



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. A. Anstett
Constituency of Springfield



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 45 - 10:00 a.m., THURSDAY, 29 SEPTEMBER, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virder	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKI, 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, 29 September, 1983

TIME — 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Adam and Lyon

Messrs. Anstett, Brown, Eyer, Fox, Graham,
Lecuyer, Malinowski, Nordman and Ms. Phillips

WITNESSES: Mr. Herb Schulz, Private Citizen

Mr. Alan Beachell, Private Citizen

Mr. Michel Simard, Association des étudiants
du Collège Universitaire de St. Boniface

Mr. H.S. Dulat, Sikh Society of Manitoba Inc.,
Singh Sabha of Winnipeg Inc., Nanak Sar
Satsang Sabha Inc. of Manitoba

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Proposed Resolution to amend Section 23
of The Manitoba Act

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order, please. We have a quorum, ladies and gentlemen. The Clerk has received the resignations of Messrs. Scott and Penner. I understand replacements are Mr. Adam and Ms. Phillips. Could I have a motion to that effect, please?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Malinowski, thank you. Is that agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

The first name on our list this morning is Mr. Israel Ludwig. Mr. Ludwig, please.

S. Stephansson. S. Stephansson, please.

Professor Kear, please. Professor Kear.

Herb Schulz. Please proceed.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I just completed my brief and had my wife type it out, so I'm sorry I just do not have copies for you; let me just proceed from what I have here.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, like many persons in this province I have said little privately, and nothing publicly, on this issue to date because like many others I fear the accusation of being a bigot and a racist. We knew it wasn't true. We also knew that would not stop the accusations being made by those who do not know any better, by those who believe they can win on that basis and, worst of all, by an embattled government striking out blindly to save itself at any cost to the people of Manitoba.

Considering some of the tear-jerking, guilt-ridden presentations that have been made to this committee, I feel at a distinct disadvantage. You see, I have never been a bigot, or a racist, or a redneck, or a French-hater nor, as I see in this morning's "Sun," a lackey of the Tory Party and, therefore, I feel no need to assuage a guilty conscience by publicly flagellating myself and pretending to be a professional small "I" liberal.

I believe this government has undertaken something politically stupid, socially disruptive, and totally unnecessary. If, to the professional cause, joiners who are always so anxious to ignore the substance while reaching for the shadow, that makes me a bigot or a racist, then I suggest that makes them fools toward whom I feel nothing but contempt.

The real tragedy of this whole melancholy episode which has been visited upon us by our government is that, indeed, this issue will attract the racists and the bigots out of the woodwork. However, it would be a miscalculation of magnitude for those who support the proposed constitutional amendment to suppose it is being opposed only by bigots and racists, or for the Government of Manitoba to base its policy on that premise. There are good and decent people on both sides of this issue and those who are opposed to this constitutional amendment are as much concerned about the future, the shape of the future of this province, as are those who feel impelled to rectify what they perceive as the injustices of the past.

Let us examine how our government, this government that listens, got us into this stupid mess which has aroused public passion such as we have not seen since the war. Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 states that either French or English may be used in the Legislature, in the courts and that the statutes and the records of the Legislature shall be in both languages. Twenty years later, in 1890, the Manitoba Legislature declared English the official language of Manitoba. This is the historical injustice the Government of Manitoba now presumes to rectify.

Were the French-speaking people of Manitoba robbed in 1890? Perhaps, but why? We have been propagandized into believing, and a tremendous campaign has recently been mounted the Société franco-manitobaine and the Government of Manitoba to reinforce this belief that it was the consequence of the malignant anti-French attitude of the racists and the bigots of the time, and that this act has left in our society and body politic a cancer that must excised. So powerful has been the propaganda and so tender has our collective conscience become on this issue that we forget, or ignore, or fail to understand what else occurred in those 20 hectic years in our history between 1870 and 1890. The fact is that it was not only the troops sent from the East to crush Riel in 1870, and again in 1884, or the Orangemen farmers determined to avenge the death of Thomas Scott, who settled here, additionally there were thousands of farmers and

fishermen from Scandinavia and Germany and thousands more from Eastern Europe and Asia who had been recruited to build the CPR. By 1890, the demography of Manitoba had changed radically from 1870; furthermore, we were engaged in a nation-building exercise - an effort to organize and direct the human resources of the province toward a common goal.

As the nation building in 19th Century Europe had been organized around a language, so it was considered a common language was needed here; and here that common language was deemed to be English. That, Mr. Chairman, has been part of our great good fortune in this province. Thus, in 1890, the Manitoba Legislature enacted a law which established English as the official language of Manitoba.

The same year, the Legislature of Manitoba also established what was considered another prerequisite of nation building, a secular public school system which had been pioneered in Britain only 25 years earlier and in which the language of instruction would be English only. The French-speaking community, led mostly by the Catholic Church, which saw its denominational schools in jeopardy, fought back. They took the case all the way to the highest court, the Privy Council, and lost. By then, it was 1896, the federal Conservative Government was in shambles; John A. Macdonald had died; it was an election year and the Conservatives desperately wanted votes in Quebec and assumed this could be done by being nice to the French in Manitoba. They ordered the Government of Manitoba to redress the grievances of its French-speaking community. Failure to do so would invite intervention by Ottawa, presumably by force, if necessary. But they had misread the mood of the country, and especially of Quebec, and forgot to temper their principle with pragmatism.

A new man had swept out of Quebec, Wilfred Laurier. He wanted votes in Ontario and Manitoba as well as in Quebec and, therefore, he was not about to offend the Orangemen in Ontario, or the majority of the population, non-French, in Manitoba. The great fear of the Catholic Church was that federal intervention in Manitoba to restore the language and educational rights of the French-speaking people might set a precedent for future federal intervention in Quebec. Therefore, Laurier astutely argued that Conservatives should not force Manitoba to return to the pre-1890 situation and stated if he became Prime Minister he would peacefully negotiate an agreement with Manitoba. He was, and he did.

In so doing, this man, who was to become a legend to Canadians generally, and a folk hero to the French-speaking people of Canada, sold out the French-Catholic people of Manitoba in order to protect the denominational school system in Quebec from possible future intervention. Laurier, in his peaceful, negotiated agreement with Manitoba, planted the seeds for another case of historical injustice 20 years later. The Laurier-Greenway compromise of 1896 left English the only official language and the secular public school system as enacted in 1890. However, the language of instruction would be that spoken by the majority of the children in the schools; that was the compromise.

The waves of the so-called sheepskin-clad immigrants who came to Manitoba after 1896 had every reason to believe they were guaranteed that their children would in perpetuity be taught in their own language. And,

indeed, from 1896 to 1916, school children were instructed in English, French, German, Ukrainian, Polish and Icelandic. In 1916, The Manitoba Schools Act was amended requiring public school instruction in English only. That is the way it was until 1970 when the Schreyer administration enacted Bill 113 permitting instruction in French. In 1916, aside from the French, the German, Ukrainian, Polish and Icelandic people of Manitoba were robbed of what they believed their prerogative to have their children taught in their own language. Why? Was it, again, the work of the bigots and the racists or a wartime hysteria?

Well, perhaps, but why then was this also applied to the Ukrainians and the Poles and Icelanders who presumably were on our side? Could it have been because a problem had developed? There are places in Manitoba where, following the arrival of a trainload of immigrants from the Ukraine, the school board was required to hire a Ukrainian-speaking teacher. Three months later a trainload of German-speaking children would descend upon the school requiring a German-speaking teacher. In some Manitoba schools, teachers were changed as many as four times a year, just as the arrival of the English-speaking immigrants in Manitoba in the period 1870 to 1890 caused a problem not anticipated in 1870. So the arrival of many immigrants from many countries between 1896 and 1916 established a new set of circumstances and created an unanticipated problem. This Tower of Babel problem was resolved in 1916 by requiring that English be the only language of instruction in the public school system.

So, in 1916, because of the exigencies of nation building, the German, Ukrainian, Polish and Icelandic citizens of Manitoba were robbed of their language and educational rights.

Why have they not spent the last 67 years complaining about it? Why have the German-speaking Manitobans of Steinbach not sought out a school text not printed in German, and taken a case to the Supreme Court arguing they will refuse to send their children to school unless the language of instruction be German?

Why have the Ukrainian-speaking Manitobans of Dauphin not taken a case to the Supreme Court asking that all education in Manitoba since 1916 be declared invalid because they were denied their rights to have instruction in Ukrainian?

Why have the Icelandic people of Gimli and Arbog not threatened to create a state of "legal chaos" if they do not have restored to them the right to have their children taught in their own language?

Well, could it possibly be because they have better things to do? Could it be because they are far more dedicated to guarding against injustices in the future than wasting their time and energies correcting historical injustices, whether real or manufactured? Could it be because they are far more concerned about building a new society than attempting to recreate an old one? Could it be because they are more interested in making history than in rewriting it; or could it be that the last thing these people want is a recreation of the linguistic mishmash of their ancestral homelands where it was virtually impossible to communicate with the inhabitants of the next village, and where it was necessary to learn four or five languages to carry on a business? Could it be because the last thing they

want is to condemn their children to racial and linguistic ghettos as in Europe, from which there was no escape except to become a priest or a soldier or move to another country? Could it be that the thought of a multilingual education system offends their sense of the practical? Or could it be just that, while they respect their racial heritage as much as English or French or anyone and want their children to retain something of their ancestral culture and language, they are more concerned that their children should be proficient in English, which is the nearest we have to a universal language, and which, for them, is a passport to most places on earth and, more recently, to the moon?

One of the most important geo-political facts of the 20th Century is that America speaks English. That meant that the language of science and technology, which has flowed from this burdening industrial giant for the past century, would be English. Therefore, while the secular education system in the United States and English-speaking Canada was producing scientists and engineers and managers, the classical church-directed education system of French-speaking Quebec was producing lawyers and poets and politicians. Understandably then, when the post-World War II industrial revolution swept over Quebec, it was in the hands of English-speaking people. The quiet revolution of the past two decades in Quebec, following the secularization of Quebec's educational system by Premier Lesage has been a rebellion against the legacy left by Laurier, and a determination to advance French-speaking people to senior levels of research and management.

Now, unfortunately, some foolish people in Quebec have interpreted this perfectly natural phenomenon as an obsessive desire for separatism and have acted on that principle. Some equally foolish people here, knowing nothing of Quebec's past, and less about her present, have become panicked into proposing this constitutional amendment which has paralleled the natural and understandable social disruption in Quebec with an artificially created and unnecessary and alien disruption here.

In the light of the recent resurgence among the French-speaking people of Quebec, it is perfectly natural Francophones in other provinces should feel the call of a kindred culture and respond. It was equally natural that we should have the development of something like the Society Franco-Manitoban, although frankly one wonders if the Society Franco-Manitoban was called into being by cultural resurgence or by federal funding. It was also natural that it would, sooner or later, challenge the English-only act of 1890 and demand restoration of the French language rights stated in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870.

That challenge was undertaken in 1976 by George Forest. In 1979 the Supreme Court ruled in his favour. In 1980, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act was reinstated and the French language rights in The Manitoba Act of 1870 were restored by the Government of Sterling Lyon.

The present government's commitment to restoring the rights of 1870 are a bit late. I quote from an article by Eric Wells of August 29, 1983: "It is a sorry spectacle to see our province's future being bandied about those who contend that the proposed language bill only restores rights to a minority which were abrogated 93

years ago. According to Manitoba's Hansard, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act was reinstated in April of 1980. Basically, the issue remains hooked on the false assertion of the restoration of minority rights, but that was accomplished more than three years ago.

Now, of course, there are those here who believe that Eric Wells is a bigot or a racist or a redneck or a French hater, I suggest you tell that to him. But, nonetheless, Eric Wells must be wrong. Surely our Attorney-General is not convulsing this province to restore rights which have already been restored? After all, in 1970, the right to French language instruction in public schools lost in 1916 was restored by the Schreyer Government which, incidentally, included such persons as Sidney Green and Russell Doern, whom we are now to believe are racists and bigots. Therefore, would it not follow logically that Messrs. Pawley and Penner would wish to restore the other constitutional rights, to the courts, the Legislature and the statutes which had been lost in 1890? And is not this what the people have been led to believe?

We have the headline over an article by Frances Russell of September 14th reading: "The government must honour the Constitution."

We have a recent article by Michael Doyle, Free Press, September 23rd, describing Premier Pawley's recent antics in Ottawa, desperately attempting to disown one of his partners to his "Made-in-Manitoba" solution, which concludes: "At issue is the Provincial Government's plan to restore most of the rights for Francophones contained in the 1870 Manitoba act."

We have the article by Walter Stewart in the Winnipeg Sun, September 9th, which states: "Sterling Lyon, the Cro-Magnon Man of the West, has gone charging to the barricades to pummel the NDP Provincial Government for proposing to restore the constitutional rights of Franco-Manitobans." Obviously, then, Eric Wells must be wrong. The Cro-Magnon man could not possibly have restored French rights guaranteed in 1870.

The City Council of Thompson, which incidentally includes Bob Mayer, a former NDP President, is calling a referendum asking its residents if they favour "the proposal by the Governments of Manitoba and Canada, and the SFM, to amend the Constitution by making English and French the official languages of Manitoba." Perhaps these are merely the opinions of innocents who do not know the facts. You know, these are the not the kind of people to whom the government would want to entrust a referendum.

For the official position let us go to the official statements. We have Gerard Lecuyer, a government MLA, telling the Manitoba Legislature that this amendment "simply establishes what was originally intended, no more, no less."

We have the half-page ad by Manitoba 23 informing Manitobans that "The resolution re-establishes, after 93 years, the equal status for French and English as official languages of Manitoba."

We have some New Democratic Party literature quoting an editorial from the Vancouver Sun, which criticizes the opponents of the proposed constitutional amendment because, "They fail to acknowledge the fact that the province has deprived its French-speaking minority for almost a century and is now being offered the chance to redress this wrong." The same NDP

literature quotes from The Gazette on Manitoba's decision to finally recognize French as the language of the courts and the Legislature.

We have the newspaper ad with the photos of an impressive looking Premier Pawley who adjures us all to, "Think about about our constitutional commitment as Manitobans."

And we have the large four-page sheet, in color yet, distributed by the Department of the Attorney-General, at considerable cost to the taxpayers - you know, the one showing the photo of Premier Pawley, Attorney-General Penner and MLA Elijah Harper in Ottawa making deals - and this one informs us, this Attorney-General's literature informs us, "The Manitoba Government has proposed a constitutional amendment which will allow the use of French in the courts and in the Legislature.

Certainly nothing in the above official government and party literature supports Eric Wells' contention that French language rights contained in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act were restored by the Lyon Government over three years ago. And what do those who have presented briefs to this committee in support of the government's position believe they are supporting?

The Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties supported the government's action because, "It carried forward the development of French language rights abrogated in 1890.

Professor Bailey supported the government's action because, "The issue is respect for the Constitution."

And another professor, a legal expert yet, Dr. Stephen Scott of McGill University informed us this mess has been caused because, "Following the Forest case, the Lyon Government did not live up to the ruling that French and English are equal in the courts and the Legislature, as spelled out in The Manitoba Act of 1870."

Dr. Tsai, on behalf of the Chinese community, supported the government's action because "The proposed amendment really establishes the equal status for French and English as official languages in Manitoba." The brief by the Ukrainian Community Development Committee states, "The proposed amendment of Section 23 really establishes the status of two official languages in the Province of Manitoba." The brief from the Ad Hoc Committee of Mennonites states, "It is our opinion that the Mennonite community and the public generally support the efforts to have French recognized as required in The Manitoba Act of 1870."

Dr. Bill Shaw - and I read in the paper that he's coming here all the way from Quebec to honour us with the benefit of his wisdom - is reported stating his wisdom to this Made-in-Manitoba solution. He's reported stating, "After the Forest decision, Article 23 is clearly law. The Federal Government must assume its responsibility to uphold the Constitution."

Now who have we here? Dr. Joseph Magnet, a law professor from the University of Ottawa, no less. He is also the legal counsel to the Society Franco-Manitoban. He says, "In 1979, the Supreme Court of Canada declared the 1890 act unconstitutional. Since that ruling, the Government of Manitoba has not reinstated the official bilingualism requirements of the Constitution."

On the morning following the large Francophone rally at Ste. Anne, on the 7:00 a.m. news, the CBC reported

that people were there, ". . . determined to regain the rights they were guaranteed under the original Manitoba Act." If I may refer to this morning's Sun, Leo Robert added that, "Franco-Manitobans are not seeking new rights, but only the restoration of the rights granted in 1870."

So is Eric Wells wrong? Well he must be, after all, have we not heard that Lyon and the Tory Caucus are a bunch of bigots and racists and rednecks and French haters? How could they possibly have restored the French rights abrogated in 1890? But they did.

On July 9, 1980, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba assented to An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which reads, "WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to make certain provisions for the proper implementation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870." In this act "official language" means the English language or the French language. The same act also repealed the English-only act of 1890.

We have a fact sheet in multi-colours, yet, that was recently sent out to Manitobans, at considerable cost to the taxpayers, by the Department of the Attorney-General. Is there a single word in here to show that the Lyon Government, by an act of the Manitoba Legislature, restored Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870? Not one. Rather, in a personal message, the Attorney-General writes, "Our government has a constitutional commitment to Manitobans and Canadians; we are meeting our constitutional obligations."

More recently, Manitobans were treated to another piece of literature. It's probably the sleaziest piece of propaganda published on this issue. It invokes the hallowed names of Tommy Douglas and Stanley Knowles, and calls on NDP supporters to rally in the proud tradition of the CCF-NDP, and it informs us: "When Manitoba entered Confederation in 1870 our province's founders declared that English and French would be the languages of the court and the Legislature; but in 1890 the Legislature passed The Official Language Act declaring that only English would be the language of the courts and the Legislature.

"In 1979, the Supreme Court ruled that the 1890 law was invalid. The French Language Services resolution will restore an historic option, the historic option of French-speaking service from their government in the language of their choice will be restored," emphasis on the word "restored."

Now is there anything in that to show that the Lyon Government restored Section 23 over three years ago? Does the word "entrench" appear even once? Does the word "extend" appear even once? But the word "restore" appears twice.

So let me recapitulate. The Manitoba Act of 1870 provided certain language and education rights to our French-speaking people. In 1890, they were deprived of their language rights. In 1916, they were deprived of their education rights. Their education rights were restored by the Schreyer Government in 1970; their language rights were restored by the Lyon Government in 1980. Any obfuscation of that is sheer deception.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, I believe that this government has engaged, to use the words recently immortalized by our Attorney-General, in a political fraud. I believe this government has employed the big lie technique. I believe that this

government, if it has not actually encouraged the lie, has allowed the people of Manitoba and its own party supporters to believe the lie. But this government has done something worse for which it simply cannot be forgiven, it has emphasized our differences, rather than our common interests; it has aroused atavistic impulses, caused us to sort ourselves into racial groupings and to look backward instead of forward. We have been regaled with stories about how, once upon a time there was a sign on a cafe stating "No dogs and Chinamen allowed"; about how a school teacher once required a child to write, "I must not speak Ukrainian" on the blackboard; and how children were required to hide their French textbooks when the school inspector came once or twice a year. We have seen some interesting examples of the kind of hysteria this issue has aroused, but not among those who have been damned as bigots and racists and rednecks and French haters.

For example, Leo Robert, President of the Society Franco-Manitoban, is reported in the Free Press of September 22nd, stating, "If the people cannot accept the constitutional right that we have to exist, I am not interested in justifying the fact that I will speak French in Manitoba, and justify the fact that my father spoke French and my grandfather." So who the hell is stopping him from speaking French in Manitoba? Did his father and his grandfather need constitutional entrenchment to speak French in Manitoba? Who is asking him to justify anything?

Of course, there was Georges Forest, speaking at a Winnipeg City Council meeting, stating that when the court ruled that he could receive his traffic ticket in French, "I felt like a free man; I suddenly had status." Now are we to assume, from this, that Georges Forest is such a delicate flower that his status depended on the status of the French language in Manitoba? If so, what is the position - if that's the only way one acquires status in this country, then what about the other linguistic groups in Manitoba whose languages are not mentioned in our Constitution? Do they have no status? Are these not free men?

But probably the most irresponsible statement made in this whole tragic debate, displaying for all the world the sort of juvenile hysteria, which some people have invested in this issue was, in my opinion, made by Gerard Lecuyer. He made an impassioned speech, stating failure to enact this constitutional amendment would require him to surrender his language and culture in order to be a Canadian. Very interesting. When Gerard Lecuyer was saying this, he was speaking in the Manitoba Legislative Chamber as a member of the government benches and he was speaking in French. After these 93 years of horrors that we are supposed to believe have been visited upon the French-speaking people of this province, Gerard Lecuyer was still able to be elected to the Government of Manitoba and speak in the Legislature in French.

Mr. Chairman, when this mess is resolved for better or worse and its perpetrators slink back to their ivory towers or disappear into well-deserved oblivion, the most maligned people will be those Manitobans who are opposed to what this government is doing because they consider it divisive and disruptive and unnecessary, and who have had heaped upon them the blanket criticism that they are bigots and racist and rednecks and French haters. The sorriest people will be those

minority groups who have appeared before this committee in support of special status for the French language and education rights in the expectation that the Francophones, once securely established, will help them achieve similar special status for their own language and education. This will not happen.

Where I was born, the country consisted of linguistically homogeneous villages of Germans, Russians, Ukrainians, Rumanians, Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Greeks and Turks, each with their own language and each with their own schools. The result was that a common language was needed to be adopted for purposes of commerce and diplomacy; that language was German. Here, as long as only English and French are given special status, French is fairly secure. However, the moment there are more than two, people will automatically revert to a common language and that language will be English. Therefore, the special status for or the entrenchment of any other minority language will be a threat to French.

The saddest people of all will be the French-speaking people of Manitoba. From the moment that this resolution is forced through the Legislature, if indeed this government is so destructively irresponsible, for the next two generations, whenever a person is unemployed, or his taxes go up, or a school division is reorganized requiring some children to go further, it will be considered the fault of the French. The social experimenters, with their attache cases full of shiny new solutions to problems they haven't discovered yet, will have moved onto other adventures leaving those among whom they have created impossible expectations to pay the price.

So here we are, instead of focusing on the future and dreaming of what we could do if we pool our efforts as a people with a common purpose, living here in this freest of all countries in the world, instead we concentrate upon the hurts of 100 years ago. Instead of marvelling at our great good future, at our great good fortune and revelling and being alive here in this best of all possible countries, we continue our morbid compulsion for social fragmentation.

It has been said a nation is a people which has memories of great things we did together in the past and visions of great things we intend to do together in the future and we have done some great things together. We own half a continent. We have the second-largest territory of any country on earth; we planted a civilization in the wilderness; we built the world's longest railroad; the world's longest natural gas pipeline; the world's largest hydro-electric generating plant; the world's first jetliner; and the world's best nuclear-fueled power plant. We have the world's third largest iron ore deposits; the world's second-largest uranium deposits and the only known cesium deposit outside the communist country. Canadians pioneered synthetic rubber, developed insulin, drilled the world's first oil well, developed the Medicare system for which we are envied and flew across the Atlantic eight years before Lindbergh did, but most of all, Canada has provided a home for millions of people who just wanted away from Europe from her blasted hopes, her fields of carnage and polluted air, and more recently Canada has become the refuge of many people from other continents. And yet our primary national posture appears to have become navel gazing and here we are

at it again, not over some crucial issue, but over whether or not we should rewrite a century of history.

Rational observers of this current cat fight can hardly avoid recalling the comment by some unknown Canadian political scientist who wrote, "Whenever I sit down to think seriously about this country, it seems to disappear," and possibly even more appropriate, in the light of what is happening in Manitoba, is the comment by another political scientist that it would appear that Canada, instead of struggling to be a nation which has some status in the world, we resemble more an unsuccessful lobotomy to which we voluntarily assented.

Why is this happening today? Why is our society being convulsed? Why have families who have lived as neighbours all their lives without differentiating on a racial basis, suddenly become suspicious of one another? Is it because despite the fact that 100 linguistic groups have lived here for 100 years in reasonable harmony, Manitoba is really a seething cauldron of bigotry and racism awaiting any excuse to erupt in 'a psychological pogrom'?' Is it possible that all these people from all over the world, who have lived beside Francophone families all their lives without being conscious of the fact that their neighbours were Francophone, are under this veneer of neighbourliness really secret bigots and racists and rednecks and French haters, simply awaiting an opportunity to burn a fleur-de-lis on their neighbour's lawn?

The reason for our current social convulsion is not racism or bigotry. It is the result of a fact that our government has made a sleazy, under-the-table deal with a very small and very noisy special interest group, which does not represent the Francophone community any more than it represents Manitoba generally, which would collapse in a heap if it wasn't for federal funding, which is so immersed in its own silly rhetoric that it fails to see it has destroyed the generous impulse on the part of the larger community which has brought it into being, and incidentally, which has creditability only because naive and inept governments pay attention to it.

Why do I say this special interest group does not represent the Francophone community of Manitoba? Because this is the same special interest group which three years ago supported the separation of Quebec from Canada. No one can convince me that is the sentiment of the French-speaking people of this province, they are simply not that stupid. Yet this is the special interest group with which our government has made a deal and now Manitobans are being held to ransom on the grounds that if we do not live up to this deal, this special interest group has the power to cause our entire legal and administrative system to collapse around our ears, to cause - and the memorable words of our Attorney-General - "legal chaos." Therefore this government negotiates with this special interest group as though it were treating with a foreign power.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, long ago, as a child, I came from a distant land. Had my parents immigrated to Brazil, I would have learned Portuguese. I have travelled in Mexico, so I learned to speak Spanish. I needed a third language at the university, so learned to read and write French. Were I to move to Quebec, I would learn to speak French. All three of my children took French at school, and I

have a Francophone son-in-law. I spoke German before I spoke English. I was not always happy to be an ethnic, and had it not been for the honour of it all like a few black eyes and bloody noses I could well have done without.

In retrospect, being able to converse in more than one language is probably one of the nicest things that ever happened to me. But my greatest good fortune was that my parents brought me here, and I learned to speak English which has taken me virtually around the world. I still speak German whenever needed or whenever the spirit moves me, and indulge in the occasional German cultural ritual, but never, not once, not even during the darkest days of the war when my German relatives controlled Europe from the Atlantic to the Volga and from Narvik to North Africa, did anyone ever tell me that I must not speak German or read German books, whenever and wherever I pleased.

During this half century, I have not felt the need nor been called upon to justify the fact that I spoke German, nor have I had an identity crisis because my many traffic tickets were not printed in German as well as English.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Schulz, your time has expired.

MR. H. SCHULZ: May I have 30 seconds on my last paragraph, Mr. Chairman? (Agreed)

MR. H. SCHULZ: I suggest that, despite these 93 years of horrors we have been hearing so much about, most Francophones have had exactly the same experience that I have had, all of this without entrenchment. At a meeting at the International Inn awhile back, some man said rather wistfully, "I have watched this country become slowly Canadian." Well, gentlemen, so have I, and I suggest to you that you have no right to destroy that process.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Schulz. Any questions for Mr. Schulz from members of the committee?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Schulz, during the course of your presentation, you made reference to - and I wrote it down - the remarks of a Mr. Joe Magne or Magnet or whatever his name is, who appeared before us. I believe the wording you used, that Manitoba had failed to live up to the official bilingual requirements of the Constitution. Can you tell me if Mr. Magnet at that time was referring to The Manitoba Act, or was he referring to the Canadian Constitution of the present Prime Minister, which is suggesting that French and English be the official languages of Canada?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I'm just looking to find the answer, and I believe I have it here, but he was at your hearing, so what was he talking about? It would seem to me that he came to your hearing to talk about what is happening in Manitoba. What else was he doing here?

What he said was that the Government of Manitoba simply has not lived up to its responsibilities, and that

the Federal Government should see to it that it does. After all, this is a tripartite deal, isn't it? The Federal Government is a part of it. The Federal Government is a part of this Made-in-Manitoba solution, is it not?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Magnet was the legal counsel to the SFM and, as he told us in his presentation, he was a constitutional lawyer and a professor. I forget all the other things.

MR. H. SCHULZ: That long resume.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: I was also under the impression that he had served the Federal Government from time to time. As a legal counsel to the SFM, would that be the only hat that he would be wearing when he was appearing before us?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Considering the full paragraph that it took in Hansard to explain his resume, I suspect that he brought several hats with him just in case.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, you also in your remarks, and I'm jumping quite a bit now, referred to, I believe, an NDP letter or pamphlet which you referred to as the sleaziest piece of information. Was that a general mailing, or did that go out only to NDP members?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Just let me find it. I'm sorry, I thought I had this piece of sleazy propaganda with me. I'm sure it's here someplace; I will find it in a moment.

It states on this piece of sleazy propaganda that it was published by the New Democratic Party of Manitoba. I assume they paid for it. Whether it was a general mailing or not, I do not know. I know I received one in the mail in a plain white envelope, and so did my mother. Since we are both members of the New Democratic Party, it's possible that it was only a party distribution. I assume that it's a general distribution.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, since I didn't receive it, I would assume then that I was not a member of the NDP.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Sorry about that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Maybe it was just a mailing to the membership of the party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, please.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Since I have not received it, would you be willing to provide me with a copy of the same?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Yes, I would be most happy to provide you with a copy. I assume that the NDP office would be even more happy. After all, this is something for information for the people of Manitoba. I'm sure they would be very happy to have you receive a copy.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Schulz, you made mention on two or three occasions

of Mr. Georges Forest. I think you said that he appeared before the City of Winnipeg Council. I think you said he said, I felt like a free man. That was the result of what - a Supreme Court decision, was it?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Yes, on the ticket that he found on his windshield that he couldn't read apparently, because it was in English only. So he went to the Supreme Court and he made a presentation to that long council meeting that lasted until 4:30 in the morning, saying, "When the court ruled in my favour, I felt like a free man; I suddenly had status."

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Schulz. Mr. Forest commenced that case in 1976, I believe you said; was that right?

MR. H. SCHULZ: 1976, yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: In that particular case, was the parking ticket issued by the municipal government or by the provincial, under municipal statute or provincial statute?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I believe it was issued under a municipal statute in the same way as Dauphin issues its parking tickets, and has been warned by John Plohman that they better do it in both languages, despite the fact that, naturally, the honoured Attorney-General tells us that this act has no relevance to municipalities.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, we had a number . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. H. SCHULZ: You'll get your chance, why don't you put your name on the list?

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Schulz. Another witness appearing before us said that would never have happened if the Schreyer Government had left the City of Winnipeg alone, but it was the amalgamation of all the municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area that caused the whole thing. Would you think that would be a correct statement?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Why, what has that to do with the amalgamation of the City of Winnipeg?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're getting into a subject area that was not covered in Mr. Schulz's brief.
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will follow the direction of the Chair and I won't pursue that any further. Mr. Schulz, in listening to your brief, I would have to think that you spent a great deal of time preparing this in the historical facts that you present. Are you a teacher of history, or a professor of history, or an author of history?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I took my university work in history.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I would just leave it at that, I'll pass. I may want to ask some further questions later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Graham. Mr. Doern.

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

MR. H. SCHULZ: If I may, Mr. Chairman, the piece of literature that Mr. Graham referred to is this piece of sleazy propaganda which, as I said here, has on it . . . Incidentally I phoned both Mr. Douglas and Mr. Knowles and neither of them knew that their pictures were being used for this piece of sleazy propaganda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Schulz. Just on that very last comment, are you suggesting that neither their pictures, nor their signatures, nor their statements came from them?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I wouldn't say that. I assume that there must have been some general consent, but I asked them both and they said they had not known that it was going on that particular piece of literature, nor did they know the contents of that particular sleazy piece of literature.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Schulz, in regard to your brief and your upbringing and your experiences in Manitoba in a number of towns and cities that you've lived, what responsibility would you say that each ethnic, cultural or linguistic group has, in regard to being self-sufficient or self-funding? Should they be fully responsible for their own funding or are they entitled to some government support?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, that's a question which calls for a long speech, which I'm not going to make. I suppose that one can look at this in several ways. We have heard the term mosaic bandied about rather loosely in the last few weeks . . .

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

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

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a question that is not for clarification, does not arise from the presentation of Mr. Schulz. It is out of order.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Mr. Chairman, I disagree, I believe it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Further members to the point of order? With respect, Mr. Lecuyer, the question raised by Mr. Doern follows directly upon Mr. Schulz's comments with regard to the sufficiency of ethnic organizations and other heritage language groups which he made reference to in his brief. It does so in a tenuous way and I allowed the question for that reason. I think pursuing it beyond that might fall outside the scope of the brief, but

certainly I felt the question was in order and I continue to feel that way.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me make it very brief. We claim, and I think with some justification, that as opposed to the American melting pot where everyone is more or less induced to be an "American" about which some people have some fears; whether those fears are justified or not, I don't know, but anyway there is a fear which I suppose can be considered as legitimate, that people are being forced into a common mold, and we say in Canada that we haven't done that, that what we have is a cultural and linguistic mosaic and there's not a doubt in the world - or at least there isn't to me - that one of the reasons we have that sort of situation is not because French is entrenched or not entrenched in the Manitoba, but because of the French fact in Canada, which is Quebec. It's quite possible that, as opposed to the American so-called melting pot, I can speak German wherever I want to in Manitoba and whenever I want to, because the people of Quebec speak French; although, frankly, I lived in the United States for two years in the most conservative part of the United States, I've done a lot of travelling in the United States, I noticed they speak a considerable number of languages. But, in any case, if the mosaic, as we see it, has some validity, has some relevance, then fine let us maintain it, and that could conceivably mean that a government, in attempting to maintain this mosaic because it adds something to our society, may wish to fund it. But you know, the German Club is now what, 100 years old? Until very recently I don't think that they've had any funding.

MR. R. DOERN: 91 years old.

MR. H. SCHULZ: 91 years. The Ukrainian organizations, until very recently, I don't think have had any funding. To me the mosaic means that the people who come here from other countries will do what people do, they will get together in their groups and they will establish clubs where they can meet occasionally. They may even establish Saturday schools in which they will give their children, teach their children to maintain their ancestral languages, but on the streets they speak English and they're very happy to get away from the kind of thing that they left in Europe, where they couldn't travel to the next community without becoming involved in a race riot.

MR. R. DOERN: You use the expression in your brief about an alien disruption being created in Manitoba. What do you mean by the word "alien"?

MR. H. SCHULZ: It is alien to the Manitoba social structure. We have been doing very nicely. The city, the province, is full of people who speak whatever language they want to wherever and whenever they want to, and we were getting along just fine until suddenly the government decides to make an issue of doing something which in effect was done three years ago.

If we are to take the position that the French were robbed of their rights in 1890, fine. Had I been around in 1890 I might have done something differently. Had I been around in 1870 I might have helped write the

Constitution differently, but that's the way it was written. If people insist on going back and rewriting 93 years of history and saying because we had it 93 years ago, we want to have it now, fine. But they've got it.

MR. R. DOERN: Did you also intend in the use of the word "alien" to refer to outside of Manitoba influences?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Well, I was hoping somebody would pick that up when I put the word in, I put it in very deliberately. But I don't want to make an issue of that; Canada is a big country. Everybody who lives between the Atlantic and Pacific are Canadians and I suppose if they want to come in here and give us the benefit of their advice, fine. I find it rather ironic though that we're screaming about this: Mr. Trudeau please stay out of this because we want a Made-in-Manitoba solution; when, in fact, Trudeau was one of the signatories to the original agreement made last May.

MR. R. DOERN: To what extent would you say that the grassroots of the New Democratic Party agree with you as opposed to the government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Doern, questions are intended to be for clarification of the brief, not for speculation about subjects upon which Mr. Schulz did not touch.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my question is to know whether Mr. Schulz is speaking as the Lone Ranger, or whether he is reflecting to some extent a feeling within the party which he has also talked about. He's talked about the fact that he's a member, he's given his views on pamphlets. I don't know whether he believes that he's speaking for himself or whether he thinks he's speaking for a sizable minority or majority of the grassroots.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Phillips, to the same point of order.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, on the point of order. Mr. Schulz, No. 39 on the list, is listed as a private citizen. I presume that means he's here to express his own views and is not representing any group. If he wanted to put himself as a representative of a large or small group within the New Democratic Party, he could have done that. So I think the question is totally out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a further question, Mr. Doern?

MR. R. DOERN: Well, I'd like to know if the question is out of order, if it's in order to ask whether Mr. Schulz is reflecting a widespread opinion within the party. I didn't ask whether he came here to represent X thousands of New Democrats, I asked him whether he thought his thinking was representative of other party members.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Mr. Chairman, if I'm expected to answer that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think it's clear, as Ms. Phillips points out, that Mr. Schulz is not claiming

to represent any broader organization. I have some difficulty with that kind of questioning.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Schulz, in his brief, did make mention of the fact that he was a member of the New Democratic Party, so that the mention of the New Democratic Party I believe is perfectly in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that came in response, Mr. Graham, to a question you asked, rather than in the brief itself.

MR. H. GRAHAM: That was in the brief, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I stand corrected. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Doern?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to know if that question is in order. If it is, I'd like Mr. Schulz to answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the question is not in order in view of the way Mr. Schulz has listed himself. If you have a question to ask Mr. Schulz to reflect on whether or not he considers his views to be more widely held, obviously I can't rule that out of order. But certainly a reflection of his views being representative of organizations is a different question.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then I will follow your line of wording, which I'm sure is acceptable to yourself and ask him whether he believes that his views are widespread within the New Democratic Party.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that, I'm here as a private citizen. I do believe that if the party felt that its view was generally accepted they would not have found it necessary to put out this piece of sleaze.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Schulz if he could clarify a statement he made. He said words to the effect that the government has utilized or encouraged the use of the big lie. I'm not sure in what context he was using that statement or that . . .

MR. H. SCHULZ: I believe that an awful lot of people in Manitoba believe and I believe that that is attested to by the kind of briefs that have been presented here, at least the ones that I have heard. They believe that what they are doing is fighting on a principle to restore the rights which the French-speaking people lost in 1890 which is a very legitimate concern. I don't know how many of them know that that was done three years ago.

For example, now that you've asked the question, let me tell you this. Approximately a month ago, I was at an NDP meeting at which we were addressed by two members of the caucus urging us to get out there and present briefs - you will notice that I took the advice - supporting the government. We must have been there for two to two-and-a-half hours and not one word was said about the fact that the rights of the French as contained in the act of 1870 had been restored.

Incidentally, I have my notes here from the meeting in case anyone is interested in checking them, but I don't think you need to bother looking at the notes. I don't think you need to ask too many questions to realize that a lot of people who are presenting briefs are not rushing in to extend French rights. They honestly believe that what they are doing is asking the government to restore the rights of which the French were deprived in 1890.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Schulz, I think there are people within the government who sincerely believe that this legislation will in fact result in greater harmony in our province, yet you yourself claim that this is causing division and disunity. Can you account for either position?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I attended the meeting at the International Inn about two months ago. It was a large crowd, around 800 people. It's not the first meeting I have attended so I was watching what was happening. I said to my wife when I returned home that evening, I saw something this evening which I haven't seen since 1946, pure unadulterated racial hatred - on both sides incidentally - I haven't seen anything like that since the war. If the government really wants to know how much unity this has caused in the province, all they need to do is look around them.

MR. R. DOERN: Given this state of affairs, is there a better prospect of a return to this harmony by dropping this legislation?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I believe that the government is on the hook. If they proceed, the price is going to be paid primarily by the French-speaking people of this province. If they drop it, the price is going to be paid primarily by the French-speaking people of this province, among whom the government has created unreal expectations. They are going to be very angry, but the government has a choice.

I'm not here to advise the government, they got themselves into this jam without asking any advice and they're going to have to get themselves out. I suppose in any normal government, the Attorney-General realizing what has happened here would accept the responsibility and resign, but then I suppose that's a little much to expect.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, it has been said by many people including the government that the legislation should be Made-in-Manitoba. Do you believe that the legislation was in fact, as originally drawn, Made-in-Manitoba or designed in Ottawa?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I don't know where it was made or where it was designed. I don't think all the people who are dealing with this are necessarily stupid. I think some of them are principled people who really want to do what is right, and it's natural that they should call in spokesmen for the group that they are acting for. Apparently it was felt by someone that the Federal Government had a stake in this and naturally the Federal Government does. I mean it's fairly clear in the new Canadian Constitution that the intention is to make it

possible for the people of Quebec to be able to travel throughout Canada, to be able to settle throughout Canada, to be able to send their children to school throughout Canada in French.

Fine, I accept that and have no great objection to the Federal Government being consulted. What does trouble me is this recent hypocrisy, where the huge headline in the paper: "Pawley tells Trudeau to back off." Back off what? Trudeau was an original signatory to the deal. Furthermore, the Attorney-General said in the Legislature that if one comma is changed in the deal of May 17th, or whatever it was, we will first have to ask the permission not only of the SFM but also of the Federal Government.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, you talked repeatedly of attempts to rewrite history. I'm not asking for a lengthy answer, but a fairly succinct answer. If history is being rewritten, what is it being rewritten - like is it being rewritten from what to what?

MR. H. SCHULZ: The argument is, and it's amazing how many people have got caught up in this and undoubtedly some of them very sincere people and some because they just don't think. You know, I was here when Professor Bailey made his presentation. I heard him say the trouble with the English is that they are always trying to hold other people down. Well, let me tell you something. If that's what has been the intention of the English in Canada, they done a damn poor job of it. I look around this table and I see just about everybody but Englishmen.

Do you realize that there was a time about 12 or 13 years ago when the Prime Minister of Canada, the Governor-General of Canada, the Chief of the Canadian Armed Services, and the Chief of the Supreme Court, and approximately half of the Cabinet, half of the federal Cabinet, were French. Now if the English have been attempting to hold them down, they haven't done very well.

I listened to - pardon me, if I digress, I listened to these briefs and I wonder what the hell is going on here? Suddenly people are saying, oh, I have this recollection of - once upon a time I believe I had an unhappy childhood and so I want a law passed. I feel guilty because I don't feel deprived, because I didn't have an unhappy childhood, and I never felt that I didn't have status because my language was not enshrined in the Constitution. I assumed, I simply made the assumption, as my parents did when they came to this country that this was a pluralistic country and we acted on that basis, and we never needed any law to tell us that that was so.

You know, I listened to people like Professor Bailey, who kept reminding us that he knows all about 2,500 years of European history. Well, maybe he does but he sure doesn't know a hell of a lot about what's been happening here. He rather reminded me of something that I read long ago where Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, one of the guiding lights of one of the medieval monastic orders, was such a brilliant man that he used to concentrate so much thinking about minutiae of trying to figure out logically how many angels could dance on a head of a pin that he could walk all day beside one of the most beautiful lakes in Switzerland and never

even realize that it was there. I rather suspect that this is Professor Bailey's problem, he spent too much time inside of a classroom; he just hasn't been looking. Look around this table. How many English people are here? What was your question, by the way?

MR. R. DOERN: Well, again, I think you're off on a tangent, a very good one, but a tangent. You said that history was being rewritten and you gave part of the answer. I'm saying from what to what is the rewriting?

MR. H. SCHULZ: History is being rewritten to convince us that the French have had a terrible time in this province for the last 93 years. Go and ask the French-speaking people in St. Boniface how terrible a time they have had?

You know, in the community where I was raised, 30 years ago, there was almost a distinct line that ran through the community along the railway track. North of that was the original Anglo-Saxon settlers and south of the track were the Germans and the Ukrainians. You go there now; you can't criticize anybody any more because they're married to somebody else. You don't know who is married to whom any more. They are totally intermarried - the same thing as in St. Boniface. Who the hell is talking about all these terrible injuries that have been visited upon the French?

Now, the only thing that is at issue here is not that the French have been damaged, the issue here is symbolism, and that symbolism was taken care of three years ago. No one is stopping the French from speaking French wherever they want to, or sending their children to French schools, or speaking French in the Legislature, or pleading their traffic tickets in court in the French language.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Schulz, you said that the Franco-Manitoban Society, words to the effect that you or the Schreyer Government wouldn't have negotiated with the SFM. The question is this, if the SFM doesn't represent Franco-Manitobans, who does? Or whom do you think the government should have negotiated with?

MR. H. SCHULZ: It was not necessary for the government to have negotiated with anybody. This is not the first time that the SFM has come to the Government of Manitoba and asked for what they are now being offered. They just didn't get it before, that's all. The Schreyer Government simply assumed that Societe Franco-Manitobaine was another group who were invited in when they had a complaint and were listened to and that was it. It was just never assumed that the SFM, that the silly maanderings of the SFM meant that we were going to have a revolution over in St. Boniface, unless we resurrected the act of 93 years ago.

MR. R. DOERN: You talked about the fact that you were born in Europe, I assume, and came to Canada as a small child. Did your family believe, or did you believe, depending on your age, that you were coming to a bilingual country or a unilingual country?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Since I was only five at the time, I don't know. My father spoke five languages before he

came to Canada. He spoke five languages, because he had to. Had we settled in Quebec, I assume my father would have become as fluent as possible with a German accent in French. Since we came to Manitoba, he spoke English.

What I do know is that my parents were deliriously happy because they were able to get into their car and travel from Atlantic to Pacific, or from here down to the Gulf of Mexico, and speak with everyone in the same language, something which it was impossible to do in Europe.

MR. R. DOERN: You also indicated that a number of people who were presenting briefs to the committee are not really aware - I believe you used that word - they weren't aware of the issue. How do you account for that?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I suppose they were not aware because they were not told that this is the issue. I mean, I have shown you the literature, at least I have here the literature. I'm sure that you have all received this lovely literature paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, which does not indicate that the issue they are arguing about was resolved three years ago; that an act was passed restoring the rights of 1870.

A MEMBER: How do you account for that?

MR. H. SCHULZ: How do I account for it? They simply weren't told.

MR. R. DOERN: Two more questions, you also indicated there was a great deal of misinformation, that's the word you use repeatedly, there is a lot of misinformation being spread on this issue. Who is spreading this information, or are you talking about telling not the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, or telling part of the truth, or only telling part of the story? What do you mean by misinformation?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I think the literature itself, intentionally or accidentally, simply does not state the facts but, you know, I've been hearing a great deal about misinformation.

I think that the questioner, Mr. Doern himself, has been the target of accusations that he's spreading a great deal of misinformation. I found it rather interesting when Mr. Doern first began to question what is meant by significant demand. He was asked to leave caucus, or he left caucus, or whatever the case was, in any case, everybody denied that there was a problem there, that it was wide open.

When a group of people at a public meeting at Dauphin asked the same question - what does significant demand mean? Is this wide open? They were told by the Attorney-General that, when they finally understood, they would agree with him.

When a larger group of people at a meeting at Brandon said the same thing, they were told - and I saw the Attorney-General on television saying - well it's hard, it's damn hard to explain this kind of thing to a group of people who simply don't know their history or constitutional law. Obviously, he was having some difficulties.

When the President of the Union of Municipalities said the same thing, they were simply ignored. But when Gary Doer of the MGEA said it, the government said: Oh, Mr. Doer, it was so kind of you to bring this to our attention; Oh yes, we've simply got to do something about it!

Now who then is spreading the misinformation? Gary Doer's position was precisely the same as Doern's originally but, when Doern said it, it was misinformation; when Doer said it, we've got to do something about it.

Incidentally, in case you people are having some difficulty in defining what "significant demand" means, or "where numbers warrant" means, or anything else, I was here when Georges Forest walked up to the thing hanging on the wall there and hung an earphone over it, and then walked over to this microphone and said, Gentlemen of the committee, the reason I hung the earphone on the wall is because I know if I speak French only the walls will be able to understand. You know, there is a law in this country that says you can speak French whenever and wherever you want to. There is no law that says that anybody has to listen in French. Mr. Forest was well aware of the fact that nobody in that hall, or at least very few, would be able to listen in French, but that everybody could listen in English, and that's why he hung the thing on the wall; a cute piece of symbolism.

In any case, when Mr. Forest demanded simultaneous translation, he got it. One person got it. So "significant demand", or "where numbers warrant", has now been forever defined. It's in the books, one person is significant demand.

Incidentally, just one thing here, sort of going back to a previous question about, is this uniting the country? I have here a list of all the boards and commissions established by the Government of Manitoba, and the names of the people on those boards. I find something very interesting here which I have never seen before. For example, there will be a name - let me digress just a moment. Several days ago, a fellow by the name of James Watt, a Minister in Ronald Reagan's Cabinet, got into a great deal of trouble because he said - he claims that it was a joke, I don't know - that well I've got all the minorities represented on my commission; I have a black and a woman and two Jews and a cripple. It's a statement that he shouldn't have made, but let me show you something.

Here are the boards and commissions, here are the names. Here's one name and beside it, Native. Here's another one, beside it, Franco. Here's another one, Native, Franco, Native, ah, handicapped. What the hell are you people doing to this country? Now I'm going to take this to the Human Rights Commission, I don't see any Germans on here, I don't see any Ukrainians on here, I don't see any women designated. This is the way you're uniting the country, by splitting us up into racial groups? We left Europe to get away from this.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I am inspired to ask a couple more questions. You made a reference to Frances Russell's fear of a "psychological pogrom," which is one of the more frightening references I ever read in my entire life. Is this a case of hyperbole, or what did you make of that remark? You referred to it in your brief. What did you think of that statement?

MR. H. SCHULZ: It was that statement which induced me to present my brief today. Frances Russell is not going to accuse me of being involved in a psychological pogrom. If she wants to be that stupid, that's her problem, but it isn't mine.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, you also quoted, Mr. Schulz, the Attorney-General who said in Brandon on television that you either had to be or almost had to be a constitutional lawyer and a Canadian historian, both, to understand this issue. Now, do you agree with the statement? And in particular, can the average man understand this complex question?

MR. H. SCHULZ: I think that the average person out there feels that they are being leaned on and fooled. I believe that if the question was pure and simple: do you wish to restore the rights which the French people of this country, of this province, were robbed of in 1890? The answer would probably be an overwhelming yes. People would feel probably, well, I don't know if it's necessary, somehow the French have managed to survive very nicely without that, but okay, if they feel that there is some symbolism attached to that, some status attached to that, fine. But that's not the question here, is it? That question was settled three-and-a-half years ago. Possibly the inarticulate mass out there realizes that it's being fooled.

There is, of course, the other problem that the Attorney-General keeps drawing to our attention about, you know, if we don't do this, we're going to have legal chaos. I sat here last night and listened to the Attorney-General arguing with the President of the Union of Municipalities and remember the one question was, well how many people do you represent? The man had just handed in resolutions from 123 rural municipalities, but that's not enough for the Attorney-General, and he said - I think I'm quoting him correctly - "you probably don't represent more than 50,000 people." Well the question immediately in my mind was, you know, that's just about the same number as there are French-speaking people in this province, but on the one hand 50,000 weighs very heavily, on the other hand it's discounted. We keep hearing, well figures are not important here, percentages are not important here. It's the issue that's important. Fine, but when somebody else brings in percentages, then those are discounted.

But we have to deal, or at least the government seems to feel impelled to deal with the court challenge of Mr. Bilodeau. There seems to be an assumption that Mr. Bilodeau is going to proceed. That seems to be simply accepted, despite the fact that if he lost in the lower court and he lost in the appeal court, he's going to automatically proceed. There seems to be another presumption, not just an assumption, that he is going to win and when he wins the nine old men or the eight old men and one old woman of the Supreme Court are going to declare the laws of Manitoba invalid.

Now I want to know if all the laws of Manitoba since 1890 are invalid, does that mean that I get back all the taxes that I've paid since 1890? Are they going to be refunded to me?

You know, we are left here to listen to the Attorney-General. We are left here with the scenario that, gee, you know, we won't even have a law that allows us to

pass a law. I'm just wondering where this all began? I had this thought that came to me when I was listening to the Attorney-General last night. The Old Testament says, "In the beginning there was the Word," but according to the Attorney-General, if Bilodeau wins his case, we won't even have the word.

Surely, you are not going to be able to sell that to the ordinary decent people out there in Manitoba. The Attorney-General may believe it. I don't know whether he really does. I can't imagine that anybody can possibly believe that. However, if he wants to believe it, that's his business. Then, of course, if that should happen there will be all kinds of problems. He will lose his law degree because while it is probably written in English and Latin, it wasn't written in English and French. Presumably the Legislature of Manitoba will simply collapse, this building will go up in a puff of opium smoke. There are some terrible many things that can . . . I'm sorry folks, that is garbage, and if you don't know it, there are an awful lot of people out there who do.

MR. R. DOERN: My final question, Mr. Schulz, if you could just make a brief comment on this point. You mentioned again that your family immigrated to Canada, and I was wondering whether you would be able to comment on this state of affairs, you mentioned your father, yourself, etc. It appears to me that German-speaking immigrants, to some extent, are one of the most assimilated groups. I wonder if you could comment on that or account for that in your own experience.

MR. H. SCHULZ: All right. Mr. Chairman, there isn't a question here of assimilation. There are those who object to that. I don't know. I have never seriously thought about it, nor I don't think did my parents, whether they wanted to assimilate or not assimilate. They wanted to be able to communicate and then they wanted to be able to do things. They wanted to live, they wanted to make a living, they wanted to engage in business, and so they learned the language that people were speaking. At the same time, I still speak German with my mother. That didn't deprive us of anything, the fact that we spoke the same language as everybody else, we never had the idea that that deprived us of anything. Now, why this talk about, and I see it again in this morning's Sun, if I can find it here, a statement by someone at the Ste. Anne's meeting, and if I may digress for just a second, where did all this sudden demand for services in French, where did this erupt from?

About six, seven, eight weeks ago, there was report in one of the local papers that they had done a survey of the Town of Ste. Rose, or the Village of Ste. Rose. They had gone to the mayor, and the mayor had been asked: have you had a great deal of demand for services in the French language? He said, "No." I think if I recall correctly, he said the village has been incorporated since 1920 and we've never had any demand for services in French. They went to the town library and they were told, well, yes, they had had some books there in French, but they had been thrown away because nobody was borrowing them. Then suddenly when the committee arrives the hall is full of people demanding services in French. Now who do you think

induced those people to suddenly demand services in French?

I think it's Mr. Robert or possibly, I could be wrong on this, possibly someone at the Ste. Anne's meeting the other evening said, well, we're fighting against assimilation. Now, I have watched some of this kind of thing and I think while that attitude may be sincerely held, it spells trouble for the future. I watched for example the Native people of Manitoba screaming that they don't want assimilation. I watched the chiefs screaming that they don't want assimilation. Why? Because the chiefs know that their power base is the reserve and once their people assimilate into the mainstream of the Canadian economy and the mainstream of the Canadian society, they lose their power.

I notice also that the briefs that I have seen presented here, for example, by the Mennonite people and by the Society Franco-Manitoban come from young people. The Mennonites must be at least a third generation. It doesn't come from the old people. The old people are very happy with the way things are because they remember what the situation was in Europe, the place that they left, because they were involved in precisely that kind of thing where they couldn't court a girl in the next village because they couldn't understand each other and almost invariably it led to riots.

Now assimilation, I have never felt that it was something that I had to work at. I learned the language; I went to school. I speak English; I speak German; I go to the German Club when I want to; I go to Folkorama when I want to; I speak Spanish to people when I want to; I read a little bit of French. It's really never occurred to me that I was being sucked into something here.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Schulz, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Schulz from members of the committee?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Schulz, I noticed you were sitting here all day yesterday. Do you have a list of the people who want to appear before this committee?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So you knew pretty well that there was a good likelihood you wouldn't be on yesterday, but you still listened to all the briefs that we heard yesterday. You said in your remarks, I believe, that you were a member of the New Democratic Party and you referred to a piece of sleazy information. You also said that members of the New Democratic Party were urged to present briefs. Mr. Schulz, you have a list before you, and being a member of the New Democratic Party, could you indicate on that list how successful the government has been in getting members of their party to present briefs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. H. SCHULZ: Am I allowed to answer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have some reservations about the question. I'm not sure that it is something that the

committee would want Mr. Schulz to do, in terms of identifying the political affiliation of people on a list that is appearing before this committee.

Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't see that that is a clarification of Mr. Schulz's presentation, nor is Mr. Schulz expected to be able to identify who is of what political affiliation by the very fact that his name appears on the list. I don't think the question is in order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I was dealing predominantly with the information that was provided to this committee by Mr. Schulz. He indicated he was a member of the New Democratic Party; he said that members of the New Democratic Party had been urged to present briefs to this committee, and I was just asking him if he could tell me if they had been successful in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Eyer.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you. I think that there's a certain point here that we have to consider, and that is, the privilege of individuals to maintain the confidentiality of their own political affiliations. I don't think it would be any more in order for us to ask a known Conservative, or a professed Conservative, how many people who are on this list are Conservative members.

HON. S. LYON: We wouldn't be resentful of that, we're proud of the fact.

MR. P. EYLER: There is a certain point here of invasion of privacy and I think that that is the point that we have to respect. We have to respect the privacy of the individuals who have come forward to present their opinions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Phillips.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I agree with my colleague, Mr. Eyer, but would like to carry it a bit further. People have their names on the list, they have identified whether they are representing a group, or whether they are speaking as a private citizen, and I think that is all the information the committee needs to know. If they want to ask each and every person, as they appear, what their political affiliation is, the person can then choose whether they wish to identify that for the committee, and it's up to that individual to choose whether they want, as Mr. Schulz has done, to identify his political affiliation.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I realize that, and I would like to withdraw the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions, Mr. Graham?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I would ask Mr. Schulz, because I want to protect the identity of people, if he could go through that list and indicate the number?

MR. H. SCHULZ: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to answer that question for the simple reason that I believe

that probably most of the people who have made presentations, or intend to, and who are members of the New Democratic Party, are taking their position very sincerely. The fact that they have been misinformed by their government, whether accidentally or intentionally, is not their fault. Now they have a right to - you know some of them may oppose the government. I'm a member of the New Democratic Party and I don't think the government is particularly happy with the brief that I have presented here this morning; there may be others that feel the same way. In any case, I decline to answer Mr. Graham's question.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members? Seeing none, Mr. Schulz, thank you very much for your presentation here this morning.

Reeve Alan Beachell, R.M. of Rosser. Reeve Beachell please. Please proceed.

MR. A. BEACHELL: Mr. Chairman, I am listed as the Reeve of the Municipality of Rosser and that is quite true, however we do have an official brief that will be coming this afternoon from the municipality. I have rewritten mine several times after attending four or five days of the hearings, so I think it's only fair that today I speak as a private citizen, because I don't have it clarified with the council, although I'm quite willing to answer any questions that are put to me.

I would like to state at the outset that I happen to be one of the minority here today, I'm of English descent. I'm a Canadian, but I do happen to be of English descent.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. I would like to start with The Manitoba Act of 1870, Section 23 which stated, and I quote: "Either English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House of the Legislature, and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses, and either of those languages may be used by any person in any pleading or process, in or issuing from any court of Canada established under The British North American Act, 1967, or in or from all or any courts of the province, the acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both these languages."

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 does it say either English or French are the official languages of Manitoba.

English became a working language in Manitoba as well as the rest of Canada, other than the Province of Quebec. This happened partly because of the ethnic background of the people of Manitoba and also because of our close relationship with the United States.

In 1890, the Manitoba Legislature attempted to amend the section by passing The Official Language Act, which provided that English only be used in the Legislature, the courts and the statutes. In 1979, the Supreme Court of Canada, in the Forest case, held that Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is part of our Constitution and cannot be amended by the Legislature of Manitoba acting alone, and declared the 1890 Official Language Act inoperative. Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, which is set out above, is therefore in force in Manitoba and has been in force since 1870.

The Forest case dealt with the provision of Section 23 that either English or French could be used in court. In 1981, in the Bilodeau case, the Manitoba Court of Appeal dealt with the provision of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act relating to the printing and publishing of the acts of the Legislature in both languages. This has never been done from the outset, and the Bilodeau case raised the question whether the omission to print and publish acts in French invalidated all of the legislation passed by the Legislature of Manitoba since 1870.

The Manitoba Court of Appeal held that our Manitoba statutes were not invalidated by this omission, but as Mr. Bilodeau was going to take the case to the Supreme Court of Canada, the Government of Manitoba negotiated a deal, as I understand, with Mr. Bilodeau, the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Government of Canada.

Mr. Penner tells us, this is a good agreement for Manitoba. I must disagree, for this will cost millions of dollars over the years. The Government of Manitoba talks of the money that is coming from the Federal Government for translation, etc., but don't forget the Federal Government gets their money from the same source, the people.

Now we have an amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act that takes up four pages, as compared to one paragraph formerly. You will now have everything that comes from any government office in both languages: hydro bills, telephone bills, tax notices, all the pamphlets from government offices to municipalities and school boards, etc. Consider the cost of this compared to translating the statutes, and anyone can see it's a very poor deal indeed.

The main concern of those opposed to the government amendment is the cost of translating and the cost of providing services in French. This is a very valid point, for the last two days of the hearings in Winnipeg - and this was the last two days of the first set of hearings - proved the problems with translation and, in my opinion, how unnecessary it was. The people who presented their briefs in French also spoke fluent English. It makes me wonder why they didn't speak in English. Everyone would have understood them, and translation would have not been necessary.

Can you imagine the cost over the years, if at every hearing that is held by the government, they must provide translation whether it is needed or not? In my opinion, there has never been any problem in Manitoba in providing a translator for those who could not speak English or what I would call our Canadian language. I do oppose, however, providing translation for someone who is fluent in English, but demands to be served in French.

Official bilingualism divides a country. The word "unity" means one; therefore, two languages can only divide. There should be one working language so that everyone can communicate with one another. There should not be two official languages for our province, or any special status for any culture or language, but simply one working language that all can understand.

English can be spoken by nearly everyone in the province and so it would seem reasonable that it should be the working language. This does not prevent any group from doing business in their own language if they so desire. This is more than can be said for the Province of Quebec, where any sign must be in French only.

I'm also rather disturbed - this is an ad lib to my brief, Mr. Chairman - that we have groups from Quebec coming down here to tell us what we should be doing in Manitoba. It seems to me that in Manitoba, as a Manitoban, I think we can make our own decisions without help from the other province.

One other thing that concerns me after listening to the questioning at the hearings is that several organizations in favour of the government amendment, it appears, are almost totally funded by the Federal Government. The Franco-Manitoban Society, the group which made the deal with the Provincial Government, according to reports gets over \$600,000 in grants annually, and yet I have talked to a number of French people who say, the Franco-Manitoban Society does not represent them. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what percentage of the French-speaking people of Manitoba are represented by this group.

The ethnic groups who have appeared in favour of the government amendment seem to feel that if this amendment is not entrenched in the Constitution, their groups will suffer and not be able to keep their culture. I do not believe this to be true. We have always had a free country and province, and any group has always had the freedom to keep their own religion, culture or language and this is as it should be. However, I do not believe you can legislate a language or a culture, and it seems to me this is what the government is trying to do.

I also wondered last night when I heard a Mr. Lim speaking on behalf of an ethnic group in the questioning. They asked him why he thought it would benefit them if the amendment went through and French was entrenched in the Constitution. He said, well, it would help us to get more government funding. I think this is what I understood, and this is a concern of mine. I think we should certainly supply the climate in Manitoba so that every culture can flourish, but I don't think they should be funded by public money.

The government and the Society seem to be bending over backwards in their attempt to right the wrongs or the imagined wrongs that were perpetrated 100 years or more ago. Mr. Chairman, it's time we all became Canadian, not Francophones or Anglophones, but Canadians, who are proud of our country and our province. Today everyone is concerned about their rights, but no one mentions their responsibilities. I feel very strongly that Manitoba is being used as a test case to get votes in Quebec, and also to persuade other provinces to become bilingual. We should oppose entrenchment of bilingualism in Manitoba. It's time to stand up and be counted.

There has been some concern expressed by some learned people that a referendum will not solve anything, as the public do not understand the issue. How can they understand the issue? The amended Section 23 states, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, but Mr. Penner in the brochure sent out from his office (The Facts About French Language Services) states, Manitoba is not becoming bilingual. Mr. Chairman, either we are, or we aren't.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the problem with entrenching this resolution is that no further government can change it. So I must say, if this government is going to change the Constitution of 1870 - remember, 1870, not the 1890 amendment - then in all fairness, they should call an election and let the people decide.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, P. Fox: Thank you, Reeve Beachell. Are there any questions of Reeve Beachell? Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Reeve Beachell, you mentioned that you either don't think or you're not sure whether the Franco-Manitoban Society represents Franco-Manitobans. Are you aware of the fact that there is a pro-Canadian group, which also claims a sizable representation, of Maurice Prince?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I didn't hear his brief, but I read it. It was presented.

MR. R. DOERN: You also said that you can't legislate a language or a culture, but are you concerned about the fact that the Federal Government, in particular, seems to be determined to - if not legislate a language or a culture - underwrite the costs of cultural or linguistic groups in our country?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, and I believe this is what is causing all our trouble today.

MR. R. DOERN: As a reeve, are you ever approached by various ethnic or cultural groups for funding or support?

MR. A. BEACHELL: No, we never have been.

MR. R. DOERN: What would your attitude be as a government person or public representative? Would you say that the government has no obligation, or some obligation to fund ethnic or cultural organizations, or are you, in general, believing that they should fully fund themselves?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I believe the climate should be there so that they can certainly keep their culture or their language, but I think it should be funded on their own, after all, we have the public school system. If you're going to teach languages there, certainly that is funded publicly. I have no argument with that.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm sorry I didn't hear that last sentence. Could you repeat that please?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I said if you're teaching languages in the universities or in the schools, that is publicly funded and I have no argument with that.

MR. R. DOERN: You've been given guarantees, verbal guarantees, by the government that this legislation would not impact or be imposed upon the municipal governments of Manitoba. Do you now sleep soundly at night, or do you believe, in spite of guarantees, that there will be pressure put on you if this legislation proceeds?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I don't think you can have two levels of government that are bilingual and then the third one is going to be unilingual, it's going to taper

down to the municipalities being affected, too, I would think, I can't see it not happening that way.

MR. R. DOERN: So you would feel more safe and secure if this legislation did not proceed. Is that your position?

MR. A. BEACHELL: That is correct.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you support referendums or plebiscites on this issue?

MR. A. BEACHELL: We are not having a plebiscite in our municipality. I neither support or am against them having it. I think the reason people are having it is that they feel the government won't listen to the majority and I think they're wanting a referendum to prove what the people are thinking.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: Reeve Beachell, at previous hearings a question has arisen about the affect of these amendments on municipalities and, specifically, the point that you raise, specifically how the bilingualization of the province would ultimately affect the municipalities, whether or not the proposed amendment tabled on the 6th of September was proceeded with. You will be familiar with The Municipal Act and the Constitution of a municipal council as an Assessment Appeal Board. Have you had any satisfaction, or indeed, have you asked this question or have you thought about this question, as to whether or not when a municipal council sits as an Assessment Appeal Board, as to whether or not it will then become a quasi judicial and/or administrative board, in which French or English could be spoken?

MR. A. BEACHELL: We have had legal advice on that and the advice was that it may extend to Courts of Revision.

HON. S. LYON: So with or without the amendment proposed by Mr. Penner, you could see that one intrusion already, possible intrusion into municipal affairs where someone might demand the right to plead his tax revision before your municipality in French, and your council is saying that might possibly be acceded to under the amendments?

MR. A. BEACHELL: That is possible.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Adam.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, just on the last point raised by Mr. Lyon. Mr. Beachell, under The Manitoba Act as it is now, if the Court of Revision is viewed as being a court, a judicial court, a judicial body, if someone were to come in at the present time and demand that they be served in their own languages, would that not have

to be provided now, or would it may not have to be provided now? Which do you feel?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I'm not sure, Mr. Adam. We have never had this situation arise. Possibly if someone had come and demanded to be served in French, maybe we would have had to, I don't know. I don't think it's covered in the original act, but I would have to check this to make sure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions of Reeve Beachell?
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Mr. Beachell, and it stems from the question Mr. Adam put to you Mr. Beachell. I would ask you, as a person who is concerned about the people you represent, if you had a member of your municipality come to you and wanted to communicate with you and had difficulty with whatever language you spoke, would you, as a municipal councillor, do everything in your power to provide some means by which you could commonly communicate so his problem would be resolved?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Certainly, Mr. Graham. If they could not communicate in English we would do our utmost to find someone so that they could get their point across.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, you would do that then, Mr. Beachell, whether this amendment passes or whether it doesn't pass; whether the law requires it or whether the law doesn't require it? You would do it as a courtesy that the municipalities extend to their people? Would that be the correct case?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I would certainly think so, it would only be a common courtesy to try and accommodate a person in that regard.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Reeve Beachell. Reeve Beachell in your memory, can you recall any time in your previous history where a constitutional amendment has been proposed to The Manitoba Act of 1870?

MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: Reeve Beachell.

MR. A. BEACHELL: No, I can't.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Beachell, being involved in municipal government and knowing something about government, any proposed changes of that magnitude, would you consider it almost imperative that intense dialogue and communication with every level of government should occur before any proposals are put forward?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I would certainly think so on something where you're going to change the Constitution.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Beachell, in this particular proposed change, can you tell me or members of this

committee whether there has been an extended period of dialogue between the municipal level of government and the provincial level of government?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I am free to answer this, I'm quite willing to. I'm kind of here with two or three hats. Like, when he's asking if it's municipal government; yes, since the amendment was announced, we have met twice, I think, with the Premier and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Also, at all the municipal district meetings, the amendment was discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Reeve Beachell, the matter of you answering questions with regard to the other hats you wear is at your pleasure, because those hats may also be relevant to the issue.

MR. A. BEACHELL: Fine, I have no objections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You said you were presenting as a private citizen, but if to clarify for members the role you play in other organizations, that's certainly up to you if you choose to answer those questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Phillips.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: I'm just a bit confused in that about the last three people who have asked questions have asked questions that are not pertaining to Mr. Beachell's brief. I thought we were being very specific in terms of asking for clarification of their brief. Nowhere do I see in his brief where he's talking about the difficulties it presents to a municipality. So I do have some concerns about the line of questioning with the last three committee members, but I'll leave that to your discretion.

HON. S. LYON: I think we can put the concerns of the member to rest. Mr. Beachell said that there was a certain inevitability that if two levels of government became bilingual that the third would almost automatically become bilingual. So to that line of questioning, the member can take rest from. There's been nothing out of order, Mr. Chairman. The sensitivity

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was not in the committee for a short period of time and missed some of the questions, so I am not completely familiar with the line of questioning nor with the brief, unfortunately, although I am perusing it now, and if I feel that the questioning goes beyond that, I will raise that with the committee. But so far, I haven't seen any problem, and Reeve Beachell has certainly indicated a willingness to address areas of municipal concern which relate to positions he holds with the UMM. I certainly, at this point, consider those questions to be in order.

Mr. Graham, please proceed.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then I will get back to the content of your brief, Mr. Beachell. In your last sentence on your last paragraph, you say, "If this government is going to change the Constitution of 1870, then in all fairness they should call an election

and let the people decide." It's from that statement that I was asking these various questions.

I would assume from that statement, Mr. Beachell, that there are several suggestions being put forward to the government from the municipal level, offering the government various ways to go forward. Have you seen so far any indication from the government that they are taking into consideration the advice being offered to them from the municipal level of government.

MR. A. BEACHELL: I would have to say, I don't think so, although hopefully these hearings and having had meetings with municipal people, that possibly when the Legislature reconvenes they will be taking into consideration some of things and maybe there will be some changes. I have to, in all honesty, say, it doesn't look like it at the present time, but I wouldn't want to prejudge.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I realize this is outside of the content of the brief, but I think it's very very important. I would like to ask one final question.

The Federal Government passed The Official Languages Act in 1968 or '69 and some 13 years later, after intense dialogue and communication with other levels of government, entrenched it in the constitutional act. Here we are being asked to amend the constitution of the Province of Manitoba with a deadline of December 31st, some seven months after the 17th of May. Would you suggest that the time-frame for that amendment is unrealistic?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I think it would pay to go slow on this one. I know, as a municipal person, sometimes we have made quick decision and wished we had sat on it for another meeting and looked it over. I would think that this is being rushed, in my opinion.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No further questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members? Seeing none, Mr. Beachell, thank you very much for your presentation this afternoon.

MR. A. BEACHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michel Simard.

Mr. Simard, before you start, I would like to advise members of the public gallery and members on the committee that this brief will be in French. Anyone who wishes to sign out a transmitter can do so. Is there anyone who wishes one? If so, the committee will take a short recess.

There doesn't appear to be anyone moving for a transmitter, so Mr. Simard, please proceed.

MR. M. SIMARD: M. le président, membres du Comité.

L'Association Étudiante du Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface se sent préoccupée de la controverse qui existe en ce qui concerne les amendements proposés à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Nous rendant compte qu'il y a une opposition persistante envers notre demande de faire respecter nos droits, il est important d'exprimer notre intérêt et d'accentuer

leur importance. Ainsi je me réfère à l'entente du 17 mai, celle qui assure l'application éventuelle des services français les plus essentiels. Nous considérons cette entente rationnelle à tous les points de vue et une résistance contre celle-ci nous paraît non justifiable.

Notre constitution est la fondation sur laquelle on se base pour assurer le bon fonctionnement de notre pays et ses provinces. C'est pourquoi que nous ne pouvons nous permettre de la manipuler imprudemment. Il y a 93 ans, le gouvernement manitobain a été coupable d'illégitimement transformer ce que nous appelons "la fondation sur laquelle on se base pour le bon fonctionnement de notre pays et ses provinces"; notre constitution. Cette transformation impliquait l'abolition des services français à l'intérieur de la province.

Les conséquences de cette abolition ont retardé le développement de la communauté franco-manitobaine. Nous disons retardé puisque lorsqu'on ne met pas en pratique une langue, il est difficile de bien la maintenir. Et, c'est à ce sujet qu'il faut se poser des questions. Si les services gouvernementaux auraient été disponibles en français, peut-être que les immigrants de différentes cultures auraient adopté le français afin d'obtenir les services nécessaires pour leur bien-être? Du moins ils auraient eu l'option. Peut-être qu'aujourd'hui je représenterais 6 000 étudiants au lieu de 600? Nous sommes convaincus que ces objectifs et bien d'autres auraient été atteignables si notre constitution n'aurait pas été illégalement modifiée. Il est évident que l'abolition des services français au Manitoba a infligé un grand délai sur le développement de la communauté franco-manitobaine.

Aujourd'hui, malgré les injustices commises dans le passé, il y a une opposition qui insiste que l'entente du 17 mai ne soit pas implantée. En tant qu'étudiants cela nous étonne, et ainsi ça m'inspire de parler d'identité. De nier au Franco-Manitobain son droit, fait que l'usage de la langue est réduit et toujours très limité. C'est lui enlever le privilège de vivre pleinement son héritage. C'est le rendre craintif envers son identité et sans l'identité, on lui nie sa liberté. C'est comme lui voler quelque chose de précieux. Nous ne nierons jamais le privilège à une autre ethnie de s'exprimer à sa façon unique et de retour, nous nous attendons à ce que notre héritage soit respecté. Nous avons évolué énormément, il n'y a plus question de préjugé aujourd'hui et il n'aurait jamais dû avoir ce manque de respect entre différentes cultures. C'est comme se fermer à l'originalité de ton prochain.

Il ne faut plus se limiter, puisque l'avenir tient pour nous un monde élaboré de tous les aspects. Qui sait si un jour nous auront un système éducationnel tellement avancé, qu'il sera possible d'apprendre plusieurs langues à la fois. On embarque dans un monde d'ordinateur qui multiplie les possibilités d'accomplir des choses magnifiques. Notre destin est donc difficile à prévoir. Mais, la jeune génération semble détecter qu'il existe une solution qui permettra le respect culturel de dominer au Manitoba.

L'amendement que nos représentants de la Société franco-manitobaine a négocié le 17 mai 1983 serait un pas dans cette direction. Ça nous revient, c'est notre droit constitutionnel. Nous avons confiance que la justice prévaudra et nous permettra d'assurer la continuité de l'héritage franco-manitobain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Simard. Questions for Mr. Simard from members of the Committee. Seeing

none, Mr. Simard, thank you very much for your presentation here this afternoon.

Mr. Joe Smith. H. S. Dulat, Sikh Society of Manitoba Inc. Mr. Dulat please.

MR. H. DULAT: Mr. Chairman, and honourable members . . .

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

Please proceed.

MR. H. DULAT: Mr. Chairman, and honourable members, before I go into my brief, allow me to say it is a brief presented by very simple people who are more trying to understand this problem, rather than trying to solve it. It's not a learned brief like some of the ones I heard today, but it is a well-meant, well-intended brief.

My name is Harikirpal Singh Dulat and I appear before your prestigious committee on behalf of three major organizations of the Sikh community in Winnipeg; namely, the Sikh Society of Manitoba; the Singh Sabha of Winnipeg Inc., the Nanaksar Satsang Sabha of Manitoba Inc. Each one of these three organizations unreservedly and unanimously support the adoption of the amendments to Article 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870, as they were originally proposed, on the following very solid and substantial grounds:

1. It would be the most legal thing to do because, with the Supreme Court of Canada decision striking down the act of the Manitoba Legislature of 1890, the only valid law left on the statute books governing French Language Rights in Manitoba is The Manitoba Act of 1870, which clearly states in Article 23, both English and French shall be the official languages for the Province of Manitoba.

2. It is the most expedient step to take for any government which believes in the rule of law, as opposed to the rule of numbers, because the French-speaking community is, it appears to us, to be in a very strong legal position. By virtue of the Supreme Court decision in the Forest case, the French-speaking community can legally demand that every one of the Manitoba Statutes be translated into French; and, furthermore, that services in French be made available at every level of government in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman and learned members of the committee, with your legal backgrounds you will appreciate the force of this argument and, with your vast experience as legislators and experts in public finance, you will appreciate the crippling costs of doing this. It is, therefore, in our opinion, expedient for the Government of Manitoba to reach a compromise with the French-speaking community in Manitoba who, we understand, are willing to compromise in good faith, and ask that only the major designated laws, numbering some 400, as opposed to all laws numbering some 4,000, be translated into French, and only services in the major offices, as opposed to all government offices, be made available in French.

We, the Sikhs, are aware this will be expensive, but only a fraction in comparison to the cost of having to provide full services in French and having to translate

all Manitoba Statutes into French. Hence, the cost-benefit argument which is being used to oppose the amendment, is actually and truly an argument in favour of adopting the amendments.

3. In all fairness, the cost-benefit argument should not even be considered when what we have at stake is the unity of Manitoba and the happiness of a people. May I be permitted to suggest that if the cost-benefit argument were the guiding principle for action, not a single progressive concept could have surfaced and survived in civilization, and not a single noble cause been championed.

4. We feel that it would be in conformity with the principles of equity and fair play, for which both British and Canadian societies are world renowned, and after which so many of the emerging nations are modelling their own legal and political systems, to accept the amendments to Article 23 and thus allow the French community the satisfaction of conducting their dealings with the Government of Manitoba, vis-a-vis the major laws and main offices in their own language.

5. Giving recognition to French, along with English, as an official language in Manitoba in the cordial and amiable way of adopting the proposed amendments would move Manitoba from the status of a backward prairie province into a precedent-setting model province, blazing a path for the other provinces to follow in their search for communal harmony.

6. We feel that the French language, with its rich heritage and literature, will add greatly to the cultural climate of our province. But let there be no mistaking the fact that French, like any other language, cannot long endure, develop and contribute to the Manitoba mosaic unless it has some official status.

Finally, may I be permitted to point out that I come from a country, India, whose constitution recognizes two official languages for all central government work; namely Hindi and English, and that in my home province of the Punjab, we recognize three official languages, namely Hindi, Punjabi and English. This is called the tri-language formula there.

I submit to this committee therefore, one concluding thought, namely, if a country as poor as India, as burdened with economic problems as India, can insure language rights to its people, why not Manitoba with all its wealth and resources? In a word, gentlemen, like the tin man in the Wizard of Oz, "All we need here is a heart."

In summation, may I be permitted to say that by adopting the original proposed amendments, the Government of Manitoba will be not only redressing a wrong which has been perpetuated for some 90-odd-years, but will also show to the rest of Canada and especially to the ethnic minorities in Manitoba, that it has the courage and moral fibre to subscribe to and enforce the rule of law and that what influences its decisions is not political expediency but justice and fair play. The Sikhs as an ethnic minority group in Manitoba would support any government wholeheartedly - I want to underline the words "any government wholeheartedly" - should it adopt it the original proposed amendments.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before you. I remain, yours respectfully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Dulat. Questions for Mr. Dulat? Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Dulat, starting at Page 4 of your brief, I draw your attention to the statement "that by adopting the original proposed amendments, the Government of Manitoba, will not only be redressing a wrong, which has been perpetuated for 90-odd-years, but will also show to the rest of Canada, and especially to the ethnic minorities that it has the courage and moral fibre to subscribe to . . .", etc., etc. I would be interested in having your further opinion what wrong is being redressed by these amendments, given the fact that the Supreme Court, in 1979, said that Section 23, which was the only section dealing with this matter, had been restored. What further restoration is there either needed or present in Section 23?

MR. H. DULAT: With all due respect, as I mentioned at the very beginning, it is more an educational process for us. You are the experts on this, not me. All I can say is that our understanding is, there was a law passed by Parliament of Canada and then the Provincial Legislature passes a law, cancelling or abrogating that law. That is unconstitutional as far as I understand the thing, but the Parliament of Canada is supreme, nobody here should have the authority to neglect its laws and cancel them.

If something illegal like that continues for 90 years in our understanding, anyway, it is a wrong.

HON. S. LYON: I understand you, Mr. Dulat. Do you understand the third step that was taken; namely, that the Supreme Court said, in 1979, that the law in 1890 was invalid and restored Section 23. What I'm harking your attention to is the word "restore" and I'm merely suggesting to you that there is nothing restorative in the amendments put forward by the NDP. It's an extension of Section 23 that they are putting forth. The restoration was done by the Supreme Court and by the Legislature in 1980.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, please.

HON. S. LYON: So would you change your brief in that respect, or . . .

MR. H. DULAT: First of all, the only change I would like to suggest is, I am not an NDP, I am not a Conservative, I am not a part of the political process. What I do feel is, I accept your interpretation that the restoration of that section would have taken care and done a good deal of justice, but evidently there is a section of the community here which feels that full justice has not been done. And if we bring these amendments in, it would be satisfying to them.

HON. S. LYON: And if in the satisfying of that group, a great tearing of the social fabric of our community takes place, would you still say that that is a desirable thing to have happen?

MR. H. DULAT: Sir, it was some British Justice who said - this was during the war days - that our laws speak the same language, whether it was war or peace. I forget who it was. I think as people subscribing to the rule of law, we have got to enforce the laws. The other considerations should be secondary, such as cost,

what is it doing to society. If today, we say we will not enforce this part of our law because it is creating havoc here or there, then tomorrow we can abrogate every law like that. Somebody is going to be hurt, no matter which way one turns.

HON. S. LYON: But Mr. Dulat, if you will accept the interpretation which you've heard this morning and from many others before the committee, that the law was restored, in '79 and '80, and that what is being sought to be done now is a vast extension of that restoration, can you then begin to understand that it is not a restoration we're involved in, so much as a vast extension of entrenched provisions of the Constitution which have caused, I can tell you . . .

MR. H. DULAT: I am not a lawyer, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: That has nothing to do with being a lawyer, it has something to do with being a Manitoban.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The purpose of questions is to clarify the contents of the brief. I appreciate that members may have differing opinions than those that are contained in the brief, but the purpose of questions is to clarify the opinions expressed, not to debate or ask for changes in briefs based upon questions or on points made by members in questions.

Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: On Page 3 of your brief, Mr. Dulat, you state, "Giving recognition to French along with English as an official language in Manitoba in the cordial and amiable way of adopting the proposed amendments would move Manitoba from the status of a backwards, prairie province into a precedent-setting, model province blazing a path for the other provinces to follow in their search for communal harmony." Would you like to reconsider that paragraph, Mr. Dulat?

MR. H. DULAT: It was not intended to insult anybody or hurt anybody's feelings to call it a backward province. But in the few years that I have been here and reading the literature, the feeling seems to be going around that everything in Canada is being generated in the east. The products are manufactured there, they are designed there; all the research is being done there; and what we get is just whatever is left over. What I am saying is that if - what this brief is saying, not me, it's our brief, I'm a spokesman only - what our brief is saying is that if we do give these people these amendments, it will result in communal harmony.

Sir, allow me to say, I come from a country where they used to have provinces divided on the basis of expediency, for power politics, to divide and rule and stuff like that. Then the national government came in and they said we are going to have provinces on the basis of languages. There were riots; there were thousands of people killed; the country was split on the basis of language also and religion. But it was done. It is the rule of law. I can't talk to you about the rule of law. You are the originators of that concept. It's the

British system which has given the world that gift and to find that in a country which has such a strong British background we are going to depart from it.

HON. S. LYON: Would you agree, Mr. Dulat, that part of the British parliamentary system has been to avoid entrenchment of any sort at all?

MR. H. DULAT: I agree with you. This is the largest unwritten Constitution. I have got an education from you.

HON. S. LYON: You said in another part of your brief - I'm just trying to find it here - on Page 1, Mr. Dulat: "By virtue of the Supreme Court decision in the Forest case, the French-speaking community" and then you underlined this "can legally demand that everyone of the Manitoba statutes be translated into French." No argument about that. "And furthermore" and you underline this, the second proposition, "that services in French be made available at every level of government in the Province of Manitoba." What is your legal, historical or other justification for that statement which does not, if I may say so with respect, is not factual.

MR. H. DULAT: If I am wrong in the latter part of the statement - I don't know whether I am or not - but you are a legal expert, I know that, I would accept your word for it, so that part of the thing should be struck out then. Thank you very much.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. Dulat and I wouldn't want him to accept just my word. I'll be quite happy to give him the legal opinion that was received by the government which they tabled in the House, which states that the provisions in the agreement relating to French Language Services could never be imposed by any court in Canada. It's a point the government doesn't make too often.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further question? It's not appropriate, Mr. Dulat, for you to ask questions. Further questions?
Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. Dulat for withdrawing that part of his statement, and I'll be happy to give him that opinion if he would like to have it for his records.

A final question, Mr. Dulat, on Page 2 of your brief, you say, "In all fairness, the cost benefit argument should not even be considered when what we have at stake is the unity of Manitoba and the happiness of the people." Do you honestly think that the government's method of handling this matter since May 17th has contributed in any way to the unity of Manitoba and the happiness of our people?

MR. H. DULAT: I don't think that process yet has been completed. It is still - you are all hearing these hearings. For the time being there will be debate and acrimony, I'm sure that when this dust and dirt has settled down, there will be some harmony. I have faith in that. At least people are not out here butchering people in the streets as has happened in other countries.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Dulat, may it always be so, but there is no tradition of butchery in this country. We regret the reference that you make to your own native country, but that is what some of us, who are opposed to this measure, are trying to avoid. I think you can understand that.

MR. H. DULAT: If I may be allowed to say, the level of civilization here, the level of tolerance here is so high, that I think if you do go through with these amendments, it would result in harmony, it would not result in long range ill-feeling.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, unless there be any misunderstanding by the press or anyone else, I was not referring to what we were doing as a preventor of butchery, but rather from - because I saw the press writing rather quickly - but rather trying to heal and restore the community spirit in the province from initiatives being taken, which are finding disfavour among the people of Manitoba. Fortunately, we don't have any great tradition of people in the streets of the kind that you have described, and we want to keep it that way.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions? Ms. Phillips.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, just one, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Dulat, in reference again to Page 4, your second last paragraph, where you are suggesting that to subscribe to a piece of legislation, to pass it, have it on the books, might be somewhat different than enforcing a piece of legislation and turning it into a living law and something that the community can actually use and put into practice is what we are doing and what you are supporting, and that they are two different concepts, one passing or adhering to the law in 1980, but moving on with this amendment to provide the services that make that a living law, rather than something written on the statute books is what you are supporting at this point?

MR. H. DULAT: Yes, if understood the comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The difficulty was that it was very much a leading question.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Clarification, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. H. DULAT: If my understanding of the comment is correct, what you are saying is, that a law was passed, it was on the statute books, but it was a dead law, nobody was looking at it, nobody was enforcing it, nobody was doing anything about it, and that now, the machinery is being built that that law will actually have some force and will affect the lives of the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Dulat? Seeing none, Mr. Dulat, thank you very much for your presentation on behalf of the three organizations you represent.

MR. H. DULAT: Thank you, sir.

Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: Being passed our normal hour of adjournment, committee is adjourned until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

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