



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. Phil Eyer
Constituency of River East



MG-864B

VOL. XXXI No. 66 - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Tuesday, 31 January, 1984

TIME — 8:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Phil Eyler (River East)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Mr. Anstett

Messrs. Eyler, Enns, Kovnats, Scott,
Malinowski, Harapiak, Scott, Filmon and Ashton

Ms. Phillips

WITNESSES: Ms. Lorraine Dejonckheere, Private
Citizen

Mr. Norman Edie, Private Citizen

Ms. Juliette Blais, Private Citizen

Mr. Ken McColm, Private Citizen

Mr. Henry Elias, Private Citizen

Mr. G. Nicholas, Private Citizen

Mrs. Rosemary Chabluk, Private Citizen

Mr. Howard Walsh, Private Citizen

Mr. Eric Carsted, Private Citizen

Mr. Tom Cohoe, Private Citizen

Mr. T. Lasko made a further presentation to
the committee

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill No. 115 - An Act respecting the Operation
of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act; Loi
concernant la mise en application de l'article 23
de la Loi de 1870 sur le Manitoba.

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum. Committee come
to order. I will be picking up on the list where we left
off at noon today.

Ms. Lorraine Dejonckheere.

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: Mr. Chairman, honourable
committee members, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to
speak as a French-Canadian Manitoban. I am totally
against the passage of Bill 115 because, as a French-
Canadian, I don't feel that any of my rights are denied
or ever have been. Many French-Canadians had access
to jobs because of their bilingualism for many years,
myself included.

For myself, the SFM does not represent me or any
of my family members, and we are numerous, of all-
French background. If certain segments of French
society keep pushing their causes, it is certainly going
to be to the detriment of all Manitobans of French
ancestry, because they cannot expect to force their will

upon the majority of other Manitobans who certainly
don't feel any need of this legislation without having
a severe adverse effect on the French-Canadians -
which they have already accomplished - in this province.
We already know the strong feeling of many Manitobans
in this regard. No good is served by railroading passage
of a bill which many are opposed as of the present.

I will just quote one quote here from British Columbia
which have had bilingualism for 15 years. Now let me
quote what's happening in that province right now. This
is official bilingualism. "I have only one bit of advice
to pass onto you, to your friends and neighbours.
Demand that it stop. English persons have been
demoted, laid-off and refused to be hired in spite of
their abilities."

I would also like to say that my own two daughters
- one is aspiring to go or would wish to someday enter
the police force - she has taken French in school, not
totally bilingual as she should have been maybe because
of my French ancestry. I was raised in an English area
and lived for years amongst other ethnic groups which
I'm very comfortable with and have many friends in.
She says, mom, if I can't get into certain aspects of
governments or jobs, police force, etc., in Canada, I'm
going to the States. Now this is maybe the feelings of
a lot of kids eventually; a lot of young people eventually
are going to have that same feeling as my own daughter
has.

She's in high school right now. She has dropped her
Grade 11 French, because she feels that there are other
subjects that are more pertinent that she should be
taking for whatever field she wants to go into. Maybe
this is going to be detrimental to her, but I don't
feel that all students in this society should have to take
the French courses right through to feel that they have
to get into their field. The language shouldn't be the
full criteria of what fields they want to go into.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Ms.
Dejonckheere?

Mr. Enns.

Ms. Dejonckheere, would you like to answer any
questions?

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: I think I made a mistake,
it should have been New Brunswick, if I was
misunderstood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Just one question, Ms. Dejonckheere.
I'm intrigued by what motivates you to make this
presentation. I mean, were you coerced into doing it
by anybody, like the Grassroots organization or
something like that?

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: No.

MR. H. ENNS: What motivates you to come before us, before this committee and make the presentation that you just made?

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: Because I feel that my daughters, in the future, having school French, not being raised in a French community where they are completely bilingual like many French-Canadians are, I don't think that she's going to be bilingual enough to get into a lot of positions. There are a lot of French people who are in that position.

MR. H. ENNS: But Bill 115 - I don't really like putting it this way, but I have to because this government is forcing me to - is putting your kind of people in a special status? Now that's offensive to me to have to put that question that way.

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: Well, I would think so. How would I word it? How can I say it? Because you have a French name and you're French-Canadian, that doesn't mean to say that you're going to get those jobs in a lot of aspects, because a lot of French-Canadians in Manitoba that are in English areas, they are intermarried with other nationalities. They really haven't kept up the language or they haven't spoken it in the home, and their children have taken it in school for as much as you're going to take it in school. They haven't taken immersion French or this kind of thing. With immersion French you may get a new - I think the section generation, yes. A lot of our people are French people that never had the opportunity or haven't maybe taught the language to their own children. Their kids are in immersion because they figure, well, the next generation is going to be fluently bilingual, they're going to get the chances of the jobs, this kind of thing.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?
Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Je pose mes questions en français.

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: Ou, je peux répondre.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Est-ce que tu es bilingue?

MS. L. DEJONCKHEERE: Oui, je suis bilingue. Mais je pourrais pas travailler dans le bureau à Québec. Je suis bilingue pour parler mais pour écrire il faudrait que je prenne d'autres cours.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Merci.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Thank you, Ms. Dejonckheere.
Mr. Norman Edie.

MR. N. EDIE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before the committee. I'm from the Springfield constituency and both Mr. Anstett and Mr. Mackling also live there. We were all at a large meeting a couple of nights ago, called on short notice.

About 600 came out in 24 hours notice, and I'm sure they cannot help be aware of the animosity that has developed against the resolution to entrench French as an official language in the Constitution, thereby creating an unchangeable authority whereby the mechanics of Bill 115 can be put into practice.

There were Francophones there that spoke up, although some preferred to remain anonymous because of feared repercussions, but those that did don't feel that they have any rights that have been denied, nor have they been denied learning or using the language of their choice. Any extension of French rights in their minds would seem to be divisive and discriminatory in employment opportunities.

Mr. Pawley suggests that changes to the Constitution and the development of Bill 115 is a made-in-Manitoba solution. The alarming reality is that a lot of the pressure for their implementation is spawned in an area considerably far east.

Mr. Serge Joyal, Minister of State for Canada, in an address to the Annual Meeting of the Societe franco-manitobaine last March said, and I quote: "Even in times of austerity, we will be there to support your cause." As many of you know, it is much more than moral support with a \$650,000 annual grant and a further \$108,000 payment in August for supposed legal fees to support and research Bill 115.

There are forces outside our province intent on changing our destiny. Manitoba is being used as a stepping stone to expand the French fact throughout Canada. This is the thin edge of the wedge; the seeds of expansion are being sown.

Mr. Anstett pointed out at the meeting the other night that it will only affect 2 percent or 3 percent of the Civil Service and the people in the Crown corporation positions. I believe it is naive to believe that it won't grow much beyond that.

The bill passed in 1980 in this Legislature corrected any alleged wrongs of 1890. When fully three-quarters of the people of Manitoba are satisfied and content with what we have, why change? What can the government hope to accomplish? We would admire an admission that what has been undertaken is not advisable. Admit that in your best judgment the situation should be left alone.

In this evening's press, Mr. Anstett suggests that the waters have calmed in Springfield. That is a delusion of the truth. Last night, I was handed a petition: "The undersigned electors of the constituency of Springfield are opposed to becoming an officially bilingual province. We want the Provincial Government to withdraw the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act." This is signed by 482 people in our constituency. It's just a symbol of the unrest. I would like to have Mr. Anstett have a copy of these names.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you completed your presentation?

MR. N. EDIE: Yes I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Edie?
Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Edie, I don't want to take advantage of your position as being a resident of Springfield, and

one I assume that perhaps attended that meeting on Sunday. There has been concern about media reporting of that meeting that suggested, by and large, the people supported Mr. Anstett's position. I'll identify the media, the CJOB report of Roger Currie was that Mr. Anstett's recent position was generally supported by the media. I'm asking you, as a participant of that meeting, is that a fair comment, a fair reflection of how that meeting in effect went?

MR. N. EDIE: Mr. Anstett did a good job of explaining their position and the background on the change to the Constitution and the intricacies of Bill 115, but on the other hand, fully three out of four people that spoke were against what was being proposed. He nods his head in agreement. I would venture to say that 80 percent of those people were not influenced by what he had said even though he explained it fully. They still are objecting to the entrenchment and this petition that I handed him this evening was signed at that meeting. There are 482 signatures in a meeting of approximately 500 or a little better, so that gives an idea of the proportion of discontent.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Edie, for coming tonight.

Ms. Juliette Blais.

The next name on my list is Mr. T. Lasko. I'm informed by the Clerk that he spoke once before.

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think that we have put a time frame on the presenters that are coming to the committee to make presentations, and I don't think it would be proper for us to allow people to come a second time before the committee. I would suggest that we continue on with the list and perhaps if there is time at the end of the day, once all the names have been called, that we could hear those persons, but even then I have some doubts of whether we go into running people through the second time. But at the very least, we should not be hearing people a second time before the rest of the people have been called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: I remind honourable members of this same committee that when this committee last sat we provided one Monsieur Forest that privilege of appearing before us twice. So I simply ask the committee to be consistent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I'm sure that Mr. Enns will remember there were no time restrictions during the last committee hearings but at this time . . .

MR. H. ENNS: You weren't quite that dictatorial then. We were still living with a bit more freedom then.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: . . . we have 40-minute limits, so I think if the 40-minute limit is used up in their one

presentation, I can't see how we can start hearing them a second time. I would suggest that we not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kovnats.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. KOVNATS: As soon as I have the floor, I'll speak. Mr. Chairman, I recall the presentation made by Mr. T. Lasko. It was a very very short presentation, I think five minutes or less, and I think that Mr. Lasko should be given the opportunity of completing his presentation. I think that's the reason why he is listed again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the will of the committee? Proceed.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Blais is here, the one just previous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, to the same point of order. If it's the will of the committee to hear people a second time, I think out of respect for those, some of whom have waited for three days, that those who want to be heard a second time should wait until the end of the list. I think that's reasonable. There are some people who have waited for a lengthy period of time. If that's agreeable, I think that's a reasonable way to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable then?

Ms. Phillips.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: I think though that we shouldn't make a blanket provision that anyone who has spoken once can come back and speak again. I think that when we finish the list this evening, if we could consider Mr. Lasko's case individually. I don't think at this point, I am prepared to have a blanket statement that anyone can come back two, three, four, five, six, eight times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you Ms. Juliette Blais?

MS. J. BLAIS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

MS. J. BLAIS: My name is Juliette Blais. I am a Canadian citizen of French ancestry. On October 3rd, I spoke before you on the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Today I wish to speak on Bill 115, An Act Respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

As I was reading through this bill, I am of the opinion that this is a language bill. At the present time, neither French nor English is entrenched in The Manitoba Act. Consequently, why has this been allowed to come this far? As far as I'm concerned, it is unconstitutional. This bill is unconstitutional. English and French are not entrenched.

I don't know how to proceed on this. How can we talk about a language bill? I can't make heads or tails

of this bill. Would any of you like to clarify it for me? Didn't you fellows draw up this bill? Please help me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Ms. Blais. The purpose of the committee is to get the opinions of the public. It is not procedural that the witnesses would be questioning the committee.

MS. J. BLAIS: I actually don't know how to proceed with this. How can we talk on a language bill when language is not entrenched in our Constitution? Is there something wrong with me that I can't - I'll have to leave it with you. Until you can clarify this bill for me, I can't go any further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Ms. Blais? Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Blais, would we conclude from your comments this evening that you feel that the initiative that has been taken with respect to a constitutional amendment is the priority initiative that would have to be dealt with or should be dealt with by the Legislature before there can be any decision made with respect to a statute, to legislation, to a bill such as this before us? Is that essentially your position?

MS. J. BLAIS: Yes, certainly, that's how I look at it. If we did not entrench - you know when I was here in October and spoke on the entrenchment, you know English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, that was not entrenched. It hasn't been entrenched yet. Now how can we leave that alone and now go on to Bill 115?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Regardless of your position, through you, Mr. Chairman, to Ms. Blais, with respect to the issue and which side of the issue you might be on, what you are saying as a citizen of Manitoba is that we should be addressing the proposed constitutional amendment and dispose of that one way or the other - which ever way it goes is in the hands of the fates and I guess in the hands of the members of the Legislature and the public - but we should be disposing of that and not dealing with the bill at this time just in pure and simple logic?

MS. J. BLAIS: Exactly, that's how I look at it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: And you don't feel you can deal with the proposed legislation first before we deal with the proposed amendment?

MS. J. BLAIS: No, because Section 23 of The Manitoba Act may never be. That may never be entrenched. Consequently what are we doing debating this bill?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Have you had an opportunity to discuss or examine this aspect of the situation with your friends and neighbours?

MS. J. BLAIS: Well, I'll tell you, I attended a meeting in the Springfield constituency where Mr. Anstett was supposed to straighten all this out for us, and I came

away from there none the wiser. As a matter of fact I'm even more confused.

MR. L. SHERMAN: You don't feel, Ms. Blais, notwithstanding whatever kinds of efforts Mr. Anstett may have made - and I gather that he made some very courageous ones - that you don't feel that the situation has been explained by him or by the government satisfactorily up to this point?

MS. J. BLAIS: That's exactly it, and I was hoping that the Premier would be here today. Seeing as I can't get any information from his Ministers, why is the Premier not here to explain this to me? If I am confused, how about all the other people? You know, I come to the Legislature frequently and I try to understand. I read the papers, but this thing is just beyond me.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Ms. Blais, I'm not entitled to proffer an answer to your question as to why the Premier isn't here. We'd have to leave that to the Office of the Premier, but thank you for articulating the concerns that you have and you feel many of your neighbours and friends have with respect to the order in which this very urgent Manitoba business has been placed before this committee. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Ms. Blais?
Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Ms. Blais, you mentioned just a moment ago that you are, and I recognize you to be an observer of things that happened around the Legislature and as a Francophone . . .

MS. J. BLAIS: I am a Canadian of French ancestry.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . were you aware that one Walter Weir, Premier of the Conservative Party, designated the SFM in 1969 to be the sole party that governments could relate to, or speak to, or make deals with, if you like, on behalf of all people of French ancestry in Manitoba in 1969? Were you aware of that?

MS. J. BLAIS: No, Mr. Enns. I only learned about that at the Springfield meeting when Mr. Anstett enlightened me on that fact. I never realized that the SFM was a spokesman for Canadians of French ancestry. I don't consider myself an SFM. SFM was a term brought to light in about the late 1960's and this also disturbs me very much because in Manitoba the French people are called - like the SFM would like us to refer to ourselves as Francophones, which I will never submit to. In Quebec, of course, French people, Canadians of French ancestry there are known as Quebecois and in Saskatchewan, a Canadian of French ancestry is known as a Saskaphone. You seem to be taken aback by this but this is so. I mean La Liberte always refers to the Canadians of French ancestry in Saskatchewan as Saskaphones, and I really don't know who speaks on my behalf, but it certainly isn't the SFM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Phillips on a point of order.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, I'd just like to clarify a procedural point with you, Mr. Chairperson. I haven't

been on the committee before tonight and at this stage, I wondered if we were following regular procedure where questions are to be asked on the brief that is presented, not on other issues that come out of one member's mind or another?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has been the general rule of thumb in the procedures to date, Ms. Phillips. There has been some latitude given at certain times. Are there any further questions for Ms. Blais?

MR. H. ENNS: Don't run away, Al. I'll call a few more people rednecks. It will make this meeting interesting.

A MEMBER: You're really funny, Harry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seeing no further questions then, thank you Ms. Blais for coming here tonight.

MS. J. BLAIS: Well, I'm leaving here just as confused as when I came.

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

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, yes on a point of order. Might I ask the Chair if he could give some warning, or if the Chair could give some warning, when he's going to bang that bloody gavel close to the microphone when I've got this damn earpiece close to my ear? Just any kind of warning at all, just so I don't walk out of here deaf.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The warning generally starts with the applause in the background, Mr. Kovnats.
Mr. Ken McColm.

MR. K. MCCOLM: Mr. Chairman, committee members, my name is Ken McColm. I'm speaking as a private citizen. I'm not going to presume to tell this committee whether we do or do not need a bill respecting French rights, but this bill is not it. You cannot give rights to some people unless you are very careful to protect the rights of others while you're in the process of doing it. This bill does not do that.

This bill to me, from what I've heard at these meetings, is a bill conceived in cowardice, born of blackmail, and presented in arrogance. Gentlemen, go back and bring us a bill founded on freedom, born of justice and presented with humility and dignity.

That, gentlemen, is all I've got to say, but I would ask you to listen to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. McColm? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. McColm, for coming tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here it comes, Abe. Mr. Tom Cohoe.
Mr. Henry Elias.

MR. H. ELIAS: My name is Henry Elias. I'm speaking as a private citizen.

In my submission to the Legislative Committee on October 4, 1983, on this language legislation, I then posed the question and expressed my concern of

whether the present Government of Manitoba is not in fact helping the Federal Government build a future Lebanon or a future Northern Ireland or a Spain with its violent Basque minority? From the media, reported threats against Premier Pawley and some other members of his government and from the reports of school children, segregation and all the dissension that flows from it already in some communities here in Manitoba, it appears to me as if my fears and concerns are already coming true, long before I even anticipated.

In that previous submission to the Legislative Committee, I drew the analogy of a marriage that is not working out well, that is on the rocks, as it were, because it is a forced marriage between Quebec and the rest of Canada and it is quite clear that the marriage partners have never loved each other right from the very beginning. For many years the English partner was the dominant partner in this forced marriage and the French partner felt the other was taking unfair advantage and built up a deep resentment. We cannot deny that this resentment does not exist. We all know it is a fact.

The question now is, will this resentment subside with the passing of the legislation that is now proposed? The question is, will the marriage improve to the point where the partners of this forced marriage become compatible? I suggest to you members of this committee that it won't become compatible in the foreseeable future, because now the English partner will become resentful, as you have heard many times during these hearings.

Violence is already threatening to happen. Once it begins, where does it end? Once it begins, then the reprisals and the counter-reprisals begin and there is no end to it then. We see this today in Northern Ireland and in Spain and in Lebanon and in many other countries.

Therefore, I suggest a different course of action. I suggest a peaceful separation of the two founding cultures, the two marriage partners that were united in a shotgun wedding on the Plains of Abraham in 1867. Would it not be better in the long run for Manitoba to urge the Federal Government to make a deal with Quebec, to separate amiably and in peace? Let the French culture go their own way in Quebec. Let those English and those non-French people from Quebec, those who want to live in an English society, that is the English, let them make a deal with those French people in the rest of Canada, who want to live in a French society. Let the governments even help them to exchange their province of domicile, so that they can live in the province of their own language and culture. In my opinion, that would be a much more constructive method of settling this age-old grievance and dispute that now divides this land of great promise, these grievances and now another dispute that threatens to make it another Lebanon or a Northern Ireland or a Spain with their never-ending reprisals and violence. Once such violence and reprisals start, it is almost impossible to stop them. They go on for hundreds of years, as we all know in the examples which I gave.

Now I want to make it very clear that I am not against the French people or against the French language. In any culture, the majority of people are good people, but in every culture there are also some people who

want more than their fair share. This is what concerns me regarding the present legislation. It will clearly discriminate against those who speak only English, who have or who want jobs where both languages would be required as a condition of their employment. As we all know, it would give an unfair advantage to those who are bilingual. In spite of the Premier's reassurance, there can be no honest doubt about that. It is self-evident, so to speak.

There can also be no honest doubt that the proposed legislation also discriminates against other ethnic minorities who form a larger percentage of Manitobans than the French minority, but these other minorities are willing to live with what they've got of their ethnic culture and of their great freedom here. They don't raise hell like the very small minority of those of French ethnic origin do who instigated this dissension.

Only a very small minority of the French people of this province is causing all these problems. The rest are reasonably satisfied with the way things are. This very small minority of French Manitobans, they have become highly organized, and it is they who are creating all these language problems and divisions in our province and in our country as well for that matter. It is clear now that they want more than their fair share.

They have become closely allied with their counterparts in Quebec. So now, not only do they want Quebec, but all the rest of Canada. If they cannot separate Quebec from Canada, then they try to take over the rest of Canada. That is their motto. From their point of view, it's not a bad idea. Why not take over all of Canada? Then they don't need to separate Quebec, I should say. It's not a bad idea if they can get away with it. If I may say so, they have made a hell of a good start.

Congratulations, Mr. Forest and Mr. Robert. I don't know if you are here. Robert, I should say. I take my hat off to you, and I shake your hand, but at the same time I know what you're up to. You want revenge for all the imagined or the real injustices your people believe they have suffered these last 100 or these last 300 years or whatever, but what is the price your people and the rest of the people of Manitoba are paying? Is it really worth all this? Where will it end now that it has started all over again? You think it is going to end when the bill is passed and the resolution is sent to Ottawa? I don't think it will.

When I look at the construction of this bill, then I have reason to believe it is only the beginning. Because you see, it is how an act or a statute is applied that determines what will, in fact, happen in the future. I have some experience in this with other statutes, which I don't want to go into here now. Whether this present conflict or division here in Manitoba will ignite into violence or whether it will subside, that will determine the future. How it is applied will determine that.

In my opinion, there are too many opportunities in this bill for discretionary decisions by officers administering this act. For example, under Section 22(2), the ombudsman may use his discretion as to whether to investigate a complaint. It does not say he shall.

Another example of discretionary power is in the very appointment of the ombudsman. Who will investigate the conduct of the ombudsman if the complainant cannot afford to go to court?

Thirdly is the very fact that the ombudsman shall be fluent in both English and French. Mr. Chairman, and

members of this committee, Section 7 of this act should be amended. To the end of Section 7 should be added the following words: "and shall not be of either English or French ethnic origin." But, of course, that would be discrimination and contrary to The Human Rights Act. So here again, we all know what is likely to happen.

Well, I should give you an actual example of what is already happening, a case of which I have personal knowledge. A certain schoolteacher who I know very well - I don't want to identify her - she teaches in a predominantly French community in the English section of the large school there. She informed me that the managing staff there - I don't recall whether it would be the principal of the English section or whatever it would be, anyway those who are in control. By the way, the principal of the English section is of French ethnic origin. That already tells you something.

Anyway, whoever decides where certain grant money goes which the teachers can use at their own discretion - this is about 20 percent of that particular government grant - the English section of this school has never been able to use their share of this 20 percent of this grant. It all goes into the French section of the school, and has gone there since this teacher began teaching there three or four years ago. That is what I mean when I say, they want more than their fair share. This is only one example. I could give you many others.

Do the English in Quebec get what the French want here? No way. Quebec is not bilingual. The English cannot even put up a sign in English on their own place of business. Therefore, my submission to this committee is that the Government of Manitoba should urge the Federal Government and the other provinces to make a deal with Quebec to assist those who want to move to their own culture and their language to do so, and to exchange properties for proper and fair consideration, and to let Quebec paddle its own canoe if it decides that it wants to do so. Then each culture can use its own language to its heart's content.

Why create another Lebanon or a Northern Ireland or a Spain with its Basques? I am sure Quebec would not separate even then. They have it far too good in Canada. They would be crazy to separate from Canada, and they know it. Because where else would they get as much as they do now from Canada? They are not that stupid, as we here in Manitoba can now see. They will never paddle their own canoe. We will paddle it for them, and they will be laughing all the way to the bank.

But this school teacher I was telling you about, when they hired her, they asked her whether she was bilingual. She said, yes, and she got the job, but they never asked her whether she could speak French as well as English. They just assumed that she could. You know, they already assume that. Well, she was bilingual all right, but not in French. So today, three or four years later, she is laughing all the way to the bank, because it is not so easy to fire a good teacher once you have hired her. So you see Mr. Forest and Mr. Robert, two can play this game you are now playing and you are not always the winner.

Thank you, members of this committee for hearing me. Whatever I have said is not going to make any difference to any of you anyway, but I am sure the next election will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ELIAS: I'm sure a lot of you won't be laughing, not even all the way to the bank.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Elias?
Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Elias, if I'm quoting you correctly, you said that this action, in your view, constitutes a form of discrimination against other ethnic minorities in the province; however the provincial government has insisted from the outset, Sir, that this whole initiative is a campaign for minority rights and for the restoration of minority rights. How would you explain what to me appears to be quite an anomaly, quite a . . . ?

MR. H. ELIAS: Well, quite frankly, I don't believe them. I mean to put it bluntly, it is certainly discrimination because people of other ethnic origins, they are not going to get the jobs where bilingualism is required unless they learn to speak French. It's very simple. It's a self-evident truth. It's a fact. I was born in a minority. I know all about minority. When I went to school at first, I couldn't speak English, but I couldn't speak my native language. My mouth was washed out with soap if I said one wrong word. No kidding, that's the truth, so help me.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, in other words, you have some difficulty in viewing this initiative as a campaign on behalf of minority rights and for the restoration of minority rights?

MR. H. ELIAS: I would be the first one to protect minority rights, because I have a lot of experience with that. I would be the first one. I would give my life to protect minority rights, because I know what it means if they are taken away, from experience.

MR. L. SHERMAN: And you don't see this as being a defence of minority rights?

MR. H. ELIAS: Not by any stretch of imagination.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Or a restoration of minority rights?

MR. H. ELIAS: I would certainly want the French to have their proper rights and their fair share. I don't know how this act is going to be applied, no one does.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I was going to ask you, you already touched on it a little bit, Mr. Elias, but if you don't mind my asking you, and I'll tell you my situation. I've lived in Manitoba for 40 years. I wasn't born in Manitoba. I was born in Canada, and I've lived in Manitoba for 40 years. How long have you lived in Manitoba?

MR. H. ELIAS: I was born here. My father was born here and my grandfather came here from Russia when he was 22 years old.

MR. L. SHERMAN: So you're a pretty good basic native Manitoban.

MR. H. ELIAS: Well, I was brought up as a pacifist, but after the Hitler era, I have my doubts about that.

I should say one other thing, although it doesn't belong here, I think countries can get too big. I think the United States is far too big. I think Russia is far too big. Do you know what I mean? Because, what are they doing? They're threatening the rest of us unfairly.

I think Canada could set a good example. I've studied the English law and I think the English have something over us. Even their police don't wear guns. I think they've got something over us. I come from a Dutch origin way back when in the 1600's. That's when my ancestors started moving from country to country.

MR. L. SHERMAN: And you're a Mennonite, you said, Mr. Elias . . .

MR. H. ELIAS: I was a Mennonite. I'm not saying I am. I was brought up as a Mennonite.

MR. L. SHERMAN: You were brought up as a Mennonite, so essentially you're a member of what would be described as a minority group in the Manitoba mosaic.

MR. H. ELIAS: I know what it feels like to be treated unfairly.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I consider myself as coming from a minority, an English-Irish minority, but what I would ask you is, do you ever feel that you've suffered in modern day Manitoba in the last 20 years, that you have suffered from a denial of your minority rights, if you even think about minority rights, have your rights been denied in the last 20 years?

MR. H. ELIAS: I couldn't possibly go into that. That's a subject that is very close to my heart, but I can't go into that problem now. What I can tell you is that I have discovered that the present government and the government before that, of which you were a member I presume, were both in violation of several statutes, clearly in violation. I can quote them chapter and verse, but I don't want to go into that now. If it wasn't for this question, I would have tried to bring down the present government on that issue, but I don't want it to be confused with this French language question, so, I'll wait until this is over and then I'll try it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'll look forward to seeing you at those committee hearings.

MR. H. ELIAS: I have already begun work on that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Frankly, Mr. Elias, so have I and I hope I'll be on the other side of the table. But, what I'm trying to establish is whether or not you feel that somehow you have been denied your minority rights as a member of a Manitoba minority and that this legislation that we have in front of us at the present time is going to restore those rights?

MR. H. ELIAS: Not I myself have been denied that right, but one member of my family has, but it is not in relation to ethnic origin.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Okay, but is this legislation going to do anything for it?

MR. H. ELIAS: Not for her. This is a language legislation. There is a human rights bill, which unfortunately does not apply to her, but I am very familiar with discrimination which is something I have to take to the Law Reforms Commission. I have already taken it to the government, but they won't listen to me, because I'm just a little guy, you know.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just one final question, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elias, the Premier has indicated that in a list of 61 priority problems facing Manitobans, this issue, that has traumatized the Legislature and the people of Manitoba for the past eight months, would rank as No. 58, would you be inclined to agree with that, and if so, why would you suspect that you and Manitoba and the Manitoba Legislature have been put through this kind of trauma for a matter that is No. 58 on the priority list?

MR. H. ELIAS: I explained that in my presentation. There is a very small minority of the French people that are very active and very highly organized and they are trying to push this over on us exactly as I explained in my presentation.

I'm sorry I don't have a copy for each one of you, the duplicating section is closed. I'll get copies made and I'll see that you each get one.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Certainly I was listening, but you're suggesting that in other words the current government has been the dupe of a particular cultural group in the province?

MR. H. ELIAS: I can appreciate them trying to give the French people their rights, and I am in favour of trying to give the French people their rights, but I'm not sure whether they're going about it in the right way. I have made my suggestion. Let those people who want to live in a French culture, let them move to Quebec and then let the people from Quebec that don't want to live in the French culture move over here. Let the government help them do it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Elias, I would have to . . .

MR. H. ELIAS: Quebec will never separate. They're far too smart. Not on your life are they going to separate. There is not even a ghost of a chance.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I don't think it is this government that has been the dupe of the Francophone community in Manitoba. I think it's the Francophone community of Manitoba that has been made the dupes of this government, Mr. Elias.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. ELIAS: I don't know the inside workings of this government. They never tell me any of their secrets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Mr. Elias?

Father Malinowski.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you. I would like to ask you for curiosity. You said that teacher who was hired, she was asked if she was bilingual. She said, yes.

MR. H. ELIAS: Yes.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Would you tell us what the other language she did speak besides French?

MR. H. ELIAS: What the other language was? Well, it was the language that she was brought up in. It was Mennonite.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Oh, I see.

MR. H. ELIAS: It's a form of Dutch, but it's not Dutch and it's not German. It comes from a little province in the north of Holland that's known as Friesland.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Oh, I see. So when she was asked she said, yes, I do speak - no, I am bilingual.

MR. H. ELIAS: No. All they asked her, whether she was bilingual. She said, yes, but they didn't ask her what the two languages were.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Oh, I see.

MR. H. ELIAS: I was just illustrating a point. Didn't you get it?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: So it means that she didn't speak French at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Mr. Elias? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Elias.

Mr. G. Nicholas; Mrs. Rosemary Chabluk; Mrs. Lois Edie.

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Nicholas is here too. Are you Mr. Nicholas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Did you not hear it over the applause? I called it.

Mr. Nicholas. You'd better cut back on the applause, I guess, if you want to be heard.

MR. G. NICHOLAS: My name is Gilles Nicholas, and I am a Canadian Frenchman. I say it this way, because I am Canadian of French origin. My father was born in France, and my mother in Quebec. I attended a français school until the age of 10, and I haven't spoken French for almost 15 years. I don't feel badly about this at all. I don't need to speak French. I can go almost anywhere in the world speaking only English.

This is not to say that I am not proud of my heritage. I am, but language is a very small part of it. If the only way to hold onto my roots is to speak French, then I would just as soon forget my ethnic background. A person's heritage has to be more than the language they speak, or it is a shallow and empty heritage.

As a schoolboy, I was teased and harassed because I was French, as I know every other ethnic group was teased and harassed because of their ethnic background. There were subsequent years of acceptance of every ethnic group. We were comfortable in Canada. We seemed to be forgetting our differences and thinking about our similarities. That came to an abrupt end in Canada with bilingualism, not really

bilingual but French and English. Now in Manitoba, it has come to a sad end as well. We are accentuating differences and causing the teasing and harassment and racism to come back with a vengeance.

I don't want to be singled out, part of a small special interest group. I want to be part of a large group, the citizens of Canada. I don't feel I require or deserve any special treatment, not any more than I feel any other ethnic group or groups deserve special consideration. Why must our children be forced to carry the burden of our forefathers' racial biases that were passed onto them by their fathers? Can't we accept the blame for our own shortcomings and strengths? Must we always look for a scapegoat, another ethnic group to blame for our failures?

I never felt even in grade school that I was living in Manitoba illegally. I don't know how the SFM got the notion they were. It must be awful to carry a grudge for that long. All of us, all the ethnics had an equal start, the bottom. We have moved a long way towards the goal, and I wonder if all the ethnic groups feel that they have a cross to bear or that they have been living in Manitoba illegally. I don't believe they feel that way and I don't think that Franco-Manitobans feel that way, save the executives and members of the SFM.

If the Government of the Day considers themselves champions of freedom and liberty and equality, then they are fooling themselves. The fact that they propose to take away my liberty to walk with dignity and be proud of my heritage, the freedom to be equal with my fellow Canadians - not above or below - proves that they do not believe in these principles. They are instead champions of separation, segregation and divisiveness.

The Government of Manitoba has said that we don't understand what you are trying to do for us, the French. As a Franco-Manitoban, I don't understand what you are trying to do for me. I was quite happy to have things as they were: respect rather than rejection; acceptance; trust rather than mistrust. This legislation will bring that around again.

The unfortunate result is already apparent in the schools of Manitoba. There are fences in the school yards in the Seine River school districts. In other divisions, English-only schools pay \$2 to stay for lunch while immersion students stay for lunch for free. Why do we have to drag our children into this, because as you know the children are without malice? They don't even know the meaning of the word "racist." They must be taught. Before you say that this legislation will not affect Manitobans, you had better leave this building and go out into the real world and see what is happening.

In closing, I would like to say that this land was once a land of opportunity, and has by this legislation been turned into a land of political and ethnic opportunism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Nicholas? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Nicholas, for coming tonight.

Mrs. Rosemary Chabluk.

MRS. R. CHABLUK: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Rosemary Chabluk, and I live in the Rural Municipality of Springfield. I would like to thank you in advance for hearing my views.

Firstly, let me state that I would not be against changes to the Constitution of Manitoba if the need arose, and it were the expressed wish of the people of Manitoba. I have heard the concerns of the people who have spoken out against the proposed changes to our Constitution dismissed as those of rednecks, bigots, would-be Conservatives - sorry, fellows - ignorant alarmists, hoodlums and misfits. I hope to convince you before I'm through in the next few minutes that I am none of the above, but just a very concerned Manitoban.

I am a great believer in people power, the Latin definition of people power being democracy. Surely the Constitution of Manitoba is based on the very principles of democracy. In most organizations, the assent of two-thirds of its members is required to effect a change in their Constitution. In the same respect, our Constitution in Manitoba has, for whatever reason, no such safeguard.

Our MLA, Mr. Anstett, has repeatedly told us that he does believe that those of us who have spoken out against the proposed changes speak for the people of Manitoba. I would never presume to speak for the people of Manitoba, but I would presume that on a matter as important as our Constitution, something that will undoubtedly affect the lives of every Manitoban, that the people of Manitoba should be allowed to speak for themselves. I guess I, and thousands like me, can't understand why the NDP government of Manitoba is trying to force this issue through the Legislature with such haste and without regard for the concerns of the majority of the public at large. Surely a decision of such magnitude, as the one at hand, should not be influenced by any other body than the people it affects, the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Anstett was recently asked whom he represented in this issue - himself, his party, or his constituents? He stated that in this instance he chose to represent his own convictions. This hardly has the ring of democracy. Are the rest of the honourable members of the government of the same conviction? Is there not one among you who is willing to represent the people, who have put you in this position of trust? If, in your hearts, you truly believe that you represent your constituents, and are honouring your positions of trust, then please do not turn away from those who also have the right to be heard. For when a government ceases to be the voice of its people, it ceases to be a democracy and begins to sound more and more like a dictatorship.

I respectfully request that the honourable members delay the final entrenchment of this bill, until the will of the people of Manitoba is clearly known, either by public referendum or by the election of new members, who will choose not to speak for themselves, but for the people. Surely the NDP government, in the face of almost total opposition on this issue, cannot continue in its claim. Like the young soldier who wrote home saying, "Gee mom, here it is, my first day in the army and when we were learning to march, everyone was out of step, but me."

Thank you for your time and your kind attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Mrs. Chabluk? Seeing none, thank you Mrs. Chabluk for coming tonight.

MRS. R. CHABLUK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.
Mr. Howard Walsh.

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

I'm here this evening just on a whim, you might say. I've lived in this province and this city in the past few weeks and the past few months and I'm not very happy. I'm not happy because of the tactics of you, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I'm not happy because of the procrastinating of our government and I am here in support of the action of our contemporary government in trying to rectify the wrong that was done in 1890 and further manipulated in 1916.

My name is Howard Walsh. I am a fifth-generation Canadian. I am Anglo-Irish-Scotch descent. I have all the ingredients that may be said to be a Wasp, but I'm not a Wasp. I was educated in this province. I can remember the many things in this province. I can remember when the Leader of the Conservative Party became a Progressive, John Bracken. In fact, I remember if the rural voters of this province had been communist at that time, John Bracken would have been a communist.

However, I would like to just continue here and I say this, that what happened in 1870 is fact, and all the wishing in the world will not negate it. What happened in the Supreme Court judgment, in relationship to George Forest, is fact and I have all through the course - silently, because I'm not one to seek publicity - have been along with our contemporary government in trying to negate the taxpayers of this province - undoubtedly, in my opinion - the positive fact of the costs of translation of the thousands of statutes that would be required, if the Supreme Court was evoked again.

Now I say this to you gentlemen on the government side, I say we are in a democracy and I don't know - I've read about gentlemen's agreements with the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House, but I think that procrastination has gone on long enough and I think you people in the government and you people in the opposition - why don't you grow up? Quit grandstanding, all of you. If you believed in what you're doing, you people in the government, then when the time comes, enforce closure and get on with the business.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Walsh. Are there any questions for Mr. Walsh?
Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Through you, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Walsh. I assume when you admonish all of us to rectify the wrong, that you're referring to the wrong that was done to Francophone rights, linguistic rights, that were guaranteed to them at the time the province was established in 1870, and that were arbitrarily taken away from them by an act of this Legislature in 1890? That's the wrong that you're referring to, is that right?

MR. H. WALSH: You're correct, Mr. Enns, and unfortunately to my chagrin, it was a Liberal administration that did.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, thank you for reminding the committee. I'm well aware that in every instance where Francophone rights were trodden upon in this province, it was by an administration other than a Conservative administration, however let me pursue a further question.

You also indicated in your brief . . .

MR. H. WALSH: I had no brief, I had comments.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . in your brief comments, that you aware of the Forest case and the subsequent Supreme Court decision, which I think clearly said that that 1890 law was wrong, threw it out, and restored the original Francophone rights of 1870. Is that not your reading of the Forest, the famous Forest parking ticket?

MR. H. WALSH: I understand most of you gentlemen are lawyers and I'm sure not going to get into debating lawyers.

MR. H. ENNS: No, no. I'm not a lawyer. I'm a rancher from Woodlands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. H. WALSH: That is my understanding, Sir.

MR. H. ENNS: That's right. Okay, but then you - I'm deadly serious, Mr. Chairman, to this witness. You made, I think, a reasonable appeal to us to restore, to rectify the rights, and I ask you, what rights are there to be rectified, if they were rectified by the Supreme Court decision of 1979 in the Forest case?

MR. H. WALSH: I'll have to speak a little bit to answer your question. I'll have to explain me. I primarily am proud of being a Canadian. Some of my antecedents were what was termed United Empire Loyalists. They left the United States at the time the Americans rebelled and successfully instituted a revolution against Britain.

I'm also very mindful of the fact that at the time of the American revolutionary war had it not been for the French-Canadians, the United Empire Loyalists probably would not have been Canadians today, as neither would I have been.

While I'm speaking, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to just state one thing. I've heard references here this evening to Francophones, Anglophones, French and so on. The only thing I'm concerned about is Canadians, and the fact from the end of the battle of Montreal and the Treaty of Paris and every subsequent piece of legislation that emanated historically from then, this country was, has been and is bilingual.

In relationship to references about the Province of Quebec, I knew Quebec well. I travelled and I worked in Quebec long before Rene Levesque and that was when the Province of Quebec was truly bilingual - truly bilingual. It won't be too long, as you gentlemen are aware, until it will be truly bilingual again, because the Superior Court of Quebec has so ruled against Levesque and eventually the Supreme Court of Canada will do likewise in their wisdom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that maybe I could solicit from this witness, who is presenting his comments, that we could establish that, who by his presentation acknowledges more than a passing knowledge of what transpired, more than where we started from in 1870, what happened in 1890 and what happened in 1979, I ask him the simple question: did the Supreme Court ruling of 1979 not negate the arbitrary rights that we're taken away with respect to French language rights of 1890?

MR. H. WALSH: Partially so, Sir, partially so. But let me point out to you, Sir, that until the right of Canadians in Manitoba to be bilingual is entrenched in the Manitoba Constitution there is always the danger of some new government coming into power, as has been done in the past. You know, I don't know what makes politicians stray, I really don't, but I do know that 80 percent of them in my opinion are fairly honest. There is always that nucleus who are looking for some cause, some personal thing, perhaps a vendetta, I don't know. But I do know this, that I will feel better as a Canadian with the fact of our bilingualism is entrenched in the Manitoba Constitution, as it should be, in my opinion.

You know, Sir, I resent the fact that when I was educated in this province I was denied the right that students have today for French Immersion classes. I was denied that right, and it was my right as a citizen of Canada and a citizen of Manitoba. That was denied me; so that today, I sort of speak a pidgin French. I read not too badly and I write French not too badly, but when I get to conjugating verbs I don't do too well. But I am neither pro-French or pro-English or pro anything, I am a Canadian, and I have always been proud from the time I was a little boy and I went to school that our country is bilingual. I am also very conscious of the fact that everyone from wherever when they made their decision to come to this country must have recognized the fact that Canada was bilingual.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Walsh, let me try to go through this rationally with you. Would you agree with me that rights, whatever rights we have, stem from a Constitution?

MR. H. WALSH: I'm glad you said, Mr. Enns, that because your past party Leader did more to stall our Constitution than any other man in Canada.

MR. H. ENNS: Simply, I would honestly try to go through this rationally. Would you not agree that the rights that anybody has, the French linguistic rights in this province stem from the time the agreements that were entered into, the constitutional agreements that constitute The Manitoba Act, from the time this province was formed in 1870? Would you not say that is a fair statement to make?

MR. H. WALSH: Well, I wouldn't put it - you're being very simplistic - of necessity, because I'm not an expert on this. I must be simplistic too. But we're forgetting one thing, that when Manitoba left the Northwest Territories and became a part of Confederation . . .

MR. H. ENNS: That's right.

MR. H. WALSH: . . . it was prior bilingual and it was provided for in The Manitoba Act, whatever the legislation was, that allowed us into Confederation, our forebearers, that this province be bilingual.

MR. H. ENNS: Then simply permit me to remind you what it was in 1870 that was guaranteed in terms of linguistic rights, the rights to the use of French and English in our Legislatures, in our courts and in all the Journals of the Legislature, that's all. That was taken away in 1890 and restored in 1979.

MR. H. WALSH: Well, in 1916 they went further, Sir.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's not my role to debate with the witness, except that when you speak about rights being taken - can I ask this question? I mean if you speak about some rights being taken away, they must have been taken away from something, and I'm suggesting to you what they were taken away from was the 1870 Manitoba Act.

MR. H. WALSH: Well, you're probably right.

MR. H. ENNS: The 1870 Act said that the French linguistic rights were in the Legislature, in the courts and in the Journals of the Legislature, that's all. They were restored in the Forest case in 1979.

MR. H. WALSH: On the spur of the moment, I picked up the phone this morning, I phoned some lady here at the Legislature and I decided it's time I had a little say, because I'll tell you what this thing is doing. My own family have become, in my opinion, rednecks, and I brought them up to be Liberal.

MR. H. ENNS: In the opinion of a Minister of this government, most Manitobans are rednecks.

MR. H. WALSH: And I'm not NDP and I don't belong to the NDP.

Thank you, gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One minute please. Mr. Filmon. Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just briefly, Mr. Walsh, and certainly I and everyone in this room would derive or infer from your comments that you have a very deep feeling about Canada and as a Canadian, and I believe everybody in this room shares that feeling. In fact, I know that everyone in this room shares that feeling. Among other things that you said though, Sir, you said essentially that government opposite, if you have to impose closure, impose closure. I may be paraphrasing your remarks, but essentially you said impose closure and get on with the job. I'm just wondering whether your feeling for Canada and your feeling for the nature and personality and the cultural linguistic personality of Canada extends to your feeling for our democratic process and our democratic freedoms and for proper parliamentary procedure.

MR. H. WALSH: I'm glad you asked that question, Mr. Sherman. In the past many years, my activities were

to chair meetings. Now, in a democratic society, regardless what rules of order you're governed by, you allow each speaker a chance to speak. You allow each speaker a chance to rebut, and you allow them all a reasonable length of time, providing everything is germane to the issue being debated or under discussion. But ultimately the time must come, because if it's other than the government, you are going to run out of money. It is just horrendous when I even try to calculate the amount of money this exercise that's going on in our Provincial Legislature is costing the taxpayers. I say to the government, if you believe what you're doing, then let's get on with it. Ordinarily, I don't favour closure, but I can remember recently the Federal Government had to resort to closure and rightfully so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Walsh, as Mr. Enns suggested, we are not here to debate with you, and I don't mean to do that. I think when you make reference to the amount of money that's being spent or what this is costing the taxpayer of Manitoba, that is an improperly placed argument.

MR. H. WALSH: Well, it's not germane, and I will retract it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What this is costing the taxpayer of Manitoba is what it's costing all Manitobans, and that is a rending asunder of the spirit and the heart and the cordiality of the relations in Manitoba. That's what it's costing us. It is not costing any money because the House would not normally be sitting at this time of the year. This government has not got on with the other issues facing this province.

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

MR. L. SHERMAN: They called us in for this issue. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to debate that point, but let me say, Sir, you refer to the fact that you have chaired many organizations. Could I ask you whether it was possible in any of those organizations that you have chaired and in which you have served, to change the constitution of that organization, to change the constitution of that party, of that organization, of that professional group, whatever, by an arbitrary, authoritarian measure that said that debate on that proposed change could last for 12 or 14 hours, period? That was it, and after that it was going through.

MR. H. WALSH: I'm glad you asked that question, Mr. Sherman, because in 1960 I was a representative of an international union and I was at a convention in Cleveland. The Supreme Court of the United States had ruled against segregation. I belonged to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and I was a delegate. I saw delegates there from the southern states filibuster and filibuster. They must have cost our organization \$1 million, and I heard dialogue such as this: "You put that word 'white' in that constitution, or all these auxiliary will be full of mulattoes." I heard like, "I done shot me three of them animals. I'm going back, shoot

me some more." But let me tell you, the minute the election of officers was over and the election of delegates, the hammer dropped because we were running out of dough and the majority did rule. The people who were dissenting had to acknowledge the majority.

I say to this government, you are a majority. As I say, I'm no parliamentary expert, and I don't know anything about members or deals or understandings between this side of the House or that, but I say the time must come surely in any democratic government when someone calls for a roll call vote. Then if everybody isn't there, take the vote, and let the devil stay with the hindmost, that's all. That's all I can say. Now let's get on with the business.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Then you would say that a constitution should be changed that way.

MR. H. WALSH: A constitution can only be changed by the delegates sitting as a Committee of the Whole.

MR. L. SHERMAN: By closure.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Walsh, for coming here tonight.

I will now go through the list of names of people who were called before but were not present. Order please.

Mr. Enns. Order please.

Mrs. Jean Hiebert; Mr. Merle Hartlin. Is Jean Hiebert here? Mrs. Linda Archer; Mr. Joe Beer; Mr. Winston Simpson; Reeve William Roth; Reeve Manson Moir.

Mr. Eric Carsted.

MR. E. CARSTED: Mr. Chairman, members of the House, first of all I would like to ask you to excuse my voice. I just got my tonsils out, and I'm finding it a little difficult to speak. Is that better? Okay, then I can speak more quietly. Good evening, Father Malinowski. Long time, no see.

I am presently a student, third year, of the University of Manitoba, and I'm in a seven-year program, dual honours, computer science and geophysics and I'm also a published science fiction author, so I would say that I've got a bit of an education. Though not totally bilingual, I am sufficiently fluent in German to carry out a conversation, to read and write the language. Not only that, I have also studied Russian. I studied Polish, and I am — (Interjection) — yes, my mother is getting me to do that now too. I am presently learning the language spoken most in the world, which is Chinese.

MR. H. ENNS: I predict a job in the Federal Government.

MR. E. CARSTED: Now I graduated in 1980 from a Winnipeg high school with honours, including French 300. I don't feel that my French is sufficient to be able to seek employment in a position that requires French or requires bilingualism, though I consider myself bilingual. If that is so, I don't feel that anybody else who graduated with me, anybody who graduated before me or anybody who graduated after me in the same

program would be able to seek employment in these fields unless they were raised, like I was on German and Polish, in the language of French. Therefore, the people who would be eligible for these jobs would be the 7.3 percent of Manitobans who are French, or the few people who have gone on to university and studied French.

Now before I came over here, I stopped to drop off some money at a French place and you figure he'd be grateful. I said I was coming over here and it automatically got me into a debate. I stated these points to him and he said, well why didn't you study French in university? Well, computer science and geophysics - that's a seven-year program - and I've got calculus; I've got physics; I've got geophysics; I've got digital logic; I've got - let's see what else - linear algebra; crystallography; tectonics; instrumentation. I don't have enough hours in the day.

Now I would like to ask the government if they could do me a favour. If they could legislate that there are about three or four more hours in the day, I would love to study French. The little spare time I do have, I study my French by watching the French TV late at night, you know, Friday, Saturday if you know what I mean. — (Interjection) — Well, this sounds odd. I actually watched a great Kung Fu movie on that channel.

A MEMBER: Are you picking up any French?

MR. E. CARSTED: Yes, actually I am picking up French. I watch the cartoons too.

The government has said this legislation will not affect the Manitobans who don't speak French and it won't force French on other people. Now it might be true, but I say this statement is false. If I want to work for the government, it really would be a benefit for me to be able to speak French. My qualifications usually speak for themselves, but I have a friend who graduated from the same program that I did, just computer science not geophysics, but he applied for a government position and I'm not too sure what department it was but it was in computer science. Now he was turned down, for whatever reasons.

MR. G. FILMON: He wasn't from Saskatchewan.

MR. E. CARSTED: No, no. He didn't speak French. He was Serbian and I can't remember what the language is - Croatian. Now Serbo-Croatians don't get along, but anyways he was completely bilingual in that language, and then he finds out that a friend of his, who graduated the same year, same courses, got the job. He spoke French and it wasn't dealing with the public. Now for his qualifications he had a 3.9 grade point average. The maximum is 4, so that's about as close to straight "A's" that you can get. This other person didn't have those marks - anyway this is what he's claiming.

Now he's been hired by Esso and works in Toronto, and after a year and one-half, he's already in a managerial position. This man had talent. He's almost a genius. This fantastic talent is being lost to Manitoba because of language discrimination, either conscious or subconscious. You know, if you can do the job and you can speak French, you get the job. If you can do

the job even better than somebody who can speak French, but you don't speak French, well, you know, we got somebody who can do the job and speak French, okay.

Another incident I'm aware of is of a librarian who worked at the St. Vital Library for 14 years. Last year she received a letter saying that she had done good work, but because of the new French Immersion Schools that were being provided in St. Vital, that the students should be able to come into the library and ask for the books in French, and because she couldn't speak French, her employment was terminated and a French-speaking person was hired. Now to the best of my knowledge, this person is still unemployed, and for a government that's supposed to speak for labour, I don't really see this as legislation or actions that would promote labour.

An old joke that personifies this issue well is an incident that happened at the Prime Minister's house. One day Justin Trudeau fell into the pool and started to drown. What a shame. Now the lifeguard on duty was running back and forth because he didn't know what to do. Finally Pierre jumped into the pool and saved his son. After Pierre asked the lifeguard, "Now why didn't you save my son?" And the lifeguard responded, "Well, the only requirement for this job was that I could speak French and I was bilingual." That's what I'm seeing here. We're having an employment system that does not work on merit, but one on linguistic preference, however minute.

Now we have a situation, hypothetical - two people applying for a job, both exactly the same qualifications. Let's say they were clones of each other. One could speak English and French, and one couldn't speak French. Who gets the job? Does the French person get the job? I would say so. Clearly, he has got qualifications that put him above somebody else who can't speak that language. Okay. Now this person that doesn't speak French, he speaks German like me. He provides services to more percentage of the population in Manitoba than the French, but that's not considered because while French and English are going to be the official languages of Manitoba, and the ability to speak the two official languages of Manitoba would definitely put you in preference over somebody who could only speak one, though you may speak another language, it's not an official language in Manitoba.

Now I got some statistics from Stats Canada. I obtained them on Friday so these are official, but who knows, they might have been doctored. But these are from the 1971 and 1981 census. In 1971, 82.6 percent of the people of Manitoba spoke English in the home; 4 percent spoke French in the home; and 13.4 spoke in another language, but because we're only dealing with French and English here, we'll only consider French and English. In 1981, 86 percent of the people of Manitoba speak English in the home; 3.1 percent speak French; and 10.9 speak another. In just 10 years, the amount of people speaking French in the home has decreased by 1 percent. Now, we're talking about 7 percent of the population that we're providing these services for. Now if you don't speak the language in the home, you're not going to tell me that you're going to be able to understand that language better in law. You know, I have trouble understanding this and it's in my language that I've learnt all my life, so somebody

who doesn't even speak that language in the home would require a service that he would be able to get that language in French or this documentation in French. Now that's in 10 years, 25 percent of the people who used to speak French in the home don't speak it anymore. That is a large percentage and that's a decrease in just 10 years.

Now, like I said, I'm a science fiction author, so I like to project things into the future. Now let's say we projected 100 years and I would like to propose that in 100 years, if this steady decreasing trend is going on, we won't have enough people to fill the positions required by this legislation and constitutional amendment, and the cost is going to be so horrendous that it's inconceivable that even this sort of legislation would try and be passed, and the thing about entrenchment, it's there forever. We get stuff coming back from 1870.

Now I'd like to deal with fact and fiction - also my fields. I'd like to ask the government - and the government has never really qualified these statements - that the rights provided in 1870 were restored in 1979 by a Supreme Court decision. Now I keep hearing it from the Progressives or the opposition and it's a question I got to ask. Is this a statement of fact or is it fiction? I mean it's one of the two. Either they were restored or they're not restored.

MR. H. ENNS: We know it's a fact.

MR. E. CARSTED: Please, Mr. Enns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Mr. Enns.

MR. E. CARSTED: The government has never come out and either denied this statement - they haven't denied it - but nor have they ever supported it and this almost got me into a fight last night.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: At home?

MR. E. CARSTED: Not at home, at work. I was discussing this issue with a friend of mine and he's French, and he claimed that this legislation was restoring the rights that were taken away in 1890 and then further in 1916. I stated to him that all the rights that were provided in 1870 were restored in 1979. I asked him where he was getting his facts from - (Interjection) - you know anyone can change the Constitution. - (Interjection) - I'm led to believe that the Constitution is there, you can't change it. That if this legislation goes in, we can't change it. If you entrench that French and English are the official languages, if you say that we can change it again, then what's the point of entrenching it?

Now, if you say that the laws of 1870 aren't going to be able to be held up because they were made in 1870, that they are entrenched in the Constitution, so I don't see how you can change them again.

Anyway, either it's a statement of fact or fiction that these were restored in 1979, and I asked him why he deserved any more rights. You know, why he felt that he should get more rights than any other ethnic group in Manitoba, and what we're trying to do, is get people united under a province.

I love Folklorama. I've never had any trouble. People go to all the different ethnic pavilions. There is no discrimination, none that I can see. I visited the French-Canadian Pavilion twice and I had no problems then. But last night, because I asked him this question, he called me a bigot. That I couldn't give him any more rights. Not only did he call me a bigot, he called me a Nazi, and that's how I almost got into a fight. Now who's being the bigot?

MR. H. ENNS: Bigot's okay but Nazi, nah.

MR. E. CARSTED: The thing was he did it in a bigotry manner because he knows that I'm German and he knows that I speak German. It was a statement meant to be bigotry.

A statement of fact or fiction made by the government that this legislation won't affect anybody. Last night he just called me a Nazi and a bigot. That affected me, though maybe indirectly, it still affected me and I think that should be a consideration.

Another point, French and English are the official languages of Manitoba. That's what he said, French and English are the official languages of Manitoba. Now the way I read Section 23, it doesn't say that French and English are the official languages of Manitoba. But these people are going on misleading information. He believes that. He hasn't been told different by the people in the government, and I think it's the responsibility of the people in the government to give the people the facts, that the rights were restored in 1870, that this legislation will affect people and that French and English, as of now, are not the official languages of Manitoba. They base their arguments on these.

One last thing is a statement made by the Honourable Howard Pawley was that I don't understand. With my education, I would consider myself fairly conversant with the English language, though I may not be the most consummate of speakers. But I think I'm able to understand this. Things that are going to be costing me money, because I'm going to be a taxpayer and I'd like to stay in Manitoba. I like the cold weather. Here's a wonderful piece of English prose: "There is hereby established a council to be known as the 'Language Service Advisory Council' composed of not less than 13 persons . . . "How many is not less than 13 persons? Is it 100? is it 200? Is it 1,000? ". . . appointed by the Minister for such terms as the Minister may designate." That's a wonderful one.

Now I go back a little and it says, "'Minister' means the member of the Executive Council charged by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with the administration of this act." So he's somebody who is told, you're going to administer this act. What department does he come from? I don't know. It doesn't say. Now is he in charge of sanitation?

Ah, here is another one, Section (g) of Composition of Council No. 2. Now it says, it's composed of all sorts of members, two senior members of the officers of the Crown corporation, two senior officers of the department . . . "such other persons as the Minister may deem appropriate for the council to perform its function under this Act." Well, "the Minister may deem appropriate," that sounds really ominous to me. Like I say, not less than 13 persons, and by anybody who

the Minister may deem appropriate who fits this council. There are no limitations and somebody has got to pay these people. You may feel it's your money and you've got lots of it, it's actually coming out of my pocket.

Now, the Language Ombudsman - "On recommendation of the Standing Committee of the Assembly on Privileges and Elections," these are the people that were just appointed by the Minister, "the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall appoint a Language Services Ombudsman who shall exercise the powers and perform the duties and functions assigned to the Language Services Ombudsman under this Act." Now, I flip the page and I look at this thing: "Removal or suspension." ". . . Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, on the resolution of the Assembly carried by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the Assembly voting thereon, may suspend the ombudsman or remove the ombudsman from office." Two-thirds - it only takes a majority to change the Constitution of Manitoba, and they're going to do that under closure, they want to do this under closure yet, but it takes two-thirds of the Assembly to fire the Ombudsman. This guy is walking on water, you know.

I'm sorry, Father, I shouldn't have that reference, but that's how I see it, two-thirds. All I can see in this is that the opposition - or the present government - I'm sorry I called them the opposition - but the future opposition wants to keep their finger on this person so they can say: no, he's going to stay, and we appointed him for five years. Now they're not going to be around that long, so obviously they want to keep their finger in this legislation even after they're out of power.

I underlined something else in here.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Don't stop now.

MR. E. CARSTED: I'm just about finished.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Keep going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Members of the committee will please come to order.

MR. E. CARSTED: I would like to conclude now; I think that would be a good idea. Any amendments to the Constitution that makes English and French the official languages of Manitoba will have such grave repercussions that the lawyers are going to be working them out for years. I mean look at the lawyers that are having just a field day over the new Canadian Constitution. They just said that the government legislation that says that you have to use metric is illegal, so now you can sell your stuff in — (Interjection) — imperial. Thank you very much, I'm forgetting, it's been so long since I have been taught imperial. Seeing as how I was brought up on metric, I'm already part of that generation.

It is going to have such grave repercussions that this government cannot possibly conceive them all. If you forget one little thing, it could cost us billions of dollars. I say to you that if one job is lost on language discrimination, it's a criminal act. It is not going to be just the French discrimination; it is going to be the English discriminating against the French, because we are human, we have emotions.

They say, we get too emotional. Well, we have emotions, and we're getting emotional about this issue because we're getting called bigots, because we're getting called Nazis, because we're getting called rednecks. I go to . . .

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: How about socialism?

MR. E. CARSTED: Pardon me?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: How about socialism?

MR. E. CARSTED: I've never been called a socialist, nor do I ever want to be. I think that's just as bad as the rest of them.

Anyway, because this is happening, there are going to be jobs lost upon the part of the French where somebody is going to apply in the private sector - we must agree that the private sector makes up the majority of the employment in Manitoba - and there's going to be some really cheesed-off guy who is paying all sorts of money for language services to dinky little communities and not getting the health services that he requires because his money isn't going to health or education.

Anyway, I would like to propose - I can't guarantee it, it might be as far-fetched as the rest of my proposals and suggestions in the future, but I would like to say that somebody might come in and apply for a job, and he might speak with a French accent or he might have French on his resume, and the guy is going to go, m'huh, so you've been causing all this trouble, I am not going to hire you. I think that's also a crime and a shame too.

I think that the people of Manitoba are really getting divided on this issue. I have never had an argument with a Frenchman before. Actually, that's not true. I spent a few weeks in Quebec City, and this was with school, the exchange student, and it was my luck that I got stuck with a Separatist. We had this argument about separatism of Quebec.

A MEMBER: Was she good-looking?

MR. E. CARSTED: I wish. Unfortunately, I don't go for that kind of guy. Anyway, the last night was the deciding factor. I might have interjected a little humour into this; I was kind of shaking here, but humour eases me considerably. But this is not a humorous subject; I am very serious about my convictions, and I'm very serious about my beliefs. I don't believe that my wishes are being respected by the members of government.

I would like to say that I am from the constituency of St. Vital, and Mrs. Dodick is my representative. I have been calling her since November. — (Interjection) — Oh, sorry, Riel. St. Vital or St. Boniface is federal. Anyway, I have called her — (Interjection) — I'm in Riel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. E. CARSTED: I live in Riel, and she has yet to return one of my calls on any issue, not just the language issue but every single issue that I have called her about. I've talked to her secretaries and I've left a message.

I have yet to receive a call back. Do they have a list of the Progressive Conservative members and say, well, you're a member of the Progressive Conservative Party; I'm not going to talk to you? I find that really difficult to believe - or my parents. I just became one.

I paid up my \$5 or whatever it is, because I felt that — (Interjection) — anyway, I wonder why she hasn't called me. That's a real question that I would like to ask, and I don't know if Mrs. Dodick is here. I don't even know what she looks like — (Interjection) — exactly, but if she would have returned my call, I might have been able to discuss with her and that problem would have been remedied.

I don't feel that I have ever been represented by this government. If they had even showed me the courtesy to call me back and asked me my views I would have a lot more respect for this government than I do right now.

Thank you. Any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Carsted?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Carsted, let me, as one member of this committee, say that this committee has been subjected to a long series of briefs, many of them highly emotionally charged, all very sincere, but nonetheless they are tough on committee members. I, for one, enjoyed your presentation, enjoyed it coming from a student, from a generation that is going to have to live with this legislation. I don't think the fact that you injected a bit of humour into the presentation did not take away from the message that you were giving us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that's probably out of order . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and I have to ask a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no reason to start now, Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my question to Mr. Carsted is: if I heard you correctly, you by choice, because of that list of physical things and algebraic things that you were doing, did not avail yourself of the opportunity of immersing in the French language or getting the kind of French language education that you might now feel necessary under this bill, is that right?

MR. E. CARSTED: Not by choice, a necessity. I don't have the time. My Honours program requires me that I take five computer science programs this year, because it's dual: five computer science, two geophysics one year, and then the other way around.

MR. H. ENNS: Okay, that's fine, but the point that I'm coming to, I represent the Interlake, that as late as 1968, as 1970, still had 186 single schoolrooms. In fact, I was part of the Roblin administration that passed the consolidation of schools in the Interlake. That, of course, didn't happen overnight; that happened in 1970, '72,

'73. It is only now that we are trying to get in rural Manitoba a level of education that's coming close and comparable to what has been offered in the more well-to-do and more populated city school divisions. So on the level of education, we're getting that way.

It is only in this area where children can get access to French Immersion courses. It is going to take a long time before my students in Woodlands . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: . . . or in Arborg or in Moosehorn . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Have you got a question, Harry?

MR. H. ENNS: I have a question and this is germane to the question. I'm simply asking, I want to know. I know that many thousands of the students of the Interlake don't have access to French education. This young student told us about people being hired and discriminated against job applications because of non-capability of the French language.

Do you understand the question I'm asking? I mean you said you had a difficulty because of your heavy honours load - or what have you - that prevented you from taking the French language. Don't you see some difficulty for that student, that Grade 11 or 12 year student in Moosehorn or in Inwood, that will never get access to a French Immersion course? Does he have a fair chance at the jobs that you are talking about?

MR. E. CARSTED: Definitely not. I don't think so. I don't think I have a fair choice or fair chance of getting the jobs that I've just discussed.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I wonder why.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What do you mean by that, you wonder why?

MR. E. CARSTED: Because of my humour, you wonder why I can't get a job?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Because he belongs to the wrong party? Is that what you mean by that?

MR. E. CARSTED: First I'd like to make a point . . .

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is that what Harry said? Is that what you said Harry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order.

MR. E. CARSTED: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to say that presently I hold five jobs. I work as a computer engineer for a plastics manufacturing company in Winnipeg; I work for a professor in psychology; I work for a doctor out in the St. James area doing all his patient's files; I also work as a Special Constable for the City of Winnipeg, and I'm a member of the Canadian Armed Forces Reserve.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. E. CARSTED: Now I have no fear that I'm not going to be able to get a job, but my fear is that if I wanted a public service job in the Province of Manitoba, I would be discriminated against and that I would have to leave Manitoba to get the job I would prefer, as my friend did. Obviously, he had the qualifications and he's shown that by his employment now that he was discriminated against because he couldn't speak French and this was a year and one-half ago. — (Interjection) — Pardon me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

MR. E. CARSTED: I would like to see a question from the government. I think they understand - if you understand me. Do you have a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scott.

MR. H. ENNS: I'm still asking questions.

MR. D. SCOTT: How can he presume to judge the basis of an interview on one fact? He wasn't in the interview. He doesn't know what happened in the interview.

A MEMBER: Were you in the interview?

MR. D. SCOTT: I wonder how he could jump to that conclusion. I wouldn't want to jump to any conclusion of why one person got a job and why another person got a job?

MR. E. CARSTED: I agree with the honourable member. I wasn't there. I really don't know and I wasn't in the mind of the person who was hiring. I just see a person with good qualifications, doesn't speak French; a person, not so good qualifications, speaks French, and he gets the job. Now maybe I'm being a little basic, and maybe the guy had a bad day or something, but obviously the qualifications were there, the talent was there, and he didn't get the job, and he's no longer in Manitoba and I've lost a friend because of it. I don't know whether or not he was NDP or Progressive Conservative either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns do you have a question?

MR. H. ENNS: One further question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Was it a he or a she?

MR. E. CARSTED: He.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: You, I think, identified yourself as being a student at this time?

MR. E. CARSTED: That's correct. I'm third year.

MR. H. ENNS: Then could I ask you this question? Among the fellow students that you meet and mix with

at the U of M, is this question of job availability and access to jobs an issue on campus among your fellow students?

MR. E. CARSTED: It is a very big issue and a point I forgot - I was looking for it now, I just remembered, thank you - was that the Honourable Mr. Anstett said that this legislation would create approximately 160 jobs. Maybe I'm misquoting, but that's the quote I heard by the press, and I don't always believe the press. But who are going to get these jobs? Am I going to get this job? I speak German. I can read, write, I can translate; I've done that job. I'm not going to get this job, because I don't speak French. So there's 160 jobs created - bang - for French people.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I speak Polish.

MR. E. CARSTED: I speak Polish also.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Well, you may get a job, you have a chance.

MR. E. CARSTED: But not for one of those jobs created there. The jobs created by this council, they're going to have to speak French. The ombudsman has to speak French. I can't be the ombudsman. There's 13 people, no less than 13 people - 1,300 people - they all got to be speaking French and English. I see jobs being created for one language. I don't see them being created for my language in German, do I? I can't ask you any questions, but this is what I see and this is the impression I get. I feel that jobs that are presently available - now they say the jobs, let's say at the Liquor Commission - now people retire, they quit, they die, jobs change hands. Two people are applying for the job - now this is a public service job - wouldn't it be better if we had another person in there that can speak French, and then another, and then another? Now these people who are getting hired who can speak French, five years down the road, they get promoted and they're going to be hiring, and another, and another, and it's going to have the proverbial domino effect, where your whole bureaucratic system, your whole Civil Service is going to be controlled by one language group, one racial group and it's going to affect the private sector. It's going to affect everybody.

I phone up City Hall in St. Vital and I get answered in French. Most of the people in that area speak English and the assumption would be that, "Hello, this is the city hall," something like that, but I get blub, blub, blub, that I didn't catch, I don't know what the word for city hall is in French and I wonder have I got some French meat market or have I got city hall. These are concerns that I have, though I'm making them mildly humorous. I didn't know who I had when he answered me in French. Can anybody tell me what the word for city hall is in French?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Je pense, l'hôtel de ville.

MR. E. CARSTED: L'hôtel de ville. Did I get the Village Hotel? That would be my direct translation and my command of the French language . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. E. CARSTED: Like I say, my command of the French language could translate that to the Village Hotel and I really feel that there is definitely something wrong in this system. I really hope that this legislation doesn't get through and that no amendments to our Constitution is made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Carsted. Your time has expired.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Jake Janzen. What is the will of the committee?

MR. G. FILMON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No? Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I only want to indicate that I understand through - I want to put this correctly, perhaps illness may be the wrong word - but the committee was notified that Mr. Hutton wanted to make a presentation to the committee tonight, but has been delayed from making that committee. I just want to have some assurance from the Government House Leader that Mr. Hutton will be able to make that presentation when next this committee meets, which I assume will be tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the Clerk's Office has not been advised that Mr. Hutton was ill, but there are quite a few other names on the list before Mr. Hutton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, we, I think, have been under the understanding that we would sit relatively normal hours in the committee and it has been normal practice that somewhere on or about 10 o'clock the committee rose. I would go so far as to say that if there are some people here on the list who are from out of town, that they be asked, so that they're not inconvenienced and don't have to return. But beyond that, I would suggest that the committee rise and presentations be heard at the next sitting of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared on this side to agree to committee rise. People are here, want to be heard. I think there is an opportunity for them to be heard. I think the committee should continue to sit until they've heard all the people who want to be heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I would urge you to proceed to hear the people who are present here this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact the very next name on the list is Mr. Jake Janzen and I don't think Mr. Janzen is here; but Mr. Janzen has, in effect, been here on two other occasions and not been called to speak at that time. — (Interjection) — Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

A MEMBER: He's been called twice and has been absent.

A MEMBER: You must be here.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I don't really think that I said that he wasn't called twice. I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that he was here on two other occasions and because of the numbers he wasn't called at that time. I know that he wants to make a presentation. He has advised me, and at this point I can't tell you whether he belongs to the New Democratic Party or some other party; but I think he wants to make a presentation and should be given the courtesy of being allowed to make a presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the will of the committee? Proceed? (Agreed)

The next name on my list is Mr. Jake Janzen; Mr. John Dyck; Mr. Anthony Melnyk; Mr. Claro Paqueo; Ms. Elizabeth Fleming; Mr. Tom Futti; Mr. W.J. Hutton. Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hutton conveyed by telephone to me that he was ill in bed this evening and would like to have the opportunity to appear at the committee tomorrow morning or when it next meets. I pass on that request. I know that he attempted to get in touch with the Clerk's Office. He may not have succeeded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will return to the top of the list then. Is Mr. Tom Cohoe here?

MR. T. COHOE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Tom Cohoe. I have something to say on this matter. I never really had the time to prepare this presentation as well as I would have liked to, so you'll have to forgive me if you find me tedious. I would have rather had the opportunity to stroke out the lines I had written down, which at the time I felt were particularly fine, but I hadn't had that opportunity so I will just continue with what I have here.

The first thing I would like to ask is whether or not justice and democracy are compatible? If I ask this as a hypothetical situation in which there is a trial and a jury decides by a vote whether or not the defendant is guilty and it comes to the decision that the defendant is guilty and an observer happens to know that the defendant is innocent and cannot properly affect the jury, but has as the choice of a loving democracy to proceed or to interfere with democracy and to allow justice to take place, which would be the proper decision for him to make? Most people would choose justice.

However, this precludes the argument that reason can be used to influence democracy, and in fact because of this, reason can be used to influence the democratic process, justice is compatible with democracy.

Now I'd like to ask another question. Is the government the true defender of the minority here? The government has stated as its most fundamental argument - it was placed, I believe, in the Free Press by one of the Cabinet Ministers - that the position of the government is, it is protecting the people of Manitoba against chaos if the Supreme Court case is allowed to proceed.

The government has in fact not been bargaining for the French. It has been bargaining against the French. This is incompatible with the position and it's defending the right of the minority - it has to take one position or the other - and I believe it's basic position is that it has been bargaining for the people and that the French are not in need of a defendant because they have the Supreme Court case, which is pending, as their trump card. So what we understand from this is that the government is supposed to be bargaining for the people.

Another question I would like to ask is, is there an emergency here? I don't think that anybody can reasonably argue that there is an emergency here. I don't understand why this whole procedure cannot be gone about in a completely different way. The Societe franco-manitobaine appears to be quiescent apart from the alarm of perceiving a frightening arousal of the majority which they never intended nor believed that they ever intended to get away with something that would make the majority unhappy, as we have long been friends. They are probably a little bewildered. My sympathy goes out to the French community.

The truest progress in any kind of a procedure that is designed to come to a just position is a process of opposition, one in which a dialectic process takes place. I don't think that there is anybody who likes to be surrounded by yes-men or yes-women, if there is such a thing.

I don't think that the French community finds itself in a comfortable position in that it no longer has a debating partner anymore. There is no valid or properly-constituted organization debating with the French anymore. They are in a vacuum. It's a well-known fact that the best sailing is not with the wind. It's against the wind, or into the wind. It provides a direction and all the mistakes are chewed out by the proper process of debate. The government has ceased to negotiate for the people, and is instead negotiating for the SFM with astonishing determination. This is not the position that it has held that it has taken.

Now another question I would like to ask is whether or not the government is honour bound to hold by the agreement that it has made with the French community. If the government were the true party to the agreement, the government would be honour bound to stick by this agreement. But in fact, the final parties to the agreement will not be the government or the legislative body as a whole, because the legislative body will pass away with the dissolution of the Legislature and the government will undoubtedly pass to another government also in the future. The people of Manitoba are the true parties to the agreement. The government is not honour bound to stand by something to which it is not truly a party.

If the government does feel that it is honour bound to stand by this agreement in which it has negotiated for the people of Manitoba and it has not been ratified by the people of Manitoba; if it feels honour bound to stand by this, then it has made this agreement for itself. The government cannot properly hold that it is making this agreement for itself.

I, as a citizen of Manitoba, do not feel honour bound to elect a government which will not repeal the legislation if I haven't been given my opportunity to be involved in the ratification of it. The government is honour bound to the people of Manitoba. I'm not taking a position on anything here.

The parliamentary system is a great system, isn't it? But I would like to ask a question with regard to that. Do we think the parliamentary system is good because it approximates democracy, or do we think that democracy is good because it is approximated by the parliamentary system? Well, the ideal is democracy, and the parliamentary system is the practical approximation to it that we use here in the province. The word "practical" in itself is a very dangerous word, in that it can be used to justify an impediment to progress, an attempt to impede progress. I don't like to use the word "attempt," because it implies a wilful act.

If you call some position that you take in an Assembly a practical position or say that you cannot do something because the rules do not say you have to do them, that's not sufficient. If you have the opportunity to improve the parliamentary system, you should take it.

Another question that has been asked a lot of times is whether or not people think that government by plebiscite is proper. Well, we're not talking about government by plebiscite, we are not even really talking about legislation by plebiscite; we are talking about changing the Constitution. That's another matter.

I think that the government has an opportunity to realize that it has attempted to do a good thing. The whole thing has gone wrong, and that all parties should try this thing all over again. Start right from the beginning. There is no emergency here. There is no reason why we can't do it.

The first thing that we have to do is for the government to ask some members of the opposition to join them in bargaining with the Franco-Manitoban Society. If they do that, there is no temptation for the opposition to make political mileage out of it, because they're responsible. At the same time, if it's referred to the people by plebiscite, it doesn't become an election issue. Nobody will make political mileage out of it, and nobody will be defeated by it either.

It could easily be put on the next election ballot as a non-partisan question. It wouldn't even cost much to do that, if you can do this that fast.

There is only one other thing, if I can remember what it was. I think that this would be a great way to bring the sunshine back to Manitoba. That's all I have to say. Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Cohoe?

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Do I detect that at this stage of the game you have some trouble supporting the

process, because the process is an agreement or a bargain struck on your behalf by the government which you, as a citizen of Manitoba, are going to have to live with, and that you, as a citizen of Manitoba, have really not had very much input into the process, is that a fair . . . ?

MR. T. COHOE: What I feel about this is that both sides in the House have been saying a lot of things in the Legislative Assembly Chamber that neither side could truly support. One side has been saying the people are very angry and the other side has been saying they haven't. Neither side really knows what the people want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions? Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Have you followed this debate from last May until now?

MR. T. COHOE: Well, I haven't followed it as closely as you have.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Are you familiar with the beginning position being basically a three-part constitutional amendment which declared French and English as official language as one part, a second part involved the validation of our laws and the third part involved extension of French Language Services via constitutional amendment and because of the process . . .

MR. T. COHOE: I have never had it put to me in such a way that I really know what you're talking about. That raises another point because some people might say, well this is too complex a question to put to the people, but that's completely incompatible with the idea that the governments of Manitoba should be elected. Because, what we do when we elect a government is we're involved in a process that has far more ramifications than this one single issue does. I don't feel that I should have to defend the fact that I am not as familiar with the issue as you are.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm not attempting to have you defend your familiarity with the issue. What I'm trying to determine is whether you are satisfied with having this issue put before you as a citizen of Manitoba. This issue was not one which was mentioned during an election campaign wherein the citizens had their opportunity to mark their ballot either for or against a government proposing this course of action or the other course of action.

MR. T. COHOE: I can say something about that. I heard it asked in the Chamber the other day whether or not the opposition thought that the government should advertise these public hearings and I thought, yes, that would be a sensible thing to do and I wondered why that would be the kind of question that you would ask the opposition. It seemed to me that it would be obvious to both sides, like you are not doing a very good job of getting it to us, the people here. I mean, I can't say that I'm representing the people, I'm only representing my own point of view. But I heard both sides sitting there, talking loudly, that they knew what the people

wanted and I know that they don't know what the people want because they haven't asked them.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What do the people want?

MR. T. COHOE: Well, I can't tell you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What do you want?

MR. T. COHOE: I just wish that you would do this more sensibly.

MR. D. ORCHARD: How would you recommend we do that?

MR. T. COHOE: I would recommend that you go back, you start right from the beginning, you go back to the Societe franco-manitobaine. The government says to the Societe franco-manitobaine, we're going to have to renegotiate this thing. Our position is untenable and the bargaining process isn't over yet, and start it up in a way that doesn't come to this situation like this.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then would it be fair to assume that you're recommending the government should drop this entire package right now and go back to the drawing board?

MR. T. COHOE: I'm not saying that the government should drop it, but I'm saying that what should be done - I mean, yes, in a sense, that what it's trying to put through right at this particular moment, it should withdraw it with the agreement of the opposition that the procedure will begin again from the start.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So that you would not, if it were up to you to voice your opinion as a citizen of Manitoba, you would not have the government proceed with Bill 115?

MR. T. COHOE: I wouldn't have them proceed with it as it is now, not because I particularly necessarily object to it, I object to the process that's gone on in the Chamber or the House.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Would that same comment apply, Sir, to the constitutional amendment?

MR. T. COHOE: The constitutional amendment is one that I am particularly thinking that we have an opportunity to make a precedent in Manitoba, that we don't make constitutional amendments in Manitoba without a plebiscite, because it's the type of thing where we lose our free will as a province here. We're passing off free will. So, if it's something that is that important there is no reason why it shouldn't be carried to the people. If both sides are involved in the process of negotiation with the Societe franco-manitobaine and the Federal Government then it's not likely that by the time they reach the government that it will come to the people in such a way that it can't be passed.

The reason it's very difficult for the government to pass this right now is because the opposition has impeded the process, but I'm not convinced that the opposition isn't doing this - I could, if I wanted to be

cynical, say the opposition hopes that the government will introduce closure so that they will be elected in the next election. I mean, I'm not convinced that this process is really valid. What's going on here? I think that if you do it by working in a joint committee that you can do this in such a way that - I mean if you love Manitoba, I don't know what you want.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, I guess one of the points you're making in the constitutional amendment is that it is of significant importance and of a long-standing effect to the Province of Manitoba, that prior to any government proceeding with a constitutional amendment, somehow the people's wishes should be represented in that constitutional amendment, is that what you're basically saying?

MR. T. COHOE: Well, if this hadn't come up as an issue that's being raised in the papers like this and attracted my attention, I probably wouldn't care what was happening. I do believe in the parliamentary process and I follow it from time to time. I even come down and sit in the gallery and watch what's going on from time to time. But I'm not really too concerned with the specific issues, so much as I am concerned with the process by which you are coming to your decisions here. I think you could improve it. I'll say that to both sides. You're not working in a way that you're attempting to make progress. It's okay if you want to take the position that it's all right to get all kinds of people angry and hurt people and things like that, but it's not right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well then how would you suggest that the people are represented as you seem to desire in the constitutional amendment, if you have a government that insists, even by closure, to pass that constitutional amendment when a majority of Manitobans have said they do not want it? By what process do the people of Manitoba have their opinion known? How do they represent their views to the government?

MR. T. COHOE: How would I make my opinion known, is that what you're saying?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. T. COHOE: First of all, it would be done as a plebiscite.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Would it be fair to, since the government has an aversion to plebiscites and a lot of people have an aversion to plebiscites, would you agree the ultimate plebiscite would be an election, for a government to call an election on an issue like this?

MR. T. COHOE: Yes, but I don't see that the government should be forced into taking this up as an election issue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then what other opportunity do the people of Manitoba have to express their will on this issue when the government that's bringing it in did not campaign on it. It appears to be going against the wishes of the vast majority of opinion in Manitoba.

How does that vast majority of Manitoban opinion get through to a government that insists on pushing through a constitutional amendment, other than via the election process?

MR. T. COHOE: You ask them in a plebiscite.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Plebiscite via an election.

MR. T. COHOE: You can put the question on a ballot, but it doesn't have to be an issue that is fought as an election issue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then failing calling an election today, you would recommend the government not proceed with the constitutional amendment until they next call the election, and have it as a plebiscite question on the election ballot.

MR. T. COHOE: I have been angry at both sides in this thing. I can understand that when you call the government a socialist horde and all this kind of stuff, this is not exactly the kind of process that went on in the Roman Senate in the days when observers from outside the country were so awed by the process that they said it was like an assembly of kings. You're not using diplomacy.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You consider diplomacy to be closure?

MR. T. COHOE: No, I don't consider diplomacy to be closure or anything else. You have to back off, you know, like both sides. I mean, okay, you can go ahead. I can't stop the government from introducing closure or anything else like that. I mean, that's maybe what the government wants to do. I don't know. The government can do that.

MR. T. COHOE: But there are more people here involved than the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ransom.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Cohoe, would you consider that a constitutional amendment passed unanimously by the Legislature would be something that was valid and binding and acceptable to you in the absence of a plebiscite.

MR. T. COHOE: If I could feel sure that it's not going to result in some kind of damage, especially emotional damage, to the people of Manitoba. Like I said, I would not really have cared about this if I had never heard about it, and I would never have heard about it if you people had been working together diplomatically. That doesn't mean that you are necessarily on the same side, but you don't sit and call each other names.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Cohoe, you have said that - well first of all, you have

presented us with a very thoughtful brief, and I certainly want to offer my commendation on it. There's much food for thought in it. But you have said that your concern is basically with the process, not with the issue.

Can you help me out as a member of the Legislature on that point? I would like to know if you can tell me: how long did it take you to come to this point of concern, the point of concern at which you've now arrived? Did sort of the red flag of warning go up the moment you first heard about it last May or June?

MR. T. COHOE: My position changes on this thing daily. That means that I adapt to the situation as it comes along. I was ready to make a harangue against closure, but I understand now that's forestalled for a while anyway.

MR. H. ENNS: Hopefully forever. I think it's been dropped.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Hopefully, you'll drop the bell ringing.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The reason for my question really is to gain some guidance from you as a thinking member of the public and the electorate as to just what sort of process would be best pursued in situations of this kind that go to the very heart and nature of the form and format of our society?

MR. T. COHOE: I can answer that question. Sometimes I feel that everybody is trying to find out who I'll vote for in the next election or who the people will vote for in the next election. Sometimes I wonder whether or not it would be better for the people to put a completely new group of people in, not just change one side, but change them both. Change everybody.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But you're worried about the process, and would you not agree that the process of travelling from a point of not fully knowing about a situation to the point of understanding it takes some time? It might take eight months and it might take eight years.

MR. T. COHOE: Yes, that's true, and that holds for an election too. Do you want to call an election?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Sure. We'd be delighted to.

MR. T. COHOE: Well, you call one and make it for two months from now and see how fast the situation can change, because I'm sure you're well aware that it can change very quickly.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I certainly am well aware of that, but we're not in a position to call an election. But why is it better to go into an election with an uninformed electorate than to go through a process of eight or 10 or 12 months of debate, informing the public about the issue in the process that is being pursued?

MR. T. COHOE: I understand what you're saying. The electorate is never informed. You know that, don't you? If you want to take the logical conclusion to what you

should do, keeping in mind that the electorate is never informed - nobody is ever informed - then we shouldn't be having elections.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I don't agree with you that the electorate is never informed. I am not suggesting that I said on this, for example, on an issue of this kind, not fully informed. Obviously the public has learned and now understands and so does the media and so does the government and perhaps even so does the opposition a great deal more about this issue than was the case last May. How do you get to this point of everybody knowing more fully about the subject if we don't go through this process?

MR. T. COHOE: Yes, I agree with that. I wanted to say something at the hearings in the fall, but I didn't. I never really decided that I would say anything until this idea of closure came through. I felt that was enough to stimulate me to say something, because I thought this was going to be the end of my opportunity to say anything.

Now I've written letters to the newspaper, and you can probably figure out what my position on the issue is by reading what I've written in the newspaper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sherman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Mr. Cohoe? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Cohoe, for taking the time to come here tonight.

MR. T. COHOE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As you will remember earlier, we had two people who had asked to speak twice. One of them, according to my records, has spoken for 40 minutes already. The other one has spoken for three minutes, Mr. Lasko.

What is the will of the committee?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Hear Mr. Lasko.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lasko? Is that agreed? (Agreed) Mr. T. Lasko.

MR. T. LASKO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members of this committee, citizens of this province, I don't believe we need this bill. We have Section 23, Section 23 is good enough as it is. We don't need this bureaucracy. All you have to do is take "official" out of 23. We can't say, French and English are official in Manitoba; they're official in Mr. Trudeau's department, not in Manitoba.

I believe that Bill 115 be put to rest forever, this bickering, for it is only creating racism, discrimination, hatred and bad feelings between the people of this province, and above all, a bigger tax burden on the province.

I believe the onus is on the NDP Government of this province to scrap this bill and quit blaming the opposition for stalling such bad legislation that this government has put forward. Good god, the people of

this province don't want this bill to be passed, so how does this government expect the opposition party to support such a useless bill?

I don't believe anybody in their right mind can support such a bill. This bill is not being passed for the majority of French-speaking people of this province. This bill, if passed, will only cater to a small ethnic group of people who do not want to be recognized as Canadians. Instead they want to be recognized as Francophones, supported by people like Trudeau and Serge Joyal, who come from Quebec. We do not need two official languages in Manitoba. We need only one working language in this province.

Mr. Anstett is talking about preserving rights and freedoms of minorities. I say this, Mr. Anstett, whenever you pass this bill you are taking away the rights and freedoms of other minorities, or other minority language groups. This bill dictates that you have to learn the French language to be able to hold a government position or government job. I say this is discrimination and not preserving rights and freedoms.

Whenever you manage to pass Bill 115, you are just opening the doors for more demands from this ethnic special group, such as stated in Mr. Serge Joyal's address to the annual meeting of the SFM, March 19, 1983. I will read you some of the excerpts addressed by the Honourable Serge Joyal to the annual meeting of the Societe franco-manitobaine, March 19, 1983.

"On my way here as I was making up a list of the kind of objectives you should have over the next few years, I realized that the task is so monumental that I wondered if you would ever manage to finish what has to be done. The first thing, obviously, I said to myself, is to guarantee that the interpretation of Section 23 for the Francophones. This is already under way. Then it is necessary to get agreement on entrenching Section 23 in the Canadian Charter of Rights. Then Section 23 must be made compulsory in the new Constitution. Then we must see that the Francophone community is given control over French schools."

What other minority group can get these rights and how many more minority groups are going to be able to get these rights, if these rights are all given to the French? I ask the Premier of this province, scrap this bill and start doing what he promised to do for the people who elected him. The economy, the unemployed, agriculture, the sick, the aged, are more important matters than Bill 115.

This language problem originated in Quebec. Let Trudeau and his gang settle the Quebec language problems first. I don't believe the people of this province should burden themselves with more taxes to correct the language problems that exist in Quebec. I ask this government to quit playing games with Bill 115 in this Legislature and get on with the real problems that the people have to put up with in this province. I will say this, there should be no such thing as Anglophones or Francophones. We should all be Canadians. I am proud to say that I am a Canadian or be a Canadian, but I don't know for how long, when our governments try to distort our language rights.

We should not be digging up old bones from the past to tear this country apart. Instead, we should be looking to the future to make Canada a united nation for future generations to live in and let the past be water under the bridge.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Lasko? Seeing no questions Mr. Lasko, thank you for coming tonight.

I will go through the list of names of people who have not yet appeared one more time. Mrs. Jean Hiebert; Mr. Merle Hartlin; Mrs. Linda Archer; Mr. Joe Beer; Mr. Winston Simpson; Reeve William Roth; Reeve Manson Moir; Mr. Jake Janzen; Mr. John Dyck; Mr. Anthony Melnyk; Mr. Claro Paqueo; Ms. Elizabeth Fleming; Mr. Tom Futty; Mr. W.J. Hutton.

That completes the list of people I have wishing to make presentations. What is the will of the committee? Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask the committee to consider adjourning at this point in time and allowing for further representation to take place at the next call of this committee.

Every member of this committee, including Mr. Anstett and you, Sir, as Chairman, are aware that Mr. W.J. Hutton who has been faithfully attending these hearings, but finds himself unavoidably absent this evening. In fact he was before the podium at 12:20 at noon today. I would like not to think that this government would deny its immediate past president of the New Democratic Party from making a presentation — (Interjection) — a few years - would deny Mr. Hutton an opportunity to make his presentation before this committee. Mr. Chairman, the fact that it's singularly noteworthy that so many past-prominent members of the New Democratic Party; past-presidents, Mr. Sidney Green; past-Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Sidney Green; members that have been expelled in kangaroo courts by the New Democratic Party, Mr. Herb Schulz, Executive Assistant to Premier Schreyer, who have made presentations.

I take an affront that Mr. Hutton has made it very plain that he had every intention to make a presentation to this committee, the fact that Mr. Hutton who is not a well man cannot appear at this time. This is a time that's well beyond the usual adjournment hour. When we began these committees, we agreed, a gentlemen's agreement, with the Government House Leader that we would be keeping regular hours. We are not under Speed-up conditions of the Legislature. I remind the honourable member that even though the rules are less formal with respect to the committee, nonetheless normal adjournment hours prevail, which is 10:00 o'clock.

I appeal to the Chairman, I appeal through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Government House Leader that consideration be given to allow this committee to resume its sittings tomorrow at 10:00 a.m to hear any final briefs. Mr. Chairman, I make the further appeal that - again I am well aware that the government is under no particular rules or restrictions that call for notice or a specific time of notice to be given with respect to these hearings. I can only remind him, Sir, that it has been practice on many instances to provide 48 hours, two-days notice, because so many Manitobans want to take part in these hearings and many of them are from out of town. That is a normal practice. I acknowledge it's not a rule.

Mr. Chairman, this session of this meeting was convened at about 20 to three this afternoon when the Government House Leader stood up in his place in the Legislature and could inform definitively that this committee would be sitting tonight. This committee has been on that kind of notice throughout its sessions. I really think that that, plus the issue itself, Mr. Chairman - Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about repealing the horn tax fund on cattle; we are not even worrying about Brucellosis that affect the dairy herds of Manitoba; or how we can improve the crop insurance program for the farmers that have been in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about an issue that I haven't had to face in 17 years as a legislator. This is the first constitutional amendment that is being asked for by a province, but it is part - to use the words of the Government House Leader when this legislation was introduced in the House - this legislation flows from and is consequential to the very first constitutional amendment that is being asked of the Government of Canada to make. If we can't have the sensitivity to deal with this in a somewhat different way than another normal bill, it only underlines the lack of understanding, the lack of feeling and the callousness of this government in treating this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you; I know that I can't demand it of you. You have the numbers; you can invoke a form of closure on this committee, but I ask you, on behalf of Mr. Hutton and others, that this committee be allowed to sit at 10 o'clock in the morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With respect to my colleague, the Opposition House Leader, I think I should deal with each of the points he made and refute each of them, because not a single one of them has a foundation based on either fact or the rules of our House.

Sir, the regular hours of House sitting do not apply to committee and never have. Sir, any gentlemen's agreement or discussion about the sitting of the committee was that we would not sit to unreasonable hours. I find it hard to believe that when the last witness appeared, which was something about 20 to 11, that that would be described as an unreasonable hour, since members are used to sitting in committee often till 11, or past 11 in Committee of Supply, and certainly in standing committees where we hear the public during the Session.

The regular legislative package which goes through a Session, and went through the Session under the stewardship of members opposite, as well as members on this side, over the past dozen or more years, has often gone to 11:00 p.m. in the evening. Mr. Chairman, members know it has often gone much longer than that. So to suggest that in any way the hours are irregular is just not in conformity with our rules or with historical fact.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside also suggests that 48 hours notice is normally given. Well, it isn't normally given, but members on both sides and House Leaders on both sides have tried to give as much notice as possible and wherever possible, except during the latter period of the Session; not necessarily during

Speed-up but during the latter period, that notice sometimes shrinks. Forty-eight hours notice was given last Wednesday for the first committee hearing on Friday. It has never been suggested until tonight that 48 hours notice should be given of the last meeting of a committee when it is holding hearings. The hearings are continuous, names are called; in this case the names of those absent have been called four times now.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised by the Clerk that every single person who was on the list left to be called was contacted today. That being the case, certainly notice has been given.

Mr. Chairman, certainly, any suggestion that the subject matter goes beyond Bill 115, goes beyond the very specific reference this committee got from the House. We have allowed a fair amount of latitude in the discussions because the subject matter does overlap and is a package, but the fact of the matter is the reference to this committee is not a constitutional amendment; is Bill 115, which is substantially less than that. In fact, the whole character of the package was that it was less than that.

I remind the honourable member, as well, that this is not the first constitutional amendment passed by this Legislature. One with respect to aboriginal rights was passed last summer. And, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that the most important constitutional amendment, in fact, not only an amendment but a whole new Constitution for this province and this nation, was not even submitted to the Legislature when members opposite were in government two years ago.

Mr. Chairman, as well, the suggestion that the committee would sit at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, the member knows that Wednesdays are Cabinet days - it sounds like a good title for a book - and that that wouldn't be possible. The next possible meeting might be tomorrow evening and, if members want to sit tomorrow evening, that could be accommodated.

Certainly, in the past, when individuals have not been able to be present for committee meetings or when individuals wanted to present briefs after the expiration of the time appointed for the presentation of public briefs, the committee has accepted written briefs. That has been a very standard practice. It is not provided for in our rules, but I will concede to the member that it has been a standard practice and I would certainly recommend that we adopt it in this case.

I think that because of the significance that members opposite attach to Mr. Hutton's brief, I would be perfectly happy to ask the Clerk, instead of just including it in the appendix to the Hansard of this committee, that that be done but, as well as soon as the brief is received, that copies be made and transmitted to all members of record on the committee.

But beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for the committee to sit and wait for people to appear who have not appeared, we call a meeting of the committee for people who have not appeared. Mr. Chairman, that would be the first time we have done that. So for members opposite to suggest that that in any way is closure, I have to reject that out of hand.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would move that the committee adjourn and that a subsequent meeting be at the call of the Government House Leader for clause-by-clause consideration of the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: The motion to adjourn is not debatable.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You really like closure, don't you, Andy?

HON. A. ANSTETT: You were the guys who were moving adjournment. Four days the bells rang and you moved adjournment.

MR. A. KOVNATS: There's a motion to adjourn, which isn't debatable, and we were criticized for it and he's just doing the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The motion to adjourn is not debatable.

All those in favour, please say aye; those opposed, say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it.

MR. H. ENNS: Count members, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A counted vote.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 6; Nays, 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.
Committee adjourned.