



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. A. Anstett
Constituency of Springfield



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 55 - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 4 OCTOBER, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

TIME — 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Bucklaschuk and Cowan; and
Hon. Ms. Dolin

Messrs. Anstett, Ashton, Brown, Graham,
Kovnats, Lecuyer, Malinowski, Nordman

WITNESSES: Rev. Bill Hutton, Private Citizen

Mr. Ferdinand Guiboche, Private Citizen

Mr. J.G. Russel, Private Citizen

Mr. Guy Savoie, Fort Gibraltar et la Brigade
de la Rivière Rouge

Mr. Ivan Merrit, Private Citizen

Dr. Joe Slogan, Tri Club of Winnipeg

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Proposed resolution to amend Section 23 of
the Manitoba Act

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, the committee has a quorum. Gentlemen, I understand the Clerk has received the resignations of Hon. Messrs. Mackling and Storie, and that Messrs. Cowan and Bucklaschuk are the replacements therefore. Could I have a motion to that effect please?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Father Malinowski. Agreed? (Agreed)

Your Chairman received a copy of a document from Myron J. Spolsky, President of the Manitoba Association for Promotion of Ancestral Languages in reply to requests that were made by the committee on Friday last. I have sufficient copies for all members, they can be distributed.

In addition, members will have received yesterday copies of a supplementary submission by the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties. It was distributed yesterday. Because both of these are supplementary to information given at the hearings, I've requested that copies of both be distributed. The same has not been done as members may be aware for all the other written briefs because of the tremendous volume involved and, instead, those will be printed as an Appendix to the final transcript. There are at this time in excess of 90 written briefs that will be in that Appendix.

If there is no further other business before the committee, we'll resume calling the names where we left off this morning. Rev. W. J. Hutton.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I hate to make another request but I just want to mention, in passing, that is - perhaps I should ask a question. Are the hearings going to conclude today, and this is in regard to Rev. Hutton, or is there a possibility that they could be continued tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee agreed at this morning's hearing that the committee would only call through the list one more time. All those individuals who were absent this morning had been called a minimum of three times since Friday evening. It was the committee's feeling this morning that there would be one more call to exhaust the list. That was agreed to this morning.

MR. R. DOERN: Then can you clarify this, I spoke to Rev. Hutton this morning and he has a fairly serious health problem in the sense of a heart condition and he probably would appear this afternoon if it were possible for him to know that he would be called. So I'm asking whether that is a possibility or now, having called his name, is he therefore off the list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: First of all, Rev. Hutton, as were all other individuals who were on the list, was told this morning they were all to be called this morning. Obviously you could have advised Rev. Hutton had you been here this morning, Mr. Doern, that his would be the first name called at 2 o'clock. That's where we left off. We exhausted the list at five after 11 this morning, adjourned and said we would call all absentees this afternoon. I'm at the will and pleasure of the committee. The Chair certainly has no objection to calling the list a second time, again, after we have gone through it, it depends on how many people are here. I don't know if the committee will exhaust the list by 3:30, 5 o'clock or 10 o'clock tonight. That's something that will depend on the number of presentations. But certainly after four calls to absentees, I think the committee certainly has gone to some length to exhaust the list. That was the direction I received this morning.

Mr. Ashton.

MR. S. ASHTON: I would think the best way to handle it is to just go through the list and advise the gentleman this morning, for example, we went through the list and we completed it in one hour and 15 minutes. There is that possibility, again, but I can't see beyond that giving any kind of guarantee to one particular individual. I think personally we'll probably go through the list and finish that list, if this morning's experience is any example. I think that can be communicated to him, but that's the example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps Mr. Hutton should also be made aware that he still has the possibility of also presenting his written brief, and it will be added to the list of the written briefs and recorded in Hansard. Is that not correct, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's correct. I had already planned on asking the committee's direction at the end of the meeting as to whether or not they wished the Clerk to advise any people who were still absent when the list was exhausted if the committee was willing to entertain written briefs from those people to be added to the Appendix. That's always been done in the past

MR. R. DOERN: Here he is right now, so saved by the bell.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I had something to say.

A MEMBER: As always. Please do.

MR. W. HUTTON: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a little out of breath, but I really didn't run all the way, I ran part of the way.

At the outset, I would like to make certain general statements because I think it's important to know where people are coming from. These statements have to do with my views on bilingualism and my relationship with the New Democratic Party over the years.

I have always supported French language rights and have upheld its national status. I have taken the trouble to learn French myself, and speak it with a fair degree of fluency. I placed my daughter in a French school for a year, and she developed about 90-95 percent oral efficiency, that meant she could understand virtually anything that was said to her. She didn't like speaking French in front of her father, but I understood that she wasn't too bad when I wasn't around. My son spent a summer in French Immersion in Moncton.

I presented a brief to the Royal Commission on Biligualism and Biculturalism in which I supported recognition of both English and French as official languages in Canada. I supported biligualism then, and still do. But I do not support an accompanying biculturalism, especially not in Manitoba where multiculturalism is so well established.

Consequently, I am opposed to the efforts of the Société franco-manitobaine to make Manitoba a lop-sided bicultural province where, on one side of the coin there exists a small, powerful, monolithic, French ethnolinguistic community, and on the other side a heterogeneous, multicultural polyglot collection of assorted ethnic and linguistic communities. In my view, the SFM concept of a bicultural Manitoba is simply a form of social and cultural separation. I oppose this form of separatism as strongly as I oppose the political separation aspirations of the Parti Québécois in Quebec.

I am a member of the New Democratic Party, and a former provincial president. I respect the CCF/NDP tradition in which there has been a strong concern for injustice towards minority groups, and I would like to

add I do not believe that our party holds a monopoly in this area. I think that this concern has led them into the present unfortunate situation. I know how sincere the government is to assure the French-speaking minority all the rights due them. I know that the Attorney-General believed and presumably still believes that a ruling by the Supreme Court should be avoided. I don't believe that the majority of Manitobans share his concern about a court ruling.

The upcoming plebiscite in Winnipeg will give a fair indication. I am sure that the Attorney-General will be interested in the results. I know that he is very open-minded and has listened very attentively to the points of view that have been expressed before this committee.

I would now like to focus my comments directly on what I see as the main issues. This task is difficult because the issues have been clouded by strong public controversy, which has not really centered on the major point at issue, as I understand it, at least. I would now like to clarify that statement.

Mr. Bilodeau has challenged the validity of Manitoba laws passed in English only since 1890. That seemed fair enough. Every citizen in the province should want to have this decision made once and for all by the Supreme Court. I am sure M. Bilodeau foresaw the possibility that courts could rule that all of these laws were indeed invalid. I am sure that he and his supporters were, and still are, prepared for such an eventuality. But I suspect that they, along with many other Manitobans, did not and still do not perceive such an eventuality as being very likely. We do not have any grounds to believe that our courts will create social havoc.

This jurisdictional direction was changed when the Federal Government - who I understand was paying the bulk, if not all, of M. Bilodeau's court costs through grants from the Secretary of State - offered to negotiate an out-of-court settlement if they included the Société franco-manitobaine in the negotiations. Negotiations were undertaken, as I understand, and an agreement was reached whereby Mr. Bilodeau will drop the court challenge if the Provincial Government takes the necessary steps to have French language services incorporated into the Constitution.

Unfortunately instead of focusing on the decision of the government to try to reach an out-of-court settlement, public debate has focused simply on the terms of the agreement whereby French language services will be extended. Thanks to a media hype - which is understandable - everyone has been cast into one of two moulds: (a) those who support the government's proposed legislation (the good guys); and (b) those opposed (the bad guys), and this image has made its way across the country unfortunately, if you'd look at the Letters to the Editor.

The former are portrayed as being liberal, progressive and tolerant of minority rights. The latter are portrayed as bigots and rednecks. No regard is given to the varying reasons why some are in favour of the proposal and why others are opposed.

The social drama that has emerged has centred on people's reaction to the proposals. Name calling, charges of bigotry and the media imagery of a long suffering "discriminated against" minority being further deprived of their rights have clouded any intelligent debate or examination of relevant factors. The

emotional climate has become so intense that the original issue has been lost sight of, namely, should the courts be allowed to decide on the Bilodeau case or should the out-of-court settlement be accepted. It is almost impossible to shift to this which, in my opinion, is the central issue. The media's contribution has been more negative than positive.

A first rate example is the media reaction to the city's decision to place this question on the city plebiscite, rather than the up-to-then popularly debated - do you favour an extension of French language services as being proposed by the Provincial Government? The question as it now stands can be discussed, I think, in a rational non-emotional way. Serious questions can be posed. For instance, what are the relative advantages and disadvantages of allowing a Supreme Court decision? Is it proper for a sovereign government to negotiate and sign an agreement which affects all of us with a private self-serving interest group which purports to represent the collective mind of a particular ethnolinguistic sector of the community? Is this not setting a precedence? Can we not now expect similar groups to approach the government and sign an agreement to entrench their language rights? - and by looking at the papers I believe that the lineup has already started. Is the procedure, being followed by the government at present, the best or even the most desirable way of making a constitutional change? Would the establishment of a Royal Commission not be better? Indeed, this very committee appears more and more to be thought of as just such a commission. - sorry I don't know what word I meant there - but in other words this committee is taking on the form of a Royal Commission, rather than a Legislative committee.

Yet, the changing of the question has made little impact on those who were and still are critical of a plebiscite. The rhetoric has remained essentially the same. This is true both of the media and academics submitting articles to the media.

We read in the Free Press dated September 27, 1983 an article by a University of Winnipeg political scientist titled: "Plebiscite could tear the city apart."

Now, I ask you, can anyone here really believe that a discussion of the above questions which I have outlined will "tear the city apart?" And I don't see it being torn apart as of now, and I don't foresee it being torn apart, even by election time. I suggested a question very similar to this to replace one in French Services Executive Policy Committee of the Winnipeg Council because I, personally, thought the previous question would have a detrimental effect on the community, the city, and I don't believe that the present question will do that. I think it will generate serious intelligent debate.

May I also add that I think it is unfortunate that academics and journalists have become so liberal in their imputing motifs to politicians involved in this debate, and are also equally liberal in tossing around derogatory labels.

If the media would co-operate and encourage honest and intelligent discussion on the substance of the question on the plebiscite, as it now stands, we could all profit.

We are told that the government is following a Made-in-Manitoba policy. I agree that how each official language and other languages are used in public institutions should be decided in Manitoba by

Manitobans. But the ground rules, both for us and for Quebec, and indeed for all of the provinces, are set by the Federal Government in Ottawa in the forms of laws and in the Constitution. You'll notice that my point of view here is very similar to Dr. Shaw's and I was quite pleased to hear that someone concerned about English rights in Quebec was sharing the same point of view. Any violation of these ground rules should be ruled on by the Supreme Court of Canada. It's absolutely essential that the Federal Government's role and the role of the Supreme Court be defined clearly and be kept separate. It is incumbent on the Federal Government to see that there is no violation of either official language as determined by federal laws.

If Manitoba did act "ultra vires," if Manitoba did break the ground rules in 1890, then the Supreme Court should be asked for a decision. I personally do not believe that the court is so isolated that it will shut its eyes to social and economic realities in any decision it may make.

Every Manitoban has the right to know the status of our laws passed in English only since 1890. We, as Canadians, expect the courts of Canada to rule on our laws in the same way as they would in other provinces.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that a large number of Manitobans, and possibly the majority are opposed either to the decision to "negotiate out-of-court" or to the terms of the agreement itself. Even the Société franco-manitobaine has voiced its displeasure over changes in the agreement. This raises the question about negotiating, in general, and of negotiating with the Société franco-manitobainem in particular.

First of all, the cloud of uncertainty about our laws is not removed, The "Saving Provision" 23.3(2) is intended to prevent future challenges to the validity of laws enacted prior to January 1st, 1986 in English only. Can this resolution itself not be challenged? Can this Legislature pass laws to enact constitutional changes and deny me, for instance, or any citizen, access to the Supreme Court to question the validity of these English-only laws? Am I to be deprived of these rights? After all, I was not, and am not, party to any agreement that the Provincial Government made regarding this.

But there are other equally serious concerns. I would like to refer back to a question I posed earlier - the propriety of the government to initiate changes to the Constitution based on negotiations with an interest group purporting to reflect the collective will of an ethnolinguistic group. First of all, M. Maurice Prince maintains that his organization speaks for the majority of Franco-Manitobans. Without the \$500,000, \$600,000 annual grant given to the SFM, his organization, l'association des pro-Canadiens, has neither the clout, nor the profile of the SFM. That fact does not take away from their claim to speak on behalf of a large sector of the French-speaking community.

The SFM has every right to speak on behalf of the interests of its members, as does any private interest group. It cannot speak, however, on behalf of all Franco-Manitobans. And certainly it does not speak on behalf of other Manitobans who have varying degrees of interest in the French language but are not ethnic French-Canadian.

Since public money from Ottawa has been used to finance the Bilodeau court case, all Manitobans and,

indeed, all Canadians have an interest in its outcome. I want to have a decision regarding the validity of the laws in question, and object to the fact that, through an agreement to which I am not party, that process is being halted. More insidious still are other implications of negotiating in this way.

We are assuming that minority ethnic groups have rights peculiar to that group, and that they are being dubbed minority rights. I suggest that this is a new concept and one that should be examined with great care. I choose to make a distinction between the rights of a minority and minority rights. For instance, in the United States, until a few decades ago, the rights available to the majority were not available to the minority negro Americans. Activists, and especially Martin Luther King and his followers, fought not for special rights for negro Americans, but for the same rights that were available to all other Americans.

In the rhetoric surrounding the present debate, a new concept has been slipped in, "minority rights." This concept assumes that there are rights particular to certain minority groups. Apart from the indigenous people in this country who had made separate treaties with Britain even before Confederation, this has not been the case nor should it be.

It is the responsibility of both the Federal and Provincial Governments to see that language rights, French and English, guaranteed by federal laws and the Constitution are extended to all citizens regardless of their ethnic background as far as the law permits. The Provincial Government should not treat any ethnic or ethnolinguistic interest group as a quasi-governmental body with a mandate to negotiate on behalf of all people in that particular social grouping.

It is the responsibility of the Provincial Government to see that all languages are treated fairly in education and in the offering of services by the government and its agencies, but such policies should be flexible and not enshrined and done so observing the legal status and particular history of each.

French and English should be recognized as official Canadian languages, it is true. It is also true that German and Ukrainian have special historical significance in Manitoba. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture - and I don't have the particular date, I was hoping to get to the university to get a copy of the letter - had signed a letter in which Mennonite immigrants were told that they could retain German in education and religion - incidentally, one of the Speakers of this Legislature was party to that. Bilingual schools are not new in this province. French, German, Ukrainian and even some Polish bilingual schools existed until they were closed down in 1915. These are all factors that should be considered by the government.

I mentioned earlier, biculturalism. Though we do not hear this term very often, it is the direction in which I see the SFM wanting to move in. It would produce two parallel subsocieties, or a society and a subsociety, I guess would be accurate sociologically, one French and one English. Let me give an example. Le Bureau de l'éducation française is responsible for all curriculum development in the so-called "français" school and "immersion schools", including English. But they also control the teaching of French in the regular English language schools. They do not believe that the main department of Education should be involved, even in

the English program of "Français" and "Immersion" schools. I, myself, was once told by the then president of the Société franco-manitobaine that I had no right to have any say in the decision whereby the school division in which I am a resident and a taxpayer was establishing French language programs. Just as a little editorial comment, I was thanked for that with a coke bottle thrown right through my very expensive picture window the day after. There was no proof to say who did it, but it happened coincidentally just after that, and it was similar to other incidents that I know of. This is biculturalism which I oppose.

Lastly, governments cannot turn a blind eye to sociological realities. French may be equal as an official language, but it's not in the minds of the public or in social reality. The government has ignored this fact and a negative reaction has resulted.

I make two recommendations. No. 1, the government pay close attention to the referenda being conducted in the province. If the majority want the courts to decide, then the courts should be allowed to do so. No. 2, establish a Royal Commission to recommend how to respond to the requests of the various linguistic interest groups in a fair and just way.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Rev. Hutton. Questions for Rev. Hutton from members of the committee? Seeing none . . .

MR. W. HUTTON: Could I just sit for a moment or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were no questions.

MR. W. HUTTON: Were there no questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Oh, there are now? Mr. Graham. Please take a seat, Rev. Hutton.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, if Rev. Hutton is pushed or rushed or anything, I would be willing to wait for a minute while he gets his breath before I ask any questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He can answer from there, he has a microphone now.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Rev. Hutton, you have presented us with a lot of very thoughtful information in your brief and I detect from that that there is a certain reluctance on your part to speak out against the party of which you have professed a relationship. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. W. HUTTON: Well I have tried in my comments to neither speak out against the government party or the opposition party. I think that I've tried to address the issues and I've wanted to make it known, I wasn't hiding my affiliation with the New Democratic Party or my background, but I was hoping that my presentation would address just simply the issues themselves and that was my approach.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Rev. Hutton, you have no concern, then, about being censored by your party for speaking

out against it, as other members in your party have been so subjected?

MR. W. HUTTON: I think the last time I was here I dropped into the caucus room. Nobody threw an egg at me, nobody threw a tomato at me and no one slammed the door — (Interjection) — and no coke bottles through my window.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members of the committee? Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a couple of questions. On the first page, Rev. Hutton makes the point that he believes - about the middle of the page he says, "In my view the SFM concept of a bicultural Manitoba is simply a form of social and cultural separation." And then he says: "I oppose this form of separatism as strongly as I oppose the political separation and aspirations of the Parti Québécois." Are you suggesting that if this legislation proceeds that we will then have two cultures in Manitoba and to that extent the SFM and the Francophone culture will be separate, apart, and distinct, and that this will create problems in the province?

MR. W. HUTTON: More separate, apart, and distinct than it is at present. I think that's essentially what I am saying. It's certainly in those areas and then, of course, you don't know how much further that goes. If I could just give an example. We hired a new secretary, our superintendent hired a new secretary in the school division, and two of the people that were very competent in my views but then I wasn't doing the hiring - they were told that the position was now bilingual and I said, "Oh, that's interesting, that was never discussed at the board, I don't know anything about it." So I asked the superintendent if any changes had been made in the job descriptions and the job requirements. He just refused to answer the question, he said: "I don't have to tell you." This sort of this, it's well, who does he tell and who tells him and where's it all coming from. When people were told this and when they speak to me and I can't even find out if that's the case. This is the kind of insidious stuff that is unhealthy and that I can see happening. Maybe I'm being unduly critical.

MR. R. DOERN: You also say in your brief on Page 3, that the media imagery of a long-suffering, discriminated-against minority being further deprived of their rights and so on - it seems to me that concept has been suggested or implied and you don't see any particular indications of an oppressed minority in terms of Franco-Manitobans?

MR. W. HUTTON: There are legal minds around this table I have noticed. My understanding is that all the rights that were assured when Manitoba came into federation are there, that there is now The Official Languages Act and in terms of rights - and it just depends on what you define it as - in my definition, I would say yes, that they are all there. Now in terms

of language use in the province, then that's a different matter, but I don't think we should call this rights. But that's equally true of other linguistic groups, too.

Can I just add at this point, that I'm not saying that French is exactly the same status say, as German and Ukrainian. Historically and numerically there are some similarities, but legally, of course, French is an official language. I think that should be made known.

But, on the other hand, there is another similarity that I don't think has been looked at very seriously and this is also part of the biculturalism and that's that French is essentially an ethnic language. Let me qualify that immediately, as is German and Ukrainian in this province, that most of the people who speak French are French. Now most of the people who speak English are not English. If you go to England, most of the people who speak English are English; if you go to Central Africa to the Congo, the people who speak French there are not French, so there it is not an ethnic language. I think this has to be recognized.

Those of you who have done studies in sociology are familiar, of course, with the special kind of networks and authority structures that come about in an ethnic community and the kinds of control. One of the things that concerns me is that we have to take very serious regard of this when we're making any changes in terms of having French services.

MR. R. DOERN: Just a couple of questions on the plebiscite. I guess, in a sense, you are the father of the plebiscite or the father of the question on the plebiscite. Do you think that that question - I don't know if that was your question or not. Was that your question precisely or was it modified?

MR. W. HUTTON: No, it was modified, but it was essentially the same in that I was directing it to the decision of the government to make an out-of-court settlement rather than an in-court settlement.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you think that the question as presently worded is clear or that it would be understandable, or do you intend to do anything to make it understandable, or more understandable?

MR. W. HUTTON: Well, you know, it's interesting, the more you read it, the clearer it becomes. I don't know if those of you who have taken introductory psychology have all been told about the little experiment where you put on upside-down glasses, and if you put these glasses on, it makes the whole world around you look upside down. That's just the way you feel, but in time you adjust, and in time, the upside-down world looks right side up. Then when you take those glasses off again, the right side world looks upside down.

Now, I think this is precisely what's happened. That's thanks to the media hype and all the vitriol and all the comments that have been made and the social drama that's been created and played on television right across the country has created an upside-down picture of the situation. What I think the question on the referendum does now is put it right side up again, and then all of a sudden people say, I'm confused. Well, you're confused just like the people taking off the upside-down glasses, I'd say.

MR. R. DOERN: Finally, could you indicate how the government should perceive the referenda? Is it a poll, is it a reflection of public opinion? Are they morally bound by the results? What do you see as the role or value of a plebiscite or a referendum.

MR. W. HUTTON: You know, I don't think you can just give a simple answer. All sorts of things have to be taken into consideration. For instance, so far there is no single body that is supporting the "yes" vote. If you wanted to get involved in a campaign or to pay for advertising, there is no advertising, there'd be no place to go. Manitoba 23, on the other hand, is very involved in this and has the support of ethnic groups which in turn have federal money coming in from the Secretary of State so that they can. So, I think that there is going to be an imbalance. I think that the people who want the "yes" vote are hindered, because of lack of funds and lack of organization to go to the public. Knowing this, I think that the vote will be in Winnipeg a "yes" vote and I hope it will be a "yes" vote. I think that the government should look at it for just what it is, that a number of people felt very strongly; they wanted to give them a message and this is the message they are giving them. I think that the government just has to come to its own decision.

MR. R. DOERN: Have you applied for funds from the Secretary of State to promote a "yes" vote in the referendum?

MR. W. HUTTON: Not yet, but maybe I will tomorrow.

MR. R. DOERN: Could you comment on this point because there was some comment that came out of Eastern Canada about some groups today who were pleading with Manitobans not to have a plebiscite on minority rights? Is that what this issue is all about? Is this a plebiscite on minority rights, or what is the actual question in the Winnipeg referendum or plebiscite?

MR. W. HUTTON: I don't have the exact wording here, but it's essentially, do you think that the courts should decide and let Mr. Bilodeau's case go all the way to the courts and be decided on, or should you accept the government's proposal? That's essentially it, but, you know, I hope that most of you looked at the Free Press the night before last, when you looked at all these letters. I don't know who organized this, but all the flood of letters coming from the East. I've never seen it before. The interesting thing when you look at those letters is, that I don't think there is a single one who understands what's going on - not a single one. That concerns me.

The other thing that concerns me is this idea that a majority group has no right to decide on a minority group. Heavens, we do it every day. There is a very significant minority group in this society and that's young people who are well educated, they're coming out of university, they want work and they can't find it. That's a very significant group. Yet, where do they stand? Aren't they being denied the right to work? Why isn't there concern for this? Yet we allow the majority in our Legislatures and in Ottawa and in the Federal Government to make policies and make decisions that

affect the welfare of these people. Nobody seems to be concerned about the majority making decisions that affect this particular minority. I wish they would.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Rev. Hutton. Seeing none, Rev. Hutton, thank you very much for your presentation here today.

MR. W. HUTTON: I just might add that I did hope that Mr. Lyon would at least have one little question, but he seems to have everything explained clearly. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: I can say for the record that I regret I only heard part of Mr. Hutton's brief, but it was so well reasoned and so well articulated and so thoughtful, and I see no reason to raise any questions.

MR. W. HUTTON: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Vedanand. Dr. Vedanand, please. Bohdanka Dutka. Michel Kiedyk. George Rykman. Don McIvor. Ferdinand Guiboche.

MR. F. GUIBOCHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I appeared before the first committee in Dauphin as the Mayor of Camperville supporting the agreement between the Provincial Government, the Federal Government and the Societe Franco-Manitoban. I am also a member of the Manitoba Metis Federation, which supports the actions taken, but I'm here today as an individual representing my views again.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask a question here, if you'll excuse me.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, it is a point of order.

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

MR. R. DOERN: I would like a clarification. There was a considerable debate, I recall, in Ste. Anne as to whether or not Mr. Prince could appear for a second time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I can be of assistance to you, Mr. Doern. When Mr. Guiboche refers to an earlier committee meeting in Dauphin, I think Mr. Doern you would agree that this committee did not hold a meeting in Dauphin. Perhaps there is some confusion between the informational meetings conducted by Mr. Penner and the meetings of this standing committee.

Please proceed, Mr. Guiboche.

MR. F. GUIBOCHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My remarks are going to be brief. I have listened to the hearings and everything that has happened, like all Manitobans and certainly Canadians throughout this

country, about what has been taking place here in Manitoba, about the emotions and the strong feelings of people all over the land debating what was the proper way, and even suggestions about the Manitoba way of doing things. I suppose, everyone has learned a great deal from these hearings. Some will have to learn, I guess, to accept the facts as they are. Others will go on rationalizing their positions.

There have been a lot of comments made which did not refer directly to the question. A lot of matters dealt with economics, dealt with other matters, roads and everything else. I suppose it just makes me wonder about politicians, that they must be tough to go through the things that they go through to fight for things that they believe in. I suppose they would have to be very dedicated with a lot of patience to move with the things that they believe.

In my own mind, there is no question about The Manitoba Act of 1870 and its legality. There is no question that what the Provincial and Federal Government and the Society Franco-Manitoban did is quite legal and proper in my own mind. I don't profess to be a lawyer, but it seems to me that events that have taken place over the last few years have indicated that, in the last six or seven years with the Supreme Court ruling that, in fact, what was being done was legal. It was decided by these three groups to make an agreement on certain things that they felt were just and fair.

I see it as a fair compromise personally, because I ask myself, what are the alternatives? If this was not accepted, if it would finally go its route to be decided by the court of the land, the alternatives, I'm sure, would be similar to what we have in New Brunswick. The court would rule, I believe, that Manitoba would be a full bilingual province. This is what the agreement, in my view, stands for. It stands for a compromise, a practical solution to meet the needs of people, people who have been wronged by certain statutes that were passed. So this is a way of correcting things.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, my comments are brief. I support the position taken by the Provincial and Federal Government and the Societe Franco-Manitoban. I support the original amendment that was proposed in the Legislature early June or July, whatever the date was, without any change. I hope that you would move with that whenever the Legislature convenes.

Mr. Chairman, those are my comments. I'm prepared to answer questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Guiboche. Questions for Mr. Guiboche?

Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: One question, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Guiboche, one of the lawyers for the government, Mr. Guiboche, told the government that the conditions contained in the agreement that it signed with the SFM and with the Government of Canada or is purporting to sign with them could never be imposed upon Manitoba by any court. Would you still make the statement to us that you have just made that the court could maybe impose New Brunswick-type of bilingualism upon Manitoba, if you know that their own lawyer said that they couldn't do that?

MR. F. GUIBOCHE: That is advice that the government would have to take under their own advisement, and follow up with their own decision. It's still my view that they are making a good agreement; that they are working within the legal law of the land; and that they should proceed.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Guiboche, I don't think anybody disagrees with you having your opinion about the validity of the agreement. It is strictly on the point that you mentioned in your brief, that if we didn't have this agreement - my heavens - the court could impose some terrible conditions upon Manitoba that are worse than the agreement.

I merely asked you to consider that the government's own lawyer told them, that isn't the case. I tell you, it isn't the case. I don't know of any lawyer who has said that the conditions that could be imposed by the court would be worse than this agreement, because that isn't the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for clarification of the brief? Seeing none, Mr. Guiboche, than you very much for your presentation here today.

Israel Ludwig, S. Stephansson; A. Warkentin; J.G. Russel.

MR. J. RUSSEL: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here as a private citizen. I represent no organized group and I must apologize that I have no written brief to provide you with. However, I realize that you've been sitting a long time and I will be very brief.

Quite frankly, when I thought of appearing here I wondered what in the name of heaven I could say to you that hasn't been said already, probably nothing, so please allow me to give you one man's opinion, one man's perceptions, one man's feelings.

When I first learned of this proposal, this resolution, the thought that occurred to me, and perhaps it's my Irish background, that it had been conducted in secrecy, and on a matter affecting our province so seriously. Private meetings had been held with, as I understand, some six or seven groups: Société franco-manitobaine, the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, Alliance Quebec, Province of New Brunswick; but the one group that was excluded from all this was the group most affected, the people of Manitoba. We were presented, in effect, with a fait accompli. Here is the resolution, we have sufficient votes and this is the way it will be.

Another aspect that bothered me was that if the resolution wasn't passed, you know, we're going to get hit with the Bilodeau case and there were blackmail aspects to this that I found abhorrent. I don't think that any government should have to operate, or any person have to operate, under the threat of blackmail.

So I became interested in what was going on. I started to read on the subject, particularly the government handouts. I received one in the mail and it says, Manitoba is not going to be bilingual but, at the same time, I was reading the resolution, the first section of which said that the official languages of Manitoba shall be English and French. Now which am I to believe? I read at about the same time a very interesting article

in the newspaper, "The language law, who is telling the truth?" And they referred, therein, to a speech by the Honourable Serge Joyal, Secretary of State of Canada. So I obtained his speech, given to the Société franco-manitobaine in March, and in there I found a blueprint as laid out by the Federal Government for this province. The Société franco-manitobaine was advised that they were to get Section 23 entrenched in the Canadian Constitution; then they were to get their own school boards; and then next on the list was the municipalities. But the government pooh-poohed all this, you know, it wasn't going to happen. Well apparently somebody had other ideas.

The next thing I did was attend an informational meeting at the International Inn and watch what, to me, was an orchestrated reaction to the speech by organized groups. I particularly resented one man getting up and saying he represented the Irish Canadian National Committee which had 5,000 members. I found that very strange because I had spoken to the man he identified as vice-president of culture just the week before, at which time he complained bitterly that he couldn't get \$60 together to register the group, and at that time they had two or three members. A week later he's got 5,000 Irishmen? No way. So who do these people really represent? Who do they really represent? But what has happened is that the Province of Manitoba, my province, is being divided in a manner that I cannot really believe, and I cannot believe that any government would deliberately do such a thing.

In summation, we now have a group, or groups, like Manitoba 23 - and just as an aside, as far as Manitoba 23 is concerned, I see reading the paper that Mr. McDonald has declined to reveal his sources of funding. He was on the Peter Warren show when I phoned him and asked him that and he said, oh we just get it from a few volunteers; apparently things have changed. But on the resolution per se, on a matter which affects Manitobans so intimately, in every aspect of our lives, which is so divisive, I ask the government to reconsider. Withdraw the resolution, let the courts decide on the Bilodeau case. They decided on the Forest case and there wasn't this hassle; people will accept it. If the government feels that they cannot do that, then may I suggest that they do not have a mandate to do what they are doing, and I would suggest that they go to the people on it, by way of an election.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. R. DOERN: You are very critical, Mr. Russel, of the - I think what you referred to as a secret agreement and backroom deal, etc. Is it your position that a constitutional amendment should be a rather open and unrushed process, that it is unlike legislation, etc., and therefore, the time should be taken to explain it to the public and to gain public acceptance?

MR. J. RUSSEL: Very, very much. In order to gain legitimacy, if you will, I feel that the government should have - Mr. Hutton mentioned a Royal Commission - should have done that or perhaps a White Paper, or something of that nature, to bring it out in the open,

give people an opportunity. Get a consensus - I think that's the art of government, if I am correct - to get the acceptance of the people prior to doing it, especially on something like the Constitution, which is almost impossible to change. I would like to go on record that I am not disputing the provision of French services; what I am doing is objecting to anything to the process that is being followed and by the entrenchment in the Constitution.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm not sure I fully understood your remarks on the Irish Association. Are you a member of that association?

MR. J. RUSSEL: I am a member of the Irish Association of Manitoba, yes.

MR. R. DOERN: And were you saying then that someone spoke on behalf of the organization that had no right to, or that he provided inaccurate information?

MR. J. RUSSEL: He said he represented an organization that had 5,000 members and a week before they had two.

MR. R. DOERN: In terms of widespread acceptance of the government's proposals, how would you ascertain that? For example, do you support a plebiscite on the question?

MR. J. RUSSEL: I think at this stage of the game, a plebiscite is simply ascertaining what the public thinks, what the public wants. I think, in my own mind, it should have been done beforehand by a different method, perhaps, but I don't think at this stage of the game that we have any other choice. There is no other process that I can think of.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you see a plebiscite or a referendum as being a barometer or thermometer or indication of public opinion?

MR. J. RUSSEL: I think it is a way for people to express themselves. I may be wrong, but I think politicians take plebiscites all the time, they just use a different term. I'm sure that if anything contentious comes in or anything, it doesn't even necessarily have to be contentious, but that a politician goes out to his constituents, finds out what they think, what their opinions are, things of that nature. I think this is the same thing in another form.

MR. R. DOERN: Is it your contention that this is needed all the more because of the secret nature of the agreement?

MR. J. RUSSEL: I would think so. I would have hoped that the government would have published all the data concerning the agreement, rather than just a small resolution. But I can see no other choice at the moment, quite frankly, than a plebiscite to obtain people's opinion.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Russel?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Russel, I have to admit that my own background is of the Scottish fraternity, so I don't know too much about the Irish community.

MR. J. RUSSEL: We're all Celts, Sir.

MR. H. GRAHAM: We had a brief yesterday from an organization that listed as one of their supporting organizations, the Irish-Canadian National Committee.

MR. J. RUSSEL: Headed by Mr. McKinney, Gerry McKinney.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can you tell me more about the Irish-Canadian National Committee? Are you a member of it?

MR. J. RUSSEL: Heaven forbid! No, I am not. There are two longstanding Irish associations in Manitoba, The Winnipeg Irish and the Irish Association of Manitoba. Both are non-political, non-sectarian. One member of the Irish Association of Manitoba wanted to start up an Irish language school. He was having difficulty doing so. We had spoken about it, and the night of the meeting at the International Inn, a week later after, Mr. McKinney got up and said that he represented 5,000 Irishmen. He identified himself as the Irish-Canadian National Committee, the first time I'd ever heard of it.

I went up to him afterwards and asked him how many members he had. He said, 5,000. I nearly fell off my chair, you know, this is ridiculous. But in any event, I asked him, give me some names of members. He named two people. One of them, as his Vice-President of Culture was the man I had spoken to the week before who didn't have \$60 to register his association. At that time, he was the sole member of the organization, so with McKinney, I guess there would be two, and that was the Irish-Canadian National Committee.

McKinney appeared - he's connected with the Garrison Diversion, incidentally - on the Peter Warren show, and I phoned and asked him about his membership. He refused to give me the membership or the names of any of his members, as a matter of fact, he finally hung up on me on the Warren show.

The Irish-Canadian National Committee does not represent Irish people in Manitoba. I don't think, in a matter such as this, Sir, that any organization can represent the feelings of all people of Irish background. I don't think the organizations that are appearing, really, can say that they speak for their total membership, because this appears to cut across linguistic lines, party lines, political party lines. So I really don't feel that he does represent them.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Russel. Seeing none, Mr. Russel, thank you very much for your presentation here today.

MR. J. RUSSEL: Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: C.J. Wenaas; Remi Smith, Remi Smith; Léo Teillet.

Guy Savoie.

MR. G. SAVOIE: Merci, M. le président. Je me présente devant vous aujourd'hui, M. le président et membres du Comité, à titre du président de la fondation du Fort Gibraltar, du bourgeois de la Brigade de la Rivière Rouge et à titre aussi d'un des anciens président du Festival du Voyageur.

Il y a aucun doute, M. le président et membres du Comité, qu'il m'est facile aussi de me présenter comme un Canadien de vieille date. La famille Savoie est arrivée à Port Royale en 1652. J'ai avec moi ici un arbre généalogique de la famille qui démontre que je suis un Canadien de 12e génération. Je pourrais facilement vous le laisser quoique j'aimerais le ravoir.

Je suis fier de ma race, fier de mon histoire, fier de ma culture et surtout je suis fier d'être Canadien. Si je vous adresse à titre d'être si fier d'être Canadien, c'est peut-être pour démontrer à travers les années et de répondre à M. Godin et à plusieurs autres que nous existons toujours et nous continuerons d'exister. Il y a aucun doute aussi; vous avez eu M. Toby Perrin qui vous a parlé à Sainte-Anne. Ma grand-mère paternelle était la tante à M. Perrin.

Je pourrais aussi continuer vous donner l'historique de ma famille, je pourrais aussi continuer pour vous dire que étant jeune homme, j'ai eu l'occasion, lorsque j'ai fini mon collège au Collège Saint-Boniface, de me présenter et d'être accepté à la GRC, d'avoir servi pendant huit ans, à travers le Canada entier, soit à Vancouver, soit dans l'Ontario, soit dans le Québec, soit dans la Saskatchewan. En 62, j'ai quitté et j'ai habité la ville de Brandon où j'étais un homme d'affaires. J'ai opéré mes affaires à Brandon pendant au-delà de onze années tout près de douze années. Il m'est important de vous le dire puisque à un certain moment donné, lorsque ma femme et moi nous avons constaté, avec nos six enfants, que lorsque nous parlions français à la maison, les enfants nous répondaient soit en anglais ou soit qui nous demandaient de répéter ce que l'on leur avait dit en français de le répéter en anglais. Alors à un moment donné, nous avons vu qu'il était très important de vendre notre commerce, de s'en revenir au patelin, soit à Saint-Boniface, de prendre des tuteurs, leur donner des enseignements en français. Et aujourd'hui je suis fier de dire que toute ma famille est parfaitement bilingue.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there are probably so many other things to say in that I certainly am not alone in that position. I say this, I have been very active in every community that I have served. Having served in Brandon on the St. Augustine Church Board for six years, I was three years as Finance Chairman; having served the Brandon University as a football coach for seven years; having been active in politics, having been a candidate in 1973 in the provincial election; having been a candidate here in St. Boniface in the last provincial election. I think that I am not unique as a Canadian. I pride myself and I pride many other Francophones in having served their community very very well in the past and no doubt there will be many others that will continue to do so. I think it's important to say, because I think that those

members of the community that serve and its people, the French Canadian community, has seen a ray of hope with the agreement that has come forward.

Now possibly we might want to say that it's a secret agreement. I rather would not want to say that, but certainly a ray of hope that in all our service to the community, even so, that we do this in a nature that it is le dévouement, de les personnes de la communauté, qui est très important. We see a ray of hope for our children.

Certainly I was successful in operating my business in Brandon. We had many very good friends in Brandon. My wife and I and the children hesitated very much to leave Brandon, but it was important to me; it was important to my wife; it was important to the generations that I represent, that my children should at least receive that chance to reflect that same Canadian heritage that I have received and that's why I moved here.

I look at the agreement and possibly I could say many things to you about the agreement, the pros and the cons, the pros and the cons of holding a plebiscite. I know that my forum is not here and I could go over all the arguments and the debates that were held at city council for or against a plebiscite, and as I have said and I will say again, once you get the answer to that plebiscite what are you, in effect, going to do with it? So it's really not the question to decide.

I think the question before you to decide and we can look at it, we can say that this agreement might not be the best of agreements. It might not be the worst of agreements. We might say that it was done secretly, although I would say that it was not. It was arrived at and then presented. Now if we want to say that was of a secret nature or that there was some great ploy being advanced, we might want to say that, I think we would be incorrect. Strategically we might have been wrong. Strategically it might have been important to have an all-parliamentary committee to discuss this agreement and to present it.

There has been a lot said that the SFM is representative of the community, the SFM is not representative of the community. There's no doubt that a few years ago on a particular issue, the SFM did not reflect the thoughts of the community and the SFM was told point-blank by that same French Canadian community that it wasn't representing their views. Rest assured that at that time, it was told point-blank by the French Canadians that you are not representing our views. Rest assured that in this issue, wholeheartedly, the community is very strongly behind the SFM in this matter. The organizations which I represent are strongly behind the agreement. Now we might debate once again strategically, if we've done the right thing or not, strategically should it have been held back, should it have been done at an all parliamentary committee, should it have gone to the courts, and so on. That's not the case. That's not what is before you. What is before you is an agreement that probably favours all Manitobans, not only the Franco community.

We, the French Canadians, are strongly behind this agreement and as I said earlier, I could probably go on and on and tell you why we feel it's important to have that agreement. I think it's evident why you should have that agreement and why it should go through and I'm here to tell you that the organizations which I belong to are strongly behind the agreement.

Thank you, members.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Just one question, Mr. Savoie. You have followed this issue recently and probably throughout your lifetime, but I just wondered whether you sometimes have thought to yourself, regardless of the outcome of this proposed legislation, that in some ways the Franco-Manitoban community would have been better off without the legislation and without the debate?

MR. G. SAVOIE: Well through you, Mr. Chairman, that's really an unknown factor whether the French Canadian community would have been better off, had the matter gone to court or not, really is not known and I can't really answer your question, Mr. Doern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern, just for clarification.

MR. R. DOERN: I was thinking, Mr. Savoie, in regard to relations with the whole community, whether you think that in one sense the Franco-Manitobans were better off in relation to the question of unity or harmony or good feelings, before this debate than after this debate?

MR. G. SAVOIE: Well there's no doubt that the debate, Mr. Chairman, through you, the debate certainly has brought about certain divisiveness, but the status quo that might or might not have remained was not acceptable either. Mr. Chairman, if I might, I use the Forest case of 1979 where very little was done after the 1979 case in front of the Supreme Court, that only 12 of our provincial laws, I believe in 1980, were passed in both languages, both official languages. I believe in 1981 there might have been two, so that status quo really, as a result of the Forest case, was not satisfactory.

MR. R. DOERN: You have said that the situation was not acceptable prior to this agreement or attempted resolution. Would you also agree that regardless of this outcome, whether it goes through amended or unamended or is thrown out the window, that this is an ongoing process, that there is no final resolution to this question, that this is a continuing live organic thing that will be discussed, even when you and I are long gone?

MR. G. SAVOIE: Mr. Chairman, through you, it's certainly ongoing, Mr. Doern, but hopefully in the near future and with the advent of the Immersion courses and so on, where our young population is going. Certainly in the near future within a generation or two, this matter should be dissolved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions? Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Mr. Savoie. I noticed in your brief that you - and I'll use the word advisedly - studiously avoided any mention of proposed amendments. Would you care

to comment on any of the proposed amendments at this time, Mr. Savoie?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Mr. Graham are you telling the Chair you're asking a question about something which was explicitly not in the brief?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I'm just being observant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your observation. Do you have a question for clarification of the contents of the brief?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I would ask Mr. Savoie if he would like to enlarge on his brief.

MR. G. SAVOIE: I would not, Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions Mr. Graham? Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You said that the Franco-Manitoban Society is clearly representative of the Francophones or French-speaking Manitobans on this question. Could you tell me on what you base this assurance of yours, and secondly could you tell me if, by the same token, you feel that the Pro-Canada group that spoke is as representative?

MR. G. SAVOIE: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Lecuyer, when I view the effort of the Franco-Manitobans on May 24th, I believe it was - I might be wrong in the date - they came from all parts of the province when the SFM asked them and posed the question, we have an agreement with the Attorney-General that will present these amendments to the Legislature, have we done your will? And at a meeting where several hours went by explaining what had been done and the reasons why; and when we see the communities from all over the province travelling at their own expense to come to the city to voice their opinion and to say to the SFM that, in effect, you are doing what we want, that tells me that this same community is definitely behind the organization.

There are other meetings and so on. I could reiterate other examples. I think that Mr. Prince's Pro-Canadien group which had its annual meeting, and I believe there were only 23 members at it, I find it difficult to suggest that so small a group would represent the total of the French-Canadian society or community or any Francophones in the province.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Savoie? Seeing none, Councillor, thank you very much for your presentation here today.

MR. G. SAVOIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom Cohoe. Tom Cohoe. Mario Sosa. Mario Sosa. Ron Nash. Ron Nash. Ivan Merritt.

MR. I. MERRITT: Sorry, I do not have a photostat of my brief here, but if anybody ever wanted I can probably get it.

Mr. Chairman, to set the tone of this brief, I quote from an informed recent publication: "The Liberal Government is using the newly adopted Canadian Constitution as the springboard for constructing a Canada that is unilingually "French." Now for those who didn't quite hear it or for those who don't want to hear it, I'm going to read it again. "The Liberal Government is using the newly adopted Canadian Constitution as the springboard for constructing a Canada that is unilingually "French." That quote didn't come from the Globe and Mail.

Now that you've got me classified as a bigot, a redneck, a racist, an intolerant, narrow-minded, prejudiced paranoid - in fact, just about everything you will find in the lexicon at "La Liberté," I'll proceed if I may. Evidently all I have to do to absolve myself of this terrible infliction is to, like flicking a light switch, just agree with Mr. Pawley, Mr. Penner, Mr. Lecuyer, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Robert, Mr. Forest and all those who habitate the same camp. Then I suddenly become an acceptable, normal, rational being.

Let it never be stated or inferred that any of you zealous proponents of official bilingualism could possibly harbour any such distorted thinking, or be alluded to as fanatics or malcontents or belly-achers or crybabies or bleeding hearts or wah wah disturbers. Those stigmas are only for those of us on the other side of the fence.

As for those professors, doctors of letters, legal minds and men of great wisdom who have appeared before you who are crying themselves to sleep every night because of the horrible injustice, the abominable persecution, the unconscionable wrong, the heartbreaking suffering, and the abuse and provocation inflicted for 100 years on these unfortunate souls, you are either very naive or are agreeable to see it happen, the francisation of Canada.

I want to ask every listener, including those of French descendency, just where would you be today - yes - just what would be your personal status today if you had not learned English? Does any language-obsessed Francophone crossing the border to the United States suffer any stigma, endure any psychological stress about operating in English? It is a fact and nobody can intelligently deny it that a great favour was extended to the French residents of this province when they were required to learn the common language. Can any one of you point out a person of any cultural descent who can in truth claim, it's not so; anyone who has been handicapped or who has experienced no benefits being conversant in English?

One speaker complained that his head was programmed English, but his heart remained French. Does he presume his heart is somehow more precious than any of German or Ukrainian or Italian or Japanese, or the heart of any person from any other heritage? Would they then have a better and more worthy and respectable heart if they were to have transplanted in them a French heart? This clamour for a predominant language identity almost seems to be approaching a childish, petty vendetta.

This past Saturday and Sunday, I observed 1,000 people with a common purpose putting together a 3,800

square foot building for worship, this from a bare foundation to a finished edifice ready to conduct their service on Sunday, all details included: framing, roofing, shingling, brickwork, doorways, windows, plumbing, heating, electrical, insulation, drywalling, taping, plastering, painting, carpentering, carpeting, cupboards, furnishings and landscaping. You should drive past and take a look, and see what really can be done by people of one mind and one language, working together in harmony to achieve a planned objective. It's a Jehovah Witness Kingdom Hall just off Waverley, about a mile south of McGillivray Boulevard.

I have no affiliation with the J.W.'s, but they certainly can show us a few lessons in co-operation that puts this English-French controversy and bickering to absolute shame with the constant tugging at each others' throats.

I am presenting this brief at the risk of offending my friends and acquaintances of French culture for whom I have a great admiration and most grateful for having known them. I want to make it abundantly clear that any remarks construed as a criticism of Francophones are not directed to the many sensible people of French descent who want to live in peace and harmony with their neighbours, those who do not want to be segregated as Francophones, who do not want to seek special status or job privileges or racial visibility. Of course, they are good people. They are friendly people. They are compassionate people. They are generous people. They are hospitable people.

If the truthful facts of the consequences of entrenchment were declared, it is very likely that if a referendum were held amongst the French population only who have been long-time residents of Manitoba - that does not include the recently arrived people from Quebec - who have not been brainwashed, the majority would vote to leave things as they are and not disturb the sleeping tiger. So why insist the doctor treat the patient who suffers no illness? The criticism is towards those agitators, those self-proclaimed guardians of our conscience, those people of whatever race who insist language should be entrenched into the law for some trumped-up vindication of some terrible wrong.

At this point, let us who are anxiously concerned be reminded that we do owe a great debt of gratitude to those members of the Legislature who demonstrated backbone, gumption and guts in vehemently opposing the passage of this divisive legislation. They who battled vigorously, unrelentingly, determinedly and constantly through long hot summer nights, demanding to sit during that infamous August long weekend, for what good purpose? Maybe a vengeful demonstration of unbending stubborn will? Was it not because of this strong opposition that consensus was finally wrestled from the reluctant government for these democratic meetings, otherwise entrenchment would now be likely on its way. Even so, knowing the dogged determination and mentality that is trying to ram it through, it is quite likely that it still will be done.

If God had written the Constitution, it would be prudent to take a closer look. But since it is written by fallible mortals, prone to error and for the reality of that day, men who could not possibly prognosticate the far distant future, then why in heaven should any sane and rational person determinately insist that we regress 100 years to invoke a fantasy, to unearth some

kind of stolen treasure he curiously believes would catapult them to a new sense of personal worth, self-fulfillment, to an unbounded joy and happiness, to a new sense of racial glory. Don't count on it in this sordid obstructed life.

I'm not here to talk about Constitutions, amendments, legalities, statutes, accords, or any of those boring man-made entrapments. You, ladies and gentlemen: of this committee, must be sick and tired, weary and worn, frazzled and frayed, exhausted and weirded from all this repetitious verbosity. I'm going to talk about common sense, reason, logic and the reality of living.

The first thing I'll take issue with is "The Big Lie," this myth that the French population in Manitoba somehow endured and suffered a torment and discrimination experienced by them exclusively. Let it be stated that French pioneers and their descendants did not experience any more trials, tribulations, hardships, discomfitures or sufferings any more than any other struggling immigrant who settled and developed this province. They, the French, were not the exclusive "choppers of the wood and carriers of water," not the primary developers of this province who has been deceitfully declared by the Secretary of State.

My father's family arrived in Manitoba with seven children during the 1880's without worldly worth or government backup. With nothing but their bare hands and a parcel of land they faced the formidable task of eeking out some means of survival. That was the early challenge - survival. During that first winter, six of those young children died. Can you possibly imagine the soul-rendering anguish that haunted that family? While that was a tragedy of the past, is it less tormenting than that which upsets the francophone today with so much fury about ghosts and wrongs of the last century?

My mother's family arrived from eastern Europe shortly after. Dropped off in the bush country wilderness on their assigned homestead, they also had the gruelling, backbreaking, tortuous struggle of wrestling a livelihood from that barren terrain or perish. Can anyone in the comfort, security and opulence of today's generation possibly comprehend the struggles faced by those early pioneers facing seasons of bitter cold and blizzards, torrid heat, hail, flood, pestiferous insects, drought, disease and all manners of obstructions? I took a walk through Brookside cemetery the other day and especially noted that most headstones of those earlier years showed life spans of less than 40 years. My mother hired out as a farm domestic, slavishly working 16 to 18 hours a day, seven days a week, performing all the tasks of drudgery, crude backwoods farm for \$2.00 a month. That's baking and milking 16 cows all by herself, churning the butter and dumping the butter out of the churn and then putting the baby's diapers in there and all sorts of things like that. This \$2.00 a month she turned over to her parents as a means to assist the survival of the family. That's 500 hours a month which calculates to slaving for less than one cent per hour. That, to me, is suffering and torment. Since my mother has now passed on, the job may be vacant. Is there anyone here who would be willing to take it on? And, in addition, to this burdensome abuse, my mother was confronted with the necessity of learning a totally new language. Should it have been French, with their dwindling population ratio dropping to below 10 percent at that time; or

should she have occupied herself more sensibly by going to some dual track immersion institution, instead of wasting her time in bed sleeping for five hours a night.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the generations of French families early in this century were fretting about petty language rights. They, like other ethnocultures, including those of British descendency, were struggling just to survive.

Taking this "fraudulent suffering" allegation a little further, I reflect on my many highly regarded associations and friendships down through the years in the workplace and socializing arena. Names, such as, Lessard, Bedard, Vermette, Roel, Sabourin, Pepin, Remillard, Doucette, they come to mind. I recall the moonlight trains to Winnipeg Beach, the revelry and good times at River Park with its roller coaster, and the many friendships I encountered in the armed forces of the Second World War, or part of an entertaining group broadcasting over the St. Boniface radio station - can you imagine an Anglophone group being welcome to use that facility today? - performing at social functions and parties in French-speaking homes, the many years of equitable employment in a French community. We worked together, we socialized together, enjoyed mutual friendships and fellowships together without realizing that our ethnic status was so totally alien and divergent. I never thought of those good and compatible friends and acquaintances of being French. I thought we all got along very well, and what's more, and the point I want to make is that I did not recognize any torment, suffering, stigma or resentment because our family lineage was different, or that I didn't speak French.

But, Mr. Chairman, whenever I encounter any person today who carries a French name, I am alerted by that name, my guard instinctively goes up. I become suspicious, defensive and apprehensive for I know that there are new legal rules of the game backed up by laws that afford distinct privileges to these newly created elitists. An inward hostility is aroused when I hear it said that French settlers developed this country, that Canada belongs to them, or when I hear a Francophone complain of having been deprived and denied of some something. Their opportunities to struggle, to work and to survive was no different than the rest of us. They were and are entitled to be employed in a free competitive workplace, equal rights to own homes, enjoy the convenience and leisure in today's living routines just like anyone else, entitled to travel, to education, to social and medical services. My God, what more can they ask, or should I say, demand?

And observing the well-adjusted, well-nourished personages of Mr. Forest, Mr. Robert and Mr. Desjardins, one is inclined to suspect they suffer no personal devastations. This language issue is stirring up animosities, driving a discordant wedge between different cultures, creating ill will, frustrations, dissensions and hostility. Is there some amongst you who would believe running two water hoses into a barrel that somehow the water can be held in separation? Official equal bilingualism cannot work, for true equality would mean every newscast, every telecast, every newspaper and publication, every piece of correspondence, every negotiated business deal, every religious service would need to be in double talk, including perhaps the bark of my dog, solely for the

exaltation and edification of a minority few. I don't want it and I don't want to pay for it.

That bad, mean government of the 1890's deserves some attention and comment. Were they really the insufferable monsters that they are being made out to have been? Take a deeper look. Mr. Lyon suggests in his expressions that the Legislature of the time committed a very wrongful act. Mr. Lyon, if you were the premier at the time, you might have done the very same sensible thing. Think about this. Thousands of immigrants, mostly illiterate, arriving from abroad, many who spoke neither English or French, like my mother. Did they not have to acquire some common media of communication in order to adjust into this divergent society? English by natural intercultural evolution emerged as the dominant language of which immigrants would be mostly exposed to. There was no law which demanded that they learn English. It was just a natural sequence of events unfolding as they became assimilated with the various English-speaking neighbourhoods.

Remember, too, that the French and some other cultures clustered into their own communities and, to a large extent, were isolated from the general influx of non-French immigrants. Did the Legislature have any of the electronic gadgetry of today, where instant translation could be achieved? Would repetitive double talk not resolve into double Legislature Session's times. Did they have tape recorders, dictaphones, phototypesetters, photocopiers, photomechanical conversion facilities to accommodate transition from the printed copy to the image carrier and thence to the high speed lithographic printing presses of today? Did they have modern-day instant communication technology and facilities, the radio, the TV, the telephone, by which they could communicate without having to even get off their butts?

Reflect on the slow, painfully slow and laborious communication and printing facilities of that day - shorthand to pick up the activities of the Legislature; transcribing into print on clumsy primitive typewriters, if such were available; letter-by-letter chasing; the make ready delay and finally the printing process on pokey letterpresses. Can you imagine the lengthy time factor, as compared with today's facilities, to record and publish their daily affairs in two languages, the exorbitant quantities of extra paper which may not have always been available, even the longer drying time of the ink of those days - all this bother and inconvenience where very limited diminishing need for French was recognized. I believe the government of the 1890's did what was prudent and sensible to avoid obstructive duplicity and get on with the job.

Yes, I would believe our former generations got along pretty well down through the years, a common bond for survival linking them together like today's generation cannot comprehend. And then came Mr. Trudeau with his divide and conquer philosophy, his French supremacy syndrome and nothing was the same again. Then began the power struggle, the confrontations, the provocations, the brainwashing, the galling impositions, the demands for rights, the inflammatory hostile and bitter resentments.

The reality remains that our basic right and fundamental need is to earn a livelihood without discrimination. The proposals now being ushered forth

are certain to resolve into a new legalized elite, who will take first priority in government jobs and promotions, who will insist on hitching a lame horse to the wagon and impeding the progress of the cargo, who will have the legal clout to trample down our accustomed democratic way of life. It cannot be any other way when two language groups struggle for supremacy. You may be familiar with an ancient custom in Peru, South America when rural Inco Indian peasants, on approaching the sacred city of Cuzco, and on encountering on the highway a resident exiting from that city, were required to bow in reverence to those privileged and esteemed city dwellers. Could something analogous to this custom perhaps eventually emerge out of this constitutional quagmire of rights this, of rights that?

I now refer back to my opening quote, "The Liberal Government is using the newly adopted Canadian Constitution as the springboard for constructing a Canada that is unilingual French." To those of you who would scoff and sneer at such a preposterous statement, be reminded that J.V. Andrew's startling book "Bilingualism today, French Tomorrow," is not a book to be found in the fiction section of any library. I have here a reproduction of a photograph of a carving above the doorway of the old Quebec City post office. It's a carving of a dog gnawing a bone and the inscription is translated to read, "I am a dog that gnaws a bone. I crouch and gnaw it all alone. The time will come which is not yet, when I will bite him by whom I am bit." Now does that have any significance, or is it just a passing thought when that was carved and inscribed?

Some other incidents which are occurring should be noted. Why does an Air Canada pilot travelling over American airspace with a cargo of predominantly Anglophones, speak to those passengers in French only? Why do so many Canadian embassies in the U.S. and around the world answer their phones in French? Why is it that the government first-choice appointments for working abroad go in inordinate proportion to Francophones? Here are two instances that were personally encountered. In Mexico, a family from Quebec, hardly able to communicate in English, is sent to a Spanish school in preparation for an instructor's job in a Bogota, Columbia furniture factory. Again, sitting at breakfast in a boarding house in Antigua, Guatemala with a family, again from Quebec, unable to communicate in English, who were posted there as a representative of the Canadian Government. Why must it be a Francophone - and you can just bet on it - who will be given priority in the selection of a candidate to first go into outer space? Why? Because the Government of Canada is determined to establish in the eyes of the foreign lands that this is a French country, and the next steps will follow through as if it is being done in Quebec. Language by law.

May I now reflect on the economic side of this malaise. Supposing an agent of the Federal Government of Canada dropped by and asked you if you would donate \$1,000 of your family income to establish official bilingualism in Canada, would you run without hesitation or delay for your checkbook? Are you proponents of this swamping of the ship of state so dedicated that you would jeopardize your financial stability and that of your posterity? Well the Government

of Canada is doing it, anyway, with your tax dollars and extravagantly continuing without consulting with you or seeking your permission. They have gouged a sum of approximately \$1,000 from every average Canadian taxpayer to ram this insidious imposition right down the gullets of every Canadian citizen, into the very heart and soul of the people. Does it really serve you, and I, or even any Francophone any useful and worthwhile purpose outside of Quebec? It's creating an artificial environment, it's fleecing us of a hefty sum of our hard-earned dollars. It's eroding our tolerance for one another, it's helping to jeopardize the future security of the up and coming generations which may be faced with a bankrupt economy, insolvent pension funds, and property taxes so high that hardly anyone could afford to own and live in a private home. How we could all use that money in a more beneficial way, if not for ourselves, for other unfortunates in our land and abroad.

With perhaps as many as 99 percent of the people of Canada outside of Quebec able to communicate in English, what then is the reality of it all? The reality is it's pampering and coddling an ego at an enormous and crushing cost in taxpayers' dollars and social division. I'll say it again, "It's pampering and coddling an ego."

It's retarding scientific and technological progress. It was recently reported that the United States has approximately five times as many research scientists as Canada - this while the Liberal Government laboriously preoccupies itself with language and culture and probably even motivating scientific and professional talent to leave the country.

The Trudeau Constitution and The Official Languages Act is doing more harm and damage and wrecking to the moral fibre of this country than any piece of legislation ever enacted in Parliament.

With the umbrella of minority control descending upon us you can have my copy of "O Canada" and the "Maple Leaf Flag." They are taking on a tainted odor. To paraphrase an old limerick: "The sermon now ended, each turned and descended, the eels went on eeling, the pikes went on stealing. Much disturbed were they as they went on their own way."

Thank you. Que les vaya bien.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Merritt. Questions for Mr. Merritt? Mr. Ashton.

MR. S. ASHTON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to get a clarification of your brief, your basic argument. If I understand you correctly, you're saying then that you're against French services in Manitoba, not just entrenchment, but French services period? Everything should be served in English.

MR. I. MERRITT: I don't think it should go any further than it is at the moment with Article 23 as it stands, with the translations as needed, with services where they are needed, not to go into the heart and soul of Manitoba, where very very few people are.

MR. S. ASHTON: So basically you are saying that because English is the majority there should be only English services.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Malinowski: Mr. Ashton.

MR. I. MERRITT: Quite probably, yes.

MR. S. ASHTON: So you think the key factor is the fact that it's a majority in this area? The reason I'm asking is, you know, what do you do, for example, in other areas of Canada where French is the majority language. Are you saying then at the same time that . . .

MR. I. MERRITT: I think they should have the language that they prefer, and it should not be legislated. I don't think language should be in the Constitution at all. It should just grow and develop as the community requires.

MR. S. ASHTON: The reason I'm asking is that it's interesting that you mention about it shouldn't be in the Constitution. What do you do when the Constitution guarantees those rights? You are obviously a law-abiding citizen. Certainly, I'm sure, you follow the laws of the land. What do you do in a situation where the Constitution guarantees those rights? Don't you think it is only fair that they be followed just the same way as you would enforce, say, a speeding ticket or . . .

MR. I. MERRITT: I would suspect that everybody at this table did not have a chance, an opportunity to vote on the Constitution. It was rammed through by political force. If we had any opportunity to speak on it, I'm very very sure that they would not have put it through with this Charter of Rights.

MR. S. ASHTON: But for example, Manitoba's Constitution, which was originally The Manitoba Act, was passed and it did recognize both languages.

MR. I. MERRITT: I have no objection to . . .

MR. S. ASHTON: Isn't it only fair that we live up that agreement, or are you suggesting that we don't live up to it?

MR. I. MERRITT: Unfortunately, what the Constitution was - could I say abolished in 1890? Okay. The government seemed to have had a good reason for doing it, and they did it, got our community involved in the English language and we seem to have got along very well. I can certainly see that reverting this at this time and creating the duplicity that's going to come about is not called for.

MR. S. ASHTON: So basically you're saying, we should ignore the 1870 Manitoba Act?

MR. I. MERRITT: We haven't ignored it. It's in the books right now. I don't agree with it, but it's there and I wouldn't object to it.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Merritt, you talked about your aversion to bilingualism. Can you put a date on that? Was that 1968, or what period of time did you start feeling some concern about this question?

MR. I. MERRITT: At the beginning, at the time that the three parties came together and promoted the concept of bilingualism. Yes, that's when I . . . around the 1970s.

MR. R. DOERN: On the Manitoba scene prior to this proposal that the Pawley administration is supporting, did you have any strong aversion to provincial policies, for example, back in the Roblin days or the Schreyer days or the Weir days or the Lyon days?

MR. I. MERRITT: No, I never had any aversion to what was in the laws or the conduct of our lives of that day, no not at all.

MR. R. DOERN: Were you aware of the fact that there was some enrichment or extension of services to Franco-Manitobans in the last 10 to 15 or 20 years?

MR. I. MERRITT: I didn't become aware of it until after the court case which absolved the parking ticket.

MR. R. DOERN: Did you then feel an aversion or reaction to those extensions, or did you accept them?

MR. I. MERRITT: I didn't accept them, no.

MR. R. DOERN: You didn't accept them?

MR. I. MERRITT: No.

MR. R. DOERN: Is one of your objections to the present arrangement the fact that this is an entrenchment, there is an entrenchment feature in regard to French Language Services?

MR. I. MERRITT: Very much so. Entrenchment to me means a continual growth of French services by demand and demand and demand, which will create a great burden on the taxpayers of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: So you would accept a government policy in principle, but you would not accept entrenchment in principle?

MR. I. MERRITT: True.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions for Mr. Merritt from members of the committee? Seeing none, Mr. Merritt, thank you very much for your presentation?

Luba A. Kwasney. Luba A. Kwasney. Dr. Joe Slogan.

DR. J. SLOGAN: Does everybody have a copy of the brief?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's being handed out now.

DR. J. SLOGAN: Can I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just wait one moment, please. Please proceed.

DR. J. SLOGAN: Mr. Chairman, distinguished committee members, my fellow Canadians, this submission, I think you may find a little bit mild. It's probably mild because it's a consensus of the opinions of three of our major ethnic groups. I know there has been a lot of discussion here regarding the composition or who various spokesmen represent, and I would like to perhaps - I'd be happy to answer questions later, but just as a matter of introduction, my name is Joe Slogan, and I am the national President of the Ukrainian Professional and Business Federation of Canada, which is comprised of about 25 clubs from Victoria to Halifax. But I'm not here in that regard, even though we endorse this brief. I'm here as a member of the local Ukrainian Canadian Professional and Business Club, and a member of what we call the Tri Club.

When we originally decided to have a presentation, we were contacted by the German Canadian Professional and Business Club, and we decided that we would have a joint presentation. They have delegated me to be their spokesman, and so this brief is submitted jointly by the German Canadian Professional and Business Club of Manitoba, the Polish Canadian Professional and Business Association, and the Ukrainian Canadian Professional and Business Club of Winnipeg.

Yesterday, I was speaking to one of the staff members here. He looked at this brief and he looked at the heading and he said something to the effect, my God, if my father saw the three groups here in a united way, he would turn over in his grave. It's quite true that we represent various ethnic groups that perhaps in the past, in the old countries, did fight and molest one another. I think it's something that we want to bring to this committee, the idea that we're all Canadians. We're all Manitobans. We are all members of our own ethnic groups and cultural backgrounds, and that basically we are proud of the fact that we can forget and forgive, and that we hope that we can be an example to other groups in Manitoba as good citizens showing mutual respect for one another.

Each of the above associations represents the professional and business people of our respective ethnic communities. Our three clubs join on occasions through each year as the Tri Club of Winnipeg to socialize and to demonstrate their respect and propensity for one another. On crucial political issues such as the entrenchment of language rights and services which we feel may be detrimental to the welfare and harmonious existence of Manitoban minorities, we ask that our unified voice be given serious consideration. We believe that our three clubs are equitably representative of the major ethnic groups in Manitoba contributing substantially to the development of the great Canadian West during the past century.

I would like to maybe as an appendix to this presentation just to pass out some statistics which come out of the Small Business Magazine in their current issue, which give the cultural statistics for the City of Winnipeg. I would ask permission if these would be passed around just to be of general interest.

The building of the CPR Railway during the Government of Sir John A. MacDonald and completed in 1885 still stands as the greatest national accomplishment. In order to settle the vast empty expanses of Western Canada which were being

threatened with annexation by the United States, the Government of Sir Wilfred Laurier and his Minister of the Interior, Sir Clifford Sifton, undertook a major colonization program. I want to explain that word, "colonization" in a minute. Vast numbers of European settlers arrived, often many from the same villages in their respective countries, settling together in clusters or colonies throughout Manitoba and the Western Prairies. Thus we find villages and districts comprised almost entirely of German, Ukrainian, French or Polish or even other backgrounds.

Whatever differences these groups may have abandoned in their Native lands, they each faced and epic struggle to together sustain and establish themselves in a rugged new land that was not the "land of milk and honey," which was painted by the government's colonization agents in Europe. I think you probably are aware that the Federal Government did have agents throughout Eastern Europe who paid five dollars for the head of each family they sent out to Canada and \$3.00 for each additional member. So it was largely in their interest to paint a very very rosy picture of Canada to these people.

These brave colonists faced economic hardship, of poverty, the dismal realities of drought, grasshoppers and extreme weather, and the social peril of being isolated in a strangely new and foreign land. Facing these mean adversities bred a character of new Canadians, uniquely western, which nurtured a harmonious relationship between various communities, giving the strength needed for the prairie provinces to survive and grow. It is estimated that German, Ukrainian and Polish colonists broke and brought some 15 million acres of land into agricultural production in Western Canada. They helped build the railways and the towns and cities throughout the west. Surely, we, too, therefore, can lay equal claim to be "founding races" in Western Canada.

We submit again, as we had previously submitted to the Federal Government prior to the Victoria conference that Canada is a multicultural nation with many languages, two of which English and French are official. Further, that every ethnic group in Canada has a natural right to the pursuit of its own language, religion and cultural identity.

In 1963, Prime Minister Pearson announced the creation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Nothing could have been more disuniting for the peoples of other ethnic origins comprising over a quarter of a nation's population. The very name of the commission precluded any role for ethnocultural groups other than the Anglo-Celtic and the French. The commission was asked to make recommendations designed to ensure the bilingual and basically bicultural character of the federal administration of Canada. Because of representations by a group such as ours, the terms of reference were amended to also include the contributions made by other cultures. I think it was self-evident to anybody that there is more than two cultures in Canada. Subsequently when the first volume of the report appeared in 1967, the commission proposed a new version of Section 133 of the BNA Act which in addition to providing a more extensive recognition of the French language, Subsection 5 was added which states: "nothing in this section shall be taken to diminish or restrict the use, as established by

present or future law or practice, of any other language in Canada."

At this time, I must extend my congratulations to the Attorney-General for proposing a new section 23.9 which basically says the very same thing as in this section I just mentioned. We are certainly all in favour of it.

Today, Manitoba is a very different province than when it was formed in 1870 as a small isolated colony with a meagre population composed primarily of Anglo-Saxons, French and a Native mix. Because Manitoba as well as Canada is a society which is constantly changing, there is an inherent risk when politicians begin to tamper with something as basic as the Constitution of Canada. Nevertheless we can be thankful that both levels of government have seen fit to seek public response and have modified their actions to reflect the democratic reality of the conditions today.

Thus it was that Prime Minister Trudeau announced in 1971 that Canada was a multicultural country and that culturally all groups are equal and no group should feel superior to any other. Subsequently the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, the Molgat-MacGuigan Committee, reported in 1972 including as its fifth recommendation which stated that a new Canadian Constitution would have a preamble "which would proclaim basic objectives of Canadian federal democracy." Four of the six basic objectives which were recommended for inclusion in the preamble, would have affected the protection of minority rights:

1. To protect and enhance basic human rights.
2. To develop Canada as a bilingual and multicultural country in which all its citizens, male and female, young and old, Native people and Metis and all groups from every ethnic origin, feel equally at home.
3. To promote economic, social and cultural equality for all Canadians as individuals and to reduce economic disparities.
4. To present Canada as a pluralistic mosaic, a free and open society which challenges the talents of her people.

Furthermore, in Bill C-60, the proposed constitutional amendment of mid-summer 1978, it was stated that the aims of the Canadian federation shall be:

"(ii) to ensure throughout Canada equal respect for the many origins, creeds and cultures . . . that help shape its society and for those Canadians who are a part of each of them . . ."

However the Charter submitted in 1982 contained a watered down provision as is indicated in Schedule B, Part 1, Section 27 of The Constitution Act, which states:

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

The reason I bring these things up is our group had made representations. We are a bit disappointed that in the end we ended up with Section 27 that is not much stronger than it is. We're happy and thankful that it is included but it's strictly an interpretive section and I think before the courts it may have difficulty in standing up.

Coming closer to Manitoba, we are not opposed to the provision of government services in the French language where the population numerically warrants such and where a demand is veritably demonstrated. The action of the Provincial Government in implementing this constitutional amendment is understandable within the concept of a bilingual Canada with two official languages and in the context of a French-Canadian Prime Minister who is dedicated to the implementation of his ideologies throughout Canada by constitutional enshrinement. However, it is really the manner and degree by which the policy is implemented that will determine its acceptability by the general populace of this province.

We believe that many of the French communities in Manitoba, unlike those in Quebec, are well integrated into the English-speaking society, as are those of other ethnic backgrounds.

Now if you want me to give you an example, we can use my own Ukrainian background and I could say that 85 percent of Ukrainians in Manitoba today, and in Canada as a matter of fact, arrived before the First World War between 1891 and 1914, which is several generations ago. Ten percent arrived after the First World War and then the inter-war period from 1918 to 1939. Five percent arrived after the Second World War and those were mostly refugees who arrived in the first five years or so after the war; and basically, in the last 30 years, there have been virtually no new immigrants of Ukrainian origin coming into Canada. This is not quite strictly the same for people of German background and even Polish background. This is what we mean by saying that our groups are relatively well integrated into our present society.

Therefore we are concerned that the extension of French Language Services should not produce discord among and within our various communities, especially if it is generated by unreasonable and artificial demands created by extremist groups from outside such communities and from outside the province. In other words, what we are saying, we endorse the idea of providing service in French, where that service can be of genuine benefit to the community and where it is required and we are against extension in those areas where perhaps an artificial need is created, especially by outside groups coming in and agitating for it, especially those from outside the province.

We have serious concerns about the tremendous cost of the translation and publication of existing provincial acts for which there has been little demand. Now that sentence is in there because one of the groups were very concerned about the cost of translating all the laws of Manitoba since Confederation and because, I believe, in answer to a question in the Legislature, the cost per unit or per act, where any demand was demonstrated, in other words, where anybody asked for the act, was a tremendous lot of money. I think there's an act regarding piano tuners, and it seems to me that that type of an act would hardly need to be translated, unless it was called for.

And we have grave concerns about what is in store for our civil servants based on experience manifested at the federal level where devoted and qualified employees find their career paths substantially narrowed because of an inability to perform in the French language, whether or not such ability is crucial

to the delivery of adequate local services. Manitoba civil servants who are bilingual in languages, other than French, express anxiety about their opportunities for advancement, even though that "other" language would be more useful at a particular location. I think somebody said that there's a tradition in Dauphin, for instance, of having agricultural representatives who could speak Ukrainian in that area, and what we're saying here is that we're concerned that, by the extension of French services, that it would not impinge on that type of a situation where the service being provided by a bilingual civil servant in another language is far more beneficial to that community.

If I wanted to refer to my earlier situation at the federal level, I recall in one instance, when I was a member of Parliament, we had a post office appointment come up. It happened to be a Civil Service appointment and there were six or seven applicants. The person getting it was French-English bilingual, although there probably was not more than one French family in the whole community, if that much, and others who could have served the local community better were overlooked.

Also I'm referring here to discussions I've had with senior civil servants in Ottawa, especially those say also in Montreal, who really fear that not being completely bilingual is going to harm their advancement within the Civil Service.

We, therefore, request that the amendments would include a guarantee that members of other ethnic roots will not be discriminated against in Civil Service selections by a requirement of being bilingually French-English, where other linguistic combinations would be more useful to the community, and that is really the gist of why we're here. We do have a real concern in this regard and we would like some statement from the government to the effect that what they are doing will not sort of discriminate against other Manitobans.

In conclusion:

1. We accept and endorse the proposition that Canada is a multilingual and multicultural community with two official languages, English and French. Where we're departing from there is, basically, I think we're stating an evident fact. Canada, we already know it's multicultural, but Canada is also a multilingual country, because all you have to do is walk down the streets of Montreal or Vancouver or Winnipeg or anywhere else, and you can see it's a multilingual country. We accept the fact that two of those languages, English and French are official. We would like though not to overlook the fact, and have it mentioned more often, that Canada really is a country of many languages, and it's not unique in this regard, because there are many countries where there are hundreds of languages spoken.

2. We accept and endorse the desirability of serving Manitoba communities in either or both languages where there is an expression of significant need and genuine demand by the local community for such services. We are not concerned about what the government is doing. We're more concerned about how it is doing it.

3. We are concerned that the implementation of extended French Language Services may infringe upon the equal opportunity in employment of civil servants, and I should add, of other Manitobans.

4. Particularly we urge that where a civil servant can serve a local community better, because of his knowledge of English and the heritage language spoken in the local community, that the candidate be extended the same privilege of preference as those for French communities. Maybe that's going a little bit beyond what some others have talked about and it's something that we really do feel, in Manitoba particularly, that is deserving.

5. Language is a sensitive and essential element in the preservation and practice of a culture. We commend the province on the opportunities it has created for the learning of heritage language in the schools of the province and we urge that this policy be maintained and equally entrenched. In this regard I think congratulations are due to both sides. I recall, in 1978, being part of a delegation meeting with then Premier Lyon and his Minister of Education, where we requested immersion programs in Ukrainian and so forth, and we are thankful that these were introduced and we're equally thankful that the present government is continuing those and we hope that they will be extended.

The actions of government must reflect the consensus of the majority of the populace. The only thing I want to add here is that there is no such thing as a majority group, because even the Anglo-Saxons in Winnipeg are a little better than perhaps a third, and when we talk in a national situation, we almost refer now as to one-third, one-third and one-third. Since politicians are entrusted with responsible action to reflect the needs of the community we, therefore, urge the government, and the opposition, to approach this sensitive issue in a co-operative and enlightened manner which will preserve the harmonious relationships amongst the multicultural peoples of Manitoba, rather than spawn discord and divisiveness, as is becoming more and more evident.

We end with a quotation from Mr. Trudeau when he proclaimed multiculturalism, "If freedom of choice is in danger for some ethnic groups, it is in danger for all. It is the policy of this government to eliminate any such danger and to safeguard this freedom." And we honestly and truly hope that both this government and Mr. Trudeau would follow those words to the letter.

That is my submission, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Brown.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did not detect anywhere in the brief whether Dr. Slogan is in favour, or his group that he reports, is in favour of the courts deciding the extent of French services in Manitoba, or the Legislature making that decision? I wonder if I would have a comment as to what his group - the group that he represents - what they would think of that issue?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Our brief, Mr. Chairman, really reflects the consensus aspects of these three groups and there are obviously differences of opinion also on certain things, such as, a referendum and, such as, a reference either to the courts or by constitutional amendment. If I do express an opinion, I can say that this isn't an

opinion necessarily of these three ethnic groups. Basically, I think we did not - to answer you indirectly I suppose - we are not against what the government is proposing as far as entrenchment. We even go so far as to say that we are in agreement with it, from the point of view that we feel that what happened in 1916 probably could be avoided in the future if there are some constitutional entrenchments. As an individual - I wasn't here to hear Dr. Shaw, but I read about some of the things he said and that. If we looked at it from a Canadian point of view, I think the people of Quebec probably would prefer to get a court decision because it would help them to get equal rights in the Province of Quebec.

To answer your question, I really can't answer it, because it's a question that we didn't reach a consensus upon between our three groups.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions? Ms. Dolin.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: There's a story out of Ottawa just this afternoon that I think perhaps we are aware of. At least, some of us are aware of, that the three major parties have agreed to ask Manitoba to move ahead on the entrenchment of French Language Services. This is something that has been in the wind for awhile, that they were meeting. The story we have now is that they have agreed to ask Manitoba to move ahead. What would your organizations, or what would you, yourself, have to say about that? How would that fit with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. The questions asks for comments on a matter which was not touched upon in the brief and is actually extraneous to the material contained in the brief.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Would it relate then to the difference between a court decision and the legislative move?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair can't answer questions as to how you should ask your question.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I'm asking it in that manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could rephrase, but the reference to . . .

DR. J. SLOGAN: Could I speak to it? I can't answer that directly, because I am delegated to speak here on three associations and I have some opinions. Obviously if any of these associations had presented this brief by themselves, it would be a much stronger brief and take probably much stronger positions. If I presented the brief on my own behalf, it would be so, too.

There is one little thing - I would like to answer that more philosophically - I think that it's the kind of approach that our three groups would take. We have come through a decade, I would say, of constitutional turmoil. The result of that has been the patriation of the Constitution which I think is a very great and admirable thing. It's a great achievement, that's probably what Mr. Trudeau will go down in history for; but the price for that is another story.

When Mr. Diefenbaker brought in his Bill of Rights he didn't bring it in as a constitutional amendment because he knew that it would vetoed by the Province of Quebec, so he had to bring it in as a bill. The fact of the matter is that there are really two philosophies. You know, B.D., before Diefenbaker, every ethnic person felt himself as an inferior person in Canada. The one thing that John Diefenbaker did - and I'm not trying to be political or anything, I'm just trying to give you a philosophy, because this is probably the greatest thing he'll go down in history for - he made every Canadian proud of being Canadian, period.

He wanted to do away with hyphenated Canadianism, period. He wanted the world to be colour blind, and he wanted Canada to be unhyphenated. He really believed this, he actually believed he had a calling from God to bring this about. The fact of the matter is that, as a result of this one man becoming Prime Minister of Canada, I think that every Canadian is proud of being a Canadian. But the fact of the matter is, when he said, I am a Canadian - and this is how he starts his introduction to the Bill of Rights - when he says, I am a Canadian, he didn't mean that's a unilingual Canadian or unicultural Canadian or anything else; what he meant is, we're Canadians, first, with every person being guaranteed equal rights as far as culture, the use of their own language - I'm talking about official languages now and this type of thing. That's the legacy that he left behind.

In some cases it wasn't easy. Our own group, for instance, one thing he wanted to do, and he did a number of things, he brought in bilingual translation of the House of Commons, bilingual cheques. He appointed the first French Governor-General; yet, he came out as being anti-French.

For instance, in the 1961 census when the census forms were being prepared, because he believed in unhyphenated Canadianism, he wanted to take out the question, "What is your nationality?" because he felt that people could answer Canadian there. What's your racial origin?

It was my own group, the Ukrainian Canadians, that protested very strongly to him to have it put back in for the simple reason is they wanted to get a head count which, from a philosophical point of view, was not good.

Then when bilingualism and biculturalism came in under Mr. Pearson, what happened is it divided people into three classes. You were a first-class Canadian if you were Anglo-Saxon; you were a second-class Canadian if you were French; the other ones weren't even considered, so obviously they were way down the lot in third-class Canadian. Ever since that time we've got this problem of being hyphenated and it's become a fad. Right now, in Canada, it's a fad to be ethnic. I'm proud to be ethnic. Everywhere you go you get all these different dances and everything, which is a grand thing. It is an admission that we're a multicultural country and so forth, and that we're free to practise this.

What I'm afraid of is, I preferred the old style philosophy, because I think it was much better for the country. I think if we talked about it less and practised more, we won't have these differences. I would rather for the Legislature to say, go ahead and have your bilingual schools, as indeed they have said, and I would

rather not have to worry about it. But with all this talk of bilingualism and biculturalism and the official status of the French and English language, as the chap before me, Mr. Merritt said, suddenly you get alerted, you become cognizant of the differences between you, instead of what binds you together.

Basically in this brief, we're not trying to preach differences to you, or tell you what we're opposed to, we are basically telling you what we are in agreement with you with, and what we're concerned about. I know that doesn't answer your question but, when it comes down to these constitutional amendments and that, you can look at it two ways. From one aspect, I would rather we practised all this and didn't talk about it, rather than having to put everything down in writing because anyone can get around it. You can't put everything down in writing, it's very difficult. I would rather get that old Diefenbaker philosophy back, and let's all say we're proud of being Canadians, and yet be proud of whatever ethnic background you are.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Dr. Slogan, incidentally just in passing, the Minister mentioned that there was a decision or something. My information is that the caucuses will decide tomorrow.

My question is just on your last point that under Prime Minister Trudeau you said that, before Mr. Diefenbaker, ethnic people felt like second-class citizens. Now we are after the Diefenbaker era, and I'm asking you . . .

DR. J. SLOGAN: We feel like third class now.

MR. R. DOERN: That's the question. Do ethnic people, once again, feel like second-class citizens, or are you saying third-class citizens?

DR. J. SLOGAN: I don't think that's quite the case. I don't think you can ever regress back to the place where we were before Diefenbaker. I could use a lot of incidents, and I could tell you a lot of incidents affecting Mr. Diefenbaker himself, but there is no doubt about it that there is an undercurrent of hostility, because we feel that one ethnic group, which we can accept wholly, say the French in Manitoba, are trying to get a preferential position.

As I mentioned, the way Manitoba was colonized, actually the French are a minority. If you look at your figures, there are fewer French-Canadians in Manitoba than there are either German-Canadians or Ukrainian-Canadians, individually and so forth, but they have certain entrenched rights. Maybe when the Constitution was formed in 1867, it recognized a fact as it occurred at that time. When The Manitoba Act was passed in 1870, it also recognized the situation as it was at that time, but these things are constantly changing. Our whole society is amorphous.

If you look at those statistics you only have to go back 20 years and you will see what the situation is with the so-called coloured minorities. They were a very minor group. Now, with the recent immigrations there are more and more of these people coming in, and they have specific problems.

Now, for instance, with education, their problems and our problems are quite different. What is our problem in education? We are afraid that our fourth and fifth generation children can no longer speak their mother tongues. Let me give you an example, in 1941, 95 percent of those of Ukrainian origins still spoke their mother tongue. If you look at it today, in those statistics right here in Winnipeg, I think that figure is down to around 50 percent. That's as equally applicable to the Jewish community or the Polish community or the German community or any of the older communities. The problem with our newer immigrants, as it was for us in 1916, was the fact that they want their children to learn English. They want their children to be socialized into the Canadian culture. We're trying to preserve something we're losing; they already have their language, their children speak their language in their homes fluently, their children know their culture because they lived in it, they are now in a new situation. This is a basic difference in the thrust that we would have as older ethnic groups and some of the new ones. I'm not criticizing them in any way for that, I'm just saying it's a distinction that probably hasn't been brought to anybody's attention.

We don't want, as ethnic groups, we're not asking for government services. I don't want Ukrainian government services in the municipalities or anywhere else. What I would like is if some old Ukrainian person comes in, or Jewish person, or anybody, and they can't speak English, that they might be able to get an interpreter. Even in his Bill of Rights, John Diefenbaker guaranteed that, to some degree, in the courts at least.

So, we're not demanding that at all, and we don't want these languages to become official, but we are concerned in the educational field because we want to preserve our mother culture. I think I got way off the track.

MR. R. DOERN: I can see that you're a budding politician.

DR. J. SLOGAN: No, I'm a statesman now, Russ; that's a defeated politician.

MR. R. DOERN: A statesman or a judge. Dr. Slogan, if there is an extension of French Language Services in Manitoba, what will be the impact on the number of students who study the Ukrainian language?

DR. J. SLOGAN: There is no doubt about the fact that there is a great emphasis on learning French, and there is no doubt about it that even within our own ethnic group, and I'm sure it's equally true of others, that now our learning heritage languages, that - and I can go by the concern of teachers who teach these languages - they are losing students to the learning of French. Now the thrust in the Ukrainian community is that you should become trilingual. Whether that's a reality or not, I don't know. I mean in North America, particularly, we are not attuned to learning languages. If you see an educated person from Europe they speak four or five languages. Even in England, they tend to speak several languages. In North America, we're strictly English and we feel that that's the only language in the world. If we travel anywhere, we expect to be served

in English because we're Canadians or Americans, Americans more so than we do.

I really think, Mr. Doern, that we're going to lose students and make it much more difficult to get sufficient to maintain classes. If there is even more emphasis placed on French, especially if it's going to be a condition of getting a job in Manitoba.

MR. R. DOERN: Dr. Slogan, there are new so-called ethnic groups being spawned or formed almost every day. We keep hearing of some new association that's come out of the woodwork to support the government's legislation; can you tell me when each of the three organizations that you're representing today were formed?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Our Ukrainian Professional and Business Men's Club of Winnipeg was formed 40 years ago, this year. It's our 40th anniversary, so, that's '43. I think the German and Polish would have been somewhere in that area, the German it might have been a bit later because of the war and so forth.

The overall umbrella organization for the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, and it was formed in 1940. It's having its national triennial convention this weekend in Winnipeg. It has about 30 national organizations that it is an umbrella for, and it's the one that actually speaks for the whole Ukrainian community.

MR. R. DOERN: To what extent does Myron Spolsky speak for Ukrainian Canadians in Manitoba?

DR. J. SLOGAN: I'd rather not answer that question.

MR. R. DOERN: To what extent would you say that your organization speaks for or reflects Ukrainian Canadians in Manitoba?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Let's speak about the Ukrainian Business and Professional Club. We are affiliated with the Federation of Ukrainian Professional and Business Associations across Canada who are a constituent organization of the Ukrainian Canadian committee. If you want I do have a list of them, there are about 30, we're a national organization.

Our role in the umbrella organization across the country is primarily to prepare briefs, particularly to the Federal Government and to relate to the Provincial Government. When we prepare these briefs, because we do have a lot of academics in our community. We then take this brief to the presidium or the executive of the Ukrainian Canadian committee who sanctions it and then when these briefs are presented they usually, if we're the ones presenting it, we usually are accompanied by the President of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

MR. R. DOERN: The Franco-Manitoban Society receives some \$650,000 a year from the Federal Government; do you receive any federal funding?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Are you talking about our club? Well, I must say that, for the first time, we did receive \$2,500 this year because we held a national convention in Winnipeg which we hold biennially. It's a tradition I think

here, where you hold a national convention, that the city, the province and the Federal Government do make contributions. The city, I think, gave us \$300 towards one banquet; I think the province gave us \$1,500 towards another luncheon, at which Mr. Pawley spoke; and the Federal Government also gave us a grant of \$2,500 which was mostly to fund speakers and to produce the proceedings of this convention. That's the only funding we get.

MR. R. DOERN: You received under a particular program \$2,500?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Yes.

MR. R. DOERN: But there are not ongoing grants to your organization?

DR. J. SLOGAN: No. It came to our club because we were the host club, but it really came to the federation which is a national organization.

MR. R. DOERN: Are there any ongoing federal funds being given to the Polish or the German Business and Professional Clubs?

DR. J. SLOGAN: I'm really not aware of that, I couldn't answer that question.

MR. R. DOERN: Now, you say on Page 4 of your brief that you are concerned that the extension of French Language Services should not produce discord amongst and within our various communities, has it?

DR. J. SLOGAN: At this point, I can't say that it has, but I do think it depends to the extent that the government services are extended. As we say, if it's in a locality where they're principally French-speaking people and that, I think we think that's a good service that they could provide. But if suddenly, they're going to start impinging on say other communities, where there are very very few French people for instance, and where this is going to hurt somebody, particularly because he cannot speak French in the way of employment, whether it be in government employment or other employment, because obviously when government services are going to be extended in certain language in a certain locality, private institutions in that area are going to be affected to a large degree and have to provide that same services - I'm talking about banks and other institutions such as that. So we are concerned about it and we are waiting to see just how far the government's going to really know what position we can take on it.

MR. R. DOERN: Do you have any concerns about the fact that by entrenching certain positions in the proposal that this could in fact be the thin edge of the wedge and could lead to significant increases in the years ahead?

DR. J. SLOGAN: It usually is the thin edge of the wedge, but constitutional amendments are very very hard to come by, and the fact of the matter is, I think we're being realistic in saying, all right, for the past 10 years

we've had this constitutional battle; now we're still going on with it. If that's the way it's got to go, fine, as long as it's temporary, as long as it's reasonable, as long as it's applied in such a way that it will not hurt us. On the other hand too, there is some gain to be had, if we can get some of our minority rights entrenched at the same time, but it's not the way we wanted to see things go. We would rather see things develop and then a constitutional amendment be a recognition of something that exists traditionally and by custom over a number of years and eventually reaches the Constitution, rather than having it go into the Constitution and being sort of impinged upon society.

MR. R. DOERN: Have you ever argued or thought that Ukrainian and German should be official languages in Manitoba?

DR. J. SLOGAN: No, not at all.

MR. R. DOERN: You do appear to be arguing though to an extent that in terms of employment opportunities, that there should be some recognition and some allocation of positions to people who may speak Polish, Ukrainian or German, depending on local conditions?

DR. J. SLOGAN: I think that's a recognition of fact. In other words, I think the government, whichever government might be in power, would want to serve the people to the best of its ability and I think if you go into an area that's say Icelandic and you want to teach them how to fish and they can't speak English, maybe it would be better to have somebody who could speak Icelandic and it would be much better than having a translator do it for them. It's the same thing if you went into a primarily German community and you want to teach them how to grow sunflowers, maybe it would be better to have somebody that could explain it to these people in that language. But we never, I don't think, have come out with the idea that this should be entrenched or that this should become an official language. What we're saying, if we're reasonable people and we're trying to provide a reasonable service to the taxpayers of this province who fund the government, that these type of realities should come naturally.

MR. R. DOERN: On your last paragraph on Page 5, you say, "The actions of government must reflect the consensus of the majority of the populace." Politically, how do you understand it? Is that a recommendation for all party support or is that for an overwhelming vote of confidence in the government through a referendum or can this only be obtained at the time of an election? How would you measure?

DR. J. SLOGAN: It's a difficult thing and as a former politician, it's a hard thing to explain, but I think basically what we're trying to say here is that the actions of the government, if they merely reflect the view or the needs of a small minority, that they're really not truly reflective. At the same time, we've got to say that if you want to protect minority rights, you cannot do it through sort of majority consensus because of the fact that whatever the minority is and whatever the majority is - the majority may not be Anglo-Saxon or French, it could be

Ukrainian and German for instance against say the Filipino's or something like that - that overall the actions of government should have the approval of the majority of the populace and whether that approval is formal or not, but it certainly should reflect what the general consensus is.

MR. R. DOERN: Would you say that the best mechanism for that is a plebiscite or a general election or what would you see as evidence of that?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Well in a democracy, I guess the ultimate plebiscite is having a general election at which the government is judged, and if the actions are not liked by a majority of the people, they obviously change governments. The idea of a plebiscite or a referendum was discussed by our three clubs and we decided not to take a decision on it. There's two sort of views on that. One view is that it will reflect the will of the community, but it is really not binding on government anyway. In the matter of minority rights, we feel that what you're doing here is a better way of gaining a knowledge of what the community feels and doing what is right, even if that right is going to guarantee maybe just a small community their rights.

MR. R. DOERN: So, Dr. Slogan, when the committee is confronted with the very difficult task of writing a report on the hearings, then how do we incorporate your concerns in that report?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Okay, we have two basic concerns. One of those basic concerns is somewhat alleviated by the amendment that the Attorney-General brought in, which is the new Section 23.9. It's not perhaps all as positive as we would have liked, but at least in a negative way it does guarantee us some respect and enjoyment of our privileges. What we would also like because we are primarily concerned in our communities with the preservation of our culture through education, if we're going to go the route of entrenchment which is obviously what the government is going about, then we would also like to have the language rights, as presently say enjoyed, in some cases these enjoyments are only in a pilot project and could be taken away very easily, but we would like those rights entrenched probably in a new section of The Manitoba Act.

I think this is being considered and I've actually seen drafts of this section and there is one thing that alarms me about the draft I've seen and I'm sure that it will be changed, because the draft I have seen says something like - let me refresh my memory. What we basically would like to see is something like this and if it was in a national Constitution, it would serve Quebec as well. It would say that children in elementary and secondary schools will be taught in the majority language of the province in which they reside. Basically that would state that in Quebec they'd be taught in French and in the rest of Canada, they'd be taught in English, which is the reality. But in addition where there is a significant number of students in some unit, whether it's a school or a school division, and the parents request it, because there is no sense putting this in just because the census says there's so many people there, but where it's requested that the language of instruction could

be one of the other languages - and I wouldn't even specify what language, because it obviously could be any language. In other words, we would like Ukrainian or German or Yiddish or whatever the language is to have equal right in Manitoba, because in Manitoba, as I say, I don't feel that we're minorities. I feel that we're equal.

MR. R. DOERN: My question is this: you say again that the legislation or the actions of government must reflect the consensus of the majority of the populace. If there is no consensus, then would you say that the legislation should be dropped?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Yes, I would. Now if you want to go and analyze the most successful politician, MacKenzie King, you know very well that he always built up a consensus by having the opposition popularize things, and then he made it government policy. What I'm a little bit afraid of is that Mr. Trudeau is in a little bit of too much of a hurry. I know he wants to retire and I think the majority of Canadians would like to see him retire, but I think that if we let the pot boil a little bit longer, I think there would be a clarification of exactly what should be done and what would be agreeable. I think it then could be brought in.

I'm not envious of the Government of Manitoba today, because I think whatever they do under present circumstances, if they push this through too fast, that it's going to hurt them to some degree. It might help them to some degree, but it's not the kind of position any politician wants to find himself in. But they've got to find the answer.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you.

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

Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Just one brief question, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Slogan, in your presentation, you mentioned that one of your concerns was that of cost. I just wanted to be sure that you understood that the provisions or the proposed amendment proposes to translate approximately 400 of the 4,500 statutes. I wondered if you see that as a reasonable course, rather than translating all the . . .

DR. J. SLOGAN: By all means. I think that's a much better course to follow because, I think if any other act has to be translated, it should be translated if there is a demand for it. But I think a lot of those acts are so now out-of-date and forgotten that it's really not necessary.

MR. G. LECUYER: My final question, Mr. Chairman, another concern you expressed in reference to extending services, you mentioned that you saw that this should be done in relation to legitimate need or demand. Two questions I guess: One is, do you understand that there is a limiting clause in the proposed amendment to that effect; and secondly, are you aware that the province already in its hiring practices abides by a similar principle in hiring people

with other second languages to serve needs in communities where another language other than English or French might be of a significant demand?

DR. J. SLOGAN: That's a commendable practice. I wasn't aware that this was official government policy but, if it is, I think it's very commendable.

MR. G. LECUYER: I'll ask you another question. In the time that I have - I guess I can't formulate it. I'm thinking that it might be in order, so I'll bypass it. I'll be a little while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions from members? Seeing none, the Chair would ask leave to ask one question. Leave? Thank you.

On Page 5 of your brief, Dr. Slogan, Conclusion No. 5 talks about heritage language programs, and the policy that you request or you urge be maintained. Then you say, "and equally entrenched." Is that an endorsement by the three clubs you represent of a proposition put to the committee in another brief?

DR. J. SLOGAN: Yes, our three clubs are in favour of entrenching the rights of heritage languages in The Manitoba Act or the Constitution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you would endorse that proposal then as made . . .

DR. J. SLOGAN: It was made by another group, I know, but I'm saying, we would be in favour of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you familiar with the language used in a proposed amendment that was submitted to the committee earlier in the hearings?

DR. J. SLOGAN: I do have something here that I would like to read, and I take exception to it so if I can find it, or if you could supply me with a copy I could tell what our opposition is to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Dr. Slogan, if you can't find it . . .

DR. J. SLOGAN: Can you excuse me for a minute?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My question would just be whether you endorse the proposed amendment fully or if you have some reservations with it?

DR. J. SLOGAN: If you'll give me half-a minute, I have it in my briefcase.

As I recall that proposed amendment - and I can tell you what our opposition was to it, particularly in our club because we had a meeting last night and Mr. Spolsky happened to attend that meeting. I think he is the one that proposed it.

Is it permissible for me to read this? I know that it's probably not public yet, or was it made public?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. J. SLOGAN: Section 23.10? All right. "Every resident in every school division in Manitoba shall have

the right to receive his or her primary and secondary education in English and/or French" . . . then it goes on. I want to almost put a period there, because that's what I want to discuss. . . . "and in any other language, provided however that the right to receive his or her education in a language in addition to English and/or French shall only occur where there is a sufficient number of students located in the school division which warrants the provision to them out of public funds of such education, including the necessary educational facilities and transportation." Now I understand that is what is being proposed.

Now we had a discussion on this last night, and we took exception to it. This is where our exception lies. It says, "Every resident in every school division in Manitoba shall have the right to receive his or her primary and secondary education in English and/or French," which means that every school in Manitoba, if it has one French student that demands it, will have to teach that student in French according to the way this is worded. Obviously, we do not approve that.

I approve the kind of wording - we had quite a discussion on this, and even Mr. Spolsky - I don't want to quote these things - agreed that he wasn't aware of the significance of it. If I interpret it as that, then we will be opposed to it, because what we want to see is that the language of instruction in Manitoba be the language of the majority. Nobody questions it. It's English. Thereafter, wherever a significant number of students in a school or a school division, whatever you want to use as your criteria for a unit, or wherever there's sufficient students and it was asked that service be provided in that second language. In a lot of places, it would be French, but not everywhere and not for every student. That's our position on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, in summary then, is your position one that you would prefer to have this entrenched or you would prefer to have it expressly laid out in The Public Schools Act as it applies to all languages of instruction?

DR. J. SLOGAN: We prefer to have it entrenched if it's modified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One last question, Dr. Slogan. On page 4 of your brief, you make reference to, I believe it was Page 4, the difficulties imposed on the Civil Service and the administration of the province in the interpretation, basically of the significant demand provisions.

DR. J. SLOGAN: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My question, just to clarify that, would be to ask you whether or not you felt that the provision should be spelled out in full in a constitutional amendment or if, perhaps, a statutory implementation plan could spell that out. Is that the sort of thing you want spelled out in a Constitution, or would you want

it spelled out in follow-up legislation? It didn't come out clear in your brief.

DR. J. SLOGAN: Coming back to my original philosophy. I don't like any of this spelled out in the Constitution, which I think should be very general. I think you're putting yourselves into a straight jacket by starting to spell out too many things in a Constitution. How many times, you know, I remember Davy Fulton, I remember Guy Favreau working on this, trying to cooperate and, from the federal level, getting a unity and going and trying to get a constitutional amendment. Now, my God, that's 25 years ago probably, or 20 years ago, and failing time after time because one province had a veto. That's the danger of putting it into the Constitution.

Personally, and I'm only speaking for myself, I would like to see the general rights entrenched, but the way they're going to be implemented done through statute, but that's a personal opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the question, thank you very much.

Any further questions for Dr. Slogan from members of the committee? Seeing none, Dr. Slogan, thank you from the committee on behalf of the organizations you represent.

The hour of adjournment approaching, what is the committee's will and pleasure, adjourn until 7:30 this evening.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Before we adjourn, it was on Friday last that the MAPAL group appeared before this committee and promised they would provide additional information yesterday morning to the committee. Is there any indication that we have received that information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The information was distributed to all members at the commencement of this afternoon's hearing. The Chairman received the information, hand delivered at noon today, and it was prepared for distribution to all members. If Mr. Graham did not receive it the Clerk has additional copies.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I admit I was a little late. I apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair accepts Mr. Graham's apologies. I would advise members of the public that in accordance with the decision taken earlier today, if the list is once again exhausted public hearing portion will be terminated. I would urge all members of the public and the gallery who wish to be heard to be certain of their attendance this evening.

The committee is adjourned and stands adjourned until 7:30 this evening.

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