson, Private Citizen,
Mr. Peter Francis, Private Citizen,
Ms. Jacqueline Fortier, Private Citizen,
Ms. Yvonne Pantel, Comité de parents,
Mr. Paul A. Cenerini, Personnel de l'Institut
collégial Notre-Dame,
Ms. Thérèse Bilodeau, Private Citizen,
Mr. Olier Labossière, Private Citizen,
Reeve Roy McLaren, R.M. of Louise,
Mayor George Kozak, Village of Manitou,
Mr. Raymond Labossière, Private Citizen.

ARBORG, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Reeve Edward Peltz, R.M. of Woodlands,
Reeve Harold Jones, R.M. of Woodlands,
Councillor Vernon Sund, R.M. of Woodlands,
Mr. Rens Renooy, South Interlake Planning
District.

2:00 P.M.

Mayor Ken Reid, Village of Arborg,
Ms. Lesley Osland, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ray Sigurdson, on behalf of the R.M. of Gimli
and as a Private Citizen,
Mr. T. Hoffman presented a brief on behalf of
Mr. Karl Lange, Private Citizen,
Mr. Mike Taczynski, Private Citizen,
Mr. John Cochrane, Private Citizen,
Mr. Robert Dubois, Société franco-manitobaine.

7:30 P.M.

Mrs. Blanche Tully, on behalf of the people of
Marquette & District,
Mr. Jim Day, Private Citizen,
Mr. Rob Sarginson, Private Citizen,
Ms. Alvira Altman presented a brief on behalf
of Mr. Bill Pendree,
Reeve William Halabura, LGD of Armstrong,
Ms. Margaret Smith, Private Citizen.

STE. ANNE, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. F.P. Doyle, Private Citizen,
Mr. René Vermette, Division scolaire de la Rivière
Rouge No. 17,
Mr. Guy Lévesque, Private Citizen,
Ms. Irène Lemoine, Comité de parents de l'école
Pointe des Chênes,
Mr. Roger Legal, Private Citizen,
Mr. Louis Bernardin, Private Citizen,
Mr. Paul Ruest, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jean Detillieux, Private Citizen,
Dr. G. Lemoine, Comité de parents des Scouts
et Guides de Ste. Anne,
Mr. Tobie Perrin, Private Citizen,
Reeve John Giesbrecht and Councillor Gilbert
Tétrault, R.M. of La Broquerie,

Ms. Margaret Smith, Centre culturel corporatif de Ste. Anne,
Reeve Carl F. Pitura, R.M. of Macdonald.

2:00 P.M.

Mr. Norbert Ritchot, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Joan Chaput, Private Citizen,
Ms. Cécile Mulaire, Private Citizen,
Mr. Robert Freynet, Private Citizen,
Mr. Maurice Prince, Association des pro-canadiens,
Mr. George Léger, Private Citizen,
Mr. Eugène Kirouac, Bureau d'administration de la Caisse Populaire de la Broquerie,
Mr. Raymond Boily, Private Citizen,
Mr. Alfred Laurencelle, Comité de centenaire de La Broquerie,
Mr. Lionel Joyal, Private Citizen,
Ms. Béatrice Freynet-Boily, Private Citizen,
Mr. Armand Desharnais, Comité culturel de St. Pierre,
Reeve John Loewen, R.M. of Hanover,
Dr. Archambault, Private Citizen,
Mr. Rino Ouellet, Comité de parents des écoles françaises de La Broquerie,
Ms. Michelle Freynet-Arbez, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Ms. Agnes Dubois, Comité de parents de l'école Noel-Ritchot de St. Norbert,
Ms. Laurette Théberge, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Marie-Joseph Fiset, Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains Inc.,
Ms. Dolores Legal, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gérard Desrosiers, Private Citizen,
Ms. Gabrielle St. Hilaire-Mulaire, Educateurs franco-manitobains de la division scolaire Rivière Seine,
Mr. Gilles Hébert, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Lucienne Boucher, Private Citizen,
Mayor Roger Smith, Town of Ste. Anne,
Mr. Léo Robert, Société franco-manitobaine,
Mr. Richard Loeb, Private Citizen,
Mr. Frank Baker, Private Citizen,
Mr. Roger Lafrenière, Private Citizen,
Ms. Elaine Tougas, Etudiants de l'école Pointe des Chênes,
Mr. Normand Roy, Private Citizen,
Father Laval Cloutier, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gérard Fontaine, Village of St. Pierre-Jolys and Conseil économique de la Rivière Rouge,
Mr. Daniel Tougas, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gérard Gauthier, La classe des finissants de l'école secondaire de La Broquerie,
Ms. Valérie Vielfaure, La classe grade 11 de l'école secondaire de la Broquerie,
Mr. Donald Boulet, Private Citizen,
Ms. Nicole Fontaine, Private Citizen,
Mr. Norbert Piché, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jean-Paul Lemoine, Private Citizen,
Ms. Carole Therrien, Conseil Etudiant, Ecole secondaire La Broquerie,
Mr. Denis A. Fontaine, Association des professeurs de la division scolaire Rivière Rouge,

Mr. Roland Gauthier, Club sportif de La Broquerie,
Mr. Michel Lavergne, Collège régional français,
Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin, Comité des parents.

WINNIPEG, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Messrs. Stan Carbone & Mario Audino, Italian-Canadian League of Manitoba,
Mr. Merle Hartlin, Private Citizen,
Mr. Clarence Morris, Private Citizen,
Mr. Fred Cameron, Private Citizen,
Mr. A. Bedbrook, Private Citizen.

2:00 P.M.

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

7:30 P.M.

Ms. Margaret Harding, Private Citizen,
Mr. Tom Fuddy, Private Citizen,
Mr. Reginald Dubbin, Private Citizen,
Mr. H.C. Lim, Chinese Community Council of Manitoba,
Mr. David Osborne, Canadian Parents for French,
Mr. Robert Clague, Private Citizen,
Mr. E.T. Annandale, Private Citizen,
Mr. Dave Harms, President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

WINNIPEG, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Herb Schulz, Private Citizen,
Mr. Alan Beachell, Private Citizen,
Mr. Michel Simard, Association des Etudiants du Collège universitaire de St. Boniface,
Mr. H.S. Dulat, Sikh Society of Manitoba Inc., Singh Sabha of Winnipeg Inc., Nanaksar Satsang Sabha of Manitoba Inc.

2:00 P.M.

Ms. Paula Fletcher, Communist Party of Manitoba,
Mr. Jack Oatway, R.M. of Rosser,
Mr. Renald Guay, Associations des avocats francophones,
Mr. Marc Monnin, Collège de St. Boniface,
Mr. K.B. Jakubowicz, Canadian Polish Congress (Manitoba Division),
Ms. Florence Bourgoïn, Private Citizen,
Ms. Maralyne Donovan, Private Citizen,
Ms. Rita Lecuyer, Pluri-elles,
Mr. Helmut Albrecht, Private Citizen,
Ms. Janick Belleau, Réseau,
Messrs. B.T. Quennelle and Paul Moist, CUPE, Local 998.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by CUPE, Local 998 was continued.
Mr. Charles Gagné, Private Citizen,
Ms. Emile Clune, President, Local 5 of the
Communications Workers of Canada,
Mrs. B. MacKenzie, Private Citizen,
Dr. E. Sabbadini & Mr. Dino Longhi, Dante,
Alighieri Italian Cultural Society.

WINNIPEG, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. William F. Shaw, on behalf of some interested
groups in the Province of Québec.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Dr. W.F. Shaw was continued.
Mr. Bruce Odium, Past President of the Welsh
Society,
Mr. Jerry Dorfman, Private Citizen,
Mr. Martin Samoiloff, Private Citizen,
Mr. A.J. Moreau, Private Citizen,
Mr. Christian Schubert, Private Citizen,
Mr. Edouard Véronneau, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ernest A. Wehrle, St. Boniface General
Hospital,
Messrs. Baruch Rand & Myron J. Spolsky,
Manitoba Association for the Promotion of
Ancestral Languages.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by Manitoba Association for the
Promotion of Ancestral Languages was
continued.
Reeve Clarence Kiesman, LGD of Grahamdale,
Ms. Lillian Stevens, Private Citizen,
Ms. Mary-Ann Adams, Private Citizen,
Ms. Claire Toews, Private Citizen,
Mr. Kenneth Emberley, Private Citizen.

WINNIPEG, MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. W. Potter, Private Citizen.

2:00 P.M.

Professor A.R. Kear, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gordon W. Pollon, Private Citizen,
Mr. Michael Kibzey, Private Citizen,
Dr. Neil G. McDonald, Manitoba 23.

7:30 P.M.

Mrs. Friesen, Private Citizen,
Mrs. B. Holst, Private Citizen
Ms. Beryl Kirk, Private Citizen,
Ms. Sandra Oleson, Private Citizen,
Ms. Judy Flynn, Private Citizen,
Ms. Ruth Rannie, Private Citizen,
Mr. André Fréchette, Association des professeurs
du Collège universitaire de St. Boniface,
Ms. Linda Archer, Private Citizen,
Ms. Juliette Blais, Private Citizen,
Dr. Rey Pagtakhan, National Chairman, United
Council of Filipino Association in Canada;
Advisor, Phillipine Association of Manitoba.

WINNIPEG, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Vic Savino, Private Citizen,
Mr. Lucien Loiselle, Le Centre culturel franco-
manitobain,
Mr. Rhéal Tefaine, La Fédération des Caisses
Populaires du Manitoba Inc.

2:00 P.M.

Rev. Bill Hutton, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ferdinand Guiboche, Private Citizen,
Mr. J.G. Russel, Private Citizen,
Mr. Guy Savoie, Fort Gibraltar et la Brigade de
la Rivière Rouge,
Mr. Ivan Merritt, Private Citizen,
Dr. Joe Slogan, Tri Club of Winnipeg.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Taib Soufi, Private Citizen,
Dr. Vedanand, National Association of Canadians
of Origins in India,
Ms. S. Stephansson, Private Citizen,
Mr. Chandra, National Association for Canadians
of Indian Origins,
Mr. Georges Forest, Union Nationale Métisse St.
Joseph du Manitoba,
Mr. Barry Turnbull, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jim Robertson,
Town of Souris,
Mr. John M. Brooks,
Mayor A.R. Friesen, Town of Morden,
Reeve J.R. Guthrie, R.M. of Pipestone,
Mr. Ben Pemky,
Town of The Pas,
Submission received and signed from Swan
River,
Mr. Jim Chegwin,
R.M. of Sifton,
Mme. Irène Lecomte (Ste. Rose, Manitoba),
Ms. Hélène Montsion, Comité culturel de Ste.
Rose,
Mrs. Elvier Brunel,
R.M. of Shoal Lake,
Mr. Jim Reid, R.M. of Albert,
Reeve Arnold M. Birch, R.M. of Rosedale,
Mayor Ken Burgess, City of Brandon,
R.M. of Arthur,
Ms. Mariette Bosc Saquet (Laurier, Manitoba),
Mr. Jean-Louis Saquet,
Mr. René Saquet (Laurier, Manitoba),
Mr. Jacques Saquet (Wasagaming, Manitoba),
Reeve Norton E. Cassils, R.M. of Winchester,
Mr. Harry F. Robinson (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mayor M.J. Stefaniuk, Rapid City Town Council,
Ms. Marie-Joséphe Fisete, Fédération des aînés
franco-manitobains,
Mr. Fablo Jajalla (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Manitoba Municipal Administrators Association,
Mr. Arno H. Jansen, United German School of
North Kildonan,
Mr. Clarence Kiesman,
Irish Canadian National Committee,
Ms. Elsie Jawolik (Gimli, Manitoba),
LGD of Fisher,

Mr. Willie Dumont, Manitoba Metis Federation, Interlake Region,
Fred & Phyllis Ronge, (Matlock, Manitoba),
S.M. Taylor (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Theresa & Alex Novak (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Brian Lange (Moosehorn, Manitoba),
Presentation signed by a number of Teachers from Ecole St. Malo,
Ms. Doris Hogue (Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba),
Mr. Gilbert Fournier, Chambre de Commerce,
Ms. Gisèle Loyer (Lorette, Manitoba),
Le Club de Bicolé,
Yvonne Lagassé (Ste. Anne, Manitoba),
Mr. Léo Nadeau,
Mr. Louis Fiola (Ste. Geneviève, Manitoba),
Ms. Carmen Catellier, Educateurs franco-manitobains de la division de la Rivière Rouge,
Ms. Yvette Fluet-Gagnon (Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba),
Mr. Gilbert Legal, Ecole secondaire La Broquerie,
Mr. Hubert Balcaen,
Le Club de Curling de La Broquerie,
Ms. Jeannine Kirouac (La Broquerie, Manitoba),
Ms. Rachelle Ouellet,
Comité Culturel de La Broquerie,
Father Gérard Clavet, Clercs de Saint-Viateur résidant à La Broquerie,
Mr. Pierre Palud, Professeurs du secondaire de l'Ecole Pointe des Chênes,
Ms. Claudette Lavack,
Mr. Hubert Bouchard, Comité protecteur Scouts-Guides Animatrices et Animateurs de La Broquerie,
Mr. Gilles Normandeau, Ecole Pointe des Chênes,
Mr. Armand Fréchette,
Mr. Léonard Desharnais, Chambre de Commerce de St. Pierre,
Ms. Carmelle Gagnon, Ecole St. Joachim de La Broquerie,
Mr. Normand Barnabé,
Mr. Aimé Gauthier, Comité de direction du centre récréatif de St. Pierre,
Ms. Lyse Desharnais, Comité de parents de l'Ecole élémentaire de St. Pierre,
Mr. Aimé Tétrault,
Comité de patinage artistique de La Broquerie,
Mme. Irma Gauthier,
Mr. Jacques Trudeau (Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba),
Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin (Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba),
La ligue St. Gérard de La Broquerie,
Ms. Georgette Gérardy, Comité culturel de St. Labre,
Ms. Raymonde Graham,
Soeur Thérèse Cloutier, (Ste. Anne, Manitoba),
Ms. Thérèse Bouchard,
Mr. André Flamondon,
Soeur Zélie Ruest,
Ms. Lucie Dupuis,
Denise & George Perron,
Lise & Roberte Boily,
Ms. Cécile Bérard,
Mrs. Sylvia McInnes (Ste. Anne, Manitoba),
Mrs. J.L. Asta Asselstine, World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union,

LGD of Reynolds,
LGD of Stuartburn,
D. Nelson (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Ross Meggison (Goodlands, Manitoba),
R.M. of Morris,
Winnipeg Jewish Community Council/Canadian Jewish Congress,
Supplementary Statement on Constitutional Amendments by Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties,
Supplementary Submission by the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages,
Mr. Omer Fontaine (St. Pierre, Manitoba),
Mrs. Margaret B. Ladders (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Henry Elias (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Ray Brunka (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. J.A. Knight (MacDonald, Manitoba),
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 2034,
Roman Catholic Archiepiscopal Corporation of Winnipeg.

Your Committee met for further deliberation on Monday, November 21 and Thursday, December 22, 1983. Your Committee has agreed to report as follows:

The Committee heard submissions from 305 delegations and received an additional 99 written submissions.

The Committee has now completed its task and has consulted with those Manitobans who expressed a desire to be heard.

Your Committee was impressed with the interest shown and analysis of the subject matter demonstrated in many of the submissions. While there was a great many more briefs which supported the government proposal in principle than opposed it, a large number of briefs noted specific areas of concern. While it may not be easy for the government to find a middle ground between conflicting views, it should seek to do so while protecting the broader public interest. In your Committee's view, a political resolution of Manitoba's present constitutional difficulties (which difficulties flow, in part, from the Supreme Court decisions in 1979 in the Forest case and the Blaikie case) is preferable to a court imposed solution.

Your Committee recommends that the Legislative Assembly proceed with a Resolution to amend The Manitoba Act. Your Committee also recommends that consideration be given to an amendment to Section 23.1. It is recommended that the Assembly give consideration to an amendment to Section 23.5 to make it uniform with Section 23.4 so as to address concerns expressed with the delay period for the re-enactment of certain private and public municipal acts. Your Committee further recommends that Section 23.7 of the proposed resolution be reviewed so as to more explicitly delineate the responsibilities of the Provincial Government with respect to the provision of communications and available services in English or French and that a specific exclusion be provided with respect to this section for all municipalities and school boards.

Your Committee also recommends that consideration be given to the addition of a further subsection similar

to Section 22 of The Constitution Act, 1982, which would provide protection for customary rights or privileges with respect to other languages.