



**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. 56 - 7:30 p.m., TUESDAY, 4 OCTOBER, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS**

**Tuesday, 4 October, 1983**

**TIME — 7:30 p.m.**

**LOCATION — Winnipeg**

**CHAIRMAN — Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)**

**ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6**

*Members of the committee present:*

Hon. Messrs. Bucklaschuk and Cowan  
Messrs. Anstett, Ashton, Brown, Graham,  
Kovnats, Lecuyer, Malinowski, and Ms. Phillips

**WITNESSES:** Mr. Taib Soufi, Private Citizen

Dr. Vedanand, National Association for  
Canadians of Indian Origins

Ms. S. Stephansson, Private Citizen

Mr. Chandra, National Association for  
Canadians of Indian Origins

Mr. Georges Forest, Union Nationale Métisse  
St. Joseph du Manitoba

Mr. Barry Turnbull, Private Citizen

**MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:**

Proposed Resolution to amend Section 23  
of The Manitoba Act

\* \* \* \*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee, come to order. We have a quorum. Before I begin to call on the delegations, the Clerk has received the resignation of the Honourable Ms. Dolin. I under Ms. Phillips is to replace her. Can I have a motion to that effect?

**MR. G. LECUYER:** I so move.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Lecuyer and Mr. Malinowski. Is that agreed? (Agreed) Agreed and so ordered.

Now, I'm going to have to ask the Clerk where we left off. — (Interjection) — Order please. We look on high for all agreements in the committee.

Mr. Roy Brunka, please, Mr. Roy Brunka; Heather Stone; Henry Huber; Jack Froese; Derwyn Davies; Jesse Vorst; Ken Morley.

Taib Soufi.

**MR. T. SOUFI:** Mesdames et Messieurs, M. le président.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** One moment please. Could you bear with us while members get the receivers. Anyone in the audience who would like a receiver, who does not have one, can sign one out with the technician at the back of the booth.

Please proceed.

**MR. T. SOUFI:** Merci M. le président. Mesdames et Messieurs, M. le président, bonsoir.

Je me présente ici en tant que fils adoptif du Manitoba. Et en particulier, en tant que fils adoptif du Manitoba francophone qui m'a accueilli il y a quinze ans.

Je voudrais commencer pour parler sur le "bill" 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Vous rappelez ces deux vers de Louis David Riel: "Vous souffrez quand un nom canadien-français vivra. Vous tâchez de l'abattre en le persécutant."

Pour quelqu'un qui était venu comme moi vers ce pays plein de promesses pour tous les déshérités de la terre, j'aurais cru que ces vers étaient un petit peu trop exagérés.

Je viens ici porter témoignage que durant quinze ans, j'ai assisté sans exagération à une persécution outrée de la jeunesse francophone dont j'ai eu la charge. J'ai enseigné aussi à des Anglo-Manitobains. Et c'est au nom de mes étudiants, au nom de la jeunesse que je vous adresse ce soir c'est quelques mots.

Je voudrais vous poser d'abord une question qui est la suivante. Vous qui êtes les représentants, vous qui êtes les élus du peuple manitobain qui représentez la province, une des provinces du Manitoba, qu'elle est votre responsabilité à l'égard de la jeunesse? Un écrivain français . . . disait: "Nous sommes les héritiers de ceux qui sont morts, les associés de ceux qui vivent et la providence de ceux qui naîtront." Je n'ai point trouvé ici la vérification de ces paroles. Les héritiers de ceux qui sont morts certes. Sommes-nous des associés et en vue de quoi?

Alors ce soir la question qui me vient à l'esprit des questions qui me viennent par esprit, c'est qu'elle a été le rôle des éducateurs durant quinze ans et durant peut-être depuis 1890 du jour où on a enlevé la langue au Franco-Manitobains et qu'on les a muselés pour que leur langue soit banni de la rue et ne trouve de refuge que dans leur foyer et dans leur cœur. Qui est-ce qu'éduquait la jeunesse, si les dirigeants jouent avec un droit naturel et sacré d'une communauté. Qu'est qu'un pays démocratique et libre qui se prétend justement champion de la modération et promoteur de la paix sur la scène internationale lorsqu'il n'est pas capable de rendre justice à une partie des siens.

Encore une fois, à quoi sert l'éducation si l'éducation est la promotrice de toutes les valeurs humaines universelles. À quoi sert la science si la science est révélation de la vérité et promotion de la justice.

Lorsque je suis arrivé en 1968, des jeunes de 14 et 15 ans jusqu'à l'âge de 18 ans me demandaient: "Peut-on faire des mathématiques en français? Est-ce qu'il existe des livres scientifiques en français?" Et alors j'étais très triste parce que je me suis dit, cette belle province, ce beau pays qu'est le Canada, comment est-ce possible qu'on a démuné toute une partie de cette communauté fondatrice de cette province, qui a accueilli tous les réfugiés de la terre, qui était donc aussi le rêve de Louis Riel? Comment se fait-il qu'on

les a mis dans l'ignorance de leur brillante culture, de leur héritage qui ne date pas, je le rapelle, il y a un siècle, mais qui date de plusieurs millénaires. Comment se fait-il qu'un pays aussi civilisé, aussi démocratique ait pu bafouer et mettre à terre les droits sacrés de la langue maternelle des enfants dont j'avais la charge.

Il fallait donc, j'aurais pu choisir d'aller vers la majorité anglophone et être peut-être à l'heure actuelle parmi les grandes chaires des universités. Mais mon idéale était autre. J'étais né pour donné une éducation et tâcher de faire prendre conscience à chaque individu qu'il était absolument unique et irremplaçable, non seulement à ses yeux mais aux yeux de sa communauté. J'ai commencé par leur montrer que la langue française, comme toutes les langues, était digne de respect et de véhiculée une culture où elle a fait preuve justement de génie; elle a donné naissance à des génies dont toute la civilisation humaine s'enorgueillie. J'essayais ensuite de leur montrer que dans leurs valeurs d'amour et de fraternité, il y avait place, non pas pour le sectarisme, non pas pour le racisme, non pas pour la xénophobie, mais pour une humanité fraternelle, franche et libre.

Mais comment est-ce qu'on peut faire passer dans l'esprit d'un jeune des valeurs humaines alors qu'autour de lui il ne peut même pas s'adresser à ces représentants, ceux qui le représentent, tant sur la scène provinciale que sur la scène peut-être fédérale, dans sa langue sans difficultés?

Comment peut-on dire qu'il n'y a pas de racisme, qu'il n'y a pas de xénophobie, qu'il n'y a pas de dédain? Lorsque ceux qui sont soient dans un parti soient dans un autre, je ne suis pas ici pour faire la promotion d'un parti conservateur ou autre, ceux qui se présentent en tant que politicien ne sont même pas capables de respecter leur propre constitution.

Que doit répondre un éducateur à de tels objections? Qu'est-ce que la politique? J'avais toujours cru que la politique, comme disaient les Grecques qui ont donné justement naissance à la civilisation Occidentale, que c'était l'art et la science de mener les êtres humains à la vertu et tous les citoyens quel que soient leurs conditions sociales au bonheur.

Comment ce fait-il alors que les Franco-Manitobains est eu à souffrir et qu'ils aient eu à se cacher pour continuer à survivre dans leur langue. Un incident, si vous me permettez de rappeler un incident que ma femme a vécu quatre jours après notre arrivée. Elle s'était perdue dans le magasin d'Eaton. Et elle cherchait désespérément la sortie. Elle s'adressait vainement dans sa langue française n'est-ce pas, qu'elle croyait être, elle aussi une langue universelle, n'est-ce pas. Pour demander seulement la façon de sortir d'Eaton, désespérément en vain se réfugia derrière des manteaux et se mise à pleurer. Alors, je dois vous poser une question. Est-ce que le gouvernement du Canada, et les gouvernements des autres provinces, sont-ils à ce point-là insensibles pour qu'ils puissent propager à l'extérieur aux autres nations cette affirmation sur laquelle le Canada est bilingue? Chose désespéré également, comment se fait-il que dans l'éducation supérieure dans les universités, dans les écoles, alors que nous avions toutes les facilités ici pour apprendre diverses langues et nous pénétrer de diverses cultures qui serait un enrichissement absolument incroyable pour le Canada qui deviendrait alors la nation

exemplaire pour l'humanité entière on se referme et on tire gloire du fait que nous soyons unilingues. C'est là une honte pour une nation aussi civilisée et aussi avancée et aussi humanitaire et humaniste que notre pays.

La formation des jeunes exige un appui de la part des gouvernants. Quel est cet appui? En quinze ans, la première fois, il fallait enseigner l'histoire et la géographie en français seulement; le reste était chose interdite ou plus ou moins banie tacitement. Ensuite il fallait se battre pour être français à 50 - 50. Ensuite il fallait se battre pour avoir le français à 100 pour cent.

Je ne suis pas venu faire un sermon. Je suis venue seulement demander au nom de l'idéal qu'on a choisi en tant qu'éducateurs que vous fassiez justice à une partie de ceux qui ont fondé le Canada et qui ont tout à fait le droit, même le droit plus que quiconque, avoir leur culture s'épanouir et se développer.

Je ne suis pas né français, je ne suis pas né anglais. Je ne suis pas de culture française seulement. Je ne favorise pas une culture au-dessus d'une autre. Ce que je vous demande c'est que tout simplement de respecter l'idéal politique à savoir que nous sommes d'abord et avant tout des êtres humains.

Lorsque j'ai entendu les plaidoyers qui étaient en fait en faveur des droits des francophones, bien souvent j'étais très attristé. Bien souvent, j'appartiens à une autre culture et je peux aussi, j'ai retenu mes larmes, pas pour moi seulement. Mais c'est parce que défendre la cause du français, c'est défendre aussi la cause de tous les êtres humains. Si par exemple, aujourd'hui nous demandons à ce que l'entente qui a été signée le 17 mai soit respectée intégralement, c'est pour montrer que les hommes politiques ont une parole. Parce que si les dirigeants n'ont pas de paroles, ne vous attendez pas à ce que les citoyens ne puissent pas enfreindre des lois impunément et ne venez pas alors les mettre en prison pour des crimes qui sont encore moins grands que le crime d'avoir enlever à un peuple son droit sacré et d'avoir commis un génocide culturel et linguistique. Et en plus de cela, d'avoir perdu son martyr qu'on a jeté derrière le parlement alors que son monument devrait être à l'entrée ici.

Je lui rends hommage à Louis Riel, oui ta vie de Riel, en se battant pour sa nation, il se battait non pas seulement pour les francophones, pour les Canadiens français et pour les Métis, il se battait pour une cause qui dépassait cela.

Pour un homme sensé, pour un vrai politicien, défendre les droits des minorités c'est défendre les droits de tout le monde. Il n'y est pas question d'esprit de partisanerie. La question, je le répète, dépasse l'esprit de parti, l'esprit partisant.

Quelque chose qui est naturelle doit être honnête. Les citoyens attendent que vous soyez honnêtes avec eux.

Et maintenant je passe, peut-être, à un autre aspect. On parle de l'inflation, de l'aspect économique. On a cédé parce que les Canadiens français ont enfin découvert, avec la lutte de M. Forest et puis d'autres luttes qui avaient été menées avant et après, que la Cour suprême pouvait vous faire traduire toutes les lois et donc mener la province à la banqueroute. Mais on a oublié qu'il y a des choses qui ne sont pas monnayables; qu'on ne ressuscitera jamais les assimilés

et ceux qui sont perdus à jamais pour la communauté francophone et pour la communauté canadienne toute entière.

Si un être humain développe son plein potentiel, il ne tombe pas dans la misère comme les Canadiens français l'ont été. Parce qu'il est vrai, et vous ne me le niez pas, que les Canadiens français avaient le niveau de vie le plus bas du Canada, juste après les Indiens, les Natifs. Ils avaient le niveau de vie le plus bas il y a une décennie. D'où cela vient-il? Non pas qu'ils étaient moins intelligents, non pas qu'ils étaient sensibles, non pas qu'ils étaient travailleurs. Ils ont défriché, ils ont arraché, ils ont préparé une terre. Mais c'est que tout simplement on leur a pas permis de s'épanouir pleinement, n'est-ce pas, dans leur langue, dans leur culture. Leur situation économique donc aujourd'hui où l'on parle d'inflation, leur situation économique est le reflet de la situation historique qui leur a été faite. Et c'est eux qui devraient être les premiers à crier.

Or, ils ont fait don à la province, non seulement, ils ont fait preuve de clémence, mais ils ont fait don à la province et à tous les habitants de cette province d'une générosité incroyable.

Les autres peuples se sont révoltés. Ils ont pris les armes. Heureusement pour nous, nous sommes dans un pays où on ne parle pas d'armes. Mais jusqu'à quand la patience des Métis et des Canadiens français, jusqu'à quand une démocratie, n'est-ce pas, pourra-t-elle impunément bafouer les choses les plus élémentaires contenues dans sa constitution.

Revenir sur sa parole lorsqu'on a conclu une entente, tout simplement pour un électorat, c'est faire de la politique à bon marché. La politique des petits pas. Quand on s'engage dans la politique, il faut voir à la distance du Canada, d'un océan à l'autre, il faut voir l'avenir. Or si vous voulez être la providence de ceux qui sont à naître, vous avez, Mesdames et Messieurs, à interroger vos consciences et à vous dire j'ai aujourd'hui à accomplir une tâche qui n'est pas pour moi mais pour mes petits enfants; comme mon fils, qu'il soit anglophone ou francophone, qu'il soit germanophone ou qu'il soit ukrainien ou qu'il soit de n'importe quelle langue ou de n'importe quelle race, se trouvera heureux dans la terre manitobaine. À ce moment-là, le Manitoba sera l'exemple pour tout le Canada.

Nous avons la chance d'établir une humanité, non pas une humanité simplement idéale, mais un idéal humain incarné dans cette province. Mais pour cela, il faut abattre les préjugés. Il faut abattre les préjugés qui se sont enracinés à travers l'histoire. Il faut aller par-delà de l'histoire, revenir à l'humanité.

J'aimerais en terminant citer encore Louis David Riel: "Nous sommes grâce à Dieu nés pour les idées belles, pour les actes d'honneur et de beau dévouement. Nous avons de l'essor pour les vertus réelles mais votre faux gouvernement pèse sur nous sans cesse et nous coupe les ailes. Faut-il espérer avoir un vrai gouvernement." Je tiens à rendre hommage au gouvernement actuel et cela non pas pour être contre l'opposition. Mais tout simplement parce que le gouvernement actuel a pris conscience qu'il fallait rectifier les injustices du passé.

Le Manitoba peut et est capable de servir comme exemple, je le répète, pour l'unité nationale, l'unité

canadienne. Et non seulement pour cela. Il peut servir d'exemple face à la Russie, face aux États-Unis, face aux peuples de la terre, comme quoi tous les humains venus de tous les horizons ont trouvé enfin refuge enfin dans un pays qui sait reconnaître et respecter, non seulement ses constitutions mais les droits individuels et sacrés de la personne humaine.

Évidemment vous allez vous poser la question: Est-ce que lui aussi veut promouvoir toute une ribambelle de cultures qui débarquent ici? Pourquoi pas? dirais-je. Si par exemple chacun peut parler sa langue et sa culture, oui. Mais aucune communauté n'était venue ici pour coloniser ou conquérir, à l'exception des Canadiens anglais, des Canadiens français, des Métis, n'est-ce pas. Eux sont les fondateurs. Les autres arrivants ont les mêmes droits, je l'entend, les mêmes devoirs que tous les autres citoyens. Mais nous sommes venus, moi qui n'appartiens à aucune des deux langues, en sachant très bien qu'il y avait deux langues officielles: l'anglais et le français.

Ce n'est pas demain que je demanderais à ce que soit enchâssé dans la Constitution ma langue. Je serais pourtant très heureux et je crois que mes étudiants le seront aussi de pouvoir tendre à la main à tout le monde si on pouvait respecter la parole donnée.

Je vous remercie.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Soufi.

Mr. Lecuyer, questions?

**MR. G. LECUYER:** M. le président, je vous demande peut-être juste pour un instant de me permettre de contrarier peut-être les règlements et de dire à M. Soufi que j'apprécie énormément ses propos, ses propos très humains; en fait que j'appellerais plutôt un témoignage venant de sa part, lui dont le français ni l'anglais sont la langue maternelle, qui n'est pas originaire du Manitoba mais dont son pays natal a bien eu l'obligeance de m'accueillir à mon tour pendant trois ans en Algérie où j'ai pu enseigner comme Franco-Manitobain ma langue seconde, c'est-à-dire l'anglais. Et je voudrais tout simplement signaler pour mes collègues que dans ce même lycée où j'ai pu enseigner ma langue seconde, il s'enseignait aussi, en plus du français, il s'enseignait l'anglais, naturellement l'arabe comme langue première, le russe, l'allemand, l'espagnol, l'italien et quelques autres langues que je ne me souviens pas à l'instant. Il s'enseignait au moins dix langues dans les lycées où j'enseignais. Et ça c'est à l'exemple, je pense, de l'Europe. Mais dans le cas échéant ici, on parle d'un pays en voie de développement. Donc si dans les pays en voie de développement on peut voir aussi loin, on peut voir aussi large, son témoignage donc est d'autant plus valable.

Merci M. le président.

**MR. T. SOUFI:** Merci M. Lecuyer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Questions by honorable members. Seeing no questions, Mr. Soufi, thank you very much for your presentation here this evening.

**MR. T. SOUFI:** Merci M. le président. Merci Mesdames et Messieurs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Henry Elias.

I understand the Clerk has received the resignation of Mr. Nordman, and that Mr. Downey is to be added to the committee.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** You're again a little ahead of the time, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Clerk has not yet received the resignation of Mr. Nordman.

That completes . . .

**A MEMBER:** Where does that leave Mr. Downey?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No one knows for sure.

**A MEMBER:** On the outside looking in.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Vedanand.

**DR. VEDANAND:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear before your committee. My name is Vedanand. I'm appearing here as a private citizen and also as president of Hindi Fellowship, an organization to promote and preserve the heritage of Hindi language, which is one of the national languages of India.

Also, I would like to present a point of view, which perhaps might be a bit different than what you have been hearing amongst various presentations.

The question of language is always a very emotional question whenever it comes up for discussion. John Stuart Mill, speaking in an address to one of the universities in England in 1865, he was author of "On Liberty," suggested that every student should have the opportunity to get instruction, besides English, in German, in French, besides the classics, Greek and Latin.

Now, that view seems to have been a very unique view of instructions in humanities, which is very broad based. Very few seem to have fascination for learning languages these days. In fact, one might even say that there is a definite indifference amongst the students to learn more than one language. In some cases this indifference almost borders on like being contempt for other languages. I am also a professor at the University of Manitoba, so I've been seeing the students and their capabilities in languages.

I'm reminded of the famous - attributed to one of the great historians - that the true test of any civilized government is its capability to treat its minorities with compassion and empathy, and therefore some of the minority rights for which this effort is being made to entrench them could be perhaps taken care of very well, only when there is some kind of guarantee or some kind of legal support. It is in this context that I am very supportive of the move that the government is making.

I have also seen in the press, one of the amendments that had been presented by MAPAL, one of the new associations, Section 23.10, and I think that follows in the same spirit and I certainly will support that as well.

The question of language then has to be viewed in what I might call psychological space, and this is the different point of view that I'm trying to present.

Apart from being a political issue and something which is being claimed to be highly divisive, and often it is divisive, I think the contemporaries of the world, and particularly the world of business, suggest that we should really take a look at this issue from a much broader perspective.

Let me get back to the inner world of the child. When the child grows up in a certain cultural environment - of course, we talk of mother tongue - the basic communication capabilities develop in the child in the so-called mother tongue. And in a multicultural society the mother tongue, the tongue of the mother, could be very well different from English or French. If that is so, then the child who grows in a dual environment begins to have a world view where he is bound to have some kind of identity confusion and also identity crisis.

The well-known psychoanalyst, Erickson, has theories about the inner world of children. When he talks about identity crisis and identity confusion, he also suggests that some of the children, who grow with this kind of identity crisis, towards the latter period of their lives, they have remnants of a negative identity. I'm sorry if I am being more abstract, but some of these issues are very crucial to my presentation and therefore I think I would like to elaborate on them later on.

He further makes out a case for nurturing a more healthy ego identity for the children of minorities. This could be nurtured in the seed-bed of appropriate linguistic and cultural environment, because folk tales, fantasies, mythologies, they could be totally different, and the greater ability with the language will enable them to preserve not only their own cultural heritage, but would give them also a world view which is broader. Therefore, if the children could go with capabilities in more than one language - and I'm not so sure they should not learn English and French, English and French they could learn, but besides those they could have some other language as well - therefore in those situations you'll find that these children would have greater capabilities in languages and also in looking at cultural differences.

A lot of the problems that some of the businessmen and executives face today is the managing of cultural differences. This is in the context of global and international trade. Corporations which go over wide and try to operate in the biggest parts of the world, they always have these problems, because they do have executives who have the capability to handle those kinds of problems.

Therefore, I'm suggesting that children who have greater capabilities with the language, who have greater tolerance of other languages, they develop a much broader world view, and therefore they more cosmopolitan and a broader liberal outlook of world reality.

The contemporary world of realities is forcing these kind of issues upon us, and those people who have to later on become not only political leaders and future decision-makers, business executives, they have to face these problems. A year ago I spent some time doing research in Japan, and the thing that you observed in Japan was to see how they want to learn other languages, and particularly English. They want to try their English on you. Whenever there is a Japanese business delegation, which goes out to negotiate trade, investment in technology, and all kinds of these trade

negotiations. Even if they cannot speak very good English, everyone is speaking English. Not only that, if they're going to Mexico, they will be speaking Spanish; if they go into Africa, they will speaking Swahili. A Mexican Trade Minister told me some time back, wherein they attracted a plant from California in Mexico, and this person said that one thing they found very different about the Japanese executives was that nobody asked them to learn the Spanish language, but after work they all would stay and they would hire a personal tutor and they would start learning Spanish and within three to four months they are all speaking Spanish. The only persons who don't care to learn the language, he said, are the Americans. They come from eight to five, the job is finished, they are the ones who want everyone to learn English, they don't want to learn the language. That attitude, Sir, I would suggest is not the attitude which will give us a greater share in the world market and greater capability to compete in the world market. I think this perspective is symbolic of that kind of tolerance, that kind of acceptance of possibilities.

I am suggesting, therefore, that the language issue has some definite spill-over effects. Greater ability to learn languages, more than one, would also suggest that people will have cultural sensitivity and empathy. They will much better manage cultural differences.

There are some very interesting practical managerial implications. Our students and future managers, decision-makers, could be become very myopic in their world view if they want to learn only one language. This, I suggest, would be a very dangerous kind of incapacity in all future citizens and leaders. We see a mindset of intolerance and prejudice against other cultures and languages; therefore, a more liberal and more cosmopolitan outlook would provide capacity for accepting diversity and a capacity also to manage diversity.

Also in decision-making there are issues and there are styles which are often discussed, and one of them has been labelled as homogenistic thinking, in which we force our point of view on the others in negotiations, in the styles of decision-making, in the way things are to be done. If the group doesn't agree to our way of doing things, then that is accepted to be very dysfunctional, let me put it this way. Therefore, if we have to develop these kinds of capabilities in our future business leaders, I think it will good for our students to develop a much broader world view and a much better handle on outside reality. As I mentioned earlier, our great trade partners, I used Japan, and there is a great world of opportunity in the Middle East, China, Asia, etc. Experts on these regions, who are looking at these issues, are suggesting that we've got to have better understanding of the Chinese and Japanese. Today the World Bank publishes its reports not only in English, but in Arabic, Japanese and Chinese; some years back, these were not possibilities.

It is this kind of point of view which needs some emphasis, because we do not have, even at most of our industries, great exploration in many languages. As I said, when our trade delegations go outside, we have to depend on others to translate. Our managers have a very rigid belief and structure from that point of view.

Demobeglan, (phonetic) who is one of the noted world authorities on . . . countries and particularly Japan,

told me a very interesting story last year. He said here we are working with all the top executives, Exxon, Gulf, etc., and finds that the even the top management in these companies have got their mindset. This mindset begins with the point of view that the world begins in Europe and ends up in North America. Yet there is a region out there which is very productive, very competitive, and what is worse, they want to compete in this area almost on our terms, employing the same labour, paying the same wage rates, and competing under the same labour laws.

There is a fetish amongst all managers for strategy. When we talk of strategy, it has almost become a cultural peculiarity. When we talk of fetish, what I mean is this: The French take off very easily when you talk of good food or romance, so do all managers. Yet when it comes to competing for worldwide, we find that with all our great strategy and tactics, there are many areas in which we have to take stock of our way of doing things. We have to improve our capabilities.

Therefore, those who have the capacity to become great leaders, they must also have the capacity to turn mere mortals into folk heroes. They don't have to become martyrs, but certainly they have to have the capacity to turn the mere moral into doing committed, devoted, honest work. When . . . took over recently - not recently, four years back . . . Corporation, the English said \$2.2 billion, and they went down and talked to the people. They said this company is losing market shares and products are very poor in quality, and they are going bankrupt. They said this great society has been built by your forefathers with honest committed work and a capacity for vision. All we want from you is honest work. I'm suggesting that kind of capacity for vision requires that we must have a broader perspective and outlook to give that capability to our managers. It decries a moral vision, more than legal and political kind of strategies.

Let me present the scenario about the myth of a well-educated businessman in Canada; he knows only English. Not only that, he does not know other languages, he hates other languages. And if it is deeply embedded in his conscience the notion of cultural superiority or the superiority of one language, that is a reflection on that kind of attitude of tolerance to other cultures. I'm suggesting that we have to give a greater capability to our future leaders, the ability to manage cultural differences, and at the grassroot level I'm suggesting that if you have this kind of tolerant view about other languages and other cultures, perhaps that would come naturally.

We usually always have what is known as a kind of behaviour discrepancy between what we want to do and what we ideally desire should be done; therefore, there is always a gap between what we would like to do and what should be done. Governments always face this dilemma, and governments face some moral dilemmas too. Therefore, it is good to raise these questions in meetings. But if you wanted to say how much funding has been done to make sure that Japanese is taught in some of the universities so that they have experts in Japanese - they are going to be a great, either trading partner, or they will be great competitors for our products - and we'll find out that those concrete examples are not there.

Therefore, I would, again in passing, suggest that one of the challenges that seem to stem from this kind

of issue is that we must have an opportunity for creating an environment in which we will nurture future leaders, business executives, who have a more tolerant view, greater cultural sensitivity and greater empathy for the issues that will come very handy when we have to fight the battle of world leadership in the field of business and in the field of social, political issues, as well. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Chairman, Dr. Vedanand, a number of people who have appeared before this committee have claimed that because English is the language of trade between Canada and the United States, and Canada and some of its other partners, that French was not a language that was particularly useful, or to any extent useful, in world trade. In fact, many said that they saw it as perhaps as a disadvantage. I think I gathered from what you have said, I understand your view, but I would like you to just dwell on that for a moment.

**DR. VEDANAND:** Thank you, sir. These statements have to be viewed in a proper perspective. When they say that English is, it is only in terms of some chronological time period in which English has become important. Certainly, by the same, turn around and say Japanese was never a language which anybody needed to learn. Arabic was not a language which anybody had to learn, and the great fortunes of nations even wanted to stay the same way. Although, English had become the world language, no doubt, but just as the British Empire was there, so was the French Empire, and French went from France to many cultures and many countries, and those people who have a proud tradition of French, as well.

If the United States had a different language, just for the sake of argument I am saying, and being the most important industrial nation in the world, somebody would be valuing that language as more important.

In perspective, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that importance of languages in world trade are there but, at the same time, there are newer forces emerging, which force us to have a much broader outlook and perspective about the language capabilities. It is not English alone which perhaps would help us, we'll have to have a greater capability about languages. This is my point of view. Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Further questions from honourable members?

Seeing none, Dr. Vedanand, thank you very much for being here today and representing your organization.

**DR. VEDANAND:** Thank you for your service.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Bohdanka Dutka, George Rykman, Don McIvor, S. Stephansson.

A. Warkentin. Is it Mrs. Warkentin?

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** Stephansson.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Oh, Stephansson, sorry.

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** My presentation will be brief for the main emphasis is on the cost of bilingualism,

but I will deviate a bit to say that I am bilingual and I feel it is an asset to know more than one language. It seems to me that this has to be achieved through the schools and through interest in the home. Ideal as it might seem to some to have a bilingual country, nowhere can it be economically sound.

In 1980, the 1870 act was re-enacted, that is to say the French and English language has equal status in the courts and the Legislature. Therefore, I see no reason to entrench an amendment to make provincial agencies bilingual. This will displace a number of people and cause further divisiveness and hate.

This is done at a great cost to the public, considering that we seem to be catering to about 6 percent of the population of Manitoba. I don't believe that any person should have special status. It seems to me that we are getting to the stage where bilingualism is more important than qualifications for a job.

There seems to be a definite bias in the bilingual program in favour of the French; in other words, a double standard, which provides services and financing to French-Canadians while denying similar services to English-speaking Canadians. French-speaking Canadians outside of Quebec receive financing from both the Federal Government and Quebec Government, while the English-speaking Quebecer, who wants a freedom of choice, does not get a penny from either government.

Another example of a double standard is the funding of the legal expenses of Mr. Forest in his fight against an English-only parking ticket here in Winnipeg. A similar challenge was instituted in Montreal against an English-only traffic ticket, but the Federal Government did not provide any money for the legal costs. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the Liberal Government goes out of its way to support French-speaking individuals and groups who want to promote and enhance the French culture across Canada.

The funding for the bilingual program is obtained by uniformly taxing the whole of Canada, however, most of the money seems to go to promote interests of one ethnic group.

Mr. Yalden, the Minister for Languages, while speaking on a cross-country program, stated that an enormous amount of money has been spent and expenditures will increase every year for the bilingual program. He also said, "Unfortunately, there is a great deal of waste." Another statement he made was that he was disappointed in the Federal Government who seemed to be lax in the enforcement of bilingualism in Quebec.

Maybe someone here could tell me why we have this concentrated effort by the Federal Government supporting further French usage in Manitoba, while they totally ignore what is going on in Quebec. Every service the public receives is funded through taxation and now we seem to have an extra service being forced by the Federal Government. So consequently, the other services will receive less. Two prime examples are higher education and Medicare, which are being threatened and maybe even sacrificed for the benefit of the bilingual program.

So, in closing, my parting comment is: The extended bilingual program is ruinous to the economy and is also creating antagonism and divisiveness across all of Canada.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Ms. Stephansson. Questions for Ms. Stephansson from members of the committee?



Mr. Ashton.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Yes, I just wondering if you aware of the cost of the agreement that was worked out here in Manitoba, and what your thoughts were on that cost.

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** I didn't hear the first part of your question.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** I am wondering if you aware of the cost of the agreement that we are discussing today.

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** No, I don't know what the cost is.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** The reason I'm asking is because one point that the government has stressed throughout is that we're not interested in establishing a program which duplicates federal bilingualism.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The purpose of questions is not to debate but to ask questions for clarification on the material in the brief. Ms. Stephansson did not make reference to the cost of the provincial program and has said she is not aware of them, so obviously questions on the subject will not facilitate the deliberations of the committee.

Do you have another line of questioning, Mr. Ashton?

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we're discussing the provincial jurisdiction, it was a lead into a question which had nothing with the federal.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Could you ask a question for clarification, then, please?

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Yes, I will. I'm just wondering then, in view of the fact that we have tried to avoid some of those costs here in Manitoba, whether if the cost factor was not a problem, whether you would still be opposed to some form of French services here in Manitoba.

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** I am not opposed to it, as I said. We have it in the courts and the Legislature and we also have it in the schools and have had for a long time.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** So you are not opposed to French services per se then?

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** No, as they were, as they have been re-enacted from 1870.

**MR. R. DOERN:** So what areas do you disagree with then in the proposal?

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** Well, I mentioned it in my brief, obviously you weren't listening. I said provincial agencies.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** My question was if there was not a concern about the cost, what areas you were concerned about, but obviously . . .?

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** We all know that we don't get this for nothing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Further questions, Mr. Ashton? Further questions for members?  
Mr. Doern.

**MR. R. DOERN:** You talked about federal funding and so on, could you indicate whether you believe that ethnic or linguistic groups should be totally self-sufficient, or do you think they could receive some federal or provincial support?

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** Well, the country is declared bilingual, so we have French and English officially. Are you referring to funding for other ethnic groups?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Yes, any ethnic or linguistic group, do you think it's appropriate for the Federal Government or the province to fund them, or would you suggest they are not eligible and shouldn't be supported by any government?

**MS. S. STEPHANSSON:** Well, not really.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Further questions? Seeing none, Ms. Stephansson, thank you very much for your presentation.

A. Warkentin, Remi Smith, Léo Teillet, Tom Cohoe, Mario Sosa, Ron Nash, Luba A. Kwasney, Roy Brunka, Heather Stone, Henry Huber, Jack Froese, Derwyn Davies, Jesse Vorst, Ken Morley, Henry Elias.

I believe I have called all of the names remaining on the list this evening. Is there anyone whose name was on the list whose name I did not call?

Seeing none, ladies and gentleman on the committee, that concludes the list in front of us. I'll make the standard last call to the gallery. Is there anyone in the gallery whose name was not on the list who wishes to make a presentation to the committee?

Two individuals, please come forward, Sir. Your name, Sir.

**MR. CHANDRA:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my name is Chandra. I am the regional Vice-President for Manitoba for the National Association for Canadians of Indian Origins. I represent 20,000 people of Indian origin from India, Pakistan, Ceylon, East Africa, Asia and South America. We are broadly located in Winnipeg and some outside of Winnipeg.

I have watched these proceedings with some kind of trepidation and in fear. I'm sure all Manitobans, as all Canadians, respect and love certain values.

One of the values, outstanding, and perhaps demands importance is tolerance of other's rights. This is how democracy thrives, and this is how democracy builds on the basis or bases that promote that liberalism, that those considerations that promote multiculturalism.

Coming down to the entrenchment of French language rights, I think we have the view from two points of view. One, as people of my background view it, is philosophical, historical and constitutional, all rolled in one. We believe that for the last 93 years illegality

existed in this province, denying French of their legal rights for whatever reasons - and I'm not accusing anybody, it could be out of sheer ignorance - was a constitutional denial and that illegality has to be corrected. The sooner it is done, the better for all Manitobans that live in this great province. In that denial we view a dark future not only for French, but all ethnic minorities that live in this province, that elected to live in this province.

Good - that a case came around and the Supreme Court ruled on that, and therefore we today are debating it, although I thought if democracy is the prime consideration that should not have arisen. Nevertheless, whatever reason, if it's denied, the time has come that we correct the historical constitutional fact with grace and good will.

I'm flabbergasted, Mr. Chairman, to see that a fact that is so clear is not perceived by what were political considerations that coax and guide some of our friends here not to see it and then to stand up and oppose it. To my mind it is a very simple case of restoring that illegality. If we do not do that, then we'll do that at great expense. When the Supreme Court rules it out and then you turn around and start doing what we want to do with good will, we're kind of convincing everybody that we are not doing this, restoring French to its legal status because of legal pressure, but we are doing it as a matter of good will, it would perhaps convince everybody in this province that we are not doing it under any pressure. This is one thing.

Another point of view, Mr. Chairman, that is basically moral and I think, to my mind, of great importance that this country is a country that is founded by two chartered nations, French and English. To deny French their fundamental right would be denying the history of our heritage and our present reality as a nation. Refusing to recognize that we are a nation of two languages and also denying the cultural richness that the multicultural society in Canada contributing to our province and to our nation would be a great tragedy.

What we are in fact doing is fulfilling a constitutional obligation to the French. I think this is a unique Manitoba-made solution to correct the situation.

It is rather amusing, Sir, that there are certain people amongst us who do not or refuse to face facts. Manitoba, like Canada, is a multicultural society. To impose a language on others is to deny them or to deny the nation, for that matter, the cultural richness that these ethnic minorities will bring to the nation and to the province. Ethnic minorities, especially, are very fearful that when you can turn around and deny the French-speaking people their fundamental right, what kind of justice can you expect for the minority here? Therefore, in entrenching the French language, we see great hope and we see that there is a future for the ethnic minorities in this country.

People talk about the price, the great price attached to it. I don't see that. There is always price to pay for certain values, for certain ideals, for certain goals. Democracy thrives on those goals and values and if you want to run a country in a cheap way - and I'm using the word "cheap" for a very definite purpose - you have to sacrifice democracy and build a different kind of political system here. Make a military rule, it will make everything easier for you, and therefore I think you would pay a price.

When you pour millions and millions of dollars to support NATO, nobody raises a human cry on that, although that is token support. Nobody is going to attack Canada. When you pour millions of dollars in permitting experiments of missiles in Alberta, none of these rednecks raise their voice. But when you want to correct an illegality, whether you want to contribute to the cultural richness of a province and of a nation, bigotry raises its head. They want to live in a fool's paradise, I would say, closing their eyes to the reality of the situation, to the fact that ethnic minorities generally and particularly in this case, French minority, need assurance that they are wanted, that they are not second-class citizens, that they have a right as much as anybody else.

On the one hand, we shed crocodile tears when those rights are denied to Anglophones in Quebec. We talk about all kinds of funny things, I don't want to repeat them. On the other hand, when it comes down to our own province, when we are trying to correct a situation that has continued for decades, all kinds of practical reasons are raised, pragmatic reasons are raised. Mr. Chairman, all this pragmatism and practicality is coming out of our narrow-mindedness. We are lacking vision, we are lacking commitment. We are not in fact supporting those values and goals, as I said before, on which democracy thrives.

Well, there are ways or, perhaps, practical solutions that our friend in Germany tried - get rid of all the minorities. One-quarter of the French-speaking public in Canada or others - get rid of them, and then, of course, there'll be no questions asked. But until those facts are there, we have to live with them. We might pay lip service, I don't care, but they are facts of life, particular facts of life, historical realities, constitutional facts that we need to accept and entrench.

One of my friends said, why constitutional amendment? Why not leave it to the Legislature? People have not read political history right. If left to the whims and fancies of political parties, they play around with minority rights. Nowhere in the history of the world, minority rights have been left to the sweet whims of political change and political process. The history, if my friends who are opposed to me read with care, well, tell them that the entrenched majority always goes against it, has gone against it, is being done here.

I'm amused by some of my friends who support political conservatism. When their leader supports the principle of bilingualism in Canada and in Manitoba, I'm sure they must be embarrassed by Mr. Mulroney's support to the principle of French language entrenchment here. Is it a rebellion going on here against the leadership?

To my friends, who subscribe to the political philosophy of the NDP, it's really a chuckle, I just don't understand. I thought the philosophy of democratic socialism was based on benign, enlightened, liberal principles of politics. The founding fathers of the New Democratic Party did make it a point to see that this be a party of minority groups wherever in this country. It really amuses me to see some of those who say they subscribe to that political philosophy and then stand up and oppose for some cheap political gains. They do not see the tomorrow, they see only the today, and they stand up and oppose those great liberal principles with the founding fathers of the New Democratic Party, entrench and made the bases of this political party.

I do not say, and I appeal through you to Manitobans and to the people who live in this great province to shed fear. In doing this, in entrenching this, we are in fact providing leadership to the whole country, to our sister province, Ontario. What we do today, other provinces will follow later. What will happen today here is being watched with great care in Quebec. We will not have to raise up our voice later on. If we do provide rights to French-speaking people here, the Anglophones will get the same right in Quebec. They are watching us.

So, I would appeal to the people, all the people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, that they should see beyond their nose, and I'm sure they would. It is not in our power to change the course of history. I see the writing on the wall, so instead of leaving it to the political change and political process, I would suggest that let this fact be entrenched and let us make political history for Canada and for the generations, and by doing this, let us confirm our belief in the good great principles of democracy and multiculturalism.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chandra. Questions for Mr. Chandra from members of the committee?  
Mr. Ashton.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Yes, I was wondering if you could tell me what the situation in India is, in terms of languages, how many . . .

**MR. CHANDRA:** Thank you, sir, I think that's a very interesting question . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** A very intelligent question, but certainly out of order, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Kavnats, you anticipated the Chair's ruling. The question was not touched upon in the brief and is therefore out of order. Questions for clarification of the material in the brief only please. These are the rules the Chair has followed throughout.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** My apologies, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do you have a further question for clarification?

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Since the speaker was speaking on behalf of Canadians of Origins from India, I had wondered what his perspective, coming from his own national background, was. However, that's not for me to ask that question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If you wish to wonder about that, you may ask him after the hearing is concluded.

Further questions for clarification of the contents of the brief?

I know you would have liked to answer that question, but it would not be appropriate.

**MR. CHANDRA:** There is time, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Seeing no further questions, Mr. Chandra, thank you very much for your presentation here this evening.

**MR. CHANDRA:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I believe on the last call Mr. Forest was also standing.

Mr. Georges Forest, please. Mr. Forest, you have appeared before the committee once before. Do you appear again as a private citizen?

**MR. G. FOREST:** I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I am making history. Tonight I appear on behalf of someone else.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much.

**MR. G. FOREST:** I have for so many years been my own committee and my own group, but tonight I am proud to say that I have been asked by M. Joseph Bruce, le président de l'Union nationale métis Saint-Joseph du Manitoba, who is here to speak on his behalf for l'Union nationale métis.

I would like to draw your attention, Madame, Messieurs, to the fact that Louis Riel is here with us this evening. Would you stand please Louis. This is Louis Riel IV. Louis Riel IV, l'arrière-neveu je crois que je dois dire, de Louis Riel.

Je prends la parole, M. le président, ce soir et tout particulièrement comme étant le dernier à parler dans ces audiences publiques pour faire le point. Le point particulier sur ce fait qu'en 1869, Louis Riel, représentant de façon officiellement son gouvernement provisoire, représentant tous les groupes de la vallée de la Rivière Rouge, avait demandé au gouvernement canadien, entre autres, dans la liste des droits que l'anglais et le français soient les langues officielles du Manitoba. Avec tous les années qui ont suivies, nous avons toute une histoire à raconter et malheureusement trop peu de gens la connaisse. La fin de cette histoire est qu'aujourd'hui il y a un effort sérieux qui est fait pour essayer de corriger tout le dommage qui a été fait durant les 90 dernières années.

J'entendais plus tôt cette après-midi quelqu'un dire que les Canadiens français n'avaient pas souffert et on a semblé faire allusion au fait que l'embonpoint de M. Desjardins, de M. Robert et de moi-même était une indication que nous n'avions pas souffert. Au contraire, M. le président. Nous avons certainement su survivre. Mais comme l'a dit si éloquemment M. Taib, le professeur Taib Soufi, il y a quelques instants, ce fut cruel ce pénible effort de la législature du Manitoba de 1890 de pratiquer, comme certains l'ont dit, un certain génocide culturel sur le peuple canadien-français ou parler en français du Manitoba.

En particulier, le groupe métis que je représente ici ce soir, à titre moi-même de vice-président de l'Union nationale métis et au nom de notre président Joseph Bruce, ce peuple métis dont le livre que vous avez en main, "Hold High Your Heads", est le volume particulier de l'histoire de la nation métis en français, que nous avons présenté à M. Lecuyer, ça pour l'occasion c'est un cadeau que l'Union nationale du métis vous fait.

M. le président, je vous encourage fortement le plus tôt possible à lire cette histoire qui vous fera comprendre le rôle qu'a joué la nation métis dans la fondation de cette province et les temps difficiles qu'ils ont vécus même lorsqu'il s'agissait le traité avec les

leurs de langue française. Un épisode particulier, vous la trouverez dans le texte anglais "Hold High Your Heads" dans l'introduction qu'avait fait l'auteur Antoine Lussier. M. le président, il fait allusion à la difficulté qu'existait 1916 lorsque siégeant comme représentant de la circonscription de Saint-Boniface, le député Joseph P. Dumas avait lui-même tenté un procès devant les tribunaux du Manitoba et cela en français. Fort de sa responsabilité de mener la destinée du peuple, de ce petit peuple de 30 000 âmes, l'Association d'éducation des Canadiens français du Manitoba, fondée au printemps de 1916, s'efforçait de à être le seul porte-parole. Malheureusement, la communication n'était pas établie assez bien entre le peuple métis et l'Association de façon à ce qu'il s'est fait une division qui a, je crois, duré jusqu'à nos jours. M. Dumas et le peuple métis croyaient que c'était par les tribunaux et seulement par le tribunal qu'on pourrait rétablir la justice d'un droit qui nous avait été si cruellement enlevé en 1890. Alors l'Association d'éducation avait dit à tout le monde: N'appuyez pas Dumas, son avocat Dubuc et tous ceux qui se mêlent de cette affaire; ils n'ont aucun droit de nous représenter.

Je vais vous lire afin de consacrer au procès-verbal de votre comité le procès-verbal de la réunion du 16 juillet 1916.

"Une assemblée d'un groupe de Métis de Saint-Vital et des environs pour discuter et étudier les questions touchant les intérêts métis.

"Étaient présents: Joseph Riel, Alexandre Riel, Colin McDougall, Duncan McDougall, Martin Neault, Camille Teillet, Alexandre Neault, Jean-Marie Poitras, Patrice Beauchemin, William Beauchemin, Simon Marchand et Roger Goulet.

"M. Joseph Riel est nommé président et M. Patrice Beauchemin est nommé secrétaire de l'assemblée.

"M. le président invite M. Camille Teillet à faire l'exposé de la question principale qui a motivé cette réunion.

"En conséquence, M. Teillet dit comme suit:

"Le 27 février dernier eut lieu à Saint-Boniface une assemblée des citoyens de langue française de la province pour protester contre la persécution dont nous étions l'objet de la part du gouvernement Norris. Cette assemblée fut magnifique d'ordre et d'enthousiasme; l'union semblait assurée entre les diverses sections de la population française; les partis politiques étaient abolis; "TOUT POUR NOTRE LANGUE", tel était le mot d'ordre. Un comité fut formé. Il prit le titre de "ASSOCIATION D'ÉDUCATION". Quelques-uns des nôtres, 2 ou 3 je crois sur 50, furent nommés dans ce comité; c'était peu. Peut-être pouvions nous espérer une plus grande représentation, peut-être, mais les Métis habitués à ces sortes d'injustices, des injustes oubliés ne protestèrent pas. Ils acceptèrent le fait. Maintenir l'union était nécessaire pour réussir et nous étions prêts à bien des sacrifices d'amour-propre pour sauver notre langue. Tout alla pour le mieux pendant quelque temps. Depuis plusieurs semaines, deux faits très graves vinrent passionner l'opinion publique et jeter entre les Canadiens français et les Métis français un malaise qui va en s'accroissant et qui menace de briser d'une façon irréparable l'union indispensable au succès. Ces faits sont la poursuite Dumas-Baribault et l'attitude de l'Association. Ces faits sont de notoriété publique et nous en avons tous entendu parler. Aussi nous

n'allons donner qu'une analyse rapide et succincte en nous plaçant au point de vue métis.

"La poursuite prise par M. Joseph Dumas, député de Saint-Boniface, a pour but de faire respecter le traité fait entre le gouvernement provisoire de la Rivière Rouge en 1870 et le gouvernement canadien, traité sanctionné par le gouvernement impérial. Ce traité rend obligatoire l'impression des documents dans les deux langues dans les cours de justice. C'est-à-dire que le procès Dumas-Baribault a pour but de nous faire rendre l'officialité de la langue française et le résultat atteint il serait difficile de ne pas faire enseigner dans les écoles une langue officielle. L'attitude du député de Saint-Boniface n'eut pas l'heure de plaire à l'Association d'Éducation, qui par l'entremise de son président, l'Honorable Juge Prendergast déclara dans un article qui fit le tour de la Presse, qu'elle condamnait énergiquement la poursuite Dumas, qu'elle était décidée à ne pas se prévaloir des traités et à ne pas demander l'intervention fédérale, qu'elle abandonnait la lutte pour la langue et qu'elle confinait son travail à la maison d'école. Le président condamna Dumas en disant que celui-ci n'avait pas d'autorisation de l'Association pour mener une telle poursuite, que l'Association représentait les 30 000 habitants de langue française du Manitoba et qu'une douzaine de Canadiens français ne pouvaient pas avoir aucune autorité. L'Association seule devait agir.

"Maintenant, quelle doit être la position que doit prendre la nation métisse dans la circonstance? Devons-nous adhérer entièrement à l'Association d'Éducation ou devons-nous approuver la poursuite Dumas? Je crois que l'hésitation pour un cœur vraiment métis n'est pas permise. Nous ne pouvons pas à notre tour approuver l'Association d'Éducation et nous ne pouvons pas désapprouver la poursuite Dumas. La raison de cette attitude est que le député de Saint-Boniface, un métis, n'a fait que demander au gouvernement de faire honneur à la parole donnée aux Métis en 1870. Il fait cette demande au gouvernement de cette province, dans quelques jours il la demandera au gouvernement fédéral et il le demandera, espérons-le, jusqu'au gouvernement impérial à Londres. Nous ne pouvons approuver l'Association d'Éducation pour deux raisons. Premièrement, parce qu'elle n'avait pas le droit de condamner un homme sans connaître ses moyens. Elle aurait pu se contenter de le surveiller et de le laisser agir. Quel tort pouvait-il faire? Deuxièmement, les Métis ne pouvaient renoncer à lutter pour la langue. Libre aux Canadiens français d'abandonner le legs de Montcalm, ainsi que les libertés gagnées par la loyauté et l'héroïsme de leurs pères en 1775 et 1812, et par leurs martyrs de 1837. Ils sont maîtres de leur attitude et nous n'avons rien à y voir. Mais savent-ils ce que c'est de nous demander, à nous Métis, de cesser de lutter pour notre langue? C'est de demander à la nation métis d'oublier et de déclarer comme nul ce que leur résistance calme et digne de 1869-70 a obtenu; c'est lui demander d'oublier les persécutions dont elle a été l'objet; c'est de demander aux Riel d'oublier l'échafaud de Regina que les années écoulées n'ont fait que grandir et dont les années à venir feront un autel; comme le bucher de Rouen d'où s'est envolée l'âme de Jeanne d'Arc, Jeanne d'Arc qui est aujourd'hui le palladium de la France dans sa lutte gigantesque contre le despotisme touton; c'est de

demander à Lepine d'oublier l'exile et les cauchemars qui lui faisait voir le gibet et lui demander d'oublier les chaînes qui l'ont fait gémir longtemps dans les sombres prisons; c'est de demander aux Goulet d'oublier la vision qui leur montre une ligne de sang qui traverse la Rivière Rouge; c'est demander à André Neault d'oublier les poursuites acharnées de malfaiteurs altérés de sang, c'est lui demander de ne pas regarder ses mains et ses pieds jadis chargés de fer, c'est lui demander de ne pas mettre sa main sur sa tête pour ne pas penser à la profonde cicatrice qu'ont laissée les baionnettes des soldats de Wolseley; c'est de demander aux Lagimodière, aux Harrison, aux Beauchemin, aux Delorme, aux Carrière, aux Champagne, aux Proulx, aux Larivière, tourond, Vermette et tant d'autres d'oublier ce qu'ils ont souffert de persécutions et de misères; c'est en un mot demander à la nation métisse d'oublier une des plus belles pages de son histoire en renonçant de suivre ses traditions. Sans doute quand ils se sont prononcés, ils n'ont pas songé à toutes ces choses, autrement ils auraient pris une autre attitude. J'en suis convaincu."

Je m'arrête, M. le président, pour souligner que ce M. Camille Teillet, qui fut le secrétaire de cette assemblée historique, était le père de Roger Teillet, député de Saint-Boniface à la Chambre des Communes, et le grand-père de Léo Teillet qui je crois vous a présenté un mémoire il y a quelques jours. M. Camille Teillet était marié à Sarah Riel, une descendante de Louis Riel, le meunier de la Seine.

"Que devons-nous faire? (continu le mémoire) Prendre une attitude sur la question Dumas; et je crois que la seule que nous puissions prendre c'est d'approuver le principe, l'idée que revendique ce que la nation métisse a gagné. Pour ce qui est de la responsabilité, nous la laissons toute entière à M. Dumas. Ne connaissant pas ses moyens, nous demeurons convaincus qu'il saura porter haut et ferme le nom métis et qu'il rejettera loin de lui toute combinaison qui serait de nature à rabaisser un homme. Ce qui dans les circonstances rejallirait sur la nation à laquelle il appartient. Pour le moment, nous n'avons qu'à le féliciter de son idée en lui souhaitant bon courage, convaincus que nous sommes qu'il ira jusqu'au bout. Cette attitude nous force à nous tenir à l'écart de l'Association d'Éducation. Nous le regrettons profondément mais nous devons nous rendre cette justice que nous ne l'avons pas voulu. Un peu plus de jugement et de discrétion et, disons-le, un peu plus de connaissance de l'histoire et des faits lui auraient empêché de commettre ces erreurs vis-à-vis nous. Nous nous tiendrons sur la réserve; mais qu'il soit bien connu que nous n'avons au coeur aucun sentiment de haine ou de jalousie. Nous voulons garder et maintenir la nation métisse dans son entité, fidèle à ses traditions et à son passé. Nous sommes résolus à lutter de toutes nos forces pour conserver notre race distincte. Nous voulons qu'elle soit toujours métisse-canadienne-française. Que ceux qui rêvent d'assimilation en fasse leur deuil; leur rêve ne se réalisera pas. Nous resterons ce qu'ont été nos pères et nous enseignerons à nos enfants à suivre leurs traces. Dans les graves circonstances que nous traversons, il est important pour la nation métisse d'avoir une organisation nationale. Pour cela, formons d'abord un comité; nommons-le Comité national métis; que ce comité nomme un sous-comité, etc., etc."

Et là, M. le président, le restant du procès-verbal passe à la formulation d'une résolution qui fut transmise à M. Dumas. Et les pages d'histoire que je n'ai pas avec moi ce soir nous racontent que M. Dumas a répondu dans une lettre écrite de sa plume, en ses termes: "Je m'attendais pas de moins d'un coeur métis."

M. le président, une autre expérience que je dois vous raconter, et celle-ci est tout à fait courante. Certains d'entre vous avez entendu dire l'expression parlant du petit reste de 3 pour cent ou 8 pour cent de Canadiens français, que c'était une espèce endangée. Lorsqu'on parle de toute espèce naturelle endangée, on prend les mesures nécessaires pour sa protection. Je vous donnerais l'exemple de l'ours polaire qui est, nous le savons, une espèce endangée. Qu'est-ce qu'on fait? Premièrement, on interdit la chasse. Mais pour ce peuple français au Manitoba, c'est la chasse à l'homme et ça ne prend pas de permis. C'est à tout chacun dans le bureau, sur la rue ou ailleurs de lancer des bêtises, de faire toutes sortes de discriminations pour des droits enchâssés dans la Constitution qui ne sont pas respectés.

Sur cela, M. le président, c'est aussi d'actualité. De nos jours et de la part de quelqu'un qui est présent ici ce soir dans l'audience parce qu'il est Métis, parce qu'il est de langue française, il subit de la part de ses supérieurs, toutes sortes d'injustices sociales. Suffisamment que si c'était moi, il y a longtemps, et ça, ça se passe de plus en plus rapidement ces temps-ci à cause du débat qui fait le tour des journaux, le tour de la presse. M. le président, si dans le projet de loi que vous proposez établir ou passé devant la Chambre du Manitoba, il n'y a pas l'explicite déclaration que la langue française et la langue anglaise sont officielles au Manitoba - point - c'est injustice va continuer.

Je fais allusion, M. le président, à l'amendement qui nous a tombé sur la tête le 6 septembre dernier. Vous allez remarquer qu'ils sont peu nombreux les gens qui ont présenté des mémoires devant vous, qui ont fait, qui ont basé leurs arguments sur les amendements croyant que ce n'était pas fini, qu'il y en avait d'autres à venir, ou que ceux-là peut-être n'étaient pas tellement clairs.

Permettez-moi de m'attarder quelques instants là-dessus. Il y avait d'abord la résolution puis l'amendement. Je faisais, il y a quelques instants, allusion au fait que l'amendement qui se nomme 23.1, qui restreint la déclaration des deux langues officielles telle que l'on trouve dans la section 23 ou les sections 23.2 à 23.9 inclusivement, pour moi est hors d'ordre. Ce n'était pas entendu dans l'entente du 17 mai, et dans ce à quoi je me suis associé en tant qu'individu, le 24 mai dernier à Saint-Boniface. Le restant, et plus particulièrement pour ce qu'il en vaut, je trouve un peu genre omnibus de vouloir introduire une nouvelle section, celle qu'on appelle 23.9.

Dans ma présentation personnelle plus tôt, et je crois que c'était vers le 8 du mois de septembre, j'avais lu in extenso les remarques que faisait le député Harry Enns par rapport à la position des groupes ethniques au Canada et au Manitoba en particulier. Je ne réalisais pas à ce moment-là que ce que M. Enns disait dans son texte que peut-être l'année prochaine certains groupes ethniques ce présenteraient pour faire

enchâsser leurs droits et que l'année après et l'année après ce serait une suite infinie. Mais non!

Ce qui semblerait avoir été un échange de sympathies, si pas d'autre chose, entre les groupes ethniques et la Société franco-manitobaine, s'avère maintenant une course à faire enchâsser ce billet de crédits qu'elle réclame toutes ses sociétés ethniques en demandant à la SFM d'appuyer l'enchâssement de leur propre langue. Ça devient une vraie bouillabaisse. C'est un méli-mélo qui je crois n'a pas de sérieux. Ça n'a pas de fondement, ni dans le projet qui est cette résolution, ni dans ce qu'on peut s'attendre à ce que le gouvernement fédéral puisse accorder. Imaginez-vous s'il fallait enchâsser 32 langues dans la Constitution du Manitoba, et cela avec la sanctionnement du gouvernement fédéral, que deviendrait des autres provinces? Et plus particulièrement, nous osons croire puisque la province ou la circonscription de Louis Riel en 1869 était celle de tout le territoire du Nord-Ouest, était celle qui couvrait ce que sont devenues plus tard les provinces de l'Alberta et de la Saskatchewan en 1905.

Et alors vous êtes pas sans savoir vous qui êtes dans le domaine public que très tôt, je dirais d'ici quelques années, la Saskatchewan et l'Alberta vont se faire dire par la Cour suprême du Canada qu'elles doivent respecter le français dans leur province distinctive comme étant une langue officielle. Que peuvent attendre les citoyens de langue française et ceux de langue anglaise qui désirent le français dans ces provinces si nous ici au Manitoba, avec un droit enchâssé tel que celui que constitue la section 23, que peuvent s'attendre les citoyens de la province de Saskatchewan et l'Alberta, si nous, nous avons résolu à ne donner que des miettes.

C'est pourquoi, M. le président, s'il vous faut revenir à l'entente des trois partis qui a été signée ou sur laquelle vous vous êtes donnés la main le 17 mai dernier, je suis prêt à vivre avec les services dans les groupes distinctifs de là où le nombre suffit, lorsque le nombre le demande. Parce qu'avec la déclaration parapluie, la déclaration primordial qui établit les deux langues comme étant officielles au Manitoba, j'espère qu'avant trop longtemps on enseignera le français comme matière obligatoire à partir de la première année au Manitoba. Et dans trois ou quatre générations, il y aura des services partout - à Dauphin, à Brandon, et le reste. Vous m'avez déjà entendu parler de mon rêve et je n'y attarderai pas ce soir.

M. le président, lorsqu'on parle qu'il y a beaucoup de travail à faire, et sur ça je fais encore allusion au noble, je dirais même fameux, la fameuse présentation de le professeur Soufi qui nous a donné un exposé qu'on pourrait appelé peut-être un de l'extérieur puisque lui vit encore quand même sa culture tout en étant, avec ses enfants, pris dans le rouage de cette culture canadienne qui est en voie de développement. Mais il nous apporte une connaissance comme disait M. Lecuyer d'un homme qui faisait partie d'une université l'a où on enseigne pas moins d'une dizaine de langues.

M. le président, c'est dans cette optique qu'il nous faudrait envisager l'avenir. Basé sur les deux langues officielles et avec la part que nous donne toutes les autres langues et toutes autres cultures, la culture canadienne, dans les générations à venir, sera la plus riche au monde.

Nous avons, M. le président, dès cette après-midi, et ça m'a énormément surpris lorsque j'entendais M. Hutton, je crois le Révérend Hutton, à la page 6 de son mémoire faire allusion aux droits de la minorité. Il dit qu'il y a un nouveau concept qui est présenté ici. Je suis d'accord avec lui. J'interprète pas le nouveau concept de la même façon que lui, de toute façon.

Moi ce que je trouve c'est ceci. Mes droits de langue au Manitoba ne sont pas des droits de minorités. Ce sont des droits d'égalité. Je m'adonne à vivre dans un groupe minoritaire, mais mes droits sont des droits absolument d'égalité. Si je suis en minorité, ce n'est pas de ma faute. C'est 1890 qui l'a causé. Parce que si 1890 n'eut eu lieu, certainement beaucoup plus de Québécois se seraient dirigés vers le Manitoba. Que ça plaise ou que ça ne plaise pas à ceux qui n'auraient pas aimé cela.

M. le président, il n'est pas trop tard. Vous savez comme moi qu'il y a beaucoup de gens qui viennent du Québec pour s'établir au Manitoba. Il y en a qui se rendent même au B.C., en Colombie-Britannique et qui subissent là, comme la radio et la télévision nous l'ont appris dernièrement, de cruelles discriminations. Il est temps d'agir. Et puisque le Manitoba est le premier des enfants nés à la Confédération canadienne après cette union de 1867, c'est cet enfant premier qui doit montrer l'exemple. L'exemple que vous donnerez au Manitoba, et l'écriture est là sur le mur pour tout le monde à voir, le fait qu'on apprend cette après-midi que les trois partis politiques au gouvernement fédéral vous prient, avec toutes délicatesses j'espère mais avec toutes pressions possibles, de s'il vous plaît aller de l'avant, allez-y de l'avant. Il n'y a personne qui en sera le plus pauvre. Tout le monde en sera enrichi. Faudrait laisser de côté les énergumènes. Laissons de côté tous ces gens qui nous apportent des solutions qui sembleraient vouloir dire reculons l'horloge, refaisons la Constitution ou faisons une nouvelle constitution à tous les ans pour refléter ce que la voix du peuple, ce que la démocratie nous demande.

M. le président, les droits de la minorité, j'ai déjà traités. L'enchâssement des droits, je n'y touche pas; j'ai déjà développé cette chose-là. Le référendum au plébiscite, j'aimerais dire un mot. C'est une bombe. C'est dangereux ce plébiscite-là. Je suis prêt à accepter l'une ou l'autre des décisions pour ou contre le développement de la résolution par la Législature du Manitoba où le processus de M. Bilodeau devant la Cour suprême. Mais les conseillers en campagne électorale vont-ils pouvoir contenir le débat sur la question référendaire? Parce que ceux qui étaient les auteurs de cette plébiscite au Manitoba, autant M. Harms, président de l'Union des municipalités, que ceux qui l'ont poussé à la Législature ou à la Cité de Winnipeg, voulaient une autre question. Une question qui aurait été désastreuse à mon avis. Nous sommes heureux à cette heure de ne pas avoir la question qui aurait été voulue.

M. le président, il y a grand espoir pour l'avenir. Moi-même, je suis si longtemps pris par cette question constitutionnelle, que je languis. J'ai hâte qu'on passe à d'autres choses. Et déjà mon esprit s'envole.

Il y a un avenir à notre pays pour ceux qui j'ai entendus encore ce soir, quand M. Trudeau se retirera, ou quand M. Trudeau sera remplacé, il y aura certainement un successeur à la tête de notre pays. Et nous lui

souhaitons bonne chance. Pour se faire indépendant de tous partis politiques comme je le suis, et ça je parle autant au nom de l'Union nationale métis qui est absolument à politique, je me suis procuré personnellement deux billets pour assister à la réception que doit donner le parti conservateur du Manitoba à son chef national Brian Mulroney le 19 octobre ce mois.

Messieurs du parti conservateur qui êtes ici ce soir, j'ai aucune intention pour le moment de joindre votre parti. Mais je vous pose cette question. Pouvez-vous faire de la place dans votre parti politique pour un Canadien français ici au Manitoba. S'il vous faut dire à ces individus, dans vos rangs, sur la scène provinciale comme sur la scène fédéral, de la trempe de Dan MacKenzie, de soit se retirer ou de grâce se modérer ou de rien dire, je crois que vous allez montrer signe que vous voulez faire de la place. M. Mulroney, j'en suis certain, serait des plus heureux. Et c'est ça que je vois. Je vois le besoin d'un équilibre dans ces deux grands partis du pays, les deux grands partis politiques. Que le conservateur perde des votes dans l'Ouest parce qu'il a dit à son extrême droite, vous en avez déjà trop dit sur l'antimétrique, vous en avez déjà trop dit sur l'antifrançais. S'il vous plaît, passez donc à un autre parti politique. Ce cette façon, peut-être que les libéraux gagneront des sièges dans l'Ouest. Et ce n'est rien de mal dans les démocraties de souhaiter bonne chance à l'opposition. Et je souhaiterais bonne chance au parti conservateur au Québec parce que vous savez, comme moi, que l'Ontario est sensible au Québec. Et les électeurs conservateurs en Ontario seront plus certains de voter Mulroney s'ils savent que le parti adopte une politique nationale forte vibrante pour tout le pays.

M. le président, je m'adresse encore à ce parti conservateur et c'est dommage qu'il ne soit pas ici. Je vois qu'il a encore laissé ses papiers, M. Sterling Lyon. Le soir même de la réception de M. Mulroney, je vais demander à M. Lyon de me présenter à son chef. Je voudrais aider à ce parti politique de regarder vers l'avenir parce que c'est très important. Il y en a d'autre que moi. Je voyais dans La Liberté, dans nos journaux dernièrement, les remarques de M. Camil Chaput, qui à la réception qu'a tenue la Société franco-manitobaine à Sainte-Anne, indiquaient qu'il y avait un certain malaise. Il y en a combien d'autres de gens conservateurs de tous les temps qui se sentent mal ici au Manitoba. Et ce n'est pas naturel. Ce n'est pas du tout naturel. Il faut que quelque chose soit faite et si vous m'acceptez, Messieurs du parti conservateur, de vous aider à tracer cette voie. Je suis là.

Merci M. le président. Je vais terminer en disant, vous avez lu devant vous toutes sortes de papiers. Vous avez vu, et ça je l'attire à l'attention de mon bon ami Russell, celui qui parle du chien dans la crèche.

And that item, Mr. Chairman, I'll come back to my other language that I can use fairly well. The dog in the manger, I was speaking about that on the 8th of September, and someone was able to find this in the Winnipeg Library. It comes from Aesop's Fables, which are something like 600 years before Christ, and it reads like this, at Page 155 of this one book:

"A churlish envious cur was gotten into a manger, and there laid growling and snarling to keep the horses from their provender. The dog ate none himself, and yet rather ventured to starving his own carcass, then he would suffer anything else to be the better for it."

The moral - envy pertains to no other happiness than what it derives from the misery of other people, and will rather eat nothing itself than not starve those that would.

The context in which I was saying this is that, unfortunately, there are some people of the minority ethnic groups who feel that they must, at all cost, bark loud enough to keep the French-Canadians from having the rights that were so unlawfully removed from them in 1890. That, I think, is a very very good reminder of what was already seen more than 2,000 years ago.

M. le président — (Interjection) — yes, oh this. I was wanting to bring this to your attention. What you see behind Monseigneur Empson who is now just recently named as Chairman of the Manitoba Alcohol Foundation, I believe, is le drapeau de l'Union nationale métis. It is our flag. It was the flag of Louis Riel's Provisional Government of 1869, and as you see it is still regarded as our flag today with the ensign and the fleur-de-lis. I would only hope that once the Province of Manitoba recognizes its official status of a bilingual province that we might again, once more, consider that to be the Manitoba flag. It is a lot to ask, but I think it is an honest request. It's not going to be the flag debate of the Federal Government, but it is one that would only reflect what the Metis themselves wanted in 1869, and what this province was created as, respecting the two main cultures, and it certainly doesn't take anything from all those other people who have come to this province to participate in the growing culture and not to impose their language.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Your time has slightly more than expired. Questions for Mr. Forest?

Mr. Doern.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I have three or four separate and probably distinct questions. You made a statement, Mr. Forest, about a month ago that Mr. Penner had committed treason. I wonder if you could explain that remark. That's pretty strong language. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. R. DOERN:** . . . and I'm not here to defend the Attorney-General, but I wonder . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. That statement was not made as part of the presentation today. It's not our purpose to go back to previous presentations or other statements. Questions only for clarification of the brief presented tonight.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Well, I will then reword what I am interested in, and I want to ask you what you think of the proposed amendments?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Forest.

**MR. G. FOREST:** I was happy, although I wasn't present at Ste. Anne, I wasn't well that evening, I had not planned earlier to be, but on the very day of this very momentous occasion in Ste. Anne I was able to learn what Mr. Robert was going to say in his presentation.

Because it was so positive, I then regretted not having psyched myself to go. But on the other hand, I was not well and I had a lecture to give at the Mennonite Brethren School the next morning at 10 o'clock, and therefore I decided not to go.

But as a result of Mr. Robert's assertive statement that it is only the agreement of the 17th of May that they will be satisfied with, I feel that the comments that I had made earlier about Mr. Penner or about the amendments to the resolution are now passé.

**MR. R. DOERN:** And therefore you are withdrawing that statement?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. G. FOREST:** What is said is said.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Questions with regard to previous statements were ruled out of order. Mr. Doern, you have done this in the past. Please, when the Chair directs that certain lines of questioning are out of order, respect the Chair's direction. Do you have a different line of questioning, please?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, it has come up many times, and I wonder - there's been many references to Mr. Forest's experiences and the different fights that he's been involved in - if he could clear up a point, and that is in regard to your legal battles in regard to your parking ticket challenge, can you indicate what the total cost of that procedure was?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, order please. Mr. Forest, did you make mention to that case in your brief?

**MR. G. FOREST:** No, in no way.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Once again, Mr. Doern, the question then is out of order. I didn't hear the reference in the brief.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions, but perhaps I'll clear them with Mr. Forest later. They concern various things that he's involved in and interested in, but perhaps weren't covered in the brief.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If they don't relate to the brief, I'm sorry, I'd had to rule them all out of order or I would be inconsistent with all the previous guidelines I have received from the committee. Further questions?  
Ms. Phillips.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** No, I just want to speak on the point of order, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Lecuyer.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** I have just have one question, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Forest.

Mr. Forest, I understand and you stated you were speaking here to us tonight on behalf of the Union Nationale Métisse St. Joseph du Manitoba . . .

**MR. G. FOREST:** Union Nationale Métisse St. Joseph.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** . . . and I was wondering, Mr. Forest, if the comments you were making towards the end of your speech, which had to do with, I think, what one might call advice to the members of the opposition and offers of your support, or efforts that you offered towards them, were also made on behalf of the Union Nationale Métisse.

**MR. G. FOREST:** I don't think that my president would be at all foreign to the idea, because he is, himself, a very strong Conservative person. I have not previously cleared with them, because I told you that I was doing it on my own. Frankly, I can discuss that at our next meeting.

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton:** Mr. Anstett.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Forest, just a couple of questions. You spoke tonight with regard to Section 23.1, and in your brief I got the impression that you were willing to consider a package similar to one that would be fashioned on the principles of the May 17th agreement in your reference to Mr. Robert and, then in answer to Mr. Doern, expanded on that.

Is that a change from an earlier position, or is that an expansion on a position in which you held only a declaratory statement was required? Are you suggesting to the committee that basically the full statement of principles is now acceptable to you?

**MR. G. FOREST:** The full statement, which was the entente that was presented to us on the 24th of May at the St. Boniface College, I adhered to that. I gave my full support to that, but I broke ranks immediately upon reading the texts of the amendments of September 6th, and that is where I made some very strong statements, I agree. But as far as I'm concerned, and this would have to go back to what I have said before and the way I feel about entrenching services, I feel that you'd only entrench services if you want to limit a right. Therefore, I'm afraid of limiting the right and therefore I have stated that limiting services to a ghetto area where numbers warrant, in my opinion, is low abhorrent and that again I can identify with the Metis and the Native people, our ancestors. In that context, Mr. Anstett, I feel and I've said it before that I am flying above the need to be within a ghetto area.

If the government had only one thing to do, and from my knowledge of the court case as they have been going on since 1979, Mr. Bilodeau's included, the prime importance of your resolution is to establish a time frame for translation. The idea of entrenching services is secondary. So along with the time frame, a basic declaration, a reaffirmation of the two official languages, would in my opinion be the minimum that you should do. That in my opinion is something that you should do.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Just one short follow-up before I come to the next question. You say a minimum, but you're willing to accept the broader package.



**MR. G. FOREST:** I'm willing to accept, because based on that declaration, I'm sure that the door is open for the future.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** My second question then of the two I wanted to pose, Mr. Forest, relates to the declaratory section, and both in your brief and in your answers you have talked about the strength of your commitment to that.

Would you have strong exception to a declaratory statement, just to get an understanding of where you're coming from, similar to the one contained in the federal Constitution Act of 1981?

**MR. G. FOREST:** No, there you are talking about a limited statement. I would be tending to go towards the declaration for New Brunswick if that is of any assistance to you. But my main concern about the need to reaffirm the two official languages is based primarily on the fact that the 1890 law itself said "an act declaring that English is the official language of Manitoba." We have lived for 90 years with that assertion and in order to reinstate the status of the French language, a like declaration is necessary encompassing both, not to limit them to Section 23. 1890 did not state an act to make English the official language insofar as Section 23 is concerned; it was making it the language of the province . . .

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Just one very quick supplementary to that, Mr. Chairman. What do you see is the difference between the federal declaration statement and the New Brunswick? You appeared to make a distinction between them, and I don't have the act in front of me, so I'm not clear myself, but I didn't think there was a substantive difference, do you see one?

**MR. G. FOREST:** The federal declaration statement in Section 81 I think is derived from The Official Languages Act, which was so constructed to be able to apply to those provinces where French is not an official language. It was not intended per se for Manitoba, nor for Quebec, Ontario or New Brunswick, but for provinces like B.C., for Newfoundland. That is where I think the question of numbers warrant comes in and things like that. That's not the aspect that you're thinking of?

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Perhaps we can discuss that some other time.

**MR. G. FOREST:** Separately.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Ms. Phillips.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Forest, you said mostly in answers to the questions from my colleagues but also in your brief, I believe, your opinion of the amendments. I'm wondering what the opinion is of the group that you are representing tonight on the proposed amendments to the agreement.

**MR. G. FOREST:** Our position I think can be said very eloquently in those very words that Louis Riel himself

uttered in 1874, at the time of a political election, at the time when he was elected as a member in Ottawa, "All we want is the application of Section 23, nothing more, but equally, nothing less."

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett:** Further questions for Mr. Forest?

Mr. Graham.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Forest. Mr. Forest, you made mention in your address to us that you took strong exception to the position the SFM was taking after the amendments that were placed before this committee on the 6th of September, was that correct?

**MR. G. FOREST:** I did indicate that, Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr.- it is possibly and I was surprised myself in reading the minutes of Mr. Teillet of the 16th of July, 1916: "But it is my nature to make a quick judgment."

And at the time of the presentation of the 6th of September, I felt that something was going wrong because there had evidently not been a new meeting between the three parties and, for this resolution to be tabled, somehow this drew me to say quickly, things aren't right. That's why my reaction was so sudden. Frankly, of course, this is now water under the bridges over the Red River, but because of the battle that we are in I have already suggested several times to some of the people involved with the SFM, they should have constituted sort of a war committee meeting at 6:30 every morning in order to prepare what was going on and to decide, because this is the battle of the century for the rights of the French Canadian. I think anybody here would respect them for doing that. That is the nature of the beast that I would have directed and certainly would have been kept on top of it and being able to react more quickly.

I think what's happening now with the resolutions of the MARL on Friday is because of the SFM not having spoken fast enough. They're allowing everybody else to try and get their foot in the door before it's closed again.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** In your mind, Mr. Forest, will the proposed amendments and the subsequent proposal that we received here just in the last few days seriously undermine the position of the French community in Manitoba?

**MR. G. FOREST:** Now we're talking on the amendments as against the resolution itself?

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** That's right.

**MR. G. FOREST:** I am prepared to wager that if the amendments are brought in and even if they are passed with the majority that the government holds the Federal Government should not approve it; therefore, it's time wasted.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Forest, when you made your initial break, should I say, or made your position known

after the amendments were placed and the Franco-Manitoban Society explained their position, was that done on a matter of principle or was it a snap judgment that you were making?

**MR. G. FOREST:** Snap, but with principle.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Forest, in his remarks made several mentions of members of the Conservative Party and his desire to sit down and discuss matters with members of the Conservative Party. I know Mr. Forest, being a man of principle, and I think it would be an excellent idea to sit down with members of the Conservative Party, who are also men of principle. I thank him for the invitation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Graham. Further questions from honourable members for Mr. Forest? Seeing none, Mr. Forest, thank you very much and the association for your presentation here this evening.

**MR. G. FOREST:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Unless there is anyone else in the gallery whose name was not on the list who wishes to make a presentation, last call.

**MR. B. TURNBULL:** Mr. Chairman, my name is Barry Turnbull. I wasn't going to speak but, as many of you have seen, I've attended quite a few of the hearings. I am amazed that no one has touched on the things that are deep in my heart that I got involved in some two years ago, when the issue came up of putting the French language into our school.

Now, I represented a group that opposed this situation and immediately we were labelled as bigots and radicals. We found this very hard to believe because it was not only coming from people within the community that were supporting the bilingual process, but it was coming from trustees on school boards, principals, superintendents of schools, secretary-treasurers. This was really disheartening because we were fighting something that was foreign to us. We were very ignorant of the situation, but we weren't fighting it for the sake of French Immersion coming into the school.

In our particular school, we had a situation of English; we had a situation of Ukrainian bilingualism, if that's the correct word; and we also had a program of a special education program for disability learning children. The proposal that was put forward to us was that they proposed to put 14 classrooms of French Immersion into our school and take one-half of the school. That was the issue that we opposed.

As we got deeper into it, we found that the proposals were: No. 1, to remove the Special Education children because, after all, who were they? They weren't really people; we would just cart them off to another school someplace. After all, what do they know? They don't care. The second step was to remove the Ukrainian Immersion Program and park that off in another school to make room for the uprising French Immersion courses.

I'm happy to say that after some degree of negotiations with the school trustees and the school

board, we were able to limit that particular program to seven classrooms in our school. I'm not happy to say that it was limited, because I feel that the program will grow. But I'm happy that the fact is that we were able to keep, in particular, the Special Education Program, which is not only so vital to the children that it educates from the disability learning stage, but also from the fact that it also helps to educate the children on sounder footing that work with these children at the Grades 5 and 6 level.

Now, I have listened at these sessions to Mr. Forest, and I have received history lesson after history lesson from he and other members who are supporting this program. I am thankful for that effort because I've learned a lot; however, I still feel this is all dealing with what's in the past.

Presently, the way the French language is being taught in the school, this to me is the key issue. I feel it is being taught poorly. At the present basis of Immersion, we are teaching separation and segregation. This also breeds bigotry, and we are teaching it right to our children, and why? Because we are separating our children, we are dividing them into groups, we are making special cliches. We are saying to the children, you are different.

Already I've heard problems, just recently, of what's happening in St. Boniface in the high school - I forget the name of it, I think it's Belliveau - but I already heard that the teenage children are at war with one another. Why? Because we adults, politicians, school trustees, we have made them different. We have set up barriers of communication, and that is the most important thing, is the fact that we have set up the barriers, the walls, the children cannot communicate to one another any more.

I question the Liberal and the NDP financing of a minority group within a minority, and I call the SFM a minority within the French community. Mr. McDonald's speech of yesterday, or was it two days ago, of where he was questioned for financing, gave cause to believe that there was some mistrust in his credibility, that he was in fact another federal-provincial NDP shill. I say that because he is not honest; he is afraid to bring forth the facts.

The busing of the people to Ste. Anne was another example of playing poker with your own money. Twenty chartered buses bussed 2,000 people to Ste. Anne, and I think that's wonderful.

You give me 20 chartered buses and I'll fill this whole building of Anglophones that do not support you. That isn't necessarily the way it should be.

I am in favour of education. I am in favour of children learning the French language. I don't think it has to be done with entrenchment; I think it can be done with evolution. Put it properly into the schools, where it can be gained, and total bilingualism is not necessarily the answer.

There is a program that seems to be shunned called a French Core Program. The facts that have been presented to the school boards state clearly that the program does work with a great deal of success. It does not make a person bilingual, but it does give the person a firm foundation of becoming bilingual. The latest reports I read was that three months in a total immersion situation will produce a bilingual person. Now, if there is anybody that has other facts to that, I would be glad to hear them.

We talked about bigotry and prejudice in our briefs. I've heard them time after time, and I'm sick of hearing them. Anybody who is opposed is a bigot, is a racist, and this predominantly is brought on by anybody who basically supports the French entrenchment.

We talk about organizations and unions that support the SFM. These, gentlemen, I say to you, are individuals. They are not the masses.

I sat here and my wife held me down two nights ago when the union that I am a member of, the president stood here, without justification, and supported the amendments as put forward by the NDP. That union president has since been taken to task and he'll account for it tomorrow night at a meeting. Because it was not only my doing, but it was members of the employees' union that got very demanding on how one individual could stand up here and make statements for 1,000 people without consulting them, without consulting his executive, without consulting his shop stewards. Let me tell you there is turmoil within our union because of it. It is not that the people don't support it, it's the point that they were not given the right to choose. They were told that they support it.

As long as this kind of kangaroo court is going to continue, you're going to have turmoil, you're going to have unrest, and you may end up even with civil war.

Mr. Forest may go down as another Louis Riel. They may hang him, but unfortunately it won't be a legal hanging, it will be a lynching. Those are strong words and I realize that maybe they're out of context, because I believe that Mr. Forest is doing what he feels is right for his people. But unfortunately Mr. Forest speaks for a very small majority of his people, because I, like others, have very many strong friends who are of French ancestry. They have told me that they do not support the entrenchment of bilingual rights. They do not feel that they need it; they do feel intimidated.

I have friends of Anglophone origin that live in Ile des Chenes. They thought this was a great idea to put their child in French Immersion. Well, they didn't choose French Immersion, they chose the Francais Program. That child went through Grades 1 to 6. The reports all came home from her school saying, "Beautiful, the child's doing wonderful, just great," and the child can't speak French. But come Grade 7, she's no longer a good student. She's a handling problem. Why? All of a sudden, she's a handling problem. Grades 1 to 6, she had beautiful marks, participated in the French Program, did well. Now, all of a sudden, she's a French handling problem. Her teacher has given up on her, he'll teach her, but he won't stay with her. So therefore we have a child that has spent six years in a program and has now been taken out of the program, put into the Anglophone program and is now doing well in English.

However, the travesty of the justice is that child has lost six years of education and may eventually lose her right to become bilingual. This is a crime.

Gentlemen, the way we're going, entrenchment I don't think is the real case. I think if we let things go on a normal course of events, put the education into the school where all children can be taught, the entrenchment will not be a question, it'll become a fact. You won't have to say that English is the only language because many of our children, probably not in your time or mine, will become bilingual. It'll be an accepted

rule, not a fact of one that has to be entrenched. Thank you.

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Two questions: Mr. Turnbull, you talked about barriers of communication and you talked about a concern for elitism, are you saying that your concern is the fact that in Immersion programs or in bilingual programs that the separation element and the fact that one group will be bilingual and the great majority of people will not will produce very negative results?

**MR. B. TURNBULL:** Very definitely, I have fact - it all started I believe with William Osler School. There are many other people who can give you facts, too, that were in it much earlier than I whereby the school was suffering under - lack of enrolment.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Declining enrolment.

**MR. B. TURNBULL:** Declining enrolment, and that school was chosen for a bilingual setting, an Immersion setting. Keeping with the rules of the school board, etc., children were bussed in from other areas of Winnipeg that wanted to have this teaching.

I have letters from people in the area that I could produce, if warranted. One I was asked not to, but I don't think that's a problem today because I received this letter two years ago and this was from a very prominent doctor. He openly states that he tried very diligently to live with the situation as many parents were pulling their children out of the school because they didn't want it, or for whatever reasons. He was one who stuck with the program. When the principal was removed from the school for whatever reason and a Francophone was put in his place, they found the road of equal rights to both segments of the program eroded immensely. The next thing that came in were the milieus, and we must have this area, and the children must be segregated, and we don't want the English children to participate with the French Immersion children because that detracts from learning the language.

I have other facts on a school in Fort Garry where the children are definitely separated. There is a French end of the school and there is an English end of the school. The children start at different starting times. They have recess periods at different times, lunch hours at different times, a matter of 15 minutes either way just to avoid conflict with the children. The reason I know that is because I have a personal friend who is in that area who has a boy now in Grade 5 and her youngest was starting kindergarten last year. That child would now be in Grade 1. She did enroll her child in the program because she felt that this was the thing to do because of the federal commitment to bilingualism, that jobs depended on it.

You know, you can see it through the Armed Forces, the Civil Service, the RCMP, you name it. So goes French, so goes your promotions.

I have the latest facts that - how can I say this? People of scientific nature are being hired and replacing

doctorates and are being trained on the job to become doctors of philosophy or whatever you want to call it. I don't know the correct words for it.

These are all little things that irritate. People are afraid; they are fearful; they're afraid of the unknown. They're afraid of what can happen to their children. You ask the average person why they are putting their children in the bilingual program. They don't tell you that the child is there because they think it's a great education experience, which the answer should be. They tell you that my child will not be able to get a federal job. Now, isn't that a travesty, that the only jobs available to the population of Canada are government jobs? But that's what the public fear. I've asked that question because it was put to me by a citizen of St. Boniface. I couldn't quite believe it because that's the first time I heard it. I made it a point to go out and ask people who I knew, friends of mine, who were in the French Immersion Program, why they enrolled their child in French Immersion. That was not all the time the answer, but quite a few times that was the answer I received, "Their child will not be able to get a government job." — (Interjection)—

I'd like to go on if I may, because the more I talk about this, the more I get wound up, I remember things.

We talk about the funding, and I heard Mr. Ashton say something to the effect of how much money has been allotted by the Provincial Government? Maybe it's to a minimum amount, considering the fact of what has to be done, or what has potentially been agreed upon, but the fact still remains is that the people, the Anglophone people, who happen to be the majority, are fearful because of the reported - and these are facts, they are written in Hansard.

I have a copy of one, that in 1981, I believe the various ethnic communities of the St. Boniface proper area were given to the tune of \$600,000 financing from the Federal Government - \$600,000 and I think about the unemployment of Canada. I think about the Medicare programs in Canada and countless other things, and I say to myself, couldn't this money have been used to greater extent? Couldn't we have benefited the starving people of our nation, the unemployed? What is it, something like 800,000 unemployed in Canada? — (Interjection) —

Now, you see I hear the little catcalling in the background of the pro-bigot group in the back that don't appreciate facts and figures coming out. They sit here and catcall.

I remember a man here yesterday who was ejected from this meeting for this very same thing, because he spoke his mind. I don't say he was justified in what he did, but he was thrown out of the meeting because he spoke his mind.

But if you are a French supporter, and you come to this meeting, you can say all the things you want, and the present government stands there and agrees with it.

**MR. R. DOERN:** My final question, Mr. Turnbull, is this: Again, on the same topic, you express the concern about elitism and the separation of students and so on, do you have any comment or knowledge or information about the students themselves, whether they are acting in a manner or consider themselves

superior to the unilingual students because of their status in this program?

**MR. B. TURNBULL:** I can honestly answer that by saying "no." The area that I'm involved with right now is very young in the program. I have tried as a citizen member to advise our school board of these situations, and I've tried to head it off in our area, because I feel that the French program can be taught in unison with the Anglo programs, and the Ukrainian programs, and the German programs, and they can be taught with harmony, but they'll never be taught in harmony as long as you segregate children.

I just wait, like the present program we are running in our school, we are running at the Grade 3 level. I've heard educators in our area and trustees say, "We don't have any problems. There is no fighting or misconception of the individuals." And I say, "The program is a young, it is just growing."

From my experience from my own two children, who I have been quite successful in keeping my stand on the issue private from them up until this last year - they're both in high school now - it took me two years to establish a parents' group in our school. I can honestly tell you that the principal of that school is doing everything within his power to destroy that group, because he doesn't like the interference of the school membership, parents. I'm sad to say that I will be issuing my comments to the school board and I am going to publicly ask for this man's removal, because I feel he is not only a detriment to our children, he is a detriment to all the children because he is not looking at things in an equitable manner.

I'll give you another example. There has been talk in our school, and I have no foundation for this fact outside of it's hearsay, except for one thing. I know of one person. New children are coming into our school and we have reason to believe that they are not being told that there is an English program within the school. They are being sold the merits of bilingualism in the French and Ukrainian language. I have it on fact that one person, who is an immigrant, came into the school to register and she was interested in the English Program. She was shown the Ukrainian Program - this woman happened to be Ukrainian, by the way - and she was shown the French Program. She went from there to another school who taught English and German. The principal of that school, once finding out where she lived, directed her to Springfield Heights, and she told the principal they don't have an English Program there.

I question what's going on in our education system. Are our school boards, are our school trustees, are our superintendents and principals being guided to push this Immersion Program at all costs? I question that, because that's the kind of distrust that is being reaped in the area. It's sad, it really is, because I don't think any person in their right mind has anything against a person learning another language.

Gentlemen, I submit to you, it's all in the way the soup is being made.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

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

Seeing none, Mr. Turnbull, thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

That concludes the presentation hearing portion of the meetings. The Chair hasn't been notified of any intention to call subsequent meetings, so I take it the next meeting would be at the call of the Chair, unless there is further business before the committee.

Mr. Graham.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I have a question that probably is one that the Clerk might be able to answer.

There have been numerous briefs that have been filed and we, as members, have not yet seen those briefs. Have we any indication when the addendum will be printed and when we can expect to get the recorded Hansard of all of the hearings to date?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'm advised that the transcript for this meeting will include all of the 95, I believe, written briefs to date; that it may well be, because of the volume of that particular transcript, that it may not be available until the middle or end of next week. The other transcripts up to that one have been coming on a fairly regular basis, and I expect the balance should be caught up by the end of this week or early next week.

The Hansard staff, because of the volume and also because of the translation that has been involved, are doing the best they can, but there have been some delays.

Mr. Graham.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, does that include the translations?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The translation of briefs presented in French to English, they have originally appeared in French in the transcript of the hearing at which they were given. The translation has appeared in the earliest subsequent issue of the transcript at which it was available, so they have appeared on an ongoing basis. For example, all of the briefs given in French at the initial Winnipeg hearings have already appeared, I believe, in the Swan River or Ste. Rose transcript as an appendix to that, and they are cross-referenced as to the original issue.

It may be possible, if perhaps each caucus might like, we have avoided this so far, but if there is some urgency in terms of seeing the written briefs, we are reluctant to copy all of the 95 written briefs for every member and felt we only put them in the transcript to avoid fairly extensive costs and volume of material. It's a stack almost a foot high, and Hansard is currently working on the documents to get them into the transcript, which is what the committee had earlier requested. It may be possible by Friday of this week to produce one complete set for each caucus.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** No, Mr. Chairman, that wasn't the request that we are making at all. What I am concerned about, and I'm sure every member is concerned about, we have heard numerous briefs, it's going to take time to assess those briefs, and it would be beneficial to have the complete recorded Hansards for that, so that we would have it all in one uniform size where we could do our work.

The work that is before us still is extensive, and I was just wondering if there was some indication of when we could have the Hansard additions so we could then begin our work.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Clerk has advised that they should all be done by the end of next week at the latest, done and printed and in members' hands.

Of course, that's based upon the Clerk's best estimate at this point, having talked to the Hansard Co-ordinator earlier in the day. I can get the member a firmer estimate perhaps tomorrow or Thursday.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** That I thank you for, Mr. Chairman. I was just looking at what kind of time frame we're looking at when you mention the next meeting should be at the call of the Chair. Realizing that it is going to be another 10 days before we have the material before us, I think it's a pretty voluminous task that is before us, and I'm sure that there will be some contact before that time as to the suitability of the next meeting, so I'm quite willing to abide by the call of the Chair for the next meeting.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would make one point, Mr. Graham, in accordance with a request of members at the beginning of these hearings, I had asked Hansard staff and asked them to ask the Queen's Printer to put the transcripts of these hearings on the same basis as they do the transcripts of Hansard of the Assembly itself, so that the fastest possible reproduction and turnaround time could be accomplished because of the importance of the issue. They have been doing that, but certainly the volume of some of the transcripts and the translation have meant some delays.

With regard to the time for the next meeting, as Chair, I don't have any specific information at this time, but I think it's reasonable to assume that since the meeting to consider an initial draft report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture considering the Western Transportation Initiative, the whole Crow issue, was some four weeks or thereabouts after the hearings ended, I think on this issue it's not an unreasonable assumption to think that it may well take that long or longer.

I know that members in the government feel there is a time imperative, but that's something that's going to have to be decided. I assume the Chair will be advised by the government when it wishes to have the first meeting to consider the report and that will be done in consultation with the opposition. I understand that's normal practice.

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

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** One other item I would have - Mr. Lyon.

**HON. S. LYON:** I think you've already confirmed it, Mr. Chairman, and if so, the question is redundant. If there could be any indication from members of the government, who are at the committee tonight, about your expectation and it would be mine, too, that at the very least we would not be convening until after all members had had the opportunity of having all copies of Hansard in front of them; that's No. 1.

Then, if we could expect as in the normal course that there would be sufficient notice, as Mr. Graham has indicated, given so that people on both sides of the House can order their affairs to be at the committee meetings; that's No. 2. I think you have quite properly indicated that kind of notice would be given by you as soon as possible.

Then, No. 3, I would expect again, can we expect that the government at that reconvened meeting two, four weeks hence, whenever it may be, would be working toward providing a draft, a first draft of a committee report, that we would have an opportunity to look at preferably before the committee met or what would be your expectation in that respect?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Lyon, all of the suggestions you make are reasonable and conform with past practice, but I can't speak for the government's intentions at this time and I don't know if anyone on the government side of the committee can. Certainly I would say it's reasonable, it conforms with past practice and to do otherwise would be a deviation from what normally happens with regard to committees, both intersessionally and during the Session, when they're considering a matter on an extended basis such as this.

#### WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED, BUT NOT READ

1. Mr. Jim Robertson
2. Town of Souris
3. Mr. John M. Brooks
4. Mayor A.R. Friesen, Town of Morden
5. Reeve J.R. Guthrie, R.M. of Pipestone
6. Mr. Ben Lemky,
7. Town of The Pas
8. Group of Residents from Swan River
9. Mr. Jim Chegwin
10. R.M. of Sifton
11. Mme. Irène Lecomte, Ste. Rose, Manitoba
12. Ms. Hélène Montsion, Comité culturel de Ste. Rose
13. Mrs. Elvier Brunel
14. R.M. of Shoal Lake
15. Mr. Jim Reid, R.M. of Albert
16. Reeve Arnold M. Birch, R.M. of Rosedale
17. Mayor Ken Burgess, City of Brandon
18. R.M. of Arthur
19. Ms. Mariette Bose Saquet, Laurier, Manitoba
20. Mr. Jean-Louis Saquet
21. Mr. René Saquet, Laurier, Manitoba
22. Mr. Jacques Saquet, Wasagaming, Manitoba
23. Reeve Norton E. Cassils, R.M. of Winchester
24. Mr. Harry F. Robinson, Winnipeg, Manitoba
25. Mayor M.J. Stefaniuk, Rapid City Town Council
26. Ms. Marie-Joséphe Fiset, Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains
27. Mr. Fablo Jajalla, Winnipeg, Manitoba
28. Manitoba Municipal Administrators Association
29. Mr. Arno H. Jansen, United German School of North Kildonan
30. Mr. Clarence Kiesman
31. Irish Canadian National Committee
32. Ms. Elsie Jawolik, Gimli, Manitoba
33. L.G.D. of Fisher

**HON. S. LYON:** We will then adjourn with the presumption that common sense will prevail.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I trust we always adjourn that way.

**HON. S. LYON:** We live in hope.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** One other item, ladies and gentlemen, there may be some individuals who were absent and will not now have an opportunity to present a brief. Would it be agreed so as not to hold up the production of tonight's transcript that any further briefs that may be submitted in writing be distributed to each caucus, in terms of providing a copy initially, and then printed in a subsequent transcript when we are considering the report, in other words, an initial copy to each caucus and printed further on down the road as an appendix? Is that suggestion agreeable?

Any further business before the committee? Hearing none, the committee is adjourned to the call of the Chair.

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

34. Mr. Willie Dumont, Manitoba Metis Federation, Interlake Region
35. Fred & Phyllis Ronge, Matlock, Manitoba
36. S.M. Taylor, Winnipeg, Manitoba
37. Theresa & Alex Novak, Winnipeg, Manitoba
38. Mr. Brian Lange, Moosehorn, Manitoba
39. Presentation signed by a number of Teachers from Ecole St. Malo
40. Ms. Doris Hogue, Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba
41. Mr. Gilbert Fournier, Chambre de Commerce
42. Ms. Gisèle Loyer, Lorette, Manitoba
43. Le Club de Bicolo
44. Yvonne Lagassé, Ste. Anne, Manitoba
45. Mr. Léo Nadeau
46. Mr. Louis Fiola, Ste. Geneviève, Manitoba
47. Ms. Carmen Catellier, Educateurs franco-manitobains de la division de la Rivière Rouge
48. Ms. Yvette Fluet-gagnon, Ile des Chênes, Manitoba
49. Mr. Gilbert Legal, Ecole secondaire la Broquerie
50. Mr. Hubert Balcaen
51. Le Club de Curling de La Broquerie
52. Ms. Jeannine Kirouac, La Broquerie, Manitoba
53. Ms. Rachele Ouellet, Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba
54. Comité Culturel de La Broquerie
55. Father Gérard Clavet, Clercs de Saint-Viateur résident à La Broquerie
56. Mr. Pierre Palud, Professeurs du secondaire de l'École Pointe des Chênes
57. Ms. Claudette Lavack
58. Mr. Hubert Bouchard, Comité protecteur Scouts-Guides Animatrices et Animateurs de La Broquerie
59. Mr. Gilles Normandeau, École Pointe des Chênes
60. Mr. Armand Fréchette, La Broquerie
61. Mr. Léonard Desharnais, La Chambre de Commerce de St. Pierre-Jolys, Manitoba
62. Le Personnel de l'École St. Joachim de La Broquerie
63. Mr. Normand Barnabé
64. Mr. Aimé Gauthier, Comité de direction du centre récréatif de St. Pierre
65. Ms. Lyse Desharnais, Comité de parents de l'École élémentaire de St. Pierre

66. Mr. Aimé Tétrault
67. Comité de patinage artistique de La Broquerie
68. Mme. Irma Gauthier, La Broquerie
69. Mr. Jacques Trudeau, Ile des Chênes, Manitoba
70. Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin, Ile des Chênes, Manitoba
71. Ms. Michèle Lagimodière-Gagnon, Lorette, Manitoba
72. La ligue St. Gérard de La Broquerie
73. Ms. Georgette Gérardy, Comité culturel de St. Labre
74. Ms. Raymonde Graham
75. Thérèse Cloutier, s.j.m., Ste. Anne, Manitoba
76. Mr. Thérèse Bouchard
77. Mr. André Plamondon
78. S. Zélie Ruest
79. Ms. Lucie Dupuis
80. Denise & George Perron
81. Lise & Roberte Boily
82. Ms. Cécile Bérard
83. Mrs. Sylvia McInnes, Ste. Anne, Manitoba
84. Mrs. J.L. Asta Asselstine, World Women's Christian Temperance Union.
85. LGD of Reynolds
86. LGD of Stuartburn
87. D. Nelson, Winnipeg, Manitoba
88. Mr. Ross Meggison, Goodlands, Manitoba
89. R.M. of Morris
90. Dept. of Community Relations, Winnipeg Jewish Community Council
91. Ralph James, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties
92. Supplementary submission by the Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages
93. Omer Fontaine, Ste. Pierre, Manitoba
94. Mrs. Margaret B. Ladders, Winnipeg, Manitoba
95. Mr. Henry Elias, Winnipeg, Manitoba

### **SUBMISSION NO. 1 JIM ROBERTSON**

Mr. Chairman and Member of the Legislature.

I do not agree with Premier Pawley wanting to entrench The Manitoba Act, Section 23, making French permanent, which means that once entrenched it cannot be changed. I think that would be a step backwards, we might be giving future generations something that they don't want. The act can be changed in the courts or by referendum.

Two leading constitutional lawyers said that it was possible that the Supreme Court could decide that all Manitoba laws were invalid. What is Premier Pawley's motive for entrenching French? It is not just the cost of the courts, and there is not enough French people in Manitoba to warrant the change, or does he just want to gain favor with Quebec? If the Manitoba Government wants to demonstrate constitutional process they should have a referendum.

In 1968, I watched the Premiers and Prime Ministers Convention on T.V. At one point they were discussing bilingualism in Canada. Walter Weir read the part in The BNA Act concerning the two languages, "French may be spoken in the House of Commons, it may be spoken in the Exchequers Court, and it may be spoken in Quebec." Daniel Johnson, the Premier of Quebec, and the Prime Minister and other Frenchmen were

present. There was no more discussion on the subject. That means that French does not have to be spoken in Canada. The government has been fooling the people all these years for Quebec's 87 seats, and the provinces have been going along for political reasons.

I think that is Premier Pawley's reason for wanting to entrench French in Manitoba.

The French situation in Canada is just a political farce from start to finish.

Submitted by: Jim Robertson.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 2 COUNCIL, TOWN OF SOURIS**

To the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections:

The Council of the Town of Souris would like to thank you for the opportunity of presenting a brief regarding the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

The British North America Act of 1867, under "Miscellaneous Provisions" Section 133 stated as follows:

"Either the English or the French Language may be used by any person in the Debate of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any Person or in Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any part of the Courts of Quebec. "The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages."

At the time of enactment of said Act, Canada was divided into four Provinces - Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

The Parliament of Canada and Houses of the Legislature of Quebec were singled out to provide either English or French Language services as well as Courts of Canada and Courts of Quebec. The Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in passing The British North America Act of 1867 must, in its wisdom, have felt that French Language Services were unnecessary in the other provinces which formed the Dominion of Canada.

The Canadian Parliament in 1870 enacted legislation known as The Manitoba Act (validated by The B.N.A. Act in 1871).

"The Manitoba Act, Section 23 requires that either the English or French language may be used by any person in the Debates of the Houses of the Legislature, and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any Pleading or Process, in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under The British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any part of the Courts of the Province. The Acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages."

In 1890 the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba sought to abolish the use of the French Language,

insofar as it was to be used in the Legislature and the Courts, by passing The Official Languages Act. This Act was invalidated by a Supreme Court ruling in 1979.

The fear of having to have all Manitoba Statutes translated into French has led to a blackmail atmosphere whereby the Provincial Government is willing to go beyond the required services and extend French Language services into other areas, such as Municipalities.

The main concern of our Council is that the cost of providing French language services in Manitoba will become a burden on taxpayers in one tax form or another.

Extension of French Language services as proposed will, in our opinion, be the start of an uncontrollable advantage of bilingual persons employed in both the Public and Private sectors.

With the above factors in mind, we would ask the Committee to convey to the Provincial Government our dissatisfaction with the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Respectfully Submitted: Council, Town of Souris, Souris, Manitoba, R0K 2C0

**SUBMISSION NO. 3  
MR. JOHN M. BROOKS, MORDEN,  
MANITOBA**

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections  
Morden, Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman:

In a word or two I would just like to say that I am opposed to the amendment to The Manitoba Act entrenching the French language in the Constitution.

The French-speaking population in Manitoba that would be unable to communicate in English would be very small. In fact, I believe it would be safe to say that it would almost be impossible to find any person of French origin in Manitoba who cannot speak English.

Well, does this mean that should a French-speaking person who wishes to communicate with a government service be denied the right to speak French? No, it means that I, as a taxpayer, would be better off to hire an interpreter on that person's behalf than to have all the laws written in French. It is an unnecessary expense.

I might add that I believe Mr. Roland Penner, and the present provincial government, have made a mistake in bringing this issue forward at this time. Mr. Roger Bilodeau should have been permitted to take his case to the Supreme Court because I feel quite confident the Supreme Court would not let us become a province without laws because they were written in English only.

In closing, I would like to say the Francophone society should be promoting English and not French, as English and not French is the most widely spoken language in the whole world.

Respectfully Submitted: J.M. Brooks.

**SUBMISSION NO. 4  
MAYOR A.R. FRIESEN, TOWN OF MORDEN**

To the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections

Morden Hearing - September 22, 1983

Re: Amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen

The Council of the Town of Morden go on record as being in full support of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, 1870, which states:

"Either the English or the French Language may be used by an person in the Debates of the Houses of the Legislature, and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, or in any pleading or process, in or issuing from any court of Canada established under The British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any of the courts of the province.

The Acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages."

And are opposed to further entrenchment of French language rights.

On behalf of Council of the Town of Morden, I request that no further amendments be made to "Section 23."

We are of the opinion that the communities of rural Manitoba can help any "ethnic group" with language problems. We feel that legislation is not required to solve a language problem.

I can give an example: That in 1979 an international company opened up a manufacturing plant in Morden. Members of the family of management were not able to speak one word of English and the citizens of the community provided interpreters for this family.

A.R. Friesen, Mayor  
Town of Morden.

**SUBMISSION NO. 5  
J.R. GUTHRIE, REEVE  
RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF PIPESTONE**

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections

Sirs:

The Council of the Rural Municipality of Pipestone cannot understand why any previous or present Manitoba Government have made no attempt to have Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 amended (through proper channels) to coincide with The Official Language Act passed by the Manitoba Legislature in 1890.

We think the Manitoba Government should listen to the majority of rural municipalities opposing this legislation.

These municipalities have many French-speaking citizens within their boundaries, some nearly total in population.

These people can all speak, read, write, and understand English; so there is really no urgent need for a service which the province cannot afford.

However, if the Government of Manitoba insist on going ahead with this legislation (and it appears they are), then we agree with the points made to Premier Pawley in a letter from our President, Dave Harms, particularly that the French service should adhere only



to the Legislature and not to other government or public services. The legislation should be kept to a base minimum.

We further believe that there should be no grants whatsoever (Federal or Provincial) to any municipalities who wish to offer their services in the French language. If they want it, they should have to pay for it.

In conclusion, the Council of the Rural Municipality of Pipestone are strongly opposed to the proposed bilingual legislation within the Province of Manitoba.

J.R. Guthrie  
Reeve  
Rural Municipality of Pipestone

### **SUBMISSION NO. 6 BEN LEMKY**

In my brief to the members re French extension in Manitoba, I very strongly object to the principle of two men being able to think they can force the government to make into law majority French in Manitoba, as the French have already equal rights-plus. When I shop in a store I have to make a real effort to locate the English printing on the packages.

When French was established as one of the two official languages, the two peoples were about equal. Now we have a very different situation, there is every reason to have Manitoba English. Let the French have their language in their community, where warranted, but do not force it down my throat. The Crow rates were changed, so also can this old law of French in the Constitution be dropped. Ottawa does not necessarily make good laws for Manitobans; example is, prostitution which the provinces have no say in, yet they are the only ones affected.

I want a strong Manitoba, but by enforcing present legislation is causing very hard feelings.

Louis Riel made war in Manitoba, languages were also involved. Belgium had not got unity with French and Flemish.

I very strongly urge our government to withdraw this legislation as these two instigators have lost their cases in all Manitoba courts.

Ben Lemky

### **SUBMISSION NO. 7 COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF THE PAS**

The Town of The Pas recognizes that the Province of Manitoba and our community are made up of minority groups. This is a fact and, as a community which has a number of people of varied ethnic origins, we have seen that their presence has contributed much to our quality of life. The proposed constitutional amendment recognizes this reality and the Council of The Town of The Pas has publicly gone on record in support of the plan to extend language rights. We have stated that our support has been based on the fact that the proposed amendment is a step in restoring rights which were taken away in 1890. We feel it is reasonable to restore these rights and the proposed amendment will be the one step to "right a wrong."

If there is a criticism of the proposed plan, we would focus on the process. The scenario which has unfolded

is that the government has endeavoured to legislate first and educate second; we, as a Council, feel that this process should have been reversed. The present format of public hearings should have been prior to negotiations being entered into with the Société Franco-Manitobaine. This would have enabled all individuals to state their concerns and would have undoubtedly lessened the fear and apprehension. Having said that, we recognize full well that the Attorney-General was faced with an impending Supreme Court Hearing which placed obvious time constraints on all concerned.

In summary, the Council of the Town of The Pas reached a positive consensus on the proposed plan to extend French language rights in the Province of Manitoba. We do not see the services as a privilege; rather as a right - a right which is being restored!

It appears that the foremost concerns of the majority of the municipalities in Manitoba relates to the possible inclusion of municipalities in the proposed amendments. The Premier has addressed this question in stating that the government will be proposing an amendment which will specifically exclude municipalities and school boards from any constitutional obligation under The Manitoba Act as amended. This very clearly indicates that the extension of French language services in Manitoba will not be imposed upon municipalities and school boards, but rather it becomes a matter of choice for each municipality if they wish to do so.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 8 SWAN RIVER AREA RESIDENTS**

Brief to the Clerk of Committees:

We, the undersigned, are strongly opposed to the proposed entrenchment in the Constitution of French as an official language of Manitoba for the following reasons:

1. Since the 1890's, immigrants coming to Manitoba have accepted and recognized English as the common language of the province. Generally this policy has proven satisfactory and a unifying influence in the development of the province.
2. Persons requiring services in the French language in Manitoba continue to be a small minority out of an approximate total of six percent population of French origin. For these persons adequate provision for service in their own language has been provided in the Legislature and the courts of law. Under these circumstances we do not believe the proposed entrenchment of the French language to be realistic or warranted.
3. We have witnessed the increasing disunity and animosity between French-speaking and English-speaking citizens of Manitoba arising from the Federal Bilingual Policy - to say nothing of the tremendous cost to the taxpayer. Bitter resentment has been created from what we believe has been the abuse of the act to discriminate against English-speaking Canadians in employment and promotions in the public service. We fear that the proposed change would open the door to similar abuse and discrimination in public affairs in Manitoba.

Since there appears to be many thousands of Manitobans opposed to the proposed entrenchment of French as an official language for the reasons listed herein, we favor the holding of a clear-cut referendum on this question before any change is made in the present laws in this regard.

Dated: Swan River, Manitoba, September 13/83

Bearing signatures of:

G.W. Finlay; R.W. Finlay; Gordon Parsons; Ralph Craig; William Wotherspoon; J.A. Cookshaw; Alex Macaulay; Ethel Barnfield; E.C. Sims; O.S. Brandson; E.M. Sims; Harold Dunning; A.C. Abigail; J.A. MacLeod; and C.S. Robinson.

**SUBMISSION NO. 9  
MR. JIM CHEGWIN**

September 14th, 1983

The Committee on Bilingualism for Manitoba

Sirs:

I wish to make some brief comments, but serious, on this issue.

We must respect the Constitution as set up when Manitoba joined Confederation, and I feel that it was sound thinking.

I conclude this because I feel we, as a nation of people, have a potential of richness because of our broad base of ethnic background. This richness will not come to fruition if we are not all given equal status. On the contrary, it will divide us and hurt us as a nation and as a community if we proceed to snuff the rights of some people.

The approach taken by our Attorney-General and our government; and the agreement reached between Manitoba and the Government of Canada is very reasonable and should be applauded. It would appear that most of the affected areas will have their needs looked after. The process of "catching up" has a practical time frame and is relatively inexpensive. We have the added advantage of Federal Government input.

If we take a positive and constructive attitude to this issue and our fellow citizens of other national backgrounds, we will gain and be happier together.

Respectfully,  
Jim Chegwin.

**SUBMISSION NO. 10  
RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF SIFTON  
COUNCIL**

The Council of the Rural Municipality of Sifton has discussed the questions of bilingualism in Manitoba at their recent council meetings and with as many ratepayers of the municipality as was possible.

Council found a considerable amount of opposition to writing bilingualism for Manitoba into the Constitution. Questions that have been raised and for which we have not received answers are:

1. What will the cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba be to implement the changes?
2. What form of French is to be used? "Parisian" French or "Canadian" French?

3. What guarantees are there that this amendment will not be changed in the future so that municipalities and school boards will be forced to spend tremendous amounts of money to translate documents and teach French to staff members, or replace those who do not wish to be bilingual?

We, the Council, as elected representatives of the residents of the Rural Municipality of Sifton, would like to take this opportunity to express our opposition to the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act concerning the translation of certain statutes and the provision of French Language Services.

**SUBMISSION NO. 11  
MADAME IRÈNE LECOMTE**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

L'histoire veut qu'aujourd'hui je me retrouve devant vous pour vous exprimer mon appui aux amendements à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. En toute justice, cela devrait être les législateurs de 1890 qui reviennent nous faire leurs excuses.

Je veux vous parler de mes frères et sœurs, de mes parents, de mes grands-parents ainsi que leurs parents qu'ont toujours trouvé fierté à se dire Manitobains. Canayens. Certains d'entre eux se contentaient de faire confiance aux législateurs en place. Quel malheur! Dans notre histoire, il y a eu des gens jaloux, ils ne savaient parler qu'une langue. Des gens de peu de scrupules qui préféreraient radier une langue qu'ils ne connaissaient pas, plutôt que d'offrir à eux-mêmes et à leurs enfants une plus grande ouverture d'esprit: ceci en apprenant le français, langue d'un peuple d'apparence soumise.

Je suis heureuse de voir aujourd'hui cette même législature est prête à rendre justice à des milliers de fidèles Manitobains. Je vous assure que je suis ce dossier avec le plus grand intérêt.

Donnez raison de fierté à notre province natale en recommandant que la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle que négociée en mai 1983 devienne loi. Merci.

Mme Irene Lecomte  
Ste. Rose du Lac, Manitoba  
C.P. 156  
ROL 1S0

(Je suis membre du Comité culturel à Ste-Rose-du-Lac)

Comme il est impossible pour moi d'assister le 16 septembre, j'aimerais tout de même être entendue.

**SUBMISSION NO. 12  
HÉLENÉ MONTSION**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Les Franco-Manitobains ont été privés absolument de tous leurs droits, qu'on leur avait pourtant garantis. Ce véritable génocide culturel a eu comme résultat la diminution de leur nombre-diminution tellement grave que l'anéantissement les menace aujourd'hui. Et voilà que maintenant qu'il est question de leur remettre leurs droits, on leur reproche d'être trop peu nombreux pour

justifier la remise en vigueur de ces droits. Cette situation est le comble de l'injustice. C'est une absurdité qui ne devrait pas être. On impose le supplice aux Franco-Manitobains en les forçant à s'agenouiller pour quêter leurs droits, comme le mendiant son repas. L'image est exagérée, diriez-vous? Mais non, au contraire, elle n'est que très réaliste. Elle décrit l'humiliation d'un peuple, humiliation créée par l'intolérance des uns, la haine des autres. Si la justice est notre but, nous devons appuyer la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai. Pour ma part, je l'appuie fortement. C'est la seule position qui soit dictée par la justice.

Je suis secrétaire-trésorière du Comité culturel de Ste-Rose-du-Lac.

**SUBMISSION NO. 13  
MRS. ELVIER BRUNEL**

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee,

Due to prior commitments I am sorry I am not able to be present at this public hearing. I have given much thought to this matter and I have some feelings to express as a concerned citizen.

I am of French origin, inherited from my father. My mother is Belgium — Flemish. I was brought up in a bilingual home environment where three languages: French, English, Flemish, were heard. Over the years, English became the main language spoken when together as a family unit. French became secondary due to many reasons, some of them being political, social, economical and educational reasons.

I know, for instance, in my case our educational system did limit the amount and the quality of French education. Due to some dedicated group of parents, we continued with Français in our rural school and on into high school - Grade 12 - with a decreasing number of pupils. This proved to be the last year that français as a language was taught for some time.

During this period of time people had less and less opportunity to practice the language up to the point where one has lost all confidence in speaking the language. Now people are trying to make up this loss and see the need for change. At that time, I was indifferent but now, as a parent and active person in community, I see the need to upgrade my French language skills and to use them frequently so that I may keep my French language. This is where the proposed amendment to the Manitoba Act can be of great importance.

Due to the contact with the elderly and sick, where the use of the mother tongue, which is most often French in this case, is an essential need. I have come to know the richness of being bilingual. I also feel the effect of the lack of initiative taken by our government on this point.

I dislike the animosity created over the proposed amendment of the Manitoba Act. To prolong this matter any further adds to this animosity. Feelings of resentment, anger, etc. are natural but yet hinder people to be objective and free to make a decision on this matter. You can help to avoid this, in a simple and just way if you have the true concern at heart.

I now send my children to a French Immersion school, where I know this is the only way for now, within our

school system, that they will become fully bilingual. It would be beneficial if the laws would reinforce this. The proposed amendment is a way of correcting a situation that is experienced in our community and province. The amendments will take away nothing from the majority. They can only benefit from a culturally richer society in which there is room for everyone.

I am convinced that for the well-being of our province the proposed amendments should be accepted. I, for one, support the resolution to amend Article 23 as negotiated last May, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, that you will join me in so doing.

Thank you.

Mrs. Elvier Brunel

**SUBMISSION NO. 14  
RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF SHOAL LAKE  
RESOLUTION FORM**

**RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF SHOAL LAKE**

June 7, 1983

Moved by Councillor Darr

Seconded by Councillor Dunits

"That we the Council are in agreement with the present day Provincial Bilingualism and Multi-Culturalism and we suggest that it remain as such."

"Carried."

Secretary-Treasurer Thelma Chegwin.

**SUBMISSION NO. 15  
JIM REID, R.M. of Albert**

Good morning, afternoon or evening. Ladies and gentlemen.

I'm here on behalf of the R.M. of Albert. We would go on record as being against any change in the proposed French language issue. We do not feel that the proposed change should be compulsory to all areas of the province.

We are not against any culture being heard or represented, but do not make it compulsory, for instance, to supply both languages to all people all the time.

We think that it would be more practical to pay for any translation on an individual basis to someone who cannot speak or understand English. Are there any questions?

Thanks everyone for your time.

Jim Reid  
R. M. of Albert

**SUBMISSION NO. 16  
ARNOLD M. BIRCH, REEVE, R.M. of  
ROSEDALE**

Mr. Chairman.

I am opposed to bilingualism, but I do feel that we should not be forced to include services in the French language where they are not required.

If you delete the term "Central Office," then it must mean at any level of government in Manitoba. At the present time, if the need arises, a person is accommodated if he wishes to be serviced in the French language. The majority of all people speak English or French or both, but a very small minority speak French only. Since our form of government is based on the voice of the majority, then why should such a small minority of people have more rights than any other ethnic group that is part of the population of Manitoba?

Due to the high cost of translating municipal by-laws into the French language, it is very important that municipalities and school boards be excluded from Section 23, as amended. It is also important that any secretary-treasurer of a municipality would not be forced to learn to speak French in order to keep his job. To take it one step further, any individual interested in entering municipal politics may then be required to be able to communicate in both official languages.

Our Federal Government told us that we had to switch to the metric system of measurement because that was the universal system used. English is the universal language of the world and is used in 80 percent of our trade. English has been the working language of Manitoba and should remain the working language. Based on this principle and the economic times, why burden the Province of Manitoba with the added cost of extra services?

Sincerely,

Arnold M. Birch, Reeve, R.M. of Rosedale.

**SUBMISSION NO. 17  
MAYOR KEN BURGESS, CITY OF  
BRANDON**

Mr. Chairman, honourable members of the committee.

On behalf of the City of Brandon, I would like to welcome all of you to our fair city and I hope that your stay here during the hearings will be a pleasant one. It is our sincere hope that these hearings will prove useful, both to you in terms of hearing the opinions of residents of Western Manitoba, and to us in terms of ensuring that our concerns are given fair consideration in your deliberations.

Firstly, I wish to indicate how pleased we are that the government has consented to hold these hearings around the province in order that residents could air their feelings. We were initially very disturbed that a topic with such far-reaching implications would be settled with so little public input and we are thus extremely pleased that this is now being provided for.

The Council of the City of Brandon voted unanimously to present this brief here today and I thus feel confident in saying that the views contained herein are very representative of the population in this area.

I would also like the committee to know that Brandon City Council has voted to hold a referendum on this issue in the October elections. This position was adopted before the enabling legislative amendments were in place to allow for such referendums to be held. This should be taken as an indication of the importance that the Brandon City Council places upon this issue, to the extent that it feels that all residents should have an opportunity to express their opinions.

One of our original concerns has now been somewhat hopefully eliminated by the government's clarification of its intentions with respect to the definite exclusion of municipalities and school divisions. Prior to that clarification, there was grave concern on our part as to the possible mandatory requirements being imposed upon municipalities against their will. Now that we have a clear statement in the amendments excluding municipalities and school divisions, this problem should no longer surface.

I would like to emphasize the fact that we have absolutely no objection to the provision of bilingual services in those areas where there is sufficient demand and justification. However, herein lies the problem itself - what is "significant demand"? This, we feel, is still a major shortcoming of the legislation. We already have seen the effect that one or two individuals can have in precipitating an entire provincial and indeed national debate over this issue. Left as it is, the legislation is far too enabling in that it does not define the term "significant" and thus, this leaves it up to the discretion of those involved or, inevitably, to the courts. Indeed, already in the hearings in Winnipeg, we saw what could be construed to be one person's objection defined as significant. This stemmed down the fact that one individual requested simultaneous translation and although this was promised if there was significant demand, I understand the request was granted even though only the one individual requested it. Is one person "significant demand"? I submit to you that one person could constitute significant demand if that person was powerful enough, loud enough, or persistent enough in badgering local authorities to provide what that individual wants. This is totally unacceptable to us. The term "significant" must be defined and it must be defined sufficiently so that everyone knows from the outset what the expectations are.

Ironically, the Honourable Roland Penner justifies the existence of this whole agreement on the basis that he was not willing to allow the Supreme Court to make a decision on the matter which could be detrimental to the province's legal systems. However, in this case the government seems to be willing to allow the courts to rule on a key issue of the whole affair - that being a definition of what constitutes significance. I submit to you that if the courts are unworthy of sane judgment in the first instance, then they should not be allowed to pass judgment in the second instance. I find that Mr. Penner's argument defeats itself in this issue.

We suggest to you that significance must be defined in real terms. Without this definition, a few individuals can precipitate horrendously costly and disruptive proceedings, which not only will cause unnecessary expenditures, but will contribute substantially towards cultural divisiveness and ethnic-based selfishness.

We are also concerned about definitions within Section 23.7(b) and especially in the second section of (b), where it indicates that any member of the public in Manitoba has the right to communicate in English or French with, and to receive available services in English or French from any quasi-judicial or administrative body of the Government of Manitoba. Our question relates to what is the finite definition of "administrative body of the Government of Manitoba"? Our questions in this regard go even further. We wonder if the courts might consider a municipal government,

which is a creature of the Provincial Government, as an administrative body of the Government of Manitoba. Will this mean that when the Municipal Board holds hearings in an area, such as Brandon, they could be forced to provide simultaneous translation services, or at least bilingual services, even though there is not only not a significant demand, but indeed there may be no demand. This seems to us to be creating the possibility for substantial totally wasteful expenditures since, undoubtedly, additional staff would have to be involved and in dealing with quasi-judicial or administrative bodies of this manner, one cannot depend on standard translation services - they must be virtually fully qualified legal translations since we are dealing with quasi-judicial decisions. The same would hold true for hearings of the Clean Environment Commission and other such bodies. We feel that we are opening ourselves up for substantial extra expenditures for which we see no real value or need demonstrated in this area.

The legislation indicates that services will be available in both languages where desired in the court system. We wonder just how far this is intended to go with respect to municipal involvement. You have indicated that municipalities and school divisions will be directly excluded from this legislation. However, if we are proceeding with a prosecution or defence in the court system, where will the onus lie for translation of municipal by-laws and bilingual prosecution or defence in order for the case to be held in either official language? Again, we see the possibility for an individual to precipitate totally wasteful expenditures. Again, I must emphasize that we are not opposed to the provision of such services where there is a large segment of the population and where one would normally expect this service to be available. However, as presently written, we feel the legislation is too permissive and a more finite definition is required.

It is our strong belief that in areas of the province where there are large numbers of French-speaking residents, one could reasonably expect services to be available in both languages. However, in areas such as Brandon where that is not the case, it would be completely ridiculous to expect the provision of bilingual services and when one takes into account the economic implications of same, there is absolutely no justification for it. Our concern relates to ensuring that such requirements are not forced upon us and that through lack of definition in the legislation, an individual with none other than disruptive intent can defeat the purpose of the legislation itself through cleverly designed frivolous interpretations of poorly worded sections of the legislation itself.

I must indicate that there is a considerable amount of skepticism on the part of the populace as to the intentions of the government with respect to actually listening to any of the presentations being made at these hearings.

When we heard the Premier indicate that the government's position would not likely be changed at all subsequent to the hearings, one wonders about the actual intent. Nonetheless, those of us that feel strongly enough about the issue feel duty bound to present our feelings in the hopes that the government will recognize the logic contained within the brief and make the necessary adjustments.

As taxpayers, we not only contribute to our local operations but substantially towards the operations of

the Provincial Government. We do not want these tax dollars wasted. It is our sincere hope that you will take into account the objections and concerns of residents of this area.

Thank you.

**SUBMISSION NO. 18  
RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF ARTHUR  
RESOLUTION FORM  
RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF ARTHUR**

June 23, 1983

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba are currently negotiating with the Federal Government and the Franco-Manitoban Society to declare the Province of Manitoba an official bilingual province, and declaring the English and French languages as the two official languages;

AND WHEREAS it is our opinion that our forefathers in government, in agreeing that Manitoba should be a bilingual province, could not foresee that Western Canada would become the melting pot for all nations, and that the French population would eventually comprise only 5 percent of the total population of this province;

AND WHEREAS it is feared that much dissension will be created among the people of Manitoba by such a declaration;

AND WHEREAS it is also feared that our leaders in government do not foresee, or refuse to see, the far-reaching implications of such a declaration, not only in the great dissension it will cause, but in the tremendous costs that will necessarily be borne by all the taxpayers in translating the statutes to the French language, in printing all government business in the English and the French language, in changing all highway signs to both languages; and in many other ways. Also the vast resentment that will be caused by requiring that the employees of the government and all Crown corporations be bilingual, which is surely coming.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT we request the Government of the Province of Manitoba to consult more with the people of this province, rather than just the Franco-Manitoban Society, in considering this most important declaration, and to carry out the will of the majority of the population, as they were elected to do.

**SUBMISSION NO. 19  
MADAME MARIETTE BOSQ-SAQUET**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

La Société franco-manitobaine a su très bien représenter la population franco-manitobaine. Tout au cours des négociations avec le gouvernement, elle ne voulait qu'assurer la survie des siens. Les amendements proposés sont un moyen de provoquer la renaissance des Manitobains d'expression française.

Il est impératif que l'on redonne aux Franco-Manitobains leurs droits. J'appuie donc la résolution pour amender l'article 23, telle que négociée par la Société franco-manitobaine et les gouvernements provincial et fédéral au mois de mai.

Mariette Bosq-Saquet  
Laurier

**SUBMISSION NO. 20  
JEAN-LOUIS SAQUET**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Il est impératif que l'on redonne aux Franco-Manitobains leurs droits. J'appuie donc la résolution pour amender l'article 23, telle que négociée par la Société franco-manitobaine et les gouvernements provincial et fédéral au mois de mai.

Merci.  
Jean Louis Saquet

**SUBMISSION NO. 21  
RENÉ SAQUET**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

La loi 113 adoptée à l'unanimité par l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba le 16 juillet 1970 a reconnu légalement, ce qui était considéré comme acquis depuis l'entrée du Manitoba dans la confédération: le droit, pour ceux qui le désirent, d'inscrire leurs enfants dans une école publique où l'enseignement serait dispensé en français de la maternelle à la douzième année.

La simple existence du droit de perpétuer sa culture ne constitue pas la garantie de sa survie; il faut faire l'effort de perception et d'imagination qui permet d'entrevoir aussi clairement que possible, le chemin qui conduit des droits aux réalisations, des intentions aux réalités. L'école française ne se réalisera que si elle peut compter sur tous ces agents: des individus conscients de leur identité; un foyer familial éveillé à la culture canadienne-française; des institutions sociales et économiques favorables à l'épanouissement de cette culture et de cette identité; une communauté dynamique dont les structures permettent une intégration aisée et le développement d'un sentiment d'appartenance.

En terminant, j'aimerais simplement vous dire que j'appuie avec conviction la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai entre le gouvernement du Manitoba et la Société franco-manitobaine.

Merci.  
René Saquet  
Laurier

**SUBMISSION NO. 22  
JACQUES SAQUET**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Quand on passe en revue les faits historiques qu'ont dû subir les gens de langue française au Manitoba depuis l'adhésion de cette province à la confédération canadienne, on doit reconnaître le fait que tous les droits de langue avaient été confisqués aux Franco-Manitobains. Il a fallu quatre-vingts ans pour qu'un gouvernement manitobain réussisse à ré-introduire le français comme langue égale à l'anglais dans les écoles du Manitoba. Treize ans plus tard, un autre gouvernement qui se dit du peuple et pour le peuple veut rendre au Manitoba français ses droits linguistiques arrachés illégalement en 1890.

Comme le témoigne la grande popularité des écoles d'immersion en milieu urbain, il semblerait que

beaucoup de gens de langue anglaise veulent que leurs enfants soient bilingues. Pourquoi donc refuser l'usage des deux langues officielles au Canada dans les affaires de la province si davantage de gens veulent se servir des deux langues?

Si vous permettez, j'aimerais comparer notre situation au Manitoba à une autoroute moderne (nos écoles préparent des jeunes gens bilingues dans un système d'éducation modèle) où on ne peut accéder qu'à dos d'âne (on limite l'accès de cette population aux services).

Je ne veux point amoindrir la tâche à accomplir, mais il me semble évident que si on croit toujours en justice, justice doit être faite aux Franco-Manitobains. J'appuie fortement la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai 1983 entre le gouvernement du Manitoba et la Société franco-manitobaine.

Merci.  
Jacques Saquet  
Wasagaming, Manitoba.

**SUBMISSION NO. 23  
RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF WINCHESTER  
NORTON F. CASSILS, REEVE**

August 5th, 1983.

Hon. Howard Pawley,  
Premier,  
Province of Manitoba.

Dear Sir: Re: Bilingualism

We, the members of the Council of the R.M. of Winchester, are opposed to the government's attitude with respect to the French language in Manitoba and, in particular, the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

1. We feel that it is unnecessary for a large majority of the towns, villages, and municipalities in the province.

2. We think it unfair for all of the ethnic groups who have chosen to forgo their native tongue and use English as their official language.

3. This will be a cumbersome and costly nuisance imposed upon a large section of the province's population that is really opposed to it.

4. We suggest that a provincial referendum on the bilingual issue be held in Manitoba, before any amendments are made to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Yours truly,  
Norton E. Cassils,  
Reeve, R.M. of Winchester

**SUBMISSION NO. 24  
REGARDING THE BILINGUALISM  
QUESTION IN MANITOBA  
by HARRY F. ROBINSON**

611-20 Valhalla Drive, Winnipeg

September, 1983

Members of the committee:

Due to medical problems, I am unable to attend the meeting to present the attached brief in person.

However, I trust you will accord it the same attention and consideration as though it had been delivered verbally.

While it is right to remember our past, we must also remember that the laws that were enacted then were static and were a magnanimous gesture on the part of the government to enable everyone to live in harmony. But they had no idea of what the transition of this province would be. Therefore we cannot let the past dictate our present and our future. To rescue this province from the bitter feeling and divisions that are present now, that will NOT be forgotten, and in fact will only get much worse, we must enact the following and for these reasons:

**(1) ALL PEOPLE IN THIS PROVINCE MUST BE EQUAL:**

We Manitobans want all races in this province to be equal. The evolution of Manitoba has not been English-French, but a much richer multiculturalism concept.

It is just as wrong for a minority to impose laws on the majority, for this borders on dictatorship, as it is for a majority to enforce laws on minorities that are not just to all. It is the first responsibility, no, DUTY of government to ensure that ALL people have equal rights. If they fail in their duty, public pressure must be brought to bear, as it is in this instance, to prevent the government from giving any single minority an advantage over the others. THIS IS JUSTICE!

**(2) THE COST TO THE PROVINCE:**

The cost to this province of bilingualism will be exorbitant. With hospitals, nursing homes, social services, etc., cutting costs, and Mr. Desjardins, so desperate for money, he is looking to the lotteries for help to pay costs, with thousands of people out of work, it is an absolute heartless disgrace that this can even be considered. The argument that the Federal Government is donating money to ease this cost of translation is ridiculous. Just how gullible do they think we are!

WE ARE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, so one way or another, we will pay for it. Furthermore, if this province is declared bilingual, who knows what the Federal Government will enforce at OUR expense.

With all due respect to this committee, even this expenditure would be unnecessary if the government followed their own slogan "We Listen." But they are NOT listening. We also resent the importing of people from outside this province in an attempt to influence the thinking and feelings of Manitoba, as though we did not have the intelligence to make up our own mind - and how much did THIS cost? - which confirms the fact this government will go to any lengths to try to justify an unjustifiable position and at the very least gives the impression that these hearings are being paced with pro-bicultural people too.

But above all, I hope members of this panel and supporters of bilingualism saw the TV Program on Sunday, September 4th, entitled "Who Is In Charge?" and saw the utter hopelessness, the despair, the anger and violence that is just below the surface on the feelings of the unemployed. This is one of the greatest arguments against wasting so much money on bilingualism. In fact, it is possible this could be the catalyst that sets off violence in this province.

**(3) THE ADVOCACY OF BILINGUALISM:**

To the detriment of every other minority in this province shows a complete lack of morality.

**(4) LACK OF CONSIDERATION OF THE FRENCH CULTURE FOR OTHERS:**

At no time have the French come out in support of the English. No matter how stringent the Quebec laws are, they have NEVER supported English. It is evident that French only is what they would like to see all across Canada.

(5) The popularity of the French Immersion classes is not due to the fact that the people want to learn French, but the true fact is they want their children to have equal opportunity to qualify for Federal Government positions. But as you know, the French that is being taught here can not be understood in Quebec. Imagine the parents' dismay and anger if they will not qualify under Federal Government questioning.

**(6) THE EFFECT ON ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS:**

It is impossible to understand how any other ethnic group can support bilingualism. It is either FEAR OR FAVOUR - FEAR for the reduction of their rights, which cannot be done. The other ethnic groups seem to believe that by supporting bilingualism they are protecting their rights under the Constitution and they will reap some kind of benefit in the future. But the truth is their rights are not only protected but GUARANTEED under the Constitution which cannot and will not be changed.

FAVOUR - the promise or expectation of future benefits. But that will depend on what government is in power - and governments tend to forget and, above all, it will depend on the amount of money available. With all the money that would be spent on bilingualism, they will lose all hope of help in the future.

So instead of the French being the preferred ethnic group - ALL NATIONALITIES MUST BE EQUAL - WE DO NOT WANT ANY SECOND CLASS CITIZENS IN MANITOBA!

**SOLUTIONS AND CONCLUSION:**

The first reaction to the solution of this problem will be disbelief, but don't dismiss it offhand. After the first reaction, when you coolly and calmly consider it, then you MUST agree it is the only permanent and fair solution - WE MUST DELETE THE FRENCH FACTOR COMPLETELY FROM OUR CONSTITUTION, thereby removing once and for all the only really divisive problem in our province. Otherwise, there will be a continuing and growing resentment on both sides. I realize this is a difficult solution, but all solutions are going to be difficult and expensive, whereas this would solve the problem once and for all. Surely Manitoba is valued enough in this country to be able to get five signatures and 50 percent of the population, if necessary. Most important, this is not depriving the French of any right, but making them EQUAL with other nationalities in this province.

Finally, the French people of this province have the greatest opportunity to contribute to the unity and well-being of not only this province, but of this country. Instead of resentment, would have the admiration and respect of every other nationality, not only in this province, but this country, if they would come forward and support this proposal. As has been proved, you can legislate laws, but you can't legislate feelings.

The admiration engendered by this act would inspire every other nationality in this province to VOLUNTARILY (and that is the key word) co-operate in not only maintaining the French culture, but every other culture in this wonderful province of ours.

Therefore, at the very least, a referendum should be held, but preferably an election with this as one of the questions. The politicians would then know not only WHAT their constituents want, but would have a mandate to follow their wishes, even to changing the Constitution.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 25 RAPID CITY TOWN COUNCIL**

September 7th, 1983

Ms. Carmen DePape,  
Clerk of the Legislature Office  
Room 251, Legislative Building  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3C 0V8

#### **Brief on the proposed amendment to the Constitution to provide French services.**

The Council of the Town of Rapid City, Manitoba, is totally opposed to the intention of the Pawley Government to provide French and to entrench same in the Constitution. Consider the following points:

1. Much has been said that this is done to correct an injustice done 100 years ago. This is 1983 not 1883, and a government should be passing laws to deal with issues now, not 100 years ago.
2. Rights, which should only be granted to a majority, should never be granted to a minority.
3. Rights granted to one minority (which is only 5 percent of Manitoba's population) should be granted in the same spirit to all minorities - naturally resulting in chaos, thus it is a bad move.
4. Granting concessions to one minority can in no way be helpful to other minorities who have to depend on own resources.
5. The cost of translation and of providing services to a minority (5 percent of the population), especially in this age of restraint and unemployment is shocking and nonsense in every sense.
6. For such an important issue (one which could divide Manitoba), the government should, by referendum or election, let the people of Manitoba decide on the proposed amendment to allow French.

Rapid City Council  
M.J. Stefaniuk, Mayor  
Signed: R.B. Grist  
Secretary-Treasurer

### **SUBMISSION NO. 26 MADAME MARIE-JOSÉPHE FISETTE**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

La Fédération des Aînés franco-manitobains représente 17 clubs d'aînés à travers la province. C'est l'organisme officiel représentant les intérêts des aînés francophones au Manitoba.

Nous n'avons pas besoin de vous dire que nous avons suivi avec un vif intérêt toutes les délibérations qui ont eut lieu depuis déjà deux ans entre la Société franco-

manitobaine, le gouvernement fédéral et le gouvernement provincial. Nous, les aînés, comptons plusieurs membres qui ont vécu 1916 et l'injustice commise à cette époque par le gouvernement du temps. Nous avons tous beaucoup soufferts d'avoir eu à étudier notre langue à la cachette conscients que nous commettions une infraction à la loi.

Nous comptons parmi notre organisme quantité d'éducateurs qui eux aussi ont vécu intensément et dans un état de conscience troublée ces années difficiles. C'est avec douleur qu'ils ont vu se détériorer graduellement, irrévocablement la qualité du français de notre population. Aucun d'eux n'oubliera la terreur que pouvait soulever les visites inattendues des "inspecteurs d'écoles". Nos membres ont tous travaillé et appuyé les vaillants efforts de l'Association d'éducation dans leur lutte pour maintenir notre langue et notre culture.

Quantité de nous avons fait d'énormes sacrifices pour permettre à nos enfants une éducation française et religieuse convenable en les plaçant à 12 ou 13 ans dans des pensionnats et écoles privées si souvent bien loin de nous. Combien de parents ont dû se priver de l'appui que pouvait fournir un jeune garçon à travailler la terre et aider aux travaux de la ferme! Pour ne pas parler de la douleur de perdre, dans un sens, un fils si jeune. Combien de parents se sont saigner à blanc afin de payer la pension d'un, deux parfois jusqu'à six et huit garçons afin de leur assurer une éducation française convenable parce que le système publique, que nous devons néanmoins payer, ne nous l'offrirait pas! Combien de bons religieux et religieuses ont travaillé pendant des années pour aucun salaire quelconque mais par amour de la langue et de la race!

N'est-il pas temps que justice se fasse? La révocation de l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba a fait beaucoup de tort au fait français au Manitoba. Sans nos écoles, sans droit légal à notre langue nous avons perdu bien du monde. D'un côté l'assimilation a fait ses ravages. D'un autre côté plusieurs de nos grands talents ont dû aller au Québec afin de parfaire leurs études en français et plusieurs n'en sont jamais revenus. Si les francophones au Manitoba avaient pu évoluer en citoyen à part entière comme l'avait souhaité en 1870 le Père du Manitoba aurions-nous vu partir ces grands talents franco-manitobains comme Gabrielle Roy, Henri Bergeron, Daniel Lavoie, etc. . . . ?

Les francophones du Manitoba ont payé cher l'annulation illégale de l'article 23. Et vous maintenant au gouvernement possédez le pouvoir de nous remettre certains de ces droits auxquels nous avons toujours droit mais qui nous ont été niés si longtemps! Vous laissez-vous influencer et apeurer par un petit groupe de bigots et racistes qui veulent l'anéantissement total et complet de notre race? L're de 1890, 1896 et 1916 n'est-elle pas révolu? Allez-vous commettre les mêmes injustices que vos ancêtres?

Sachez alors que la Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains et ses 17 clubs affiliés appuie inconditionnellement la position de la SFM et les amendements proposés à l'article 23.

Merci.

Marie-Joséphe Fisette  
Secrétaire  
Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains  
200, av. de la Cathédrale  
Saint-Boniface, Manitoba.



**SUBMISSION NO. 27**  
**PABLO JAJALLA**

Dear Sir:

The French language issue has bedeviled Manitoba for a long time now. Lately, it occupies again the forefront of public consciousness because of the tripartite agreement between the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Franco-Manitoba Society. Proponents and opponents of Frenchification have put forth arguments and counter-arguments in support of their sides and cause.

The Manitoba 23, a so-called grassroots coalition of community associations and concerned citizens, puts up ads in the papers urging citizens to back up the resolution because it is "consistent with historical and cultural realities of our society." I am not sure about the exact meaning and complications of the terms, but I am sure they are no longer realities today in our society. There used to be more or less equal solitudes in Manitoba before 1890 but the French moved away to seek greener pastures elsewhere and what eventually dominated was the English solitude which grew overwhelmingly in number and political power as days went by. That majority decided in a political manner that English was the "in" thing and behaved accordingly by making English as the sole language of the province.

One of the issues that seemed to be conveniently forgotten by those who claimed history as a valid and reliable argument is that the population components of Manitoba have changed dramatically in the last few years. These demographic changes and altered states should be taken into account in this debate. Newcomers in the province should be asked for their inputs because they would partly foot the bill in this "historical" but now inutile exercise. To ask only the established and the vociferous few who proclaimed themselves as spokespersons of organizations and ethnocultural groups for their inputs would be patently counter-productive, irrelevant and unfair. That seems to be the trend in the language hearings being conducted by the government.

To me, the overriding consideration in the French proposal is not history but politics and economics. History does not tie the people in its apron strings. Politics and economics do. The question to ask is: Does Mr. John Q. Public of Manitoba favour further Frenchification? If the present Government of Manitoba believe that the answer is yes, they should call an election in this burning issue as proposed already by many Manitobans. The Parti Quebecois did the same thing when they worked for French unilingualism in Quebec. This way we can decide this question once and for all in an appropriate and valid political arena. Let the silent majority rule, not the noisy minority supported by powerful politicians and old-fashioned judges.

The economic reality is very relevant too, since all taxpayers would be forced to cough up for this expensive undertaking whose merit and worth are dubious and devious. Would the opportunity cost of satisfying a handful of Francophones in Manitoba who speak and write and understand English better than many of us newcomers justify this scheme at this time of dire economic straits? There are myriads of social, recreational, educational, health and job creation areas

that we can put the scarce resources that we possess into better and viable use. The actual cost of the French amendment will definitely grow in gargantuan proportions as time marches by. Bureaucratic nightmares tend to increase, not decrease.

I don't need French in my driver's licence, in my car insurance certificate, in my parking violation tickets, and in my other numerous public documents. English will do. I don't need French in order to communicate in Manitoba. I don't understand it. It is a very expensive proposition in time of restraint. If it is a question of justice, then justice demands that I don't have to support it directly or indirectly through my tax dollars.

I need better job opportunities for Manitobans, safer workplaces, amply funded educational system attuned to the present needs, adequate health care facilities, healthful recreational atmosphere, cleaner environment, security and protection from criminal elements, lower taxes and prices of goods and services and a just and caring government and society for all, not only for the Franco-Manitoban Society.

Sincerely yours, Pablo Jajalla.

**SUBMISSION NO. 28**  
**MANITOBA MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS**  
**ASSOCIATION**

The Manitoba Municipal Administrators Association appreciates the opportunity to make known to the committee the concerns of our association as seen by our Executive.

Since Manitoba became a province in 1870, provisions, as we see them, were made in Section 23 which would affect French and English-speaking persons equally. They could be heard in the courts and provincial legislation would be in both languages. This would not create any undue hardship on either group.

Our Association wishes to go on record as supporting Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it now exists. We feel that is Section 23 is amended that it would harm municipal administration in the province by placing the ability to communicate in French and English as a criteria for the office, rather than the ability to properly administer a municipal corporation, thus watering down the services offered by the municipal personnel.

We further have concern regarding the employment of those persons now holding a position as administrator, or staff members, who may not communicate in the French language, and also for the French administrator who may speak both languages but may not be qualified to translate in both languages; that these positions not be jeopardized in any changes contemplated to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Our association respectfully suggests that funding would be better spent on concentrating on English education programs and let evolution take place rather than trying to legislate it.

We realize that this is a sensitive issue which when dealt with will affect generations of Manitobans to come.

A culture will never survive, if it must be legislated, Respectfully submitted by: Manitoba Municipal Administrators Association, Gerald A. May, President.

**SUBMISSION NO. 29**  
**UNITED GERMAN SCHOOL OF NORTH**  
**KILDONAN**

Mr. Anstett and Members of the Hearing Committee:

I thank you for this opportunity to express my views on the proposed amendments to Article 23 on behalf of the United German School of North Kildonan.

The reinstatement of the French language rights in Manitoba should be a concern to all Manitobans and particularly the ethnic minorities. Some of our constituents can still remember when the ethnic language rights were drastically curtailed in 1916, and I personally still vividly remember the insults I received when as a new immigrant in 1957, I was heard to speak German in public places. This display of intolerance was very unlike the vision I had held of Canada as one of the world's most tolerant countries. The situation has improved greatly over the last several decades, but intolerance towards ethnic minorities does persist and it should concern us.

One could conceivably argue that the French language rights were abrogated a long time ago in a less enlightened age than ours, and one could attribute the infringements of ancestral language rights in 1916 to war hysteria, but what argument could we use to justify our unwillingness to correct an old injustice today? That, I think, is the central issue; admit that the constitutional French rights had been wrongfully and illegally taken away and that this wrong should finally be corrected.

A referendum is not the appropriate vehicle to establish or guarantee minority rights. More than anything else, I believe a referendum would bring out age-old fears and prejudices and be very divisive in the community. In a democracy like Canada, one would hope that our elected officials would have the wisdom and courage to provide leadership on moral issues such as this, and not wait for universal enlightenment. It may never come. The time to act is now.

Aside from the moral issue of injustice against a minority having gone uncorrected for nearly a century, many of the ethnic community are concerned about the wider implications. If the constitutional rights of the French could be so easily abrogated, how much more vulnerable must be the other ethnic minorities who do not have these guarantees? What has happened to one can happen to others. We cannot let injustice be done to any.

It is exciting to be part of the Canadian dynamism and many consider it a privilege. Canada has forsaken the concept of a melting pot of nations and instead had opted for the concept of a cultural mosaic. Let us now show that we believe in this in Manitoba as well, and work towards greater linguistic and cultural tolerance. Respectfully submitted on behalf of the United German School of North Kildonan, Arno H. Jansen.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 30 CLARENCE KIESMAN**

Mr. Chairman, members of the board, honourable guests, ladies and gentlemen:

My presentations may be a bit lengthy and so I crave your indulgence. Back in the '50's when I worked at an Ontario gold mine, I had an excellent opportunity to meet and work with people from many parts of Canada and immigrants from Europe. I found that most Canadians and most of the immigrants were anxious

to associate with one another and were interested in learning English. The one exception was the French. They wanted no part of any of us. One of my mining partners was a young French lad who spoke English, but as soon as he saw one or two of his own extraction, he didn't know I even existed. This lad and I were both from Manitoba. How can anyone justify this behaviour or attitude from a people who claim they were here first and who should be welcoming everyone in their midst?

Friends travelling through Quebec tell me that the young people there claim that only they are the real Canadians. What does that make us? My folks came to Canada some 80 years ago. Is a real Canadian somebody like the Indians or Eskimos who were here first, or is it somebody who has contributed the most to improve our standard of living or spent his lifetime convincing all transplanted new Canadians to work and live in peace and harmony? I could easily name more than one person that you would consider a great Canadian.

Instead, I will mention one man that you never heard about, but who I knew best, because he was my father. He worked hard all this life, never collected Welfare or even unemployment insurance. He was not ashamed to be seen with people less fortunate than himself. He asked for no special favours from the government or from anyone else. Years ago, the Lutheran Church at Moosehorn had services in two languages - one week in English, the next in German. We experienced financial problems until we realized how much smaller the church offering was when there was service in German. It was decided to drop the German service completely. You can bet that this caused much bitterness in the community, but Dad and other staunch Germans finally accepted it as a necessary move. Our German community could do what the French apparently can't. That takes character. Ladies and gentlemen, I submit to you that, in my humble opinion, people like my father are the real Canadians!

Let's be honest and try to face the facts. Having two official languages in this country is as necessary to you and I as the pyramids in Egypt or the leaning tower of Pisa. What purpose would two languages serve? Our ties are with the USA, who is our partner on this continent and who has the common sense to work and play in one common language - i.e. English, which through no fault of ours or any influence or prompting by us has evolved into an international language. I can accept that. Why can't you? Why can't the French? Is it my fault that the French in Quebec choose to live for themselves in one pocket of this great nation? What can they expect if they don't want to mingle or "rub" shoulders with the rest of the world like we have to do? I should add that we are so much the richer by doing this. If their language is so important, it should be able to survive on its own and not be forced on an unwilling bystander. You can't force this on the people any more than I can force you to like or dislike me. You don't hear any other minority crying for special rights or special recognition except possibly the Indians who seem to be getting more militant all the time. Who are they learning it from?

Some of you may say that a nation is judged by how it treats its minorities. If I saw any person discriminated against because of his race or colour or religion or political views, I would fight tooth and nail on his behalf.

So would you and nobody would blame you. If the unemployed, the sick, the crippled, the deaf and dumb, the homeless, or the new immigrants were not getting a fair deal, I would take up my pen and blast the perpetrators publicly for their wrongdoings.

But I have no sympathy, no money and no time for anyone who asks me to save his language by making it official in Canada, thereby handcuffing future generations to have their lifestyle disrupted or altered by our incompetence and tunnel-vision thinking.

Now what about the law? The BNA Act has been twisted and manipulated to give a new meaning to bilingualism that never existed when it was first drawn up. It was okay because the Federal Government did it. This may shock you, but I can honestly tell you that I don't recognize the Federal Government because it does not represent Western Canada. We have no national party, because the Liberals represent the East and the Conservatives the West.

The law was changed by an eastern party to favour the east. Shall eight out of 10 provinces have to suffer because of such blundering ignorance by a Prime Minister who is supposed to represent all of Canada?

Our MP's and MLA's should have been screaming at the top of their lungs at such injustice inflicted on an unsuspecting public. Not one politician, to my knowledge, that the guts to say, wait a minute. If you want to change the law, let's cut out French all together. That's the thanks we get for voting for people we felt we could trust to speak on our behalf. Why should I have to leave my farm where the work is piled up to my ears, to come to Dauphin to defend the rights of Manitoba as a province - a province just as good or important as Quebec or any other? I am here, because I feel that nobody else will say what has to be said.

Let's talk about finances. Some of you here think that all you have to do is translate 400 statutes. Nobody who followed the turn of events since 1965 can possibly be that naive. These people aren't going to rest until all 4,400 statutes are translated. They have federal (i.e. public) money backing them. Your money and my money. Did you forget that Trudeau sent two special lawyers from Quebec to supervise the bilingual court case over a parking ticket here in Manitoba? How small can some people get?

Somebody will say, we can't afford not to. I heard this argument before. The fact is that the same people are always paying the taxes - new costs mean more taxes - it's like the straw that broke the camel's back. Few people working means fewer people sharing a greater tax burden. What are they working for? Or for whom? I might want a \$15,000 swather but I will be lucky if I can afford to buy one for \$1,000.00.

All people in government, including myself as Reeve of the LGD of Grahamdale, have to be able to justify the expenditure of public funds. I would resign if I saw The Municipal Act translated into French or any other language. Let me give you an example of government setting priorities. Our council has been waiting since last September for drainage profiles from the Water Resources Branch. I am told that they are understaffed because the government has no money to hire more engineers. If we don't get our profiles, we can't do any drainage and the people who desperately need it are the losers. In fact, everybody loses in the long run. How can our council effectively serve our ratepayers with that kind of co-operation from the government?

So would somebody kindly explain to me and to all the people hampered by lack of government funding just how there can be money for translating government documents to satisfy 5 percent of Manitoba's population?

In conclusion, I believe that laws must be made and amended to suit the people affected and to comply with the changing trends. If a law is creating animosity or disrupting or altering your lifestyle, then change the law. A simple but effective solution for the good of the nation. Let the people of Manitoba decide this by way of a referendum! Respectfully submitted, Clarence Kiesman.

### SUBMISSION NO. 31

#### IRISH CANADIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Presentation to Legislative Committee on Amendment to Manitoba Act re: French Services and language rights, July 22nd, 1983

Greetings: A Chara:

The question of the amendment to The Manitoba Act in respect to French Language Services is for us a very practical and eminently sensible proposal. The historic presence of Irish men and women at Red River last century and our close identification with the French and Metis communities here throughout several generations since that time makes it inevitable that we would support the strengthening of French language rights in Manitoba. As William O'Donoghue, a colleague of Louis Riel's in 1869 is reputed to have commented, "What has begun here this day in this struggle for freedom will cast a brilliant light into the future for generations to come." And so it has.

We find it very difficult to tolerate the incredible and divisive backlash from a vocal minority in this province who would turn the clock back to 1890. Messrs. Sterling Lyon and the Tory Party - you are dead wrong! We feel inflammatory statements only serve to feed the incredible lunatic fringe which seems to be always with us, ready at all times to exploit any situation to show discord amongst all our peoples. I would quote from the Brandon Sun in reporting an editorial from the Boissevain Recorder of June 25, 1983:

"There is little doubt that the reason behind the latest walkout is to fuel the anti-Francophone feelings that are harboured by many Anglophone Manitobans. The proposed bilingualist amendment is simply to follow-up of a Supreme Court decision some four years ago that stated that the province had acted improperly when it took away French language rights in 1890. As a result, the province proposed to translate the 100-year backlog of laws and regulations into French over the next 10 years. This would seem to be a simple and harmless solution to the problem."

We agree and call upon the government to ensure that there must be no "dilution" of the basic principle of fair play involved with this amendment. The agreement between all parties, including the Société Franco-Manitobaine must be upheld in its entirety.

We do share, of course, the concerns of Mr. Gary Doer of the Manitoba Government Employees

Association in respect to job security. We believe, however, that there should be no great difficulty in arriving at an equitable accommodation on this question with the union whilst upholding the basic principle of the agreement and amendment to The Manitoba Act.

In conclusion, we strongly maintain the view that the rights of the Franco-Manitobans must be recognized not only out of historic causes but also the rights of all minorities would be strengthened as well by this historic and very democratic proposal by Premier Pawley's Government.

Therefore, we urge "full speed ahead" with the amendment to The Manitoba Act. Thank you. Mise Le Meas.

Gerry McKinney, President, Irish Canadian National Committee; Dermot Rooney, Vice-President, Cultural Affairs Director; Tammy McKinney, Director, Youth Activities; Joy Smith-McKinney, Secretary-Treasurer; Jeff Dunn, Research Director.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 32 ELSIE JAWOLIK**

One of the root causes of separation in Quebec and other Francophone areas is discrepancy in French-Canadian history. French power exposes many myths, one of them being that Canada is "two nations" or "two founding peoples" and that they were here first is not true. The Indians, the British and the Norse were here long before them. The Norsemen came from Greenland to northern Newfoundland about the year 1002. They were succeeded around 1398 by a convoy of Scottish colonists to Nova Scotia. Next in 1497, English merchants sent a Venetian navigator named John Cabotto (also known as Coto or Zuam Talbot) on two round trips across the Atlantic. He discovered for Britain land from the coast of Labrador south to Chesapeake Bay, raising England's flag in proof. British subjects began settling in Newfoundland as early as 1527.

The 80 years of intermittent strife between the two nations terminated temporarily with the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht. Under its terms, the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Hudson Bay areas were declared to be British territory. French rule lasted from 1633 until the fall of Fort Louisburg in Nova Scotia to the British in 1758, Quebec in 1759 and Montreal in 1760.

It was not until 1534 that Jaques Cartier sailed into the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, already discovered and claimed for England by Cabot in 1497. Cartier failed to establish a French colony upon his arrival. It was not until 1608 that the French under Champlain formed a small settlement until 1629 which was captured by an English seaman. In 1633, Champlain worked out an agreement whereby France was to pay England 400,000 crowns. Under this proposal, Champlain and his charges were reinstated in the settlement.

The whole purpose of dividing the province of Canada (Upper and Lower) into the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec was to give French-Canadians back what the British had taken in 1759. The understanding was that they would govern that province for themselves under British law, and share equal rights with the English there. The BNA in 1867 made Canada English-speaking from coast to coast. Section 133 of the act stipulated that French would become the second language in the

Province of Quebec. Nowhere else would it be recognized as an official language except in the House of Commons, the Legislature of Quebec and certain courts of law where considered necessary. The act was written into the Constitution for the purpose of guaranteeing the French language equality with the English language in the Province of Quebec.

**THE MYTH THAT CONFEDERATION WAS MEANT TO CREATE AN EQUAL PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO FOUNDING PEOPLES IN THE DOMINION OF CANADA IS WHAT STARTED THE TROUBLE!**

In the Province of Manitoba, the English outside of the Indians were the first to arrive in 1670. The first identifiable Frenchman to arrive was La Verendrye in 1725, and he did not stay. The country has been acknowledged as belonging to the British Hudson Bay Co. From 1670 until it was sold to Canada, the French had never owned any part of it.

It was not until the three wise men from the east (Trudeau, Marchand and Pelletier) entered the Liberal Party that we have been divided into Francophones and Anglophones. It was Trudeau that passed the bilingual legislation, changed the Constitution and solidified French power in Canada. Since Mr. Trudeau came to power, the Federal Government has been sending agitators paid by the Secretary of State's department into every Canadian community outside of Quebec in which there are any French-Canadians at all, regardless of how few. The purpose is to have the French-Canadian element demand that every service which is provided by the provincial country, the municipal governments be provided in the French language. They are told to demand that all policemen, bus drivers, telephone operators, hospital workers, Provincial and Municipal Government workers be French-speaking. They are organized into pressure groups to demand that stores, banks and business owners hire only French-speaking clerks, personnel managers.

The primary and sole objective since Mr. Trudeau came to power has been to convert Canada to a French-speaking nation. That objective will remain until every city, town and village in Canada has become French-speaking and French-controlled.

The French conflict in Quebec and Canada is created by the same movement that:

- (1) has built the Berlin wall.
- (2) that has caused the wars in Ireland, Israel, Iran, Vietnam and Labanon.
- (3) by the same element that has caused the conflicts in Central America, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, the Phillipines and other parts of Africa.
- (4) that has caused the savagery in Combodia, Lebanon, Russia, Bulgaria, etc., etc.
- (5) and by the same movement that have bulldozed their tanks into Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan.

Elsie Jawolik.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 33 LGD OF FISHER COUNCIL**

WHEREAS an attempt is being made by the Manitoba Government to entrench French Language Services in the Canadian Constitution;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Local Government District of Fisher strongly feel that French rights in the

Constitution, as it relates to Manitoba, is both unnecessary and costly, especially in tough economic times;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Local Government District of Fisher strongly oppose the proposed changes of The Manitoba Act - Section 23, which would make Manitoba a bilingual province.

Fred Packulak, Reeve.

**SUBMISSION NO. 34**  
**MR. WILLIE DUMONT, VICE PRESIDENT**  
**MANITOBA METIS FEDERATION,**  
**INTERLAKE REGION**

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee:

I am presenting this on behalf of Mr. Willie Dumont, Vice President of the Manitoba Metis Federation, Interlake Region.

I speak to you today as a Metis and on behalf of the Manitoba Metis Federation. That the Province of Manitoba exists as a province within Canada is due to the actions of Riel and his followers in 1870. Although at that time French was the language of the majority of the people living in the colony of Assiniboia, the governing "convention of forty" consisted of equal representation of French-speaking and English-speaking delegates. It is in the spirit of justice and compassion for Riel that I ask you to vote for the amendments to Article 23 of The Manitoba Act. I and the MMF fully endorse the resolution, Article 23, as negotiated last May.

Inasmuch that French is the founding language of both Manitoba and Canada, it has a special place that is above and beyond the numbers of people actually speaking it. Manitoba is culturally very diverse. Each culture has knowledge and practices which can enrich and enhance our society as a whole.

For many years, it was told that all cultures should fit in and adapt to the dominant culture. There are advantages to such an approach, but there are severe limits. English will continue to be the dominant language of business and day-to-day interactions. Indeed to succeed in Canadian society, it is vital that one must be fluent in English. I, for one, have no quarrel with this. However, society must recognize the various groups that comprise it and not simply try to force them to "blend in." I, as a Metis person, know all too well the limits of the assimilation model. I am a Canadian, but I am also a Metis. There is no point in trying to change me. It cannot be done. If society is to be just, it must recognize culture, race and language, not only an individual. This is true, not only for Metis but for all groups with a different ethnic or national background. Manitoba will be a stronger, richer and more tolerant society to the degree that it helps various national and ethnic groups preserve their pasts, rather than trying to submerge them. I know what it is like to be shunned and shamed for no other reason than who I am. That is wrong.

Certain nationalities are given recognition for the special contributions they have made to Manitoba and Canada. The English and French are often referred to as the "founding societies" while I as an aboriginal person have some difficulty with this concept, but do

recognize the importance of their contributions. The central role of the English language in our present day society, as well as the institutions of parliamentary government and court system, together with many of our social conventions, attest to the recognition of that we accord the English.

The French also are important in the role they have played, and in the contribution they have made to both Manitoba and Canada. This must be recognized. A just recognition is the one that is provided for in the proposed amendments to Article 23 of The Manitoba Act. This is an amendment that seeks to accommodate an important minority of Manitoba, not impose the French language unwillingly onto the public. Having an important role in the establishment of Manitoba and being a minority, it is right and appropriate that they should have their language rights protected in as strong a mechanism as possible.

In closing, I ask you to approach this matter with the humanity and wisdom of Louis Riel and the "council of forty"; ensure that Manitoba today makes a place for the French and their language and culture that was provided for in 1870.

**SUBMISSION NO. 35**  
**FRED & PHYLLIS RONGE**

We would like to submit this brief to the Standing Committee on the proposed amendments to The Manitoba Act of 1870.

Far too long has the bilingual issue caused friction among Canadians. Are we as Canadians really unable to accept changes, or are we unaware of the facts that those changes are here already? In this brief, we will purposely not touch on any legal issues as they would be void anyway, because bilingualism has been entrenched since 1870 in The Manitoba Act.

Our own family is made up of two different ethnic heritages, Ukrainian and German. Not that many years ago, we, ourselves, felt the sting of racism by simply being referred to as a D.P. and other racial slurs. Some jobs were simply not available because of our heritage. Over time, these have been slowly changed in our Canadian society and today we do no longer hang our heads in shame because of our ethnic background. We are no longer ashamed to speak our language in public.

To some degree, Act 23 of The Manitoba Act in the amended form will see the rights of all ethnic groups in this province guaranteed for eternity. We are neither patriots nor bigots, simply Canadians dedicated to ensure that Canada is a country in which all Canadians feel welcomed and secure. If we have to give a little in order to ensure this, so be it. Let us get on with our lives as true Canadians and Manitobans, not as an ethnic group that has been depressed for too long. We, therefore, would like to urge you to make the amendments, entrench them for eternity, and carry on in a richer tradition.

**SUBMISSION NO. 36**  
**S.M. TAYLOR**

Sir or Madame:

In reference as to what is happening now in Manitoba about the French and English controversy, I would like

to add that French is a definite attribute in our province. I'm sure, no positive, my children (6) are backing me up. I made sure as I was bringing them up that they knew that Canada as a whole has always been a two language country, French and English or vice-versa. I sincerely hope and believe it continues to be so. We in Canada have that advantage over other countries.

Sincerely, S.M. Taylor, Nancy, Kathleen, Victor, Amy, Faye, Céleste and my granddaughter, Trista Hamilton.

**SUBMISSION NO. 37  
THERESA & ALEX NOVAK**

The Chairman and Members of the Manitoba Legislative Committee on Bilingualism:

We strongly support the action taken by our present government in attempting to resolve the age-old question on bilingualism in our province through the introduction of Bill 23 in our Legislature.

No doubt, The Manitoba Act of 1870 is still law as ruled by the Supreme Court of Canada and should, therefore, be adhered to by the lawmakers and citizens of this province. We firmly believe that these hearings were totally unnecessary. They are costly, time-consuming and insisted on by the opposition for political expediency.

The issue is not one to be toyed with, and should be given more respect than it is receiving from the opponents.

As responsible, law-abiding citizens, we strongly object to the position taken by the opponents of Bill 23. A position which we firmly believe is one of attempting to gain political points.

On the same vein, we also strongly disagree with the position taken by municipal and City of Winnipeg councillors to hold referendums in order to obtain public opinion polls on the matter. This kind of action, no doubt, is once again one of political expediency.

The laws of our province and the rights of our minorities must be respected and not used as a political football by those who are elected to public office. We, therefore, strongly urge this committee to completely disregard the results of any referendum or public opinion poll taken in order to sway this committee in reaching its decision.

Sincerely, Theresa Novak, Alex Novak.

**SUBMISSION NO. 38  
BRIAN LANGE**

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee:

I come today representing, I would hope, all youth of Manitoba to register my agreement with and support for the proposed resolution of our Manitoba Government to entrench in our Constitution the fact that we are a province in the Dominion of Canada with two official languages.

Our great-grandparents who decided to make us a province of Canada did so by signing The Manitoba Act. But they did not only make us a province. They made us a very distinct province, because they gave us the privilege of two official languages. All of us who are Manitobans should be proud of this very unique

feature. And we owe it all to the foresight and determination of our great-grandparents!

I have always been taught to respect my elders. I hope I shall always do that. I certainly want to respect our great-grandparents for the wisdom they had in determining that we will be a province with two official languages. And that is why I was so upset when I discovered that legislators of this province in 1890 tampered with their wishes and tried to make this a province with only one official language. That will be, I am sure, the greatest single embarrassment that we as Manitobans will ever have to live down!

I am proud of our government today for making the effort to correct - at least in part - the wrong that has been done. And when they succeed, we will be back into a situation where none of our French friends will need to feel that they are getting special treatment if they wish to communicate and be served in the language of their choice. And we will never need to feel that we are sacrificing anything by allowing them that privilege.

And when this happens - and most of us younger people hope it will - we in Manitoba will be a better, more co-operative and a more accepting, tolerant people.

Brian Lange, Moosehorn, Manitoba.

**SUBMISSION NO. 39  
TEACHERS FROM ECOLE ST. MALO**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Selon l'article 23 de la Loi du Manitoba (1870), le Manitoba est entré en Confédération en ayant un statut bilingue. Depuis l'adoption de la Loi sur les langues officielles (1890), l'anglais est devenu la seule langue officielle de cette province. Par retombée, les francophones ont été entièrement lésés dans leurs droits pendant un siècle. En 1979, la Cour suprême du Canada a déclaré inconstitutionnelle cette loi manitobaine sur les langues officielles et elle a soutenu la Loi du Manitoba (1870). Suite à l'adoption de la Constitution canadienne en 1981, le gouvernement manitobain a dû établir des mécanismes permettant la mise en vigueur de l'article 23.

Le rétablissement du français comme langue d'usage devant les tribunaux et à la législature est perçu comme une menace parce que c'est un changement au statu quo mais c'est seulement le respect de nos droits comme francophones vivants en sol manitobain.

Nous, les professeurs de St-Malo, travaillons dans la division scolaire du Manitoba qui jouit du plus haut pourcentage de population francophone. Les écoles sont françaises et la commission scolaire aussi fonctionne en français. Mais il est impossible de continuer en français pour l'administration officielle. Il est important que les francophones aient certains contrôles sur leurs institutions sociales et économiques. Les amendements, tels que proposés en mai 1983, seraient un pas important dans cette direction.

Il est essentiel que l'article 23 soit respecté pour le plein épanouissement de la langue et de la culture de nos élèves éduqués dans les écoles françaises du Manitoba. Nous appuyons fortement la résolution négociée en mai 1983 entre la Société franco-manitobaine et le gouvernement responsable de Monsieur Pawley concernant les amendements à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Voici les signatures des professeurs de l'École St-Malo qui appuient la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle qu'elle a été négociée: Rita Rioux, Héléne Hébert, Sr Berthe Alarie, Jacqueline Mireault, Colette M. Bérard, Denis A. Fontaine, Marcelle Desrosiers, Gisèle P. Marion, Léo Lafrance, Aline Gosselin, Colette Préfontaine.

**SUBMISSION NO. 40  
DORIS HOGUE**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

N'est-il jamais venu à l'idée de personne de voir un parallèle entre le latin, langue d'érudit, chef d'oeuvre phonétique et linguistique, devenu par la force des choses langue dite "morte" et le fait que certains gouvernements antérieurs, en abolissant l'usage du français conféraient à celle-ci tout l'éclat d'une langue de grande vicilisation, et qui devait passer à l'histoire du Manitoba en espérant en faire une langue "morte". Mais on a beau vouloir mater une population, on ne mate pas des peuples chez qui le français demeure une langue vivante, et de surcroît, une langue d'action.

Enfin, Messieurs, n'est-il pas utopique de croire qu'en interdisant l'enseignement d'une langue, et qu'en refusant d'offrir des services dans cette même langue, l'on proviendrait à rayer de la carte la langue d'un peuple fondateur qui a survécu à pire intempérie. Je n'ai pas à vous rappeler que la route des premiers pionniers n'était pas un tapis de roses. Comment ne pas reconnaître la volonté, voire la persévérance, d'une population qui a su apprécier à sa juste valeur la culture et la langue que leur ont léguées leurs ancêtres par delà monts et rivières.

Aussi, il faut tenir compte de l'évolution tant humaine que technique, et voir que le Manitoba n'est plus à l'ère de la colonisation, isolé dans sa plaine, mais à l'ère des communications universelles.

Allait-on croire que nous allions nous laisser englober ainsi, alors que de tous côtés, enfin, grâce aux communications, nous parvenons des témoignages d'appuis de nos frères et soeurs francophones dans la lutte que nous menons pour faire respecter nos droits et rétablir les injustices passées.

Aussi, puisque de nos jours tout se sait, il faut s'attendre à être jugé, condamné et blâmé pour des actes irresponsables qui perpétuent une grande injustice, ou, être félicité et reconnu comme un justicier responsable en rétablissant les droits de sa population qui fut lésée pendant de longues années.

Enfin, Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, il me fait donc plaisir de m'adresser à vous aujourd'hui dans une langue vivante: LE FRANÇAIS, et ceci afin de donner mon appui à l'entente négociée, en mai dernier, pour l'amendement à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Merci.

Doris Hogue  
C.P. 539  
Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba.  
ROA 0T0  
1-878-3293

**SUBMISSION NO. 41  
GILBERT FOURNIER**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Depuis que le gouvernement manitobain a manifesté l'intention de rectifier le tort qui subsiste depuis 1890 à l'endroit des Franco-Manitobains, une tempête de protestations se fait entendre. C'est sans doute parce que l'injustice existe depuis longue date que tout changement au statu quo est perçu comme menace. Cependant, le rétablissement du français comme langue d'usage devant les tribunaux et à la législature est inévitable.

Il reste à décider quels services offrir aux populations francophones de la province. C'est précisément cet aspect qui fait peur aux gens. Ils estiment que ces services coûteraient trop cher et que d'ailleurs, comme tout Franco-Manitobain est bilingue il n'y a nul besoin d'offrir les mêmes dans deux langues. Ce serait une risée que d'avoir une province bilingue où il serait impossible de communiquer en français avec son gouvernement pour les services essentiels.

Cette réalité, le gouvernement l'a bien saisie. C'est pour cela que dans l'entente avec la SFM, les services en français jugés nécessaires étaient énumérés.

Malheureusement, la bonne entente entre deux partis excitent la jalousie, la haine, la colère des autres. Cependant, il ne faut pas que le gouvernement faiblisse dans ses intentions, car elles sont justes pour tous. J'appuie pleinement la résolution négociée au mois de mai par les gouvernements provincial et fédéral et la SFM pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Merci.

Gilbert Fournier,  
Président,  
Chambre de Commerce.

**SUBMISSION NO. 42  
GISÈLE LOYER**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Je m'adresse à vous, ce soir, à titre de Canadienne française et je suis fière de ma langue et de ma culture. Aussi, j'aimerais bien que mes enfants puissent vivre pleinement leurs droits en tant que citoyens de langue française.

Je ne comprends pas pourquoi on s'oppose si vivement à une loi qui veut réparer une injustice commise il y a de cela 90 ans. Le gouvernement actuel doit employer tous les moyens nécessaires pour réparer cette erreur et ne pas faiblir devant l'opposition.

Chacun de nous doit accepter de vivre avec la différence de l'autre. La majorité n'a pas le droit de piétiner une minorité et leur enlever les droits déjà acquis. Il est temps que les Franco-Manitobains manifestent leurs droits et reprennent ce qui leur est dû, c'est-à-dire: "Le droit de s'adresser dans leur langue maternelle en tout lieu et en toute occasion".

C'est pourquoi, en toute justice, vous avez le devoir d'appuyer l'enchâssement de l'article 23 à l'Acte du Manitoba. Donnez-nous nos droits tels que proposés en mai dernier. Soyez audacieux, courageux et confiants car le bilinguisme au Manitoba ira loin.

Je suis persuadée que le rétablissement de la justice est votre priorité. Et nous, par notre présence de ce soir, sommes ici pour vous témoigner notre appui dans cette tâche. Le français et l'anglais deviendront bientôt

les deux langues officielles du Manitoba. C'est pourquoi, que moi, comme individu, j'appuie avec conviction la résolution négociée en mai dernier par la Société franco-manitobaine et le gouvernement du Manitoba.

Merci.

Gisèle Loyer,

Bte 159 B, R.R. 2,  
Lorette, Manitoba  
R0A 0Y0

### **SUBMISSION NO. 43 LE CLUB DE BICOLO**

Monsieur le président, membres du comité.

C'est en tant que responsables du Club de Bicolo que nous vous présentons ce bref.

Notre Club s'adresse aux enfants de 4 à 14 ans. Il existe depuis onze ans et compte aujourd'hui 7 200 membres répartis à travers la province. Ces jeunes francophones et francophiles jouissent d'une page de jeux de toutes sortes qui paraît chaque semaine dans notre journal La Liberté. Ils participent avec enthousiasme aux différents concours que nous initions pour eux.

Nous ne pouvons demeurer indifférentes devant la controverse actuelle touchant nos droits linguistiques. Au nom de ces jeunes, nous faisons appel à votre ouverture d'esprit, à votre sens des responsabilités pour réparer une injustice et redresser une situation illégale qui persiste depuis près d'un siècle dans notre province. Les Franco-Manitobains ont suffisamment soufferts du manque de connaissance ou de la mauvaise volonté de la part des gouvernements qui se sont succédés depuis 1890 dans cette province. Il est grand temps que réparation soit faite.

La loi actuelle doit être changée. En redonnant à la province son statut bilingue comme ce l'était au début et en offrant les services essentiels dans les deux langues officielles, le gouvernement pourra enfin être reconnu comme juste et équitable. En tant qu'adultes, n'est-ce pas là l'exemple et l'enseignement que nous voulons laisser à nos jeunes qui nous observent et qui suivront nos pas?

En leurs noms, nous appuyons la résolution négociée au mois de mai par les gouvernements fédéral, provincial et la Société franco-manitobaine pour amender l'Acte du Manitoba et redonner aux francophones ce qui leur revient.

Nous osons croire en votre courage et en votre sens de la justice.

Merci.

Cette soumission est signée: Laurence Bérard, Nicole Gagné, Cécile Mulaire.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 44 YVONNE LEGASSÉ**

Monsieur le Président et membres du comité.

Je suis heureuse d'avoir l'occasion d'exprimer mon opinion sur la question du bilinguisme au Manitoba.

La survie de français au Canada est très importante pour moi. Ce langage est l'héritage que j'ai reçu de mes ancêtres et que je veux transmettre à mes enfants et à tous mes descendants.

Je remercie Dieu que je suis née au Canada, et je suis fière de mes ancêtres qui ont eu le courage de quitter la France, il y a 400 ans pour venir faire partie de la colonie sur les rives du fleuve St-Laurent. Cette colonie était déjà bien établie lorsque le roi de France signa le Traité de Paris.

Heureusement Lord Durham était un homme au coeur honnête. Il a voulu donner justice au peuple conquis, et nous avons gardé notre langue et notre foi. Bravo pour les anglais de cette trempe!

Mes parents étaient tous deux de la province du Québec. Mon père aimait la terre et se rendit dans la région d'Estevan, Saskatchewan où il s'établit sur un homestead en 1909. La population de son entourage venait de différents pays d'Europe. Ils ont tous appris l'anglais pour se comprendre entre voisins. Je garde de très bons souvenirs de ces gens-là.

Lorsque j'ai commencé à aller à l'école, je ne parlais que le français - ma mère ne parlait pas l'anglais.

Si je parle français aujourd'hui, c'est parce qu'elle tenait à ce que ses enfants parlent la langue des ancêtres. Elle disait "C'est peut être le seul héritage que vous aurez de nous". Elle avait raison.

A l'école, il nous était interdit de parler en français entre nous, mon frère et moi. Nous avons donc appris l'anglais. J'ai fréquenté la petite école rurale jusqu'en 1934 lorsque nous avons quitté la Saskatchewan pour venir à Ste-Anne, Manitoba.

C'est alors que j'ai eu la chance d'apprendre à lire et écrire notre langue.

Les pères de la Confédération ont su garder les droits linguistiques des deux nation fondatrices de notre pays. Tout de même, les membres du gouvernement du Manitoba ont ignoré cette classe de notre Constitution et ont passé une loi pour abolir l'enseignement de français au Manitoba. Les membres honorables ignoraient-ils qu'il y avait encore tout un peuple au Manitoba qui ne pouvait se plier à cette loi injuste? Se voyant impuissants devant le gouvernement de la province, ce peuple organisa l'Association d'Education Française au Manitoba qui a collaboré effectivement avec les éducateurs et les parents pour que l'enseignement du français subsiste dans notre province.

Je serai toujours reconnaissante envers cette association et nos éducateurs pour ma connaissance un peu plus profonde de ma langue maternelle. Cela me permet aujourd'hui de pouvoir publier des livres (contes que mon père me racontait quand j'étais enfant).

Ca me permet aussi de communiquer tous les jours avec les voisins et amis de mon milieu; et de participer à tout ce qui se passe.

Je suis également capable de jouir de tous événements - télévision radiodiffusée, etc. . . en anglais. C'est merveilleux d'être bilingue!

Je souhaiterais que tous les Canadiens puissent l'être.

En 1941-42, j'enseignais dans la petite école rurale de Ste-Anne Centre. J'avais 34 élèves de 6 ans à 14 ans. Sur ce nombre, il y en avait 8 qui ne parlaient pas le français. Heureusement les parents n'étaient pas contre l'enseignement du français - et les commissaires m'avaient demandé de l'enseigner.

Je savais que lorsque l'inspecteur viendrait, il serait peut-être bon de cacher les livres français et faire semblant que j'enseignais en anglais seulement comme c'était la coutume mais j'avais décidé d'être franche et j'avoue que j'étais un peu curieuse de savoir ce qui se



passerait. Donc lorsqu'il arriva au commencement d'octobre il trouva du français écrit sur le tableau noir et des livres français sur mon pupitre. Cela suscita un bel argument.

Vous savez que vous transgressez la loi du Manitoba? et savez-vous que je pourrais vous enlever votre permis d'enseignement? (Je n'avais pas encore mon certificat d'enseignement.) J'ai répondu que les parents et les commissaires m'avaient demandé d'enseigner le français et que je faisais de mon mieux et que s'il y avait une loi pour empêcher l'enseignement du français dans cette école ou plus que les 2/3 des élèves étaient de parents français cette loi n'avait pas sa raison d'être et devrait être abolie car elle dérobaît à ces enfants l'héritage linguistique auquel ils avaient droit. Pour ma part, je faisais ce que je pouvais pour leur transmettre cet héritage et que si j'étais inspecteur, je serais en mesure d'en faire plus encore.

Il se mit à rire et dit - tu perdrais ton emploi - et j'espère que tu vas changer d'idée. Pour cette fois, ça va passer mais à ma prochaine visite je ferai mon devoir.

Je compris donc que je devrais jouer le jeu - et je gardais quand même le droit de ne pas changer d'idée quand je sais que j'ai raison. Si les élèves apprenaient la langue française au détriment de l'anglais - ça ne serait pas bien car ils ont besoin de l'anglais. Je sais que tous, nous sommes capable d'apprendre les langues officielles de ce pays. Si moi, j'ai été capable - n'importe qui est capable - pourvu qu'on lui en donne l'occasion.

Je suis certaine que tous ceux qui sont bilingue sont content de l'être.

De nos jours, on est en fait citoyens du monde entier. Les gens voyagent de plus en plus. Ceux qui connaissent plus qu'une langue ont sans doute plus d'agrément que ceux qui n'en possède qu'une seule.

Les pays d'Europe reconnaissent l'importance de donner à leurs citoyens l'occasion de pouvoir apprendre des langues autres que la leur.

Au Canada, nous sommes chanceux - les deux langues officielles du pays sont aussi les deux langues universelles.

Pourrions-nous faire un effort pour nous débarrasser de nos préjugés pour regarder la situation de plus haut?

Nous sommes tous citoyens d'un beau grand pays qui jouit du respect de tous les pays du monde. Nous avons des co-citoyens qui sont emmigrés de ces pays et sont heureux de trouver ici une population qui jouit de la paix ou il fait bon vivre. C'est un pays où les droits de l'homme sont respectés dont la Constitution protège les minorités.

Laissons donc tomber nos préjugés Collaborons tous ensemble pour hâter le jour où tous les Canadiens seraient plus unis - connaîtraient toutes les langues officielles - ce qui ne devrait pas empêcher qui que ce soit d'apprendre sa langue natale.

Maintenant je veux parler de la traduction des lois législatives de la langue anglaise à la langue française. Il est vrai que ça coûterait cher aux Manitobains, mais on n'a rien sans peine - il faut toujours payer pour nos bévus.

Si, depuis 1916 les lois avaient été écrites dans les deux langues tel que la Constitution le demandait, on aurait payé les dépenses petit à petit et on n'aurait pas à payer tout ça d'un seul coup.

Je suis certaine que les Franco-Manitobains sont prêt à faire leur part pour cette cause. Ce sera aussi le bon

moment aussi de faire la revue des lois législatives qui existent et mettre aux papiers (un tas de papiers) celles qui ne sont plus efficaces. Qui sait, on trouverait peut être des trésors oubliés en faisant un tel ménage.

Il faut dire aussi que les traducteurs n'auraient pas besoin d'aide sociale pour un bon bout de temps.

Voyez-vous maintenant le beau côté de la médaille. Bravo! J'en suis ravie. Merci de votre attention.

Témoignage d'Yvonne Lagassé  
Ste. Anne, Man.

## SUBMISSION NO. 45 LÉO NADEAU

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Si j'ose vous adresser quelques paroles au cours de ces audiences publiques, c'est que je crois que l'enjeu est trop élevé pour me permettre de ne rien dire.

L'enjeu va bien au-delà de la survie de la population franco-manitobaine. C'est un enjeu qui touche à la population du Manitoba en entier. Le sort de notre communauté en dépend. Les lois qui ont aboli l'usage du français au Manitoba ont été jugées anticonstitutionnelles. Si l'on continue à respecter ces lois anticonstitutionnelles, c'est la fin de notre système judiciaire. Sur ce système judiciaire repose les fondements de notre civilisation. Nous ne pouvons donc pas continuer à observer des lois qui menacent ainsi notre société. Il faut bannir éternellement ces lois répressives dont l'existence n'est pas fondée sur la légalité.

Les Franco-Manitobains subissent les injustices depuis 90 ans. Ils ont patienté tout ce temps. On leur doit d'amender ces lois qui les conduisent peu à peu vers une mort certaine.

La Société franco-manitobaine a agi dans l'intérêt du groupe qu'elle représente. L'entente conclue le 17 mai est juste envers les Franco-Manitobains et aussi, envers le gouvernement provincial. Il s'agit d'une entente avantageuse pour tous les partis en question.

J'appuie fortement l'entente conclue le 17 mai 1983. J'espère, messieurs, que vous en ferez autant.

Merci.

Leo Nadeau

## SUBMISSION NO. 46 LOUIS FIOLA

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

J'aurais aimé ne pas avoir à me présenter devant ces audiences publiques, mais il me semble qu'il y a des choses qui doivent être dites.

Je déplore que le gouvernement de monsieur Pawley soit réprimandé pour vouloir accorder justice aux Franco-Manitobains et je déplore aussi le manque de connaissance de l'histoire par certains membres du parlement et d'un certain nombre de nos concitoyens quand on les entend répéter que la province a bien fonctionné dans une seule langue - l'anglais - depuis cent ans. Moi, j'appelle cela de l'ignorance et de l'étroitesse d'esprit.

Nous, les Franco-Manitobains, qui avons payé double taxes pour maintenir nos écoles privées et avons

dépensé beaucoup d'énergie en faisant partie de plusieurs comités pour préserver notre culture, notre langue et nos droits faute d'injustices de la part de la majorité et de nos politiciens.

Je crois qu'il est grand temps que nos gouvernements nous redonnent nos droits et nous fassent justice.

Le gouvernement qui aura le courage de nous rendre justice en faisant du Manitoba une province où les deux langues officielles seraient offertes sur un pied d'égalité sera loué pour son sens de la justice. Ceci aiderait à créer une ouverture d'esprit et tous nos citoyens viendraient un jour à comprendre la richesse de connaître nos deux langues officielles et autres s'ils le veulent.

En terminant, j'aimerais vous assurer que j'appuie la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle que négociée au mois de mai par la Société franco-manitobaine et le gouvernement du Manitoba.

Merci.

Louis Fiola

Ste-Geneviève, Manitoba.

**SUBMISSION NO. 47  
CARMEN CATELLIER  
EDUCATEURS FRANCO-MANITOBAINS  
DE LA  
DIVISION SCOLAIRE RIVIÈRE ROUGE NO.  
17**

Messieurs du comité.

Vu que je me présente ici au nom des Educateurs franco-manitobains de la Division de la Rivière Rouge, je prends un plan de professeur.

Notre histoire je crois bien que vous la connaissez. Mais il faut entendre cette histoire du point de vue du jeune qui écoute une leçon d'histoire du Manitoba. Il est celui qui subira ou jouira des conséquences des décisions des gouvernants. Ce sont les gouvernants qui ont le privilège et la responsabilité de façonner l'avenir des jeunes.

Voici ce que le jeune de 12 ans de la Rivière Rouge a appris et connaît des droits accordés au Manitobains lors de l'entrée de la Province en Confédération.

Notre province, le Manitoba fut établie et bien démarée par des Canadiens-Français. L'histoire de notre province se raconte bien par les exploits et les aventures de ses premiers habitants. Où en serons-nous sans le concours des LaVérendrye, des Voyageurs, des Noël Ritchot et de Louis Riel?

Un débat excitant mené à bonne fin par la conviction et la persistance de plusieurs Métis et francophones nous donna l'entrée en Confédération. Les droits dans les deux langues officielles pour les Cours de Justice, à l'Assemblée législative et en éducation étaient assurés aux habitants de la nouvelle province.

Ensuite prenant gêne devant une province peut-être plus puissante économiquement, différents groupes politiques désireux de conserver leur pouvoir de législation ont à deux reprises enlevés les droits des deux langues officielles si honorablement acquis en 1870.

Malgré des lois répressives, le Franco-Manitobain continue d'exister. Et, avec conviction et tenacité, il

continue sa marche pour rétablir ses droits. Heureusement, il y eut au Canada en 1968 la déclaration de deux langues officielles. Et avec le gouvernement Schreyer les droits d'enseignement dans les deux langues furent rétablis dans les années 1970, un siècle après leur véritable acquisition.

Mais les droits d'enseignement ne suffisent pas. Il faut remettre à droit la loi qui fut déclarée inconstitutionnelle par la Cour suprême du Canada en 1979. Il faut redonner la place juste à l'Acte du Manitoba et surtout dans son article 23.

En plus, je travaille comme éducateur dans la division scolaire du Manitoba qui jouit du plus haut pourcentage de population francophone. Il faut réaliser que les écoles sont françaises, que la commission scolaire fonctionne en français et qu'au sein des municipalités rurales les assises se déroulent en français. Mais malheureusement quand arrive l'administration officielle, impossible de continuer dans la langue quotidienne.

Comme éducateurs, nous croyons à l'importance et au droit des francophones d'administrer dans leur langue les institutions qui sont importantes à la survie et à l'épanouissement des Franco-Manitobains.

Les amendements qui veulent insérer les partis impliqués dans la Constitution représentent, à notre égard, un pas important dans la bonne direction.

Si les gens qui siègent sur ce comité sont en profond désaccord avec ce bref historique nous avons dans la vallée de la Rivière Rouge des professeurs qui seraient soucieux de présenter un cours sur l'histoire tel que vécu par nos ancêtres.

La Société franco-manitobaine a négociée une honorable entente avec le présent gouvernement en mai de cette année. Au nom des Educateurs franco-manitobains de la Rivière Rouge, je veux dire que nous appuyons la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle qu'elle a été négociée.

Signed: Carmen Catellier.

**SUBMISSION NO. 48  
YVETTE FLUET-GAGNON**

Monsieur le Président, mesdames et messieurs.

J'éprouve une certaine angoisse de ces temps-ci. Une angoisse légitime, car encore une fois nous voilà en position de quémander et de se défendre devant une majorité qui semble vouloir fermer les yeux, le coeur et nier même notre existence. On me dit que je n'ai pas juste cause, mais je n'ai qu'à écouter les média et je frissonne. Comme francophone, je me souviens qu'à l'époque où j'étais écolière, on me défendais l'instruction en français et j'ai peur que l'histoire se répète. Qu'une fois de plus nous verrons évaporer nos droits de vivre et d'apprendre en français.

Sans doute vous, qui siégez au comité, avez appris des leçons d'histoire durant ces dernières semaines. Vous avez certainement entendu l'histoire du Manitoba racontée de façon très précise. On ne peut changer l'histoire. On peut oublier certains faits ou tenter de la raconter de la façon qui nous plaît; peu importe. Les dates, les événements, les paroles et leurs effets sont inscrits à tout jamais et on ne peut les changer.

Ceci dit, je me demande, "que vont écrire les historiens de cette époque dans l'histoire du Manitoba?"

Dira t'on que le gouvernement du temps, dans sa sagesse, déclara la province bilingue et enchassa les droits des francophones, afin de rectifier les fautes, les négligences des gouvernements précédents?

Ou dira t'on qu'une fois de plus les Franco-Manitobains se sont démenés pour obtenir leurs droits et qu'une fois de plus n'ont pas réussi, faute d'un gouvernement insécure et injuste?

Le premier exemple que j'ai cité sera vérité si l'entente du 17 mai est respectée. Que ce gouvernement revienne à cette entente, sans diluer les amendements et il se fera une place d'honneur dans l'histoire et aura mis en marche le rétablissement de la confiance des minorités, qui à ce temps est sérieusement endommagée.

Je suis mère de famille et comme toute autre mère, j'espère que la vie sera plus douce envers mes enfants, qu'elle ne m'a été pour moi.

En temps que francophone je ne peux que considérer l'entente du 17 mai comme une assurance de cela. Avec cette entente, enchâssée, peut-être qu'ils pourront vivre fiers de leur identité, sachant qu'ils n'auront pas à s'abaisser, à revendiquer leurs droits, à quémander tout ce qu'on prend pour acquis quand on est anglophone.

Pour ma famille, j'approuve et j'appuie fortement les amendements à l'article 23 tel que négociés le 17 mai par la Société franco-manitobaine et le gouvernement du Manitoba.

Cette entente garantie une vie sur pied d'égalité, elle est juste et j'y crois.

Yvette Fluet-Gagnon  
Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 49 GILBERT LEGAL**

Monsieur le Président, mesdames et messieurs les membres du comité.

Je suis directeur de l'École secondaire de La Broquerie et c'est comme représentant des professeurs et des élèves de cette école secondaire française que je me présente devant ce comité de la législature manitobaine.

C'est avec beaucoup d'intérêt que nous suivions depuis trois ans les développements juridiques et politiques en ce qui a trait aux droits linguistiques des Franco-Manitobains. Nous nous réjouissons de la victoire de M. Georges Forest en Cour suprême du Canada, mais nous déplorons en même temps qu'il a dû dépenser autant de temps et d'argent pour obtenir un droit qui aurait dû nous être constitutionnellement garanti depuis toujours. Nous déplorons également l'attitude du gouvernement Lyon de l'époque, face au jugement de la Cour suprême dans l'affaire Forest. Cette moquerie totale d'un jugement de la Cour suprême est selon nous un outrage à la cour et dénote une bigoterie semblable à celle qui a provoqué la question des écoles du Manitoba en 1896 et l'abolition des écoles bilingues en 1916.

Il va sans dire que nous étions très fiers et encouragés par les démarches entreprises par le gouvernement néo-démocrate de M. Pawley ce printemps dernier, suite au cas Bilodeau et aux revendications constantes de la Société franco-manitobaine. Notre porte-parole, la

Société franco-manitobaine. Notre porte-parole, la Société franco-manitobaine a négocié de bonne foi et a accepté, au nom de tous les francophones du Manitoba, une entente qui était également acceptable aux gouvernements provincial et fédéral.

Monsieur le Président, mesdames et messieurs les membres du comité, il ne faut pas capituler! Vous avez une chance unique et historique de redresser une situation intolérable pour nous et humiliante pour vous. Depuis cent ans que nous subissons injures et injustices parce que nos ancêtres n'ont pas voulu laisser mourir leur langue et leur culture. Oui, nous sommes encore ici, debouts et nous y resterons . . . Forts du même esprit combatif qui animait nos ancêtres, solidaires à travers la S.F.M., et surtout convaincus que la Cour suprême nous fera justice, une fois pour toute, nous sommes plus que jamais inébranlables dans les revendications de nos droits. Nous voulons, et ne serons satisfaits avec rien de moins qu'une égalité totale dans nos droits linguistiques, ce qui implique un réseau d'institutions et une gamme de services gouvernementaux comparables à ceux disponibles aux anglophones.

Bref, je vous exhorte en terminant, à prendre vos responsabilités. Il est dommage que cette question de droits constitutionnels et d'égalité fondamentale soit devenue, encore une fois, une question politique. Je vous supplie donc d'amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, tel que négocié par la Société franco-manitobaine, le gouvernement provincial et le gouvernement fédéral, le 17 mai dernier. Toute dilution de ce projet de loi sera considérée un affront à la communauté francophone du Manitoba et sera par ce fait même, inacceptable. Je le répète, vous avez une chance unique de redresser une situation d'injustice historique. Ne la manquez pas!

Respectueusement soumis au nom de l'École secondaire La Broquerie par Gilbert Legal.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 50 HUBERT BALCAEN**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

J'ai répondu à l'invitation faite au public manitobain de se présenter devant vous et ce, dans le but d'exprimer sans équivoque mon appui à l'entente de principe conclue en mai de cette année entre la SFM et les paliers de gouvernement provincial et fédéral, en ce qui a trait aux amendements proposés à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Mes raisons pour cet appui sont au nombre de trois et les voici:

Premièrement, je crois que ces amendements s'imposaient depuis longtemps pour corriger une erreur remontant à presque un siècle déjà. C'est une initiative importante de ce point de vue. Importante aussi, pour la minorité de langue officielle qui, depuis des décennies, subit les ravages de l'assimilation et est de plus en plus privée de l'oxygène linguistique et culturel nécessaire à sa survie sans parler de son épanouissement.

En deuxième lieu, les amendements proposés à l'acte 23 prévoient la possibilité de services dans les deux langues de la majorité officielle du Canada. Comme je vis dans une de ces régions, j'aimerais me prévaloir de ces services tout en sachant que la majorité, elle, ne

sera pas lésée pour autant. Inutile d'entrer dans les détails des coûts, ici: la documentation officielle publiée depuis mai est fort explicite à ce sujet.

Enfin, Monsieur le Président, l'entente conclue en mai a été négociée autour du principe de base que "les langues officielles du Manitoba sont le français et l'anglais". Je suis persuadé que ce principe-là peut être une occasion de tolérance et de respect pour les Manitobains. En acceptant les amendements à l'article 23 tels que conclus dans l'entente du 17 mai, j'ose croire que le Manitoba s'affichera comme un exemple qui fera des envieux dans plusieurs régions de notre pays.

Merci.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 51 LE CLUB DE CURLING DE LA BROQUERIE**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

J'aimerais souligner quelques points au sujet du débat qui fait rage depuis que le gouvernement de la province entend amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Premièrement, je ne sais pas si les médias sont responsables, mais il me semble qu'on est en train de faire beaucoup de bruit pour peu de choses. Les manchettes, les éditoriaux, les lettres aux rédacteurs, des feuillets, des pétitions et même ces audiences publiques.

Que vise l'amendement du Manitoba, sinon un certain épanouissement de la vie française au Manitoba? Et je ne vois toujours pas comment cet épanouissement chez 5 pour cent de la population peut menacer la majorité.

Deuxièmement, au sujet de ces audiences publiques, je ne crois pas qu'elle soient un bien. Une injustice a été commise et elle doit être rectifiée. On ne demande pas l'opinion des gens au sujet d'un certain cas devant les tribunaux. Pourquoi alors veut-on sonder l'opinion manitobaine avant de trancher une question avant tout légale?

Troisièmement, je souhaite que l'on remarque surtout les points positifs d'une province manitobaine officiellement bilingue. Cela aiderait certainement le Canada à demeurer le beau pays qu'il est. Et puis, quel signe encourageant pour les nombreuses minorités du pays, de savoir que la minorité officielle du Manitoba a gain de cause dans le rétablissement de ses droits.

Tout ça pour vous dire que j'appuie la résolution négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Merci.

Cette soumission est signée par Oscar Gagnon, Estelle Taillefer, Rita Nadeau, Gil Tétrault et Jean Normandeau.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 52 JEANNINE KIROUAC**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

En 1890, l'usage du français dans les cours et à la chambre des députés était aboli. En 1916, l'enseignement en français dans les écoles publiques du Manitoba était interdit. Malgré ces lois répressives, le Franco-Manitobain continua d'exister.

En 1970, le gouvernement d'Edward Schreyer permettait la création d'écoles françaises. Moins d'une décennie plus tard, l'école d'immersion française

apparaissait sur la scène éducative. Entre temps, Georges Forest gagnait à la aCour suprême du Canada en faisant déclarer anticonstitutionnelle la loi de 1890 qui interdisait l'usage du français dans les cours et à la législature. En 1983, les gouvernements provincial et fédéral et la Société franco-manitobaine signaient une entente pour redonner à la langue française la place qu'elle occupait jadis.

Ce bref résumé historique indique bien la tendance. Le français est à la hausse! Le beau temps revient!

A ceux qui craignent un "French takeover" au Manitoba, j'aimerais vous dire que c'est impossible car nous ne sommes que 6 pour cent. Ce que nous voulons, c'est le respect de nos droits.

J'aimerais, en terminant, vous dire que j'appuie avec conviction la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai entre le gouvernement du Manitoba et la Société franco-manitobaine.

Merci.

Signed Jeannine Kirouac,  
C.P. 82

La Broquerie, Manitoba  
R0A 0W0

### **SUBMISSION NO. 53 RACHELLE OUELLET**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

Il ne s'agit pas de venir quémander pour que nos droits soient respectés mais plutôt de l'exiger. J'ose l'exiger non pas dans un esprit de confrontation, ni dans celui de remâcher toutes les injustices, mais dans l'intention de faire reconnaître le meilleur de nous-mêmes.

J'estime que ce que nous, les francophones, avons reçu par le passé est insuffisant. Je crois que l'entente telle que proposée le 17 mai faciliterait un style de rapports d'où seraient exclues les traces de paternalisme et d'inconsciente impression de supériorité de la part de la majorité et à la fois celles de méfiance et de crainte de la part de la minorité. Plus on nous reconnaîtra une égale dignité et liberté d'expression, plus on pourra s'engager au service de tous les Manitobains.

En respectant l'entente du 17 mai le Manitoba ne peut que gagner. L'échange et l'enrichissement mutuel seraient rendus plus possible. C'est pour cela que j'appuie la résolution originale d'amendement à l'article 23 - sans les nouvelles modifications.

Merci.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 54 COMITÉ CULTUREL - LA BROQUERIE**

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité.

La résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, telle que négociée au mois de mai est plus qu'un moyen de compenser pour l'injustice commise depuis longtemps. C'est l'occasion de nous reconnaître une égale dignité. Occasion qu'on ne voudra pas manquer! Ainsi les changements proposés dans l'entente du 17 mai feront plus que nous remettre ce

qui est essentiel à notre survie et à notre évolution. Ils permettront à tous les Manitobains de s'enrichir du meilleur de nous-mêmes et rendront possible un échange plus fructueux.

Les changements proposés dans l'entente originale n'ont rien de menaçant pour la majorité anglophone. Ils ne leur enlèveront rien. La majorité a tout à gagner en nous reconnaissant pour ce que nous sommes. Ainsi seulement pourrons nous nous engager au service de tous.

Il va sans dire aussi que l'enchassement de nos droits ne pourra qu'être un pas vers l'avant pour les ethnies, groupes minoritaires eux aussi.

Le gouvernement actuel ne peut plus se permettre d'hésiter à rectifier une loi anticonstitutionnelle qui nuit à une meilleure compréhension et une meilleure participation de tous Manitobains.

Nous appuyons donc la résolution originale d'amendement à l'article 23 - sans les nouvelles modifications.

Signed: Rachele Ouellet, Norbert Piche, Hermanne Granger, Florence Torcutti, Eva Moquin, and Denise Boily.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 55 CLERCS DE SAINT-VIAEUR**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Représentant la Congrégation des Clercs de Saint-Viteur de La Broquerie, je dois vous avouer que nous sommes stupéfaits de constater que des Manitobains puissent protester si violemment à une rectification de lésion de droit acquis dès la formation de cette province. En fait, regardant l'histoire de la province, nous constatons qu'en 1870, Louis Riel, chef du gouvernement provisoire à la Rivière Rouge exigea des garanties pour la langue française sur le nouveau territoire manitobain avant d'accepter de faire partie officiellement de la Confédération canadienne. L'Acte du Manitoba, à ce moment, rendait le français et l'anglais langues officielles de la nouvelle province et offrait deux systèmes d'éducation à fondement confessionnel.

Dès 1890, ces droits furent violés et lésés. Toutes tentatives pour rectifier cette anomalie échouèrent. En 1916, le gouvernement conduit par T. C. Norris, adopta la loi Thornton qui abolissait les écoles bilingues et faisait de l'anglais la seule langue d'enseignement au Manitoba. La minorité française s'opposa fortement à cette façon injuste d'agir et depuis, elle lutte avec acharnement pour voir justice se manifester. Il semble que les immigrants venus de différents pays pour chercher fortune au Manitoba ne comprennent pas la situation. C'est pourquoi une grande majorité de ces immigrants s'opposent si violemment à ce que les droits des francophones soient récupérés. Ceux qui ont pris la peine et le temps de se renseigner savent bien qu'à la fin des années quarante et une vingtaine d'années plus tard, le gouvernement permit l'utilisation du français comme langue d'enseignement. Aussi, les bien-pensants, les gens à esprit ouvert savent que ceci fut suivi en 1970 par la loi 113, passée par le gouvernement néo-démocrate de Ed Schreyer, qui établit le français et l'anglais comme langues officielles d'enseignement au Manitoba. En 1974, une structure organisationnelle

fut mise sur pied à l'intérieur du ministère de l'Éducation appelée le "Bureau de l'éducation française". Les dirigeants, mieux informés et moins préjugés que la masse populaire, comprirent le rôle important de justification et rectification qui leurs incombait. Comment se fait-il, alors, que tant de monde s'oppose à reconnaître la loi 113 qui fut adoptée à l'unanimité par l'Assemblée législative du Manitoba le 16 juillet 1970? Cette loi a pourtant reconnu légalement, ce qui était considéré comme acquis depuis l'entrée du Manitoba dans la confédération: le droit, pour ceux qui le désirent, d'inscrire leurs enfants dans une école publique où l'enseignement serait dispensé en français de la maternelle à la douzième année. Pour s'y opposer, il faut certainement posséder des sentiments de jalousie et de haine ou simplement être tellement imbu de préjugés que l'ignorance fait disparaître toute possibilité de compréhension. Aucune menace ne semble surgir à l'horizon pour les autres dénominations ethniques. Elles ne doivent donc avoir aucune crainte de perdre les droits qui leurs sont dus. Elles peuvent vivre en toute sécurité et s'épanouir tout en laissant les autres en faire autant. Qui sait si l'avenir ne leur réserve pas des occasions où une collaboration étroite avec ceux qu'elles persécutent maintenant serait de mise.

Nous croyons qu'il est impératif que l'on redonne aux Franco-Manitobains leurs droits sans préjudice pour le reste de la population. Aussi, nous voulons signaler que nous appuyons la résolution qui a été négociée le 17 mai 1983 pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. J'espère, M. le président, que vous et les membres du comité, n'hésitez pas un instant à vous prononcer en faveur de cette résolution. Je vous en fait confiance.

Merci!

Réal St-Pierre, c.s.v.; Gaétan Lefebvre, c.s.v.; Gérard Clavet, c.s.v.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 56 PIERRE PALUD PROFESSEURS DU SECONDAIRE DE L'ÉCOLE POINTE-DES-CHÊNES**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Les amendements proposés à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba suscitent de nos jours beaucoup de controverse chez les Manitobains. Mais, pourquoi toute cette controverse? N'est-il pas vrai que les Franco-Manitobains ne réclament aujourd'hui que des droits qui d'après l'Acte du Manitoba de 1870, leur sont dus depuis plus de 90 ans.

Il est à remarquer et, notons le bien, que ce que réclament aujourd'hui les Franco-Manitobains n'enlève absolument rien aux autres ethnies de la province. Tout au contraire. Alors pourquoi y a-t-il tant de gens qui s'opposent-ils? Nous n'arrivons pas à comprendre pourquoi tant de gens veulent s'opposer à des amendements qui d'un côté ne leur enlèvent rien et qui de l'autre côté ne font que corriger les injustices commises par des gouvernements ultérieurs.

De plus, nous savons tous que la loi qui a interdit l'usage du français devant les tribunaux et au gouvernement de cette province vient tout récemment d'être déclarée anticonstitutionnelle. Comment le peuple

manitobain peut-il s'opposer à la rectification d'une loi, qui, aux yeux de la Cour suprême, est illégale? Alors, n'est-il donc pas tout à fait ridicule que nous ayons à nous présenter ici aujourd'hui pour réclamer des droits qui nous appartiennent déjà?

Il va donc sans dire, M. le président, membres du comité, que notre gouvernement néo-démocrate a pleinement raison de vouloir aujourd'hui assurer la survie de la langue française au Manitoba. Notre gouvernement se doit de rectifier l'erreur commise à l'époque du gouvernement Greenway. Il est donc impératif que les Manitobains appuient leur gouvernement dans le rétablissement de la justice.

Ce que nous vous demandons donc maintenant, Messieurs du comité, c'est que vous recommandiez l'inscription dans les lois manitobaines des amendements à l'article 23 tels que négociés au mois de mai dernier par la Société franco-manitobaine et le gouvernement Pawley. Tout cela, Messieurs, pour vous dire que nous appuyons fortement la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Merci.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 57 CLAUDETTE LAVACK**

M. le président, membres du comité.

L'usage du français dans la cour et à la Chambre des députés était aboli en 1890; également en 1916, l'enseignement en français dans les écoles publiques du Manitoba était supprimé. Malgré ces lois repressives, le Franco-Manitobain continua d'exister.

Depuis 1970, nous avons des écoles françaises. La population des écoles d'immersion françaises fait ampleur; ces étudiants sont fiers d'apprendre une seconde langue et nous, comme éducateurs, sommes également fiers de la leur enseigner. Et ceci tout en leur démontrant qu'ils soient également fiers de leur langue maternelle, quoi qu'elle soit.

Nous oserions espérer que ces étudiants auront la chance de mettre en pratique leur seconde langue, partout où ils iront au Manitoba d'ici peu.

Je termine en disant que nous appuyons fortement l'entente qui a été négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba par la Société franco-manitobaine et les gouvernements provincial et fédéral.

Merci.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 58 HUBERT BOUCHARD COMITÉ PROTECTEUR SCOUTS-GUIDES DE LA BROQUERIE**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Nous sommes bouleversés par la controverse que suscite les amendements à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Nous ne comprenons pas l'acharnement à s'opposer à une loi qui veut réparer les fautes commises à la fin du 19<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Le présent gouvernement provincial et fédéral et la Société franco-manitobaine avaient bien raison de conclure une entente pour remettre aux Franco-Manitobains les droits et les services en français.

M. le président, membres du comité, la langue française est une très belle langue. Nous voulons qu'elle soit utilisée. Nous voulons des services en français. Nous voulons que le Manitoba soit bilingue.

C'est pourquoi, M. le président, membres du comité, nous répétons avec intensité que nous appuyons la résolution qui a été négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Merci.

Nous appuyons le bref ci-inclus: Hubert Bouchard (président), Yvette Gagnon, Béatrice Boily, S. Fournier, Lina Decelles, Liliane Boily, Anita Bouchard, Suzanne Fournier, Carmelle Gagnon, Jules Balcaen, Jeanne Balcaen, Lucie Kirouac, Lucille Tetrault, Céline Gagnon, Yolande Laurencelle, Héléne Nadeau, Antoine Bissonnette, Jeannine Kirouac.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 59 GILLES NORMANDEAU**

Mon nom est Gilles Normandeau, directeur de l'école Pointe-des-Chênes à Sainte-Anne, au Manitoba. Au nom des professeurs de ladite école, je tiens à souligner qu'il est malheureux que nous ayons à défendre des droits qui nous avaient été accordés lors de l'entrée en Confédération de la province du Manitoba en 1870. Il semble inconvenable dans une démocratie comme la nôtre que des gouvernements aient pu, à travers des préjugés et des haines cultivés, léser ainsi des droits acquis en toute justice après des délibérations franches et honnêtes entre le gouvernement provisoire à la Rivière Rouge et le gouvernement fédéral.

L'Acte du Manitoba, en 1870, stipulait clairement que le français et l'anglais étaient les langues officielles de la nouvelle province et même offrait deux systèmes d'éducation à fondement confessionnel.

Comment des gens, se disant "de bonne volonté" et voulant le progrès de cette province du Manitoba, peuvent perdre un temps précieux et des énergies nécessaires pour continuer à vivre un tort commis sans sembler vouloir s'arrêter pour réfléchir sérieusement dépasse notre compréhension.

Actuellement, M. le président, le gouvernement néo-démocrate tente de réparer un tort qui existe depuis 90 ans. Dans un pays civilisé, comment ne pas seconder un gouvernement qui s'efforce, lui, de comprendre et de réparer un manque de justice?

C'est pourquoi le personnel enseignant de l'école Pointe-des-Chênes désire appuyer la résolution qui a été négociée le 17 mai 1983 pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. J'espère, M. le président, membres du comité, que vous n'hésitez pas à vous prononcer en faveur de cette résolution. Je vous en fait confiance.

Merci.

Gilles Normandeau,  
C.P. 269  
La Broquerie, Manitoba  
ROA 0W0

### **SUBMISSION NO. 60 ARMAND FRÉCHETTE**

Monsieur le président, membres du comité.

C'est au nom de tous les aînés de notre paroisse de La Broquerie que je me présente pour la survivance du français.

La controverse qu'ont suscitée les amendements proposés est de bien mauvais augure. Un grand nombre de Manitobains ont osé exprimer leur méfiance envers des changements dont ils n'ont même pas saisi la portée. Ils craignent le pire, ils se voient menacés par ces changements, si modérés soient-ils. Il est essentiel de ne pas se laisser influencer par toute cette émotivité inspirée par l'ignorance même. Tous ceux qui refusent de respecter les droits des Franco-Manitobains font signe d'une étroitesse d'esprit qui ne peut que mener à l'appauvrissement culturel du Manitoba. Depuis 1890, les Franco-Manitobains ont enduré héroïquement les injustices perpétrées par un gouvernement qui était allé au-delà de son pouvoir. Le gouvernement néo-démocrate d'aujourd'hui à l'occasion rêvée de réparer les erreurs du passé, de remettre à une population lésée ce qui est essentiel à son épanouissement. Ne tardons pas davantage - 90 ans ont déjà retardé tragiquement à l'action tandis qu'elle donne encore quelques signes de vie.

La Société franco-manitobaine a su très bien représenter la population franco-manitobaine. Tout au cours des négociations, elle ne voulait qu'assurer la survie des siens. Les amendements proposés sont un moyen de provoquer la renaissance des Manitobains d'expression française.

Il est impératif que l'on redonne aux Franco-Manitobains leurs droits. J'appuie donc la résolution pour amender l'article 23 telle que négociée par la Société franco-manitobaine et les gouvernements provincial et fédéral au mois de mai.

Merci.

**SUBMISSION NO. 61  
LÉONARD DESHARNIAS  
LA CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE DE SAINT-PIERRE-JOLYS**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Le Manitoba est une province qui contient encore des communautés francophones bien vivantes, des écoles qui enseignent le français aux francophones comme aux anglophones, ainsi qu'une culture distincte franco-manitobaine.

Il y a encore des éléments français forts dans notre province malgré les injustices imposées sur ceux-ci pendant les derniers 90 ans. Pourquoi ne pas donner la chance à plusieurs de travailler, recevoir des services et de vivre quotidiennement en français?

Ce qu'on entend sur la média à propos des droits en question, et tout le brouhaha qui sort de ces audiences publiques engendre de la peur, des fausses idées et fausses impressions parmi la population non francophone du Manitoba. La vérité de ce qui s'est passé en 1870, 1890 et 1916 n'est pas comprise.

La ville de Winnipeg propose un référendum sur la question de la survivance du français au Manitoba, tout ça avec de la fausse information. Peut-être que le maire de Winnipeg devrait inclure dans son référendum une question sur "Seat-Belt Legislation".

Les Franco-Manitobains aujourd'hui demandent que leur destin soit enlevé des mains des politiciens et que

l'article 23, avec les amendements, tel que négociés, soit enchâssé dans la Constitution canadienne.

La Chambre de commerce de Saint-Pierre-Jolys supporte cette résolution.

Merci.

Signed: Léonard Desharnais, President

**SUBMISSION NO. 62  
LE PERSONNEL DE L'ÉCOLE SAINT-JOACHIM DE LA BROQUERIE**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Nous, le personnel de l'école Saint-Joachim de La Broquerie, aimerions vous dire que nous appuyons avec grande conviction la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai entre le gouvernement du Manitoba et la Société franco-manitobaine.

En 1870, lors de la naissance du Manitoba, une entente avait été conclue, acceptant que les langues française et anglaise soient communes dans la législature et les cours, et que tous les documents publics soient publiés dans les deux langues.

En 1890, l'usage du français dans les cours et à la législature était aboli. En 1916, l'enseignement en français dans les écoles publiques du Manitoba était interdit.

N'est-ce pas là, grave injustice envers les Franco-Manitobains? Nos droits nous ont été arrachés par des gens qui avaient sûrement peu de tolérance, peu de soucis pour la culture de leurs voisins ou même de leurs enfants.

Nous voyons l'amendement de l'Acte du Manitoba, non une menace pour qui que ce soit, mais plutôt, un épanouissement de la vie française au Manitoba. Ce serait une richesse pour notre province, quelque chose de plus à être fier.

Le gouvernement actuel veut remettre cette province dans le droit chemin de ses engagements constitutionnels. Nous applaudissons fortement une telle démarche. Nous demandons que les droits de nos pères soient respectés.

Merci.

Norman J. Lavack (directeur), Yvette Gagnon, Henri Bisson, Florence Torcutti, Carmelle Gagnon, Jeannine Kirouac, Georgette Gérardy et Lucille Bisson.

**SUBMISSION NO. 63  
NORMAND BARNABÉ**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Ces audiences publiques, bien qu'elles ne veuillent que donner l'occasion à chacun de s'exprimer, n'atteignent pas toujours leur noble but. Au contraire, elles propagent l'hostilité et accentuent de plus en plus les divisions qui marquent notre communauté manitobaine.

Le gouvernement a distribué cet été un dépliant avec lequel il espérait apaiser les craintes des opposants aux amendements. Ce dépliant n'a pas suffi, puisque les opposants vocifèrent toujours de plus en plus et ils ont même réussi à obtenir la tenue de ces audiences publiques. Il semblerait que le gouvernement soit en

train de rebrousser chemin, sinon de sacrifier complètement les principes selon lesquelles l'entente a été négociée.

Cessons de donner libre cours à la véhémence. Faisons un effort pour mettre fin à la discorde entre Manitobains d'expression anglaise et ceux d'expression française. Il suffit d'amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Les opposants cesseront d'être belliqueux lorsqu'ils constateront que les amendements ne les affectent aucunement. Le rétablissement de la justice doit être notre priorité.

M. le président, membres du comité, j'espère que vous partagez mon opinion. Il faut appuyer la résolution, telle que négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Je l'appuie et j'en suis fier.

Merci.

#### **SUBMISSION NO. 64**

**AIMÉ GAUTHIER**

#### **LE COMITÉ DE DIRECTION DU CENTRE RÉCRÉATIF DE SAINT-PIERRE-JOLYS**

Je désire énoncer quelques idées dont on devrait tenir compte lorsqu'on décide si l'on doit appuyer ou non les amendements proposés à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Premièrement, il faut retenir le fait que la loi qui a interdit l'usage du français devant les tribunaux et au gouvernement a été déclarée anticonstitutionnelle. À partir de ce fait, je ne peux pas m'expliquer toute l'hésitation du gouvernement et l'opposition d'une grande partie de la population. Je ne peux comprendre que l'on refuse de rectifier une loi "illégal". L'opposition que l'on manifeste dépasse les bornes du raisonnement. Si l'on n'élimine pas les lois "illégal", quelle valeur notre système judiciaire peut-il avoir? Si l'on continue à reconnaître cette loi qui n'est pas légale, on doit remettre en question notre société, notre gouvernement et toutes nos institutions. Il va de soi que les fondements de notre civilisation elle-même s'écrouleraient. La gravité d'une telle situation fait peur. Il faut régler chez nous les problèmes de langues officielles et nous faut le faire sans plus de délai.

M. le président, membres du comité, nous accordons notre appui à la résolution négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Merci.

#### **SUBMISSION NO. 65**

**LYSE DESHARNIAS**

M. le président, membres du comité.

C'est avec regret que notre comité se sent pressé de présenter ce mémoire. En acceptant de tenir ces audiences publiques, vous montrez une certaine attitude de laisser-aller. Vous êtes maintenant dans une position où vous pourriez remédier une injustice qui a affecté la vie de plusieurs générations de francophones, et vous vacillez dans cette tâche.

Nous nous réjouissons que nos enfants détiennent certains droits en ce qui concerne leur éducation en français, mais nous voudrions qu'ils puissent vivre en français en dehors de nos foyers et de nos écoles. Si, chers Messieurs, vous appliquez les lois tel que stipulé dans l'article 23, ils le pourront.

Tout ceci pour vous dire que nous, le Comité de parents de l'école élémentaire de Saint-Pierre, appuyons la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle que négociée au mois de mai par le gouvernement fédéral, le gouvernement provincial et la SFM.

Merci.

Signed: Lyse Desharnais

#### **SUBMISSION NO. 66**

**AIMÉ TÉTRAULT**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Mon nom est Aimé Tétrault et je suis natif de La Broquerie. Je suis co-proprétaire de quelques commerces et gérant de La Broquerie Lumber Ltd. Nous offrons à tous nos clients un service bilingue puisque notre personnel est bilingue. Étant gérant d'un commerce, je crois que l'amendement de l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba serait certainement utile pour tous les commerces bilingues du Manitoba.

Une injustice a été commise et elle doit être rectifiée. Je crois que le gouvernement actuel de cette province se doit de mettre en vigueur une entente et de venir ainsi combler les faiblesses de tous les autres gouvernements qui l'ont précédé. Je dis faiblesse car tous ces gouvernements qui ont laissé se propager cette injustice ont fait preuve d'un sérieux manque de responsabilité envers leur population francophone; population dont la participation dans le passé à bâtir cette province n'est pas à redire.

M. le président, membres du comité, j'espère que vous partagez mon opinion. Il faut appuyer la résolution, telle que négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Merci.

Signed: Aimé Tétrault

La Broquerie Lumber Ltd.

#### **SUBMISSION NO. 67**

#### **LE COMITÉ DE PATINAGE ARTISTIQUE DE LA BROQUERIE**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Nous appuyons la résolution pour amender l'article 23, telle que négociée par la Société franco-manitobaine et les gouvernements provincial et fédéral au mois de mai dernier.

Depuis 1890, des injustices ont été faites à l'égard des français en enlevant l'usage du français dans les cours et à la Chambre des députés. Sans doute que le gouvernement actuel s'en est rendu compte.

Nous croyons que les jeunes francophones pourrait davantage évoluer avec une grande fierté pour leur identité si les services en français leur seraient plus accessibles.

Pensez-y, Messieurs, une province bilingue ça serait un exemple que les minorités sont respectés dans notre pays et qu'on ne devrait pas défaire et enlever les droits établis dans une constitution!

Merci.

Cécile Fournier (présidente), Jacinthe Mireault (secrétaire-trésorière), Yolande Tétrault, Jennifer Granger et Diane Turenne.



**SUBMISSION NO. 68  
IRMA GAUTHIER**

Monsieur le président, membres du comité.

C'est au nom de tous les aînés de notre paroisse de La Broquerie que je me présente pour la survivance du français.

La controverse qu'ont suscitée les amendements proposés est de bien mauvais augure. Un grand nombre de Manitobains ont osé exprimer leur méfiance envers des changements dont ils n'ont même pas saisi la portée. Ils craignent le pire, ils se voient menacés par ces changements, si modérés soient-ils. Il est essentiel de ne pas se laisser influencer par toute cette émotivité inspirée par l'ignorance même. Tous ceux qui refusent de respecter les droits des Franco-Manitobains font signe d'une étroitesse d'esprit qui ne peut que mener à l'appauvrissement culturel du Manitoba. Depuis 1890, les Franco-Manitobains ont enduré héroïquement les injustices perpétrées par un gouvernement qui était allé au-delà de son pouvoir. Le gouvernement néo-démocrate d'aujourd'hui à l'occasion rêvée de réparer les erreurs du passé, de remettre à une population lésée ce qui est essentiel à son épanouissement. Ne tardons pas davantage - 90 ans ont déjà retardé tragiquement à l'action tandis qu'elle donne encore quelques signes de vie.

La Société franco-manitobaine a su très bien représenter la population franco-manitobaine. Tout au cours des négociations, elle ne voulait qu'assurer la survie des siens. Les amendements proposés sont un moyen de provoquer la renaissance des Manitobains d'expression française.

Il est impératif que l'on redonne aux Franco-Manitobains leurs droits. J'appuie donc la résolution pour amender l'article 23 telle que négociée par la Société franco-manitobaine et les gouvernements provincial et fédéral au mois de mai.

Merci.

Signed: Mme. Irma Gauthier, La Broquerie

**SUBMISSION NO. 69  
JACQUES J. TRUDEAU**

M. le Président,  
Membres du comité,

Je crois que le Manitoba devrait être reconnu officiellement bilingue et qu'il devrait offrir ses services dans les deux langues là où le besoin se fait sentir.

Oui . . . j'appuie l'entente négociée en mai par la S.F.M. et le gouvernement néo-démocrate pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Signed: Jacques J. Trudeau, Box 333, Iles des Chenes

Mr. President,  
Members of the Committee.

I feel that Manitoba should be officially recognized as a bilingual province and that a serious attempt should be made to provide public services in both languages where there is a need.

I therefore support the agreement negotiated last May between the Société Franco-Manitobaine and the

Pawley Government to amend Bill 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

Signed: Jacques Trudeau, Box 333, Ile-des-Chenes.

**SUBMISSION NO. 70  
MARJORIE BEAUCHEMIN**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Nous voici ici réunis - nous les francophones du Manitoba en train de se débattre une fois de plus pour ce qui nous est dû. Il nous semble toujours le cas en lequel nous devons faire face. C'est le temps en toute justice que celle-ci soit donnée au francophones du Manitoba.

Je viens alors, par la présente, appuyer la résolution à l'amendement tel que présenté dans l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Nous sommes confiants que vous, M. le président et membres du comité, n'hésitez pas de vous y prononcer en faveur.

Merci.

Marjorie Beauchemin  
Ile-des-Chênes

le 27 Septembre 1983

Signed: Marjorie Beauchemin

**SUBMISSION NO. 71  
MICHÈLE LAGIMODIÈRE-GAGNON**

L'enchâssement de l'amendement de l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, tel que décrit dans l'accord du mois de mai, n'enlève rien à personne. Il garantit, tout simplement, la légalité et l'égalité des Manitobains français.

L'enchâssement de l'article 23 est déjà un compromis. Le gouvernement provincial ne traduira pas toutes les lois et ne fera pas des fonctionnaires un bilingue sur deux. Nous aurons toujours une égalité à "temps partiel" en ce qui concerne certaines sections de l'amendement. Nous n'avons qu'à redire l'histoire des services en éducation.

L'enchâssement de l'article 23 protégera l'individu. Si vous cherchez à réduire, à diluer l'accord du mois de mai, vous démontrez d'autant plus la nécessité d'enchâsser les droits. L'enchâssement nous mettra davantage à l'abri de tout ce "politicaillage" révoltant, confus et déraisonné des dernier mois.

L'enchâssement de l'article 23 fera du Manitoba une province juste, une province bilingue.

Signed: Michèle Lagimodière-Gagnon, Lorette, Manitoba.

Entrenchment of the amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as called for by a tri-party agreement in May 1983, does not abrogate or deny the rights of anybody. On the contrary, it guarantees equal and legal status for French Manitobans.

Entrenchment of the May amendments represent a compromise. The province will not need to translate all statutes. It will translate the necessary ones over a 10-year period. It will not impose complete bilingualism

upon the Civil Service. French-speaking Manitobans will maintain an equal status on a part-time basis under certain subsections of the amendment. One has to look at the history of the development of French education services for a study on the inequities of services.

Entrenchment of Section 23 protects the individual. If you seek to weaken the amendment or eliminate it altogether, you further demonstrate the need for entrenchment of rights. Entrenchment will shelter us in the future from the ridiculous, misguided and mean politicking witnesses during the past months.

Entrenchment of Section 23, as proposed in May, will make Manitoba a truly just, a truly bilingual province.

Signed: Michèle Lagimodière-Gagnon, Lorette, Manitoba.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 72 LA LIGUE SAINT-GÉRARD DE LA BROQUERIE**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Au nom de la Ligue Saint-Gérard de La Broquerie, j'aimerais vous laisser savoir comment nous sommes fiers d'être Manitobains français.

Nous sommes fiers de notre langue, de notre culture, de nos traditions.

Nous remercions nos parents et grands-parents de nous avoir légué ce riche héritage.

Nous voulons donner à nos enfants et petits-enfants la chance de vivre en franco-manitobains.

Nous espérons que notre drapeau franco-manitobain continue à embellir notre province pendant de longues générations à venir.

M. le président, membres du comité, c'est pour cela que nous appuyons avec conviction la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai entre le gouvernement du Manitoba et la Société franco-manitobaine.

Merci.

Antoinette Bissonnette, Rose-Marie Nadeau, Gisèle Gauthier, Lorraine Dumesnil, Diane Turenne, Michelle Seidler et Gisèle Tétrault.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 73 GEORGETTE GÉRARDY, AU NOM DU COMITÉ CULTUREL DE SAINT-LABRE**

M. le président, membres du comité.

J'aimerais souligner quelques points au sujet du débat qui fait rage depuis que le gouvernement de la province entend amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Premièrement, je ne sais pas si les médias sont responsables, mais il me semble qu'on est en train de faire beaucoup de bruit pour peu de chose. Les manchettes, les éditoriaux, les lettres aux rédacteurs, des feuillets, des pétitions et même ces audiences publiques.

Que vise l'amendement de l'Acte du Manitoba, sinon un certain épanouissement de la vie française au Manitoba? Et je ne vois toujours pas comment cet épanouissement chez 5 pour cent de la population peut menacer la majorité.

Deuxièmement, au sujet de ces audiences publiques, je ne crois pas qu'elles soient un bien. Une injustice a

été commise et elle doit être rectifiée. On ne demande pas l'opinion des gens au sujet d'un certain cas devant les tribunaux. Pourquoi alors veut-on sonder l'opinion manitobaine avant de trancher une question avant tout légale.

Troisièmement, je souhaite que l'on remarque surtout les points positifs d'une province manitobaine officiellement bilingue. Cela aiderait certainement le Canada à demeurer le beau pays qu'il est. Et puis, quel signe encourageant pour les nombreuses minorités du pays, de savoir que la minorité officielle du Manitoba a gain de cause dans le rétablissement de ses droits.

Tout ça pour vous dire que j'appuie la résolution négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Merci.

### **SUBMISSION No. 74 RAYMONDE GRAHAM**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Les fondateurs du Manitoba, qui rêvaient d'un pays bilingue, se trouveraient certainement tout comme moi, d'ailleurs, confus et consternés par l'ampleur que semble prendre cette épineuse question aujourd'hui. Si on dressait un bref historique du passé, qui pourrait nier que notre belle province était destinée à devenir bilingue!

Le gouvernement provincial actuel, conscient de la réalité du pays s'apprête à rendre justice à un peuple si souvent opprimé et brimé dans leurs droits, par 90 ans de gouvernements irresponsables. Nos gouvernants au pouvoir ont maintenant la chance unique de réparer les torts faits au peuple canadien-français, et ainsi redonner au Manitoba, non seulement son vrai visage d'autrefois mais bien plus, une place enviable au sein de la Confédération. Le rétablissement des droits des francophones est indéniablement la seule solution si nous désirons, pour nos enfants une province où régnera paix, tolérance et prospérité.

M. le président, je m'explique mal la tenue d'audiences publiques, qui pour moi, sont perte de temps, d'argent et d'énergie. C'est pour donner au public la chance de s'exprimer, nous dit-on; cependant, elles nous auront servi bien plus à favoriser d'autres déchirures, qu'à l'unité. Le pays tout entier regarde l'oeil attentif, et surveille de près, ce qui se passe chez nous. Tous les jours nous leurs montrons notre vrai visage de citoyens hostiles et intolérants; ces attributs sont loin de faire l'orgueil d'un peuple qui se dit amical. Cessons donc nos luttes fratricides, et conservons donc nos énergies à travailler à rétablir la justice, solution idéale et unique au maintien de la paix au pays. Les erreurs du passé sont à jamais gravées dans le coeur des Canadiens français fidèles à leur devise. L'amendement à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba, s'avère essentiel si nous voulons éviter que la situation de détériore à un tel point, que la tournure des événements prenne des proportions incontrôlables.

M. le président, membres du comité, j'aimerais souligner ici que l'avenir sourit aux audacieux, et que des perspectives nouvelles s'ouvrent à un Manitoba bilingue, qui fera l'envie du Canada tout entier. C'est pour des raisons historiques, mais encore bien plus, c'est pour des raisons de droits humains, que j'appuie la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du

Manitoba telle que négociée au mois de mai par la Société franco-manitobaine et le gouvernement du Manitoba.

Signed: Raymonde Graham

**SUBMISSION NO. 75  
SR THÉRÈSE CLOUTIER, s.j.m.**

M. le président, membres du comité.

La paroisse de Sainte-Anne a célébré, le mois dernier, le centenaire de l'arrivée des Soeurs Grises à Sainte-Anne-des-Chênes. Elles sont venues en 1883 assumer le rôle d'éducatrices auprès des enfants d'âge scolaire et de collaboratrices avec les parents en tout ce qui touchait la vie culturelle, sociale et religieuse. Elles y sont encore et se sentent bien solidaires avec leur concitoyens d'aujourd'hui.

Au cours des cent années écoulées, elles ont participé à toutes les activités et à tous les efforts pour l'avancement et la sauvegarde des valeurs chères aux paroissiens et à toutes les luttes qui ont été nécessaires pour conserver ces mêmes droits lorsqu'une majorité aveugle et défiante voulait les en priver.

En mai cette année, après de longues délibérations, il fut résolu que l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba serait amendé. Nous avons cru alors que finalement, le gouvernement se montrerait juste à l'endroit de sa minorité de langue officielle. Malheureusement, le gouvernement a déposé des modifications le 6 septembre; si celles-ci étaient intégrées au projet d'amendement, cela rendrait l'entente négociée en mai quasiment banale.

Il faut donc encore une fois affirmer notre volonté de défendre nos droits. C'est pourquoi je veux exprimer ma solidarité avec tous ceux qui désirent que l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba soit amendé tel que négocié au mois de mai entre le gouvernement du Manitoba, le gouvernement fédéral et la Société franco-manitobaine.

Merci.

Signed: S. Thérèse Cloutier s.j.m., Sainte-Anne des Chênes, Manitoba

**SUBMISSIONS NO. 76, 77, 78 and 79  
THÉRÈSE BOUCHARD, ANDRÉ  
PLAMONDON, SR ZÉLIE RUEST ET LUCIE  
DUPUIS**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Je n'ai qu'une seule chose à affirmer devant vous aujourd'hui. J'appuie entièrement la résolution pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba telle qu'elle a été négociée au mois de mai dernier entre les gouvernements provincial et fédéral et la SFM.

Il n'y a rien à négocier; ce sont des droits. Ça nous revient en justice. C'est tout l'paquet qu'il nous faut. On est 60 000 Franco-Manitobains! Faut leur parler! Merci.

**SUBMISSION NO. 80  
DENISE J. PERRON ET GEORGES G.  
PERRON**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Je désire énoncer quelques idées dont on devrait tenir compte lorsqu'on décide si l'on doit appuyer ou non les amendements proposés à l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Premièrement, il faut retenir le fait que la loi qui a interdit l'usage du français devant les tribunaux et au gouvernement a été déclarée anticonstitutionnelle. À partir de ce fait, je ne peux pas m'expliquer toute l'hésitation du gouvernement et l'opposition d'une grande partie de la population. Je ne peux comprendre que l'on refuse de rectifier une loi "illégal". L'opposition que l'on manifeste dépasse les bornes du raisonnement. Si l'on n'élimine pas les lois "illégal", quelle valeur notre système judiciaire peut-il avoir? Si l'on continue à reconnaître cette loi qui n'est pas légale, on doit remettre en question notre société, notre gouvernement et toutes nos institutions. Il va de soi que les fondements de notre civilisation elle-même s'écrouleraient. La gravité d'une telle situation fait peur. Il faut régler chez nous les problèmes de langues officielles et il nous le faut faire sans plus de délai.

M. le président, membres du comité, j'accorde mon appui à la résolution négociée au mois de mai pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba. Je ne peux pas faire autrement.

Merci!

Signed: Denise J. Perron and Georges G. Perron

**SUBMISSION NO. 81  
LISE ET ROBERTE BOILY**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Une province bilingue dans un pays bilingue . . . Quoi de si compliqué? Quoi de si simple? Encore une fois, les êtres humains s'aveuglent, construisent des tours de Babel et s'amuse gravement à s'engueuler. La plupart de ces braves gens se disent chrétien(ne)s; leur code moral est supposément d'aimer leur prochain. Pauvre Manitoba pharisaïque!

Pour en venir aux détails concrets, l'historique de cette province montre sans équivoque qu'une grave injustice fut commise en 1890 envers les résident(e)s manitobain(e)s de langue française. Au mois de mai dernier (soit 93 ans plus tard), le gouvernement néo-démocrate a essayé dans la mesure du possible de réparer le tort dans une entente avec la Société franco-manitobaine. Hélas, il ne s'agit pas ici d'un conte de fée qui finit bien car cette entente n'a fait que ré-animer des vieilles chicanes et engendrer des nouvelles bagarres. Des tas de faux-problèmes ont surgi, créés d'une hyperémotivité déplorable. Il est triste de constater que dans notre province, les habitant(e)s ne veulent pas vivre en harmonie. De telles attitudes négatives ne peuvent que mener à un monde qui s'autodétruit plus tôt que tard, armé comme il l'est jusqu'aux dents, avec des armes nucléaires.

Enfin, le but de ce mémoire, M. le président et membres du comité, est d'affirmer mon appui pour la résolution qui a été négociée au mois de mai dernier pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba - tout en espérant que les habitant(e)s de cette province apprendront un jour à vivre ensemble dans une félicité linguistique, où la langue française et la langue anglaise seront officiellement reconnues - et cela de bonne grâce.

**SUBMISSION NO. 82  
CÉCILE BÉRARD**

M. le président, membres du comité.  
Je suis Cécile Bérard et je représente la Ligue féminine catholique - section Ile-des-Chênes.

Étant fières de notre héritage et soucieuses qu'un de nos objectifs est de promouvoir la langue et la culture française dans nos foyers et dans notre communauté,

**SUBMISSION NO. 83**

**MRS. SYLVIA McINNES, Ste. Anne, Manitoba**

Clerk of Committees,

I would like to present my view on the bilingual question.

I would like to state clearly that I am against the province being bilingual because of the following reasons:

1. Without much effort a court room could be made available, staffed with people who have studied in several languages, to serve many people instead of just French.
2. Most importantly I don't feel that there are any significant amount of French people who will make use of anything that will be made available to them. There is no way the cost can even compare with the need which should be a major consideration.
3. French is not the largest minority group, just the loudest; other groups are proud of who they are. Why must we give grease to the noisy wheel, when all it needs is fixing, because it is causing its own noise.
4. I am, as a German and Scottish background, sick and tired of reading French on all my groceries, in all the comments in the newspapers and especially having it forced on my children in school. Where is my freedom to teach my children my language, instead of the taxpayers money forcing everyone to speak a language they might not want? Where does my free agency start?
5. The "feud," which it actually is if you'll just admit it, has gone on long enough and the money wasted on this could be used on a much more pressing area, e.g. training judges to give much stiffer sentences to lawbreakers so that it is the criminal who is afraid to commit the crime, instead of us the public who are afraid to walk the streets. Now really, which is more pressing - crime or the whole of Canada being forced into reading French food labels and brainwashing our children to feel they'll never succeed if they didn't learn their French in school?

There are several more reasons but these will suffice.

I would rather my tax money be spent on the needy - not the greedy! Let's get all these committees helping instead of stirring up new feuds.

Thank you for your time.

Mrs. Sylvia McInnes

**SUBMISSION NO. 84  
MRS. J.L. ASTA ASSELSTINE  
WORLD WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN  
TEMPERANCE UNION**

c'est avec conviction que nous venons appuyer la résolution négociée en mai dernier par la Société franco-manitobaine avec le gouvernement Pawley pour amender l'article 23 de l'Acte du Manitoba.

Nous croyons fermement qu'il est grand temps de rectifier les injustices commises il y a plus de 90 ans.

Merci!

Dear Carmen DePape,

I asked to express my view and likely the view of thousands, if the truth were known, according to people I know and have talked to. Many people are, like myself, very hesitant to speak up when we are invited via briefs - many are at work and no time to get involved, etc. - to state our opinion. I was brought up in Canada where all the schooling I have come from, and we were taught if you have complaints you should speak through your MLA and MP at Ottawa. Our representatives at City Hall, Fort Garry South, and Ottawa never hear me, I might as well talk to the wall. Hence I write at your kind invitation to express my views and why I think as I do, after spending all but seven-and-a-half years of my childhood in Manitoba.

Firstly, I am a non-hyphenated Canadian - no French-Canadian nor German-Canadian, nor Ukrainian-Canadian, nor Polish Canadian. I am thankful to be a Canadian because when my parents and six of us young siblings left Norway in 1928 to make Canada our home we had a very poor chance of making a living in the land God had us born in. I have no quarrel with the beautiful country God gave us for our homeland, but truly we had so little connection with Norway because we were so poor in Canada too, and our relatives in Norway were so poor that none could afford postage stamps on either side of the ocean, and we were fortunate to send greetings at Christmas. We, family of six children, and mother and father, were sent out to the Peninsula School District 907 where we had a wonderful teacher who recommended that I study French, instead of Latin, which was a choice those days.

I studied French by correspondence in Grade 9 and Grade 10. I took French from an English high school teacher in Grade 11 and 12. But without a word of a lie, I wish I had taken Latin when I look back over 62 years of living because I have never made use of, nor chance to speak, French. The district where we grew up was composed of nothing but English, Irish and Scots except for a few Belgium farmers, too, far away to have any influence on us, except for one girl, at my school, and a few years only she attended.

The reason I say I wish I had taken Latin is because I have no Latin roots of the English language. My husband studied French as well as Latin. I can ask him the meaning of any English word almost, and ask, what does this word mean. He answers: "That word comes from the Latin root . . . ." Right away, the meaning comes clear. Therefore, I say I wish I had studied Latin instead of French (preferably both) as then I would understand the English language with much more knowledge and understanding.

I want to make it clear that in my day no one was prejudiced in any way about the French people anymore than others as you can see by what I have already said. My question is: If the Federal Government and Provincial Government had wanted us to speak French

so much why did they not send us French-speaking teachers for our French lessons? My generation had no control of that. Why should taxpayers today be paying for French all over Manitoba now when the French should have come to Manitoba when the English and Scots and Irish and some USA citizens came to Manitoba as pioneers? It was much easier to remain in Quebec, no doubt, and the Quebec Canadians chose not to blaze the pioneer path in building up Manitoba, like the pioneers from Ontario actually did (build up Manitoba).

Manitoba was merely a postage stamp size province in 1870. In fact, how big was Manitoba in 1763 when General Wolfe fought General Montcalm in The Plains of Abraham? Much smaller than a postage-stamp province. Where were our French teachers then? Certainly not in Manitoba where I grew up a Canadian.

Again, when my parents came to Canada they brought their six children to an English-speaking country. My father had some knowledge of English previously, therefore, my father wanted to come to an English-speaking country, not French, or we would have gone to settle in the Province of Quebec. As it was, after two weeks an Immigration Hall here in Winnipeg the government authorities of his time tried to send us to Peace River county. My father asked about schools because of his school-age children, twins one-and-a-half years, oldest about 11 years. He chose Manitoba because there was a country school three miles from the farm which he was able to rent for 10 years. We sang "O Canada" each morning, and "God Save our King" (now Queen) and we had to stand at attention, not slouch like I see today, by adults even. It's a disgrace the way citizens of Canada don't even know enough to sing or stand at attention, showing respect for God, home and country, and with the thousands of new citizens coming from all over the world, it's time we and government taught them that very thing, respect for Canada!

If new immigrants want to learn their own native language, they should have it as their forefathers did it. Jewish schools support themselves, and French schools likewise if they do not like public schools. How can taxpayers pay for the teaching of French, Hebrew, Polish, German, Ukrainian and every country's language coming to Canada? Taxpayers should never be forced to have to speak all languages, unless they pay for it themselves, because I want to develop a Canadian identity, not a Norse Canadian - sounds wrong to me. Besides well will become ghettos here in Canada, another Babel. I believe we should prevent another Babel.

Firstly, the cost is prohibitive for Canada who is so far in debt already. What an inheritance for our children!

I feel like a foreigner now in my own Canada, Ever since our wonderful old flag "the Canadian Ensign" was taken away from us (my three brothers were in the army and they used that meanful Canadian Ensign). It represented "Canada," and that flag had meaning, right to the core, right to the Cross of St. Andrew of Scotland, who was Jesus' disciple, St. Patrick, who brought Christianity from Gaul, France - or was it Normandy, France - I can't remember exactly. The the Cross of St. George, depicting his fight against all things evil. Thus the fleur-de-lis represented the French Canadians who, through Jacques Cartier 1534, claimed Canada

(Upper and Lower Canada - Quebec and Ontario) for France. Then 1763 Canada became English. 1791 I believe was the date that divided Canada into Upper and Lower Canada.

NOTE: The three joined maple leaves represent all other nationalities in Canada, all except Indians and Eskimos were represented in our old flag.

There was no Manitoba then, only Quebec and Ontario. In 1867, there was Confederation, but no Manitoba in existence yet, only New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Quebec and Ontario. Therefore, I can't see why government is pushing French in Manitoba who have only about 4 to 6 percent French population in 1983.

You say the law should entrench "French." Why, I ask, when there is no demand for French? I prefer good proper English and no French providing all people are taught proper English instead of slang English.

May I also tell of my personal experience with a French hairdresser from Paris. As she did my hair, she said she wished there were French-speaking people in Winnipeg. I hastily said, "Oh, we have French people. St. Boniface has many French-speaking people. "But I can't understand them," she said, "they speak differently." Again, I cannot but comment, why all this rush to learn French when even the French-speaking citizens in Winnipeg cannot understand France's language?

One thing is plain, either government must help every country's language for immigrants to Canada who become citizens or else carry on as we did for the first 100 years. French language and Hebrew will come only as we work towards it and are willing to pay for our French, Polish, Ukrainian or any other language. Some people say speak "Esperanto." Why bother, when we already have English? Let's improve our English and not allow English to deteriorate in words and grammar and vulgarities which is happening.

Recommendations:

1. Let's try for more French and Latin of which the English language is composed.
2. Let's invite good, best, teachers from Quebec to speak acceptable French so we can speak good French in France,
3. and in all French-speaking colonies
4. and speak good English in all English-speaking colonies or common wealth.
5. And let each other country, except the Native Indians, start their own language schools without government (Canadian funds).
6. But let the Canadian Government revive our Native Indian language which of the 300 Indian languages of North America must be decided on instead of forcing French on all of Canada.

After all, the Indians have no place to call home except Canada. Their 300 languages have almost all disappeared, not to mention Eskimos. If the French in Manitoba want to revive French they can find their roots in France, and I can still find mine in Norway if I wish to.

7. Therefore, my strong recommendation is for countries to be so selfish and self-centred and let's build up Canada. When all Indians of Canada are satisfied reasonably so will all the poor white people. My folks were very poor,

much below poverty line via today's standards. There is no harm in being poor as long as one has faith in self-respect for self, confidence in self, and work for God and home and every land.

Indian people have a lot to learn about the white invaders like Cartier who took Canada for the French in 1534. That was the custom of those times. 1763 General Wolfe took Canada for England. It's time French Quebec and English Canada shook hands and united to restore the Indian race, what is left of it. When that day comes there will be peace on earth for there are thousands of poor whites like my family were in the dirty 30's when there were no family allowance cheques, nor welfare, nor medical care, or electricity, nor electric stoves, lights, nor refrigerators. People don't know what poverty is today. What we need is to train all parents and children to become responsible for their actions and live according to their means, and not overspend keeping up to the Jones's, etc.

8. Each person is unique and the first thing I recommend is to give all religions a chance to grow in the religion of our choice. It was a most beautiful sight to go through Montreal and Quebec and see those huge tall church spires. What a wonderful sight to see that here are the churches speaking the word of God, the greatest inheritance on earth to share with our children. Oh that every child could be taught God's word as Jesus told us: "Do you love me?" Jesus asked. "Yes," was the disciples' answer. "Then feed my lambs." These are our dear little children being murdered by their own mothers. How sad! Then Jesus asked again: "Do you love me?" "Yes," again was the reply. "Then feed my lambs." How concerned God is for all his children, all his lambs. Again Jesus asked: "Do you love me?" Again, came answer, "You know I love you." "Then feed my sheep," said Jesus.

Parents must have the knowledge of God and Jesus and be taught how to live. How can children follow Christ if their parents don't know Jesus and His Word? This is the burning questions. Is French language the priority for our French and English brothers and sisters, or is it Christ?

Yours, In His Service.

Mrs. J. L. (Asta) Asselstine R.N. (Mother of 5, Grandma of 3)

### MESSAGE TO FRENCH CATHOLICS

Please end my brief re bilingualism on these two important messages copied from the stone walls of the Peace Chapel at Peace Gardens - see booklet enclosed.

"For it is you who are to receive the Torch from the hands of your elders and to live in the world at the period of the most gigantic transformations ever realized in its history. It is you, who are receiving the best of the example of your teachers, are to form the society of tomorrow. You will either save yourselves or you will perish with it." Vatican I

### MESSAGE TO ENGLISH PROTESTANTS CANADA'S CENTENNIAL PRAYER

We ask for understanding and sympathy

For clear vision and sensitivity

For wisdom and selflessness

For strength and courage

That we may succeed in our awesome task

To dignify each one in our land

To give him freedom, right and opportunity

To enrich his material, cultural and spiritual mode of life

- spiritual mode of life must come first -

To create unity in the land

Forever and ever

Amen

The Lord's Prayer tells us to pray, Jesus own words:

Our Father, who art in heaven

Hallowed by Thy name.

Thy Kingdom come

Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Therefore we must think and act as if we really are in heaven, and what causes so much crime and poverty and violence and hate often today? - alcohol and tobacco, drugs, quarreling, bilingualism - and Jesus asked us to pray:

"Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us," - French and English and bilingualism, etc.- "and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil" - what is alcohol, tobacco and drugs but evil when they kill thousands of youth on highways, divorce, poverty alcoholism, casinos, gambling makes poor poorer, abortions, murders - "For Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory forever and ever. Amen."

So the last recommendation is let us help to make our Lord's Prayer come true. We can if we will.

### SUBMISSION NO. 85 THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISTRICT OF REYNOLDS

September 28th, 1983

Ms. Carman De Pape

Clerk of the Legislative office

Room 251

Legislative Buildings

Winnipeg, Manitoba

R3C 0V8

Dear Ms. De Pape:

RE: Public Hearings on proposed Bilingual amendments to the Constitution of Manitoba

Reeve Marlene Puzianowski of The Local Government District of Reynolds was to appear at the public hearing in Ste. Anne on September 27th, 1983 per attached authorizing Resolution 264/83 of Council.

Unfortunately, our Reeve was unable to attend and requested me to ensure that the enclosed documents were submitted to the Chairman of the Committee, Andy Anstett, MLA.

Accordingly, I have enclosed 15 copies of Resolution No. 155/83, Resolution No. 263/83 and Resolution No.

277/83 of council for Distribution to members of the committee.

Resolution No. 155/83 is self-explanatory and certified copies were forwarded as directed by the resolution.

Resolution No. 263/83 requests that a referendum be held in our province to determine the acceptability of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. The Council felt that the Provincial Government should conduct such an undertaking.

Resolution No. 277/83 authorizes the conducting of a referendum in the local jurisdiction to determine the opinion of the electorate.

Thank you for giving the council of The Local Government District of Reynolds this opportunity to go on record.

Yours truly,

Richard A. Andries  
Resident Administrator

cc. Reeve Marlene Puzianowski

### RESOLUTION FORM

#### THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISTRICT OF REYNOLDS

September 13, 1983

Moved by Councillor: D. Grouette  
Seconded by Councillor: Alex Opyc

Resolved, that attendance and expenses for M. Puzianowski to hearing on proposed Bilingual amendments in Ste. Anne on September 27th, 1983 be approved. CARRIED

Certified to be a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 264/83 of The Local Government District of Reynolds - Richard A. Andries, Resident Administrator.

Chairman: M. Puzianowski

### RESOLUTION FORM

#### The Local Government District of Reynolds

June 14th, 1983

Moved by Councillor: D. Grouette  
Seconded by Councillor: D. Allen

Whereas the Provincial Government has agreed with the Federal Government and the Franco-Manitoban Society that the Province of Manitoba be declared a Bilingual Province,

And Whereas approximately Sixty Thousand residents of French background represents a small percentage of the total population of more than a million Manitobans,

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that any declaration of Manitoba as a Bilingual Province be repealed forthwith, and further that a public referendum of the electorate be conducted to determine whether or not such a declaration is democratically acceptable to the majority of Manitobans and further that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier for the Province of

Manitoba, the Attorney General for the Province of Manitoba, and the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

CARRIED.

Certified to be a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 155/83 of The Local Government District of Reynolds. Richard A. Andries - Resident Administrator.

Chairman: M. Puzianowski

### RESOLUTION FORM

#### The Local Government District of Reynolds

September 13th, 1983

Moved by Councillor: Joe Lozinski  
Seconded by Councillor: John T. Bartley.

Resolved, that a referendum be held in the Province of Manitoba to determine the acceptability of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

CARRIED

Certified to be a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 263/83 of The Local Government District of Reynolds. R. A. Andries, Resident Administrator.

Chairman: M. Puzianowski

### RESOLUTION FORM

#### The Local Government District of Reynolds

September 20th, 1983

Moved by Councillor: D. Allen  
Seconded by Councillor: John T. Bartley

Resolved, that a referendum be conducted on October 26th, 1983 with the following question for the electorate:

Do you favour the proposal by the Government of Manitoba to amend our Constitution to make English and French the official languages of Manitoba and to entrench in our Constitution the right to receive services in French as well as in English from designated offices of Provincial Government departments, boards and agencies?

Yes or No CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Certified to be a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 277/83 of The Local Government District of Reynolds. Richard A. Andries, Resident Administrator.

Chairman: M. Puzianowski

### SUBMISSION NO. 86 SUBMISSION BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISTRICT OF STUARTBURN TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

RE: AMENDING SECTION 23 OF THE  
MANITOBA ACT

The Council of the Local Government District of Stuartburn wish to take the opportunity to make known to the Committee its concerns over proposed changes to The Manitoba Act.

It is our understanding the current debate about French language in Manitoba arose as a result of Roger Bilodeau bringing action against the government because the laws of Manitoba were not translated into French. It is unfortunate such an over-reaction has taken place. It is our view that the present government's intention to greatly widen and entrench in the Constitution the use of French far exceeds anything Section 23 of the Manitoba Act ever required or suggested.

The cost of implementing increased French services will be staggering at a time when economic growth is nil. This duplication of printing is not to be taken lightly, never mind costs paid to personnel to do the actual translating of our laws. It appears to be a totally unnecessary expense for a few people that form only approximately 5 percent of the population of Manitoba. Very few utilize any of the French services that presently exist, never mind think about increasing them.

Further, we would point out that language rights should not be handled by Courts. Any change that becomes written into the Constitution means future generations won't be able to change it. Manitoba residents won't be able to have any say in their future regarding bilingual services if these rights are entrenched — if the courts say civil servants, school trustees, councillors, etc., have to be French and English, the province will have to comply. This is very unfortunate because we will be, in effect, losing our democratic right to freedom of expression and, also, our power to govern through the legislative system.

We urge this Government to step back and look at what is happening at these public hearings — communities are being split and ill-will is being created. Feelings are being brought forth that should have died years ago. Endeavouring to make Canada bilingual is a step backward and will be too cumbersome to ever succeed. Where is our respect for all the other ethnic groups that helped establish Manitoba and Canada? Unity will never come about until we become Canadians and a bilingual system will not create unity. Do not let government erode any more of our freedoms; this is just one more step towards "Big Brother" taking over totally.

**SUBMISSION NO. 87**  
**D. NELSON**

81 Stacey Bay  
Winnipeg, R2K 3V4

September 28th, 1983

To Members of the Committee:

The resolution of a problem created by a court challenge should not be the entrenchment of a loosely worded constitutional amendment which will, in the longer term, create a far greater number of court challenges with more widely reaching financial implications for provincial taxpayers.

Recommendations:

- (i) The Bilodeau case be allowed to proceed.
- (ii) The Provincial Government immediately announce and undertake a greater effort to comply with the translation requirements of the Forest decision, as required under the original acts setting out French Language Rights with regard to the Legislature and the courts.
- (iii) That new "open" discussions take place with French groups and individuals, not the Federal Government, with a view to providing increased French Language Services of a specific nature in specific geographic areas.

Reasons:

- (i) The agreement reached, in secret negotiations, involved only three parties. The Attorney-General has stated that the agreed intent is to exclude all school boards and municipalities from legal obligations of the agreement. If this is the case, then the wording of the agreement should have been more specific, even to specify the exclusions. The SFM and the Federal Government should have no objections to this if they agreed with the Attorney-General's understanding of the agreement. The wording of the agreement should have left no doubt whatsoever as to which government bodies were covered by the agreement and the chance of wider interpretations by the courts absolutely eliminated.
- (ii) The Provincial Government I am sure recognizes a moral obligation to treat minority ethnic groups equally - especially those which are larger than the French community in numbers. I have no doubt that the strong expressions of support for the agreement that have recently come from non-French ethnic groups are basically selfish in nature. There is nothing wrong in showing such selfishness. However, the committee must ask itself whether the province can afford to meet the expectations for similar schooling and services which will subsequently be demanded by all other ethnic groups if the agreement is passed as a constitutional amendment. I have no doubt that the Federal Liberal Government is encouraging the vocalness of ethnic minorities in this situation. However, it is the Provincial Government which will later either have to turn down such requests, or alternatively find the necessary finances to pay for them.
- (iii) The wording of the agreement should have been more specific in terms. Words such as "central" and "where numbers warrant" are incredibly vague and literally invite court challenges. As we have seen, the Trudeau Government is extremely devious and underhanded. As examples I refer you to the transcripts of proceedings in the Senate on The Canada Day Act; to the way in which the Minister of Transport is preventing public information on the emergency landing of the A.C. jet at Gimli, and the absolute lack of any pressure on Quebec for repeal of its almost fascist acts regulating business language and signs. It is an absolute certainty that the Trudeau Government will continue to finance the further court challenges of the SFM, etc., to all legislation setting out French language rights in Manitoba with the purpose of making the province and municipalities bilingual in all respects - much further than the intent of the agreement. Any



amendment must not therefore by its vagueness invite such court challenges. In such a situation, we are much safer to let the Bilodeau case proceed.

Respectfully submitted,  
D. Nelson

**SUBMISSION NO. 88**  
**ROSS MEGGISON**

To the Standing Committee on the amending of the Constitution.

In speaking to you today in regard to the issue we in Manitoba are confronted with, I would like to express not only my sentiments on this issue but those of the many I have talked to. To endeavour to impose something on the people of our province to benefit a few or a small minority at the expense of the many or the majority "is wrong."

The question I ask not only myself, and not just Manitobans, but every Canadian, do we stand for what is right or what is wrong? What is just or what is unjust? What is good for the many or what is good for the few?

Because sometimes what is right for one is not right for another. We have to resort to the democratic way of making decisions. (A way which has proven itself to be the fairer and the better way over the years) I don't know who is responsible or, more to the point, irresponsible for introducing this issue at this time. They certainly did not take into consideration the welfare of the many and the goodwill in a province, or it would not have been introduced.

There never has been a time when not only our Manitoba Province but our good Canadian country is in greater need of unity, and we cannot expect to achieve this by imposing something on our people that a large majority do not want.

"United we stand. Divided we fall." It would seem ironic and really extremely dangerous for the government of a province to endeavour to improve relations with the Federal Government at the expense of the great majority of the people of that province. A responsible government should be going to bat for the majority of the people they represent, not catering to a small minority.

On principle alone, this issue is wrong. We are having problems today meeting the expenses of the necessary without even entertaining the ridiculous. We are told the Federal Government is paying a portion of the cost of this proposed, unwanted legislation. Any waste of the taxpayers' dollars is wrong.

I was unable to give this presentation in Brandon on Monday the 19th for two reasons. No. 1, there were a lot of briefs and presentations ahead of me. No. 2, it did appear to me that the intent of the Legislature's representatives was to waste as much time as possible.

Russell Doern's paper, Your view. "What ethnic support" is a true picture of the languagesituation today. If the French were a majority, then we should have one official French language with language rights as is spelled out in Mr. Doern's paper. It just has to be one official English language with language rights in Manitoba, and should be the same in every other Canadian province but Quebec where they, because of

their French majority, possibly have the right under democratic process to have French official with language rights.

This would be the result if we in Canada gave the provinces the right to determine their own destiny. Otherwise, if the Federal Government is going to speak honestly and justly for all of Canada, and endeavour to operate under democratic process, it has to be one official language with language rights in our good country.

Let us not permit a few troublemakers to destroy our good country. Let us not be so politically-bound we are no earthly good.

I spent a portion of my life serving Her Majesty's forces defending our country and helping restore freedom and peace to countries in Europe, France being one. And I don't appreciate the government of our country permitting a few troublemakers in a minority group to destroy our country. As times change, laws have to be changed if we are going to maintain justice in a changing world.

Respectfully submitted by, Ross Meggison,  
Goodlands, Manitoba.

P.S. To the Legislative Committee on this issue, it will be extremely dangerous to proceed with this issue. We could find ourselves involved in a revolution, caused by a government who are acting very childish, to say the least.

**SUBMISSION NO. 89**  
**R.M. OF MORRIS**

Proposed Bilingual Amendments to the Constitution of Manitoba

The Rural Municipality of Morris is not opposed to bilingualism, but is opposed to Bill 23, which would entrench French Language Services into many areas. We are opposed for the following reasons:

1. This is a controversial issue and to proceed in this direction would result in causing division amongst the people of this municipality, who have lived together in harmony the past 100 years. In our municipality, we have never had any language difficulties in providing services. Therefore there is no need for changes.
2. The cost factor of such a program of translation and duplication of services is prohibitive in relation to the number of people it would serve. In these times of restraint, we feel the money should not be spent, and that the \$400,000 provided would be just a drop in the bucket of what would be required for the future. Once this is enforced, then we would be committed to spending money regardless of cost.
3. Entrenchment of French Language Services into the Constitution as required in Bill 23 would be opening many jobs in government services that would be available to bilingual persons only. This is creating a case for unequal opportunity, as all these top positions would not be available to persons speaking English or any other language, other than French.

In conclusion, we of the Rural Municipality of Morris believe that French language rights should be

maintained as spelled out in The Manitoba Act, which says, both French and English shall be languages of debate and record in the Legislature, and either language may be used in court. This would not mean all the laws need be translated immediately, but just as the need arises. If the Provincial Government is determined to follow this direction, all the people of the province should be allowed to declare and voice their opinion in a provincial referendum on a matter that is going to affect everyone in Manitoba.

Prepared by the Council of the Rural Municipality of Morris.

**SUBMISSION NO. 90  
DEPT. OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS  
WINNIPEG JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

Whenever a community is presented with an issue of importance, as our province has been with the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, it is not unexpected that there be strong differences of opinion and that these be passionately argued. In such a situation it is well for the collectivity to remember that how a matter is argued can be as important as what it is one is arguing about. If the debate is marked by civility and respect for opposing views, it cannot but prove to be a healthy experience of which all Manitobans can be proud, and the province would emerge more strengthened and united. If the debate brings to the fore matters extraneous to the heart of the discussion, and is marred by ad hominem attacks and innuendo, it can only serve as a source to shame, weaken, and divide us.

In debating the proposed amendment to Section 23, too many of those in favour have tended too easily to tar all those in opposition with the brush of prejudice while the latter, in turn, have tended to look for plot and conspiracy as the only possible explanation for anyone supporting the amendment. The Jewish community also marks with regret, that the present debate has brought to the foreground scenes of bigotry and statements laced with racial hatred against our French-speaking fellow Manitobans, such as have not been seen or heard in this province for nearly 100 years.

Even when dealing with the issues themselves, the antagonists have not addressed matters frontally, but rather have put forward as primary arguments which we believe neither side holds to be primary.

According to the government, the main reason for the amendment has been the concern that the Supreme Court, in the Bilodeau case, might well have invalidated all of Manitoba's statutes.

Among the opponents of the amendment, there have been those who have insisted it is not needed because French language rights were already restored in 1980, when the Supreme Court decision on the Forest case was handed down.

The Supreme Court decision in the Forest case did indeed revalidate Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. But this did not result in the restoration of French language rights as is asserted. Otherwise, every Manitoba statute passed since 1870 would now be available in both official languages. This is not the case. Thousands of statutes, in fact, remain untranslated, new amendments to pre-1980 statutes are still introduced in English only, and

not even all statutes since the Forest decision was handed down have been introduced in both languages or been translated into French.

The official opposition, in its fight against the amendment, has stressed that there is no constitutional imperative, either for the entrenchment, or even the mere provision of government services in French. This is true enough, but the impression that all too many Manitobans have been left with is that the opposition is in fact against the provision of such government services. This impression is a mistaken one. When the Conservative opposition under Mr. Lyon was the government, following the policies of previous administrations, it opted to carry on and indeed broaden the program of providing limited government services in French. It did so because, in Mr. Lyon's words, it was the "honourable" thing to do and Mr. Lyon and his party are to be commended for having done it.

This policy, consistently pursued by a number of administrations of varying ideological persuasion, begs the question of why it was honourable. It was honourable we believe because, first of all, it was true to the spirit, if not the letter, of the 1870 Accord. Section 23 of The Manitoba Act calls for French and English to be the languages of the Legislature, legislation and the courts. To our mind, the intent was that both linguistic groups in the province would have access to key governmental institutions in either language. Since 1870 the scope of government has broadened considerably. If successive Manitoba Governments were to remain true to the spirit of the Accord, they had to see fit to provide limited government French Language Services in areas other than those specified in Section 23.

The policy was also honourable because the various Manitoba Governments all had a clear sense that The Official Language Act of 1890 perpetrated and perpetuated for generations, an injustice on the Franco-Manitoban community.

But honourable though it was, was it enough to make amends for generations of injustice, for a well-meaning and well-disposed government and Legislature to extend limited government services in French to one of the founding peoples of this province, by courtesy? We think not. Particularly, since the possibility remained that, at some time in the future, a less well-disposed government and Legislature, by acting arbitrarily, high-handedly and narrow-mindedly, could very well reverse the whole process. This is in fact what a government did here in Manitoba in 1980 and what the present Parti-Quebecois Government has tried to do to the Anglophone community in Quebec through Bill 101. We stress that we see the position of the Francophones in Manitoba as no different than that of the Anglophones in other jurisdictions.

The amendment to Section 23 now before us essentially is a trade-off. In exchange for translating only a few hundred, rather than thousands of statutes, the government is prepared to entrench in the Constitution the provision of limited government services in the French language. In our opinion it is only this amendment, with its open and dramatic entrenchment in the Constitution of limited French language rights, and with its setting down of a specific timetable for its implementation, which properly makes amends to the Franco-Manitoban community for the injustice of 1890 and guarantees that such an injustice will not be repeated.

The government, in defending the amendment has made much of successfully having resisted, on historical grounds, pressures to liken Manitoba to New Brunswick in the new Canadian Constitution and to make the language of Manitoba's amendment mirror that of the new Constitution. (In the amendment's text there is at least one important instance where this successful resistance is manifest: "institution" of government has been substituted by "agency" of government). As set down earlier, we understand the intent of the original Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to have been that both linguistic groups in the province would have access to key governmental institutions in either English or French. It is in this sense, and this sense only, that English and French can be regarded as "official" languages of Manitoba.

The Jewish community wishes to stress that by supporting the constitutional rights, which are peculiar to the Francophone people of the province, it in no way is detracting from the rights of other ethno-cultural groups. The community therefore notes with favour that the government has accepted as an amendment to the act, a clause which states nothing in the act will detract from the preservation or the enhancement of the heritage language rights of other ethno-cultural groups. On the contrary, we believe that in a multicultural society, such as ours, infringement on the rights of any one of our ethno-cultural groups becomes an infringement on the rights of all.

We note as well that the government is listening to those legitimate concerns various sectors have had about the amendment. We urge the government to continue to listen, always keeping in mind the concerns of the Franco-Manitoban community, so that the amendment which eventually is approved, in its broad strokes and spirit, remains true to the amendment as originally introduced.

The government's amendment remains clearly as the only honourable course to follow in light of past injustices and the still present concerns of the Franco-Manitoban community. And, as we have stated elsewhere, in a multicultural society such as ours, sensitivity to the rights of the two official language groups, such as the Franco-Manitobans in our own province and the Anglophones in Quebec, cannot but create an atmosphere which promotes the rights of all minorities.

Department of Community Relations  
Winnipeg Jewish Community Council/Canadian Jewish Congress  
200 - 370 Hargrave Street  
Winnipeg, Manitoba. R3B 2K1

Saul Scott, Vice-President, Community Relations  
Israel Ludwig, Chairman, Joint Community Relations  
Manuel Prutschi, Director, Community Relations

For further information, please contact:  
Israel Ludwig (957-0520)  
Manuel Prutschi (943-0406)

**SUBMISSION NO. 91  
MANITOBA ASSOCIATION FOR  
RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES**

Andy Anstett, Chairman

Statutory Committee on Privileges and Elections  
Manitoba Legislature  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3C 0V8

Dear Mr. Anstett:

We are sending you herewith a copy of the Supplementary Statement on the constitutional amendments prepared recently by MARL which we would like to bring to the attention to the members of the Committee of Elections and Privileges.

This statement has already gone forward to the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition, as well as the Mayor of Winnipeg. Our association appeared this week before City Council urging that the plebiscite be canceled.

We do not wish to appear again before your committee, but we would like the members to know that we are greatly concerned about the tenor of some of the presentations made before the committee as reported in the media.

Some of the submissions you have received show that there are people in our province who are not prepared to give further recognition to French language rights, within the limits proposed, even if they are labelled as bigots. These presenters have shown that there are people who believe one language, English, should be enough for everyone.

We respectfully suggest that members of the opposition, as well as the government, should make it clear that the inequality that has prevailed for almost 100 years, as between English and French, must come to an end and that prejudice against French-speaking citizens of Canada, who constitute 26 percent of the population of the country, cannot be tolerated.

French-speaking citizens have a constitutional right to language equality. We believe that the government proposal now under consideration, with its limitations and weaknesses, will offer a further measure of justice to our French-speaking fellow citizens. We are satisfied that this will not cause any inconvenience to the great majority of unilingual citizens of Manitoba.

We urge that the opposition ought to make it more clear to everyone that they are not opposed to the extension of French language rights, if this continues to be the case.

We make a further appeal to the government and the opposition that they should make every effort to seek a consensus resolution of the French language rights issue. While we continue to favour the avoidance of a Supreme Court decision on the Bilodeau case, we believe that the achievement of a consensus between the government and the opposition is even more important, at this stage, than whether or not the case is proceeded with in the court.

We would hope that the desired consensus can be achieved and the issue resolved in the Legislature before the holding of any proposed referendum or plebiscite by the cities and municipalities.

We commend to the government and the opposition the manner which their respective parties achieved a consensus with the Federal Government during the debate on Canada's new Constitution in 1981.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ralph James, President

Sybil Shack, Honourary Secretary

cc Premier Howard Pawley  
Hon. Roland Penner  
Hon. Sterling Lyon  
L.R. Sherman.

## MARL SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

September 21, 1983

The Board of the Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties at its meeting on September 14th, approved the brief on the resolution amending The Manitoba Act to extend French language rights in this province. The brief, which was presented to the legislative hearings on September 7th by the MARL Legislative Review Committee, involved a cross-section group of members of the association representative of the three major political parties and including English-speaking and French-speaking members. It had been submitted to the government and the opposition in the latter part of August before the public hearings began.

MARL is now responding to the proposed civic referendum and the changes to the original constitutional resolution now put forward by the government.

MARL is opposed to the holding of a civic referendum on the question of French language rights as proposed in the constitutional amendment. We are against such a referendum in Winnipeg and in any other municipality.

Manitoba is not governed by referendum. It has a representative and responsible form of government, democratically elected, with provision for public input in many ways. The legislative hearings now going on is one important way of getting public input.

Any referendum on the question of extending minority rights is bound to be divisive. However, there are other more compelling reasons for opposing and calling for the withdrawal of the proposed referendum on this particular question.

This referendum only compounds the problem rather than helping resolve it. It would be a vote for or against entrenchment of limited French language rights.

The referendum, if held, would almost certainly ensure that we repeat the mistakes of our past history. The setting aside of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in 1890 was followed by a bill doing away with separate schools and French language instruction. In 1896 the Federal Government, headed by Prime Minister Tupper, proposed remedial legislation to counter the disallowance of French Catholic schools. An election took place that year and Wilfred Laurier, the Liberal leader, proposed a compromise. The Liberals won the election and negotiated a new agreement with the Manitoba Government allowing for French language schools, as well as Ukrainian language schools and German language schools for the Mennonite population. This agreement was abrogated by the Manitoba Government in 1916 and all schools in languages other than English were closed. It is because of this experience, resulting from one government reversing the policy of another, that the Francophones are now seeking entrenchment of their language rights in the Constitution.

MARL has previously criticized the government for the manner in which the entrenchment proposal was introduced. We have also expressed certain criticisms of the government's measure and the Attorney-General has responded positively to some of MARL's concerns. MARL maintains its support for the basic objectives of the constitutional amendment. We must also add that while the government could be faulted for its original approach, the critics including some members of the Legislature and some outside the Legislature, have not helped by their intransigent opposition to entrenchment.

A referendum represents little more than a public opinion poll which may produce one result on October 1st and a different result on December 1st. This particular referendum, if it actually takes place, is likely to produce a kind of mob reaction. This referendum is dangerous because it would submit minority rights to the highly charged emotional response of a majority acting under pressure of an imagined threat to its own position.

This will not help to bring about the kind of considered response that a government ought to make after taking into account carefully thought-out public representations. All the leading protagonists, in what has become an unfortunate confrontational situation, have to be prepared to change their approach in the interest of finding a reasonable compromise. As MARL told the legislative committee, the objective should still be to achieve a consensus between government and opposition to resolve this question.

A precedent for this kind of approach was established in the House of Commons in 1981 when the final vote was taken on the new Canadian Constitution which includes the Charter of Rights. The Progressive Conservative Party played a very important role in preventing the hurried adoption of The Constitution Act and in making it possible for extended hearings to be held so that many groups and individuals from across the country could express their views. This process led to many positive changes and in the end the Constitution was adopted by 246 "yea" votes to 24 "nay," with a large minority of Conservatives and New Democrats voting with the Liberal Government.

We hope that this is the way in which the Manitoba constitutional amendments will eventually be dealt with. The fact is that we do have two national languages in Canada - English and French. Whether we are Conservatives, New Democrats or Liberals, we should be prepared to agree that French does deserve equal constitutional protection with English and its status should not be a political issue.

The Leader of the Opposition has stated that when he was Premier of Manitoba and his government began the extension of French language rights following the Forest case, no public outcry ensued. It might be pointed out, however, that one reason for the lack of serious opposition when the Progressive Conservative Government introduced the earlier measures to comply with the Supreme Court ruling in the Forest case, was that those measures had the support of the opposition of that day, the party that now forms the Manitoba Government. We are convinced that a great deal of the opposition to the government's proposal to entrench French language rights in the Constitution stems from the same kind of belief in unilingualism that led to the abrogation of those rights in 1890.

The alternatives at this time are as follows:

1. Section 23 of The Manitoba Act can be accepted as it now stands. In this circumstance the Supreme Court might not declare all Manitoba statutes invalid, as the government fears would result from the Bilodeau case. However, the court could order the government to translate thousands of statutes into French rather than the limited number of 400 which is part of the accord with the Societe Franco-Manitobaine and the Federal Government.
2. If the constitutional resolution amending Section 23 is accepted this means acceptance of the accord with the Societe Franco-Manitobaine and the Federal Government modified by whatever changes may be agreed to. It is a matter of great regret that our civic politicians have compounded the situation with their referendum proposal. We appeal to all the leading players in this real life drama of group rights to reconsider their roles and to adopt a statesmanlike and principled approach in favour of the rights of the minority. They should begin to speak and act in such a way that will help stem the tide of irrational fears that the guarantee of French language rights may seriously limit the rights of the majority. It just isn't so.

In considering the changes proposed by the government, MARL welcomes the addition of Section 23.9 which was called for in the MARL brief and provides that: "nothing in Section 23 and Section 23.7 abrogates or derogates from any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this amendment with respect to any language that is not English or French." MARL also stands by its criticism of Section 23.8 in regard to having administrative plans approved by the courts whenever it is felt that someone's rights, under Section 23.7, have been adversely affected.

Nevertheless, we continue to support the original intent and objectives of these constitutional amendments.

We therefore support those who are calling for Winnipeg City Council to reverse its decision to hold a referendum on the proposed amendment to The Manitoba Act. French language rights deserve constitutional protection.

### **SUBMISSION NO. 92**

#### **THE MANITOBA ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF ANCESTRAL LANGUAGES**

October 4, 1983

Mr. A. Anstett, MLA, Chairman  
Standing Committee of Elections and Privileges  
Legislative Building  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3C 0V8

Dear Mr. Anstett:

Further to your committee's request of Friday, 30 September, 1983, enclosed are:

1. MAPAL Board of Directors, effective 25 September, 1983;
2. Manitoba Steering Committee on Heritage Languages, whose term expired 24 September, 1983;

3. List of organizations which attended the founding conference of MAPAL on 24 September, 1983, and those who indicated a desire to attend but were unable due to other commitments.

We wish to reiterate for the benefit of members of your committee that the Board of Directors of MAPAL, at its meeting of 28 September, 1983, unanimously approved the submission made by Mr. Baruch Rand regarding the inclusion of Section 23.10 into the agreement.

Yours truly,  
Myron J. Spolsky, President.  
Enclosures

### **MANITOBA ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF ANCESTRAL LANGUAGES**

#### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Myron Spolsky (President) - Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education  
Maryse Birolini-Bryan (Vice-President) - Dante Alighiere Cultural Society  
Baruch Rand (Secretary) - Board of Jewish Education  
Betty Wong (Treasurer) - Manitoba Academy of Chinese Studies

August Bairos - Portuguese Advisory Committee  
Taras Paley - Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education  
Gerhard Enns - German Private Schools  
Josie Audino - Dante Alighiere Cultural Society  
Sharad Chandra - National Association of Canadians of Indian original (NACOI)  
Ajit Kaur Deol - Singh Saba School  
Nian Hameed - Association of Pakistani Canadians  
Darusia Kapyt - Ukrainian National Federation, Ukrainian School  
Won K Kim - Manitoba Korean Language School  
Lolita Oandasan - Manitoba Association of Filipino Teachers Inc.  
Elva Simundsson - Icelandic National League (Gimli Chapter)  
Martha Hyrniuk - Immaculate Heart of Mary School  
Gunnvor Asmundsson - Icelandic National League (Gimli Chapter)  
Leslie Lactinez - North American Hungarian Congress  
Dan Waldman - Manitoba Parents for Hebrew Bilingual Education  
Myroslaw Tracz - Ralph Brown Ukrainian Bilingual Parents Committee  
Arno Jansen - United German School of North Kildonan  
Arwind Aggarwal - Padam Bhartiya Cultural Club  
Emily Pawlyk - Fisher Branch Ukrainian Language School  
Loraine Hnatiuk - Seven Oaks Division (Ukrainian Nursery School)  
Katalin Nagy - Winnipeg Hungarian School

**MANITOBA STEERING COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE LANGUAGES**

Mario Santos (Chairman) - Winnipeg School Trustee  
 Baruch Rand (Vice-Chairman) - Superintendent of Jewish Education  
 Harry Schellenberg (Treasurer) - Manitoba Parents for German Education  
 Lolita Oandason - Manitoba Association for Filipino Teachers  
 Myron Spolsky - Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education  
 Won Kim - Manitoba Korean Language School  
 Mr. John Hofer - Hutterian Education Committee  
 Mr. Mike Maendel - Suncrest Colony  
 Terry Prychitko - Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education  
 Evelyn Katz - Steering Committee on Jewish Education  
 Mrs. Betty Wong - Manitoba Academy of Chinese Studies  
 Dr. Zita McRobbie - Hungarian Canadian Cultural Society

**MANITOBA ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF ANCESTRAL LANGUAGES**

Arabic - Thompson Muslim Association  
 Bengali - Bichitra Bengalie Language School (Regrets)  
 Chinese - Institute of Chinese Language, Culture and Arts Manitoba Academy of Chinese Studies  
 Croatian - Croatian Congregation of Winnipeg (Regrets)  
 Danish - Danish Language School (Regrets)  
 Dutch - Flanders Club (Dutch Language School) (Regrets)  
 Filipino - Manitoba Association of Filipino Teachers, Inc.  
 - Phillipine Association of Manitoba  
 - Victoria Albert Parents Association  
 - Tyndall Park Filipino Parents Association  
 - Magdarat Phillipine Folk-Arts, Inc.  
 Gaelic - Irish Canadian National Association of Manitoba, Inc.  
 German - Manitoba Parents for German Education  
 - Mennonite German Society  
 - United German School of North Kildonan  
 - Pembina Colon (West Valley School)  
 - Westgate Mennonite Collegiate  
 - German Society of Winnipeg  
 - Mennonite Brethren Collegiate  
 Greek - Brandon Greek Cultural Association, Inc.  
 - Theodros Christachos Greek School (St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church)  
 Gujurate - Padam Bhartiya Cultural Club (also teach Hindi)  
 Hebrew - Jewish Community Council (Regrets)  
 - Manitoba Parents for Hebrew Bilingual Education  
 - Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate  
 - Board of Jewish Foundation  
 - Ramah Hebrew School

- Talmud Torah - I.L. Petetz Folk School  
 - Ramah Hebrew School (Shaarey Zedec Synagogue)  
 - Aleph Beth Nursery  
 - Torah Academy (Regrets - Conference held on the Sabbath Day)  
 Hindi - Hindi Parishad of Manitoba  
 - Hindi Society of Manitoba  
 - Padam Bhartiya Cultural Club (also teach Gujurate)  
 - National Association of Canadians of Indian Origin (NACOI, Winnipeg Chapter)  
 - South India Arts Academy of Manitoba  
 Hungarian - Hungarian Canadian Cultural Society of Manitoba (Hungarian Language School)  
 - North American Hungarian Congress  
 Icelandic - Icelandic National League (Gimli Chapter)  
 Italian - Italian Canadian League of Manitoba  
 - Dante Alighieri Cultural Society  
 Korean - Manitoba Korean Language School  
 Laotian - Lao Association of Manitoba (Regrets)  
 Latvian - Holy Cross Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church (Regrets)  
 Polish - Nicholas Rej Polish School, Brandon  
 - Canadian - Polish Congress (Polish Language School)  
 - Canadian Polish Congress  
 Portuguese - Portuguese Association of Manitoba  
 - Portuguese Advisory Council  
 - Escola De Lingua & Cultura Portuguesa  
 Punjab - Western Manitoba Sikh Society  
 - Singh Sabha School  
 - Sikh Society of Thompson  
 Serbian - St. Sava Serbian Orthodox Church (Serbian Language School)(Regrets)  
 Slovenian - Our Lady of Lourdes Roman Catholic Church (Slovenian Language School) (Regrets)  
 Spanish - Winnipeg Chilean Association, Inc. (Escuela Chile)  
 - Chilean Institute of Culture of Manitoba ("Salvador Allende")  
 Tamil - Tamil Cultural Society  
 Tibetan - Tibetan Association of Manitoba (Regrets)  
 Ukrainian - Fisher Branch Ukrainian School  
 - Immaculate of Heart of Mary School  
 - Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education, Inc.  
 - River East Sadochuk (Nursery)  
 - Sts. Peter and Paul Ukrainian School  
 - Ukrainian Orthodox School of St. George  
 - Ukrainsky Narodny Fond, Inc.  
 - Springfield Heights Ukrainian Bilingual Program Parents' Committee  
 - Regent Park Ukrainian Bilingual Program Parents' Committee  
 - R.J. Morrisson Ukrainian Bilingual Program Parents' Committee  
 - Ralph Brown Ukrainian Bilingual Program Parents' Committee  
 Urdu - Association of Pakistani Canadians (School of Urdu Languages)  
 Vietnamese - The Vietnamese Community in Manitoba  
 Yiddish - Group for Yiddish Heritage (Steering Committee)

**SUBMISSION NO. 93**  
**OMER FONTAINE**

M. le président, membres du comité.

Ces audiences publiques sont pour moi comme pour tant d'autres une occasion d'exprimer notre point de vue concernant le bilinguisme au Manitoba.

J'ai donc confiance que vous prenez au sérieux les recommandations qui vous sont présentées.

Depuis 93 ans, les Franco-Manitobains endurent héroïquement une injustice qui leur fut faite par un gouvernement hostile aux francophones.

Cette injustice et cette illégalité ont assez durées. Aujourd'hui vous avez l'occasion et la responsabilité de réparer cette erreur en redonnant à notre province son statut bilingue comme ce l'était au début et en offrant les services essentiels dans les deux langues officielles de notre pays.

J'appuie donc la résolution pour amender l'article 23 telle que négociée au mois de mai par les gouvernements fédéral et provincial et la Société franco-manitobaine.

J'ose croire en votre sincérité et votre sens de la justice.

Merci.

**SUBMISSION NO. 94**  
**MRS. MARGARET B. LODDERS**

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee:

I have followed, with considerable interest, the media reports of briefs presented before this legislative committee, dealing with the proposed extension of French language rights in Manitoba. However, it was not until this late date that I realized that I might have something worthwhile to contribute to these deliberations.

My background has been one which afforded me contact, at an early age, with people of the French culture and language, and I have deep affection for my former Francophone teachers, lifelong friends, and relatives acquired through marriage to French Canadians. I, therefore, could not condone any denial of language rights to which members of Manitoba's Francophone community are entitled under the law. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the action which the Government of Manitoba has taken in attempting to circumvent Roger Bilodeau's legal challenge by entering into an agreement with the Federal Government and the Societe Franco-Manitobaine.

Entrenchment of French language rights in our Constitution is no solution, because the rights thus provided will be subjected to repeated challenge until eventually interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada. Therefore, since the need for a Supreme Court ruling seems inevitable in the long run, the Government of Manitoba should have "bit the bullet" and allowed the Bilodeau case to proceed to its natural conclusion. Agreement by the Manitoba Government to accept federal financial assistance to defray the cost of translating Manitoba statutes was tantamount to accepting a bribe to facilitate entrenchment of French language rights, which the Federal Government is determined to force on the provinces. It is quite obvious that some St. Boniface lawyers are most anxious that

the proposed "deal" be finalized, because they foresee the opportunity to "line their pockets" with fees from litigation which is bound to ensue.

My 18 years experience as a federal public servant causes me to agree with concerns expressed by Mr. Gary Doer, of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, that the proposed extension of French Language Services in government offices will cause serious problems in the provincial public service, and create unreasonable demands for positions to be designated "bilingual." This presents a serious threat to the merit system in government appointments. Ability to speak French takes precedence over ability to do a job. Having seen what has happened in the Federal Government's implementation of bilingualism, I can tell Mr. Doer that what he visualizes is only the "tip of an iceberg."

Because I believe in learning from experience, I would like to briefly relate a few examples of injustices which I have witnessed in the application of bilingualism at the federal level:

1. Our St. Boniface office staff is required to be totally bilingual, despite the fact that the area which it serves (St. Boniface, St. Vital, Norwood, Windsor Park, River Park South, etc.) is less than 10 percent Francophone.

2. When a vacancy occurred in the St. Boniface office, the position was awarded to the person who was No. 13 on an existing "eligible" list, because that person was Francophone. Obviously, the 12 others were better qualified, but were not bilingual.

3. Following introduction of bilingualism at the federal level, each department was required to assess the need for French Language Services, and designate offices which would require bilingual staff. Some areas reported no previous demand for services in French, so no positions were designated in those offices. Shortly thereafter, some of these remote unilingual offices were visited by "provocateurs," demanding to be served in French. When told that none of the staff was bilingual, complaints were immediately registered in Ottawa. It was an obvious frame-up to force the appointment of bilingual staff, regardless of need.

4. Even before bilingualism became official in Canada, the president of a Francophone organization in St. Boniface demanded French language versions of all publications (pamphlets) issued by our department. In response, we ordered hundreds of copies of each pamphlet in French, but most of these ended up gathering dust in our stockroom, because those who requested them were more interested in asserting their rights than they were in the pamphlets.

5. In our department alone, vast sums of money were spent on French language training for staff members who, subsequently, were never called upon to use their language ability. Their absence while on language training over prolonged periods of time caused disruption of service, and placed pressure on other staff members. Through lack of use, their ability to speak French was soon lost or greatly diminished. If a promotion later presented itself, they would require retraining to qualify if French were required.

6. Instead of entering the Federal Government Language Training Program, one of my fellow workers, who already had two Masters' Degrees from the University of Manitoba, decided to take leave of absence without pay and obtain his degree in French from the

University of Grenoble, France. Upon returning to his job, this man was three times refused bilingual certification by examiners in Ottawa, because they "detected a slight English accent" when he spoke French. These Francophone examiners could, themselves, hardly speak English, yet they were certifying others. Such rigid tests were applied to Anglophones seeking certification, while Francophones were certified bilingual without testing. This represents discrimination in reverse, and many dedicated public servants have seen their careers sacrificed on the altar of bilingualism. This is what has caused division between English and French citizens, and it will likely happen in Manitoba, if the proposed agreement is implemented. The concerns of the MGEA are well-founded, because once this "Pandora's box" is opened, there will be no way to control the situation.

I believe that the presentation to this committee by Dr. William Shaw, from Quebec, represented the "voice of reason" in this whole debate on French language rights in Manitoba. Contrary to what others from Quebec have claimed, entrenchment of French Language Rights in Manitoba is not going to force the Parti Quebecois to cease oppression of Quebec Anglophones. Nothing short of bilingualism in all nine other provinces would influence them. Also, those who are trying to convince other ethnic groups in Manitoba that implementation of the proposed agreement will benefit them, are committing a fraud. Most Manitobans whom I know, are perfectly willing to give Francophone residents their language rights, in accordance with an interpretation of those rights by the Supreme Court of Canada. If that is bigotry, so be it. I refuse to believe that the Supreme Court would hand down a ruling which would inflict utter chaos on the Legislature and Courts of Manitoba. Reason would prevail and whatever compromise has to be made as a result of the Bilodeau case, better that it should be based upon the wisdom of justices of the Supreme Court of Canada, than upon bribes offered by the Federal Government to achieve its own goals.

Whatever the cost of translating Manitoba's statutes, even if our worst fears were realized as a result of a Supreme Court ruling, over a period of time, it would likely prove far less costly than the unjustified proliferation of bilingual services which is currently proposed. The astronomical costs acknowledged by the Federal Government represent only a small portion of the price which Canadian citizens have actually paid to provide bilingual services at the federal level. We are only deceiving ourselves if we think that the proposed agreement is an easy way out.

Mrs. Margaret B. Ladders  
Private citizen

**SUBMISSION NO. 95**  
**HENRY ELIAS**

Brief to the Legislative Committee on Bilingualism by Henry Elias, 3 Celtic Bay, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

I want to express some of my views on this question of language. And I want to draw your attention to an alternative solution which might alleviate this language problem in the most peaceful manner in the long run.

First of all, I would like to pose the question of whether or not the Government of Manitoba is helping the Federal Government build a future Lebanon with this language bill - or a future Northern Ireland - or a Spain with a violent Basque minority.

For some time, it has appeared to me that the forced marriage of Quebec with the rest of Canada is on the rocks as it were. It also appears to me as if the only way to make this marriage go on a little longer is to let one partner have a lot more than a fair share, more than the original marriage agreement stipulated. Because of all the fighting between the parents of this forced marriage, because of this constant fighting, the children of this marriage are severely being damaged psychologically and they are thereby made to feel rejected because of all the constant bickering that is taking place between the parents, the children being the other ethnic minorities.

I guess, the alternative that I am trying to draw your attention to is that, "Would it not be better for the parents to get a peaceful separation than to continue this constant bickering and verbal fighting between these marriage partners?"

It is clear that they are never going to get along well together. The psychological wounds from all this fighting over past injustices, these wounds have become too deep for a real conciliation. It appears to me that the differences between them are too great for this marriage to continue over the long run in reasonable peace without one party giving in to the demands of the other.

Therefore, the alternative question I would like to raise with this committee and with the government and opposition here in Manitoba is, would it not be better in the long run to urge the Federal Government to make a deal with Quebec to separate amicably and in peace. Let Quebec go their own way. Let those English and non-French people who want to make a deal with those French people in the rest of Canada. Then the French from the rest of Canada have a French place to go where they can feel at home in their own language. And the English and non-French from Quebec have a place to go where they can feel at home in their own language. Then we will not be building a future Lebanon or a Northern Ireland.

It appears to me as if the French-speaking people believe that they are not getting their fair share out of Confederation. And it also appears to me as if they now want more than their fair share out of Confederation.

One alternative is to let them go their own way in as peaceful a manner as possible. Then they will learn what it means to paddle their own canoe. Of course, the same thing applies to the rest of us in English Canada.

Anyway, what I am trying to convey to you is that from what I have observed, I seriously doubt that they will ever be fully satisfied with their fair share, because of all the injustices they feel they have suffered in the past. I seriously doubt whether real reconciliation is possible without giving them more than their fair share.

So why continue on the road to building an eventual Lebanon or Northern Ireland.

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