



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 57 - APPENDIX B — SEPTEMBER 14th through OCTOBER 4th, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS
APPENDIX B - ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF PRESENTATIONS
MADE IN FRENCH DURING PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS HEARINGS
DATED SEPTEMBER 14th through OCTOBER 4th, 1983,
AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED, BUT NOT READ.

1. Ms. Irene Garand, Société franco-manitobaine Vol. 22, page 389
2. Ms. Liona Painchaud, Private Citizen, Vol. 23, page 398
3. Mr. Ken Fransoo, Private Citizen, Vol. 23, page 400
4. Mr. Ed Carriere, Private Citizen, Vol. 23, page 406
5. Mr. Louis Molgat, Jolly Club, Private Citizen, Vol. 24, page 411
6. Mr. Jacques Peloguin, Private Citizen, Vol. 24, page 413
7. Mr. André Saquet, Private Citizen, Vol. 24, page 419
8. Mr. Daniel Boucher, Société franco-manitobaine, Vol. 24, page 424
9. Mr. Gus Arnal, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 429
10. Ms. Alice Saquet, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 430
11. Father Tessier, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 432
12. Ms. Isabelle Archambault, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 435
13. Mr. Arthur Milette, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 435
14. Ms. Gisèle L'Heureux, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 436
15. Mr. Louis Saquet, Club d'Age d'or de Laurier, Vol. 25, page 439
16. Ms. Rose-Anne Verly, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 440
17. Mr. Gilbert Rioux & Ms. Claudette Savard, Commissaires d'école franco-manitobaines, Vol. 25, page 446
18. Mr. G. Waschmann, Private Citizen, Vol. 25, page 452
19. Ms. Jeannine Archambault, Private Citizen, Vol. 26, page 455
20. Sr. Helene St. Amant, Private Citizen, Vol. 26, page 455
21. Mr. Ovide Pelletier, Private Citizen, Vol. 26, page 457
22. Mr. Hervé Molgat, Private Citizen, Vol. 26, page 457
23. Ms. Claudette Gingras, Private Citizen, Vol. 26, page 457
24. Mayor Omer Chartier, Village of St. Lazare, Vol. 31, page 566
25. Mrs. L. Chartier, Private Citizen, Vol. 31, page 571
26. Mr. Mathieu Deschambault, Private Citizen, Vol. 31, page 571
27. Mr. Gerald Grenier, Société franco-manitobaine, Vol. 33, page 604
28. Mr. Albert St. Hilaire, Rural Municipality of Montcalm, Vol. 34, page 622
29. Mr. Henri Bouvier, Village of St. Leon, Vol. 34, page 631
30. Mr. Eric Lansky, Private Citizen, Vol. 34, page 632
31. Ms. Anne McEachern, Private Citizen, Vol. 35, page 638
32. Ms. Marie-Blanche Oliviero, Private Citizen, Vol. 35, page 640
33. Ms. Adéline Fillion, Community of St. Joseph, Vol. 35, page 645
34. Ms. Jacqueline Fortier, Private Citizen, Vol. 35, page 656
35. Ms. Yvonne Pantel, Comité de Parents, Vol. 35, page 656
36. Mr. Paul Cenerini, Personnel de l'Institut Collegial Notre-Dame, Vol. 35, page 657
37. Mr. Olier Labossière, Private Citizen, Vol. 35, page 658
38. Mr. Raymond Labossière, Private Citizen, Vol. 35, page 664
39. Mr. Robert Dubois, Société franco-manitobaine, Vol. 37, page 709
40. Mr. Rene Vermette, Commission scolaire de la Rivière Rouge No. 17, Vol. 39, page 738
41. Mr. Guy Lévesque, Private Citizen, Vol. 39, page 739
42. Ms. Irène Lemoine, Comité de parents de l'école Point des Chênes, Vol. 39, page 741
43. Mr. Roger Legal, Private Citizen, Vol. 39, page 742
44. Mr. Louis Bernardin, Private Citizen, Vol. 39, page 745
45. Mr. Paul Ruest, Private Citizen, Vol. 39, page 745
46. Mr. Jean Detillieux, Private Citizen, Vol. 39, page 746
47. Dr. G. Lemoine, Comité de parents des scouts et des guides de Ste. Anne, Vol. 39, page 748
48. Mr. Tobie Perrin, Private Citizen, Vol. 39, page 749
49. Mr. Gilbert Tétrault, Rural Municipality of La Broquerie, Vol. 39, page 750
50. Ms. Margaret Smith, Centre culturel corporatif de Ste. Anne, Vol. 39, page 750
51. Mr. Norbert Ritchot, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 758
52. Ms. Cécile Mulaire, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 759

53. Mr. Robert Freynet, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 760
54. Mr. Maurice Prince, Association des pro-canadiens, Vol. 40, page-762
55. Mr. Eugène Kirouac, Bureau d'administration de la Caisse populaire de La Broquerie, Vol. 40, page 770
56. Mr. Raymond Boily, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 771
57. Mr. Alfred Laurencelle, Comité de centenaire de La Broquerie, Vol. 40, page 771
58. Mr. Lionel Joyal, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 772
59. Ms. Béatrice Freynet-Boily, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 773
60. Mr. Armand Desharnais, Comité culturel de St. Pierre, Vol. 40, page 773
61. Dr. Archambault, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 777
62. Mr. Rino Ouellet, Comité de parents des écoles français de La Broquerie, Vol. 40, page 779
63. Ms. Michelle Freynet-Arbez, Private Citizen, Vol. 40, page 782
64. Ms. Agnes Dubois, Comité de parents de l'école Noël-Ritchot de St. Norbert, Vol. 41, page 783
65. Ms. Laurette Thérberge, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 784
66. Mrs. Marie-Joseph Fisette, Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains Inc., Vol. 41, page 784
67. Ms. Dolores Legal, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 785
68. Mr. Gérard Desrosiers, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 785
69. Ms. Gabrielle St. Hilaire-Mulair, Éducateurs franco-manitobaine de la division scolaire Rivière Seine, Vol. 41, page 786
70. Mr. Gilles Hébert, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 786
71. Mrs. Lucienne Boucher, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 787
72. Mayor Roger Smith, Town of Ste. Anne, Vol. 41, page 788
73. Mr. Leo Robert, Société franco-manitobaine, Vol. 41, page 789
74. Mr. Roger Lafrenière, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 798
75. Ms. Elaine Tougas, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 798
76. Mr. Normand Roy, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 798
77. Father Laval Cloutier, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 799
78. Mr. Gérald Fontaine, Village of St. Pierre-Jolys and Conseil économique de la Rivière Rouge, Vol. 41, page 799
79. Mr. Daniel Tougas, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 800
80. Mr. Gérard Gauthier, La classe des finissants de l'école secondaire de La Broquerie, Vol. 41, page 800
81. Ms. Valerie Vielfaure, La classe Grade 11, Vol. 41, page 800
82. Mr. Donald Boulet, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 801
83. Ms. Nicole Fontaine, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, Page 801
84. Mr. Norbert Piché, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, Page 802
85. Mr. Jean-Paul Lemoine, Private Citizen, Vol. 41, page 802
86. Ms. Carole Therrien, Conseil étudiant l'école secondaire La Broquerie, Vol. 41, page 802
87. Mr. Denis Fontaine, Association Rivière Rouge de la M.T.S., Vol. 41, page 803
88. Mr. Roland Gauthier, Club sportif, Vol. 41, page 804
89. Mr. Michel Lavergne, Collège régional français, Vol. 41, page 804
90. Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin, Comité des parents, Vol. 41, page 804
91. Dr. A.E. DeLayssac, Président-général de la Société Canadienne due francais à l'universitaire, Vol. 43, page 845
92. Mr. Michel Simard, Association des étudiants du College Universitaire de St. Boniface, Vol. 45, page 900
93. Mr. Renald Guay, Association des avocats francophones, Vol. 46, page 916
94. Mr. Marc Monnin, Collège de St. Boniface, Vol. 46, page 917
95. Ms. Florence Bourgouin, Private Citizen, Vol. 46, page 920
96. Ms. Rita Lecuyer, Pluru-elles, Vol. 46, page 921
97. Ms. Janick Belleau, Résean, Vol. 46, page 925
98. Mr. B.F. Quennelle and Paul Moist, C.U.P.E., Local 998, Vol. 46, page 928
99. Mr. Charles Gagné, Private Citizen, Vol. 47, page 941
100. Dr. William F. Shaw, on behalf of some interested groups in the Province of Québec, Vol. 48, page 961
101. Dr. Winnifred Potter, Private Citizen, Province of Québec, Vol. 51, page 1031
102. Mr. André Fréchette, Association des professeurs du Collège universitaire de St. Boniface, Vol. 53, page 1093
103. Mr. Vic Savino, Private Citizen, Vol. 54, page 1102
104. Mr. Lucien Loïsel, Centre culturel franco-manitobain, Vol. 54, page 1106
105. Mr. Rhéal Teffaine, La fédération des caisses populaires, Vol. 54, page 1106
106. Mr. Guy Savoie, Fort Gibraltar et la Brigade de la Rivière Rouge, Vol. 55, page 1118
107. Mr. Taïbi Soufi, Private Citizen, Vol. 56, page 1134
108. Mr. Georges Forest, Union Nationale Métisse St. Joseph du Manitoba, Vol. 56, page 1142

No. 1 - English Translation of Ms. Garand's presentation as recorded on Pages 389 and 390; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 22 - 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, 14 September, 1983.

MS. I. GARAND: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am present here as a councillor and member of the Board of Directors of the Franco-Manitoban Society. I will submit my brief in French, for this is a question of principle and it is the great issue of the day. I share with you excerpts from a speech given almost 100 years ago. I quote:

"I have come to ask you to protect the minority in one of the provinces and in the Territories against a violation of its rights and privileges. It seems to me that each member of this House has the duty, if harmony is on the wane in his province, to seek the causes of such a state of affairs and to suggest a remedy. I come from a distant region, certainly one of the most progressive in Canada. We have grown more in population, importance and influence, I think, than any other part of Canada, and the increasing contribution that we bring to the Confederation is sometimes recognized by the central government. It is now acknowledged that we form one of the great bases on which the future of our country rests. Everyone therefore is concerned with preventing, insofar as wise legislation is capable of doing so, anything which might cause us worry and uneasiness. Without blaming anyone's motives, I am obliged to say that the present Government of Manitoba has acted harshly towards the province's French minority.

"Why forbid the use of French in official documents? Is this not a great injustice towards Manitoba's French population? The privilege which we enjoyed in this regard was granted the province by the Constitution. It is recognized by The British North American Act of 1867 and by The Manitoba Act. At a time when nothing makes such a resolution necessary, the Provincial Legislature declares that French shall cease to be an official language of the province.

"What effect will the agitation caused by the provincial legislation have? It can only impede the province's development? Foreigners will not come to settle in an area where dissension reigns, where they will be constantly exposed to internal conflicts. In different parts of the world, and particularly in Europe, the emigrant groups are readying themselves to settle amongst us. They will bring not only their wealth, but that which is more important still, numerous families destined to develop and share with us the future prosperity of our great North West. We have told them many times that our vast territories have space enough for millions of people. That is very true, but foreigners who have never seen the land naturally fear to settle in a region where peace does not seem to be completely safe from assault, where conflict looms. They naturally prefer to go to those areas where total safety invites them.

"I need not, in the presence of a body such as the Senate whose sympathies lie with our cause, seek to prove the importance of the French language. I will confine myself to saying that we ask nothing but simple justice, that we claim a right that should never have been contested. We are the first settlers, French is the

first civilized tongue to have been spoken in the North West and it is the French race which first brought civilization to these vast regions. That alone should justify our claims which, for that matter, have been recognized several times. The French language was adopted as one of this country's official languages; nevertheless, without any motive, without even one request for change by anyone whosoever, the Manitoba Legislature has enacted a law stating that French will no longer be recognized as an official language of the province. Under such circumstances, we believe it is our right to invoke the protection of the federal government. There is, I think, some means of redressing this situation and of ending a policy which is disturbing public opinion and which harms the country's progress and development.

"There are citizens of French origin, not only in Manitoba but throughout the North West who expect justice to be rendered to them and cannot comprehend why they must wait so long to obtain that to which they have so much right."

Mr. Chairman, the speech which you have just heard was delivered before the Canadian Parliament in 1891 by the Honourable Marc-Amable Girard. This man played a great role in the political history of Manitoba.

Marc-Amable Girard was a member of the Legislature from the creation of this province until 1882. During these years, he was Provincial Treasurer from 1870 to 1872; Premier in 1874; Provincial Secretary from 1874 to 1875 and from 1879 to 1881. He became Minister of Agriculture in 1888, which position he held until the end of his career as a member of the Manitoba Legislature.

These words, spoken more than a century ago, are still pertinent today. It goes without saying then that the situation has still not changed.

But the speech that you have just heard was delivered by a man who was certainly filled with compassion for this province which he had served for more than a decade in the Legislature. He had felt a lack of harmony in his province on the subject of this question of official languages. He had sensed a threat to Manitoba's future.

He wanted to open the province to immigrants from all over, and in a peaceful climate, one of tolerance and mutual respect. Marc-Amable Girard understood the wealth of the many cultures that would come to settle in Manitoba, but he hoped that they might settle in a province where the respect of rights would nourish the joy of many peoples in an atmosphere of exemplary justice.

Today, Marc-Amable Girard would no doubt be pleased to review the agreement concluded on May 17, 1983 between the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Manitoba Government. He would be pleased to know that this agreement is fair and equitable. It repairs the injustice which he had denounced in 1891. This agreement is the manifest expression of justice and equity, the two focal points of his speech.

Mr. Chairman, you may be happy to note that the present government is making ready to relegate such speeches to the past. Never again shall we have to repeat the words of the great men of the past who implored their fellow men to respect the rights of the minority, for in a province which understands the respect due the rights of others, such words would be needless.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Garand. Are there any questions by members of the committee?
Mr. Adam.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I have no questions, but I would like to congratulate Ms. Garand and thank her for the brief that she has presented today.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - re GARAND, Page 390.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you for presenting this brief today. I would like to ask you one or two questions, Madam. First, do you and your organization support the rights of the Anglophones in Quebec?

MS. I. GARAND: Could you repeat the question please?

MR. D. SCOTT: Do you and your organization support the efforts of the Anglophones in Quebec to preserve their language?

MS. I. GARAND: Do I agree?

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes.

MS. I. GARAND: Yes, I agree.

MR. D. SCOTT: All right.

MS. I. GARAND: I am in favour of all minority rights
. . .

MR. D. SCOTT: All right, thank you.

MS. I. GARAND: . . . because it says in my brief - in my brief, I spoke of the rights of the individual.

MR. D. SCOTT: All right, very good. Do you agree with the amendments that were proposed at the second stage?

MS. I. GARAND: In September? The September amendments?

MR. D. SCOTT: For making amendments . . .

MS. I. GARAND: In September? The September amendments? . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, in September.

MS. I. GARAND: No, I don't agree.

MR. D. SCOTT: I don't think you mentioned that in your brief, and I would like to ask whether you and your organization support the proposed amendment, or do you think that the September amendments are too restrictive of Francophone rights in Manitoba?

MS. I. GARAND: In my opinion, and in the opinion of my organization, the September amendments are too restrictive and too weak. I support the amendment proposed on May 17th, 1983.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much.

No. 2 - English Translation of Ms. Painchaud's presentation as recorded on Page 398; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 23 - 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, 14 September, 1983.

MS. L. PAINCHAUD: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am here on my own behalf, and I would like to correct the error that appears on the other sheets. I will be presenting my brief in French because for me, it is an important matter of principle, and also because that is the issue we are discussing today. I am going to give you my point of view, but I prefer not to answer any questions.

I would like to go over a few points in the debate that has been raging in our province ever since the government announced its intention of righting the wrong that has existed since 1890.

Our province was founded on the recognition of French language, French culture, and French education rights. A few years later, the legislators chose, for reasons that were mostly political, to take those rights away from Franco-Manitobans. Recently, that legislation has been declared unconstitutional. It seems to me that if our very laws are illegal, we must question the status of our judicial system, of our government, and indeed of all our institutions. Because of the gravity of the situation, the official languages question must be settled without delay.

Since 1896, we have suffered from the loss of rights which formed the basis for the creation of our province. With the amendments to Section 23, we can at last see justice returning to our province. As a Franco-Manitoban, I greatly appreciate the wealth of diversity that other cultures can provide. Unless Franco-Manitobans are guaranteed the right to their language and their culture, as proposed in Section 23, Manitoba's other minority groups have no hope of surviving.

I therefore wholly support the agreement negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.
Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Ms. Painchaud. Are there any questions by members of the committee?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, without asking a question, I would simply like to congratulate and to thank Ms. Painchaud for her brief.

No. 3 - English Translation of Mr. R.K. Fransoo's presentation as recorded on Page 400; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 23 - 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, 14 September, 1983.

MR. K. FRANSOO: Mr. Chairman and fellow Manitobans, I am not French, so I hope you will excuse my mistakes. I feel that I have been deprived for years of the right to learn French. Manitoba, as a province, has denied me the opportunity to become bilingual.

For example, we have allowed our government to remove French from . . . (unintelligible) . . . If the French language were still part of our province, we would not be in this mess.

No. 4 - English Translation of Mr. E. Carriere's presentation as recorded on Pages 406 and 407; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 23 - 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, 14 September, 1983.

MR. E. CARRIERE: Mr. Chairman, I shall make my presentation firstly in French and then in English. I don't think I will need translation because I will be repeating the same thing in the English, but if you like to, it's up to you.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the question of the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and to Section 43 of the Canadian Constitution.

I am opposed to the amendment of these two documents, for the following reasons:

In the first place, I have to say that the Société franco-manitobaine does not speak for me. The Société decided on its own initiative to negotiate with the provincial and federal governments. It did not ask anybody in this region for any input. It acted, and then got ratification from its Winnipeg members. I find it presumptuous of the Society to claim that it speaks for all Franco-Manitobans.

According to our MLA, the government has made "sweeping concessions". The opposite is, in fact, the case. The amendments actually only weaken Section 23. In fact, if the amendments become law, the 1890 Official Language Act will be established because of Section 23.3(2), even though the Supreme Court declared it illegal in 1979.

We, the Franco-Manitobans, have waited 93 years for the Manitoba community to respect our French rights. The amendments ask us to wait another ten years. This is a clear injustice. We have already waited too long. If our governments were as democratic as they claim to be, the issues we are facing now would not exist.

French Language Services will only be available in certain regions, decided upon by the three negotiators. And what about the rest of us? We have the same rights, and we expect to receive the same consideration. The rights of all should be respected, even where numbers are not large.

I understand the problems of the government in the matter of translating 4,500 statute laws. I realize that the translating of these laws is very complex. But if the government just gives up, nothing will get done. The government should continue with the translations at whatever pace is reasonable, and in the end all the work will be accomplished.

As each English law is applied to Francophones, it will be contested in court and translated, and so the backlog to be translated will quickly diminish.

I am French-Canadian, but I have had to educate my children in English. I was a sailor while I was bringing up my family, and I was stationed on the coast. There was no French education available in that region, which was a loss to my children and to the country, and a great disappointment to me.

I am therefore strongly opposed to the dilution of Section 43 of the Canadian Constitution by the imposition of artificial limitations. Once we relax the Constitution, the effect will grow like a cancer, and eventually lead to the death of the Constitution. I suggest that we protect what we have, and that we expand Sections 23 and 33 to respect the rights of all Francophones in Canada.

To place a limit on any portion of these two documents is to take a step backwards. This must not be tolerated.

NO. 5 - English Translation of Mr. L. Molgat's presentation as recorded on Page 411; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 10:00 a.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. L. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I represent the Jolly Club which is the senior citizens' club in Ste. Rose. The club has 150 members aged 50 and over.

Our members are largely in favour of having the French language and culture promoted in Manitoba with the support of provincial and federal laws.

Our members are confident that the Société franco-manitobaine, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government had the goals of the Francophone community at heart when they drafted the amendments to Section 23 in May, 1983.

The majority of the Jolly Club's members would like to have the amendments to Section 23 entrenched in Manitoba's Constitution as they were drafted in May, 1983.

I had translated the equivalent in English but, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I will skip the part that is the translation of the first French presentation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - re MOLGAT; Pages 412-13.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I would like to thank Mr. Molgat on behalf of the committee, for his contribution here today. Thank you very much.

MR. L. MOLGAT: Thank you.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Molgat, with reference to the remarks made by Mr. Graham, who stated that French language rights were restored in 1979, do you agree, because unlike someone who appears in court and who is pronounced guilty, for example, of a given crime, the crime is immediately punished either by imposing a prison sentence or a fine which must be paid immediately, the crime is therefore punished immediately?

It takes more than an instant or year to right 93 years of wrong-doing. Which means that in actual fact, French language rights have not been restored. The laws, with a few exceptions, have not yet been translated, nor have the statutes, and even the fundamental elements contained in Section 23 in 1870 have not yet been fully restored since the possibility of having a case heard in either French or English in the courts is something that is arising only very slowly, even today.

Do you then accept the fact that your rights have been fully restored?

MR. L. MOLGAT: No, I would like to bring up the word "courtesy" again, it was just like bait at the end of a line you know and we don't have any. And we, the French, have been mistreated for so long that we jump at the first offer and accept it, but it isn't complete, it's far from being complete. We want total compensation, we want something entrenched in the law that will enable us to achieve our goal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you. Last question, Mr. Molgat. The other aspect mentioned by Mr. Graham is that Bill 2, which was passed in 1980 and reaffirmed the act of 1870, you may or may not know that Bill 2 stipulates, or in reaffirming the act of 1879, it stipulates that in the event of differing interpretations, for example, of a bill drafted in French the English version will take precedence. In your opinion, does this restore the equality of the two languages?

MR. L. MOLGAT: That isn't equality at all, Sir.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Molgat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize Mr. Scott, I would remind members on both sides that the purpose of questions is not to break new ground but to seek clarification of questions raised in the brief.

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: The Jolly Club stated that it was in agreement with the amendments proposed in May. What do you think of the subsequent amendments that were proposed in September?

MR. L. MOLGAT: When I drink whiskey, I like it a certain way and if it's watered down too much, it doesn't have any more taste . . . that's what you're doing when you put . . . when you change the conditions that had been seriously studied by the three parties, I refer to the Société franco-manitobaine, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. They sat down nice and quietly to discuss the pros and cons, and now you want to water down their agreement. You want to weaken it so that it isn't worth anything. It isn't worth entrenching.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Molgat, do you think that the amendments proposed in September are not enough?

MR. L. MOLGAT: I'm sorry I don't follow.

MR. D. SCOTT: Do you think that the amendments proposed in September do not grant equal status to both languages, that with this amendment one language is secondary to the other?

MR. L. MOLGAT: To be honest, between you and me, I'm not educated enough, I haven't studied things closely enough, I'm not in a position to answer questions like that, and I think you should direct them to the Société franco-manitobaine.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Sir.

No. 6 - English Translation of Mr. J. Peloquin's presentation as recorded on Pages 413-14; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 24 - 10:00 a.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. J. PELOQUIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would like to begin by introducing myself. My name is Jacques Peloquin and I have lived in the Laurier area for the past 33 years. I am French-Canadian and proud of it.

My ancestors came to Canada nearly 300 years ago, and my family has lived in Manitoba for more than 100 years. I was born in 1921, in a French-Canadian town in the Red River Valley.

I attended elementary school at a time when teaching French was prohibited by a law that had been passed in 1916. Despite this our teachers could barely speak English.

At the age of 20 I knew just enough English to get by. In 1940, I joined the Royal Canadian Air Force and served my country for four years. English was the only language used at work. I never had too much trouble understanding English, but I still prefer speaking the language of Moliere rather than that of Shakespeare. The language of work here is still French, and I still speak it with all my French customers.

I will admit, however, that the language used in the business world is English and I don't believe that the purpose of the amendment to Section 23 is to change that.

With regard to French Language Services in an area such as Ste. Rose du Lac where much of the population is of French descent, it seems to me that I should be able to speak French at the town hall, the agricultural office, the school, the hospital, the caisse populaire, the bank and the church without being told to "speak English please."

We should also have access to French language information services at our telephone, hydro and railway company offices. These are all services that we were used to having.

One of the regrettable things about the past is that the minutes of school board and town council meetings had to be recorded in English only, despite the fact that all the discussions took place in French.

I am certain that in the past, municipal or school secretaries often had to translate those minutes for people who could neither read nor understand English.

If I understand the amendment to Section 23 correctly, it would become possible to record these minutes in French if the school boards or town councils so desire.

A few years ago it would have been unthinkable to have a unilingual Anglophone bank manager, municipal secretary or school principal in Ste. Rose.

Today, we accept these things without too much opposition. In other words, we have been assimilated by English to a great extent.

I'm certain that there are many people in Ste. Rose who have French names but speak only English, and others who speak English very rarely. Very few young people speak French among themselves.

We might ask ourselves then: "Why this amendment to Section 23, if it's only to fill a legal requirement?"

The province seems to be at an impasse, if I understand the situation correctly. The current government must entrench in the Constitution, by means of an amendment to Section 23, certain rights and services for the French-Canadian majority as agreed with the Société franco-manitobaine last May 17th.

I don't think the government has much room to bargain. It must either accept the conditions stipulated by the Société franco-manitobaine, or have the Supreme Court impose conditions that will be even more difficult to respect.

As for the poor people who complain about having French forced down their throats, we French-Canadians have put up with that kind of treatment for 93 years.

For those French-Canadians who have kept their language, it hasn't been easy. It's taken a lot of pride and many sacrifices. We had to be able to speak English perfectly to get ahead.

To provide a good French education for our children, we had to establish separate schools. For the people living in this area that meant sending them to St. Boniface because our schools didn't and still don't offer program "A."

This year there are 11 students from Laurier attending College Louis Riel in St. Boniface.

Let the municipalities hold as many referendums as they want, and let the people vote 100 percent against granting rights and services to the French Canadian minority - I don't think that will change the decision of the Supreme Court in any way.

Manitoba has been bilingual since 1870, with French and English being of equal status. And so, for the benefit of all Anglophones, I say that if you want to get ahead in all areas you'll have to become perfectly bilingual. As far as I'm concerned, I can assure you that I will use the rights and services that are made available to me whenever I have the opportunity to do so.

I think it is deplorable that the opposition has chosen to incite all kinds of resentment against a minority in an effort to gain popularity among the voters.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. It is not appropriate at committees for responses from the gallery. Are there any questions for Mr. Peloquin?

MR. J. PELOQUIN: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I wrote one in French and one in English and it's not the perfect translation, so there is a little part here in English which I would like to read to you, if you don't mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. J. PELOQUIN: Like it or not, ladies and gentlemen, according to Section 23 of the Manitoba Constitution of 1870, French and English are equal. To be legal, every government document will have to be bilingual. Now, for the misers and the penny-pinchers who are worried about the cost, you should jump with joy and support wholeheartedly the amendment to Section 23 which waters it down considerably. It would require only 500 out of 4,500 statutes to be translated. I am a little worried about the French service in designated areas. Does it mean that other areas, such as Dauphin, Swan River, Brandon and others will never qualify for French services? With the ever-increasing demand for French Immersion courses in the province, it could very well be that a few years down the road there could be a demand for those services in those areas. I support the amendment to Section 23 as agreed on May 17, 1983, with the Société franco-manitobaine, and not if watered down any more. As for French services in my area, and from my government, you can rest assured, ladies and gentlemen, that I will make use of them at every opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Peloquin. Are there any questions for Mr. Peloquin by members of the committee?

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have a question, I would simply like to thank Mr. Peloquin on behalf of the committee.

No. 7 - English Translation of Mr. Saquet's presentation as recorded on Page 419; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 24 - 10:00 a.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. A. SAQUET: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I must begin with an apology for being late. I would like to ask a question to begin with if possible, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, why is there no translation into French?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saquet, I have to apologize that I cannot answer your question in French, but what I can tell you is that until this time there had been no request to the committee for translation in French. That is something that could be provided perhaps, that is something that will flow from these amendments if they are passed, the availability of translation services will become more widespread. But, at the present time, this is the first time that we have held committees throughout the province at which translation has been available. In the past, it has only been available in Winnipeg, when it has been made available. So it's a start in the direction in which I think your question urges us, but it may only be a small step.

MR. A. SAQUET: Thank you. I support the agreement concerning Section 23 reached by the Société franco-manitobaine, the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba on May 17, 1983.

I hope that providence will guide our leaders and that they might return to the sense of justice which they demonstrated on May 17, 1983.

Note that I said JUSTICE and not courtesy.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Saquet. Questions for Mr. Saquet from members of the committee.

MR. A. SAQUET: Mr. Chairman, if I may at this time, I would rather not answer any questions because it is getting late and there are still many people waiting to present their briefs. Consequently, I'd rather not answer any questions, but I might answer a few.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for presenting your brief, Mr. Saquet.

No. 8 - English Translation of Mr. D. Boucher's presentation as recorded on Page 424-25; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 24 - 10:00 a.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. D. BOUCHER: My name is Daniel Boucher and I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Société franco-manitobaine. As the official representative of the Francophone community, the Société franco-manitobaine acts as the spokesman for all the people that have chosen to remain Francophone in Manitoba - Francophone in language and in culture.

It has been more than a year since the Hon. Mr. Penner, Attorney-General of Canada, approached the

Société franco-manitobaine to initiate negotiations concerning Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Eleven months of intense negotiating followed. I will spare you the details of the countless ups and downs that marked these negotiations. However, Mr. Chairman, allow me to provide an example of the spirit in which the Société franco-manitobaine based its participation on the principles of honesty and integrity. We have attempted to remain diplomatic and professional in our approach at all times.

Our discussions were always based on one basic principle, which we considered to be of great importance, and which will always remain a deep inner conviction. This principle states, Mr. Chairman that "French and English are Manitoba's official languages."

On the basis of this principle, we negotiated an agreement which we considered fair and equitable, as much for the entire population of Manitoba as for our community. This agreement restores to the Francophone community in Manitoba, the status that was repealed more than 90 years ago through the unilateral and unconstitutional move by the government in power at the time - a government that was insensitive to the position of French as a minority language.

The fact that we were able to reach an agreement on May 17th is a remarkable accomplishment in itself, because we still firmly believe that no agreement, regardless of how generous, can compensate for 90 years of injustice. This then, Mr. Chairman, is an example of our good faith and our exemplary generosity which we hope will be an example to all who must come to a decision on this matter. Given the open attitude which we have demonstrated, we find it difficult to accept the remarks of people who insist on labelling us as fanatics on the subject of language.

Mr. Chairman, you must realize our surprise and amazement at the government's announcement on September 6th, stating that certain changes would be introduced to the agreement that had been reached in good and due form last May 17th. It is with a sense of great disappointment that we took note of the fact that the government with which we had negotiated for so long had changed its stand on this matter.

Today, the negotiated agreement is threatened. This threat stems from a wave of political pressure which is based on unfounded fears. We are unaware of what is causing this fear, Mr. Chairman, because the agreement we reached takes absolutely nothing away from the Anglophone majority. On the contrary, it places this province at the head of a movement towards tolerance and respect of fundamental rights, and designates this province as one of the most innovative and progressive in Canada.

Some people maintain that the section of the agreement dealing with French Language Services to the public should not be entrenched in the Constitution. We obviously do not share this view. Today, the entire agreement is threatened because some people have dared to suggest that Section 23.1, declaring English and French Manitoba's official languages, be diluted.

How can we be certain that the services offered out of pure courtesy will be obtained, when well-orchestrated political pressure has been successful in calling into question Section 23.1, which remains the cornerstone of all these negotiations? We have seen examples of this so-called courtesy in the past and it provides only a minimum guarantee of peace.

We have been particularly disappointed by the actions of all the people who have incited political instability over this question in Manitoba. This will only worsen an already alarming situation. Political instability is reflected by public opinion and fuels the most naive fears throughout the population. The final decision is in danger of being influenced by this excess of emotion and frenzy.

It seems to us that the representatives of the Manitoba Government, who negotiated the agreement which was reached on May 17th, remained open and understanding of the Francophone minority throughout these negotiations.

The members of the government's caucus no doubt also realized that their representatives had in fact negotiated a fair agreement, since they also gave their full support to the project initially. How is it that three months later the members of the caucus propose amendments that clearly dilute the agreement reached by their colleagues? Even in light of the current developments, people have dared to ask why our community wants to have the question of French Language Services entrenched.

Given the fact that the amendments proposed by the government on September 6th are being discussed at these public hearings, it is now difficult for our community to make a final decision on this matter. Although we consider the negotiations to be open once again, we are confident that within a few weeks the government will realize that the views expressed during these public hearings support the agreement reached on May 17th.

Mr. Chairman, the Francophone community would like to remain fair and honest in its approach to this matter. The patience which we have shown throughout these lengthy negotiations deserves to be recognized. We hope it will not fade and jeopardize the acquisition of our rights which are, no doubt, as valuable to the entire population of Manitoba as they are to the Francophone community.

Mr. Chairman, I came to deliver this speech today because like you, I am an elected representative, and like you I feel certain responsibilities toward the members of the community which I represent. I believe I hold the same convictions and desires as Manitoba's Francophone population, and am therefore acting in the best interests of this community. This means that what I've said here today is on behalf of the community, and I hope it is in this spirit that my words are heard here today.

Thank you.

No. 9 - English Translation of Mr. G. Arnal's presentation as recorded on Page 429; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. G. ARNAL: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, there is at present a great deal of interest on the part of many Manitoba parents in seeing that their children are educated in a school where French is offered as a language of instruction. One has only to listen to the news or to read the newspapers to become aware of this growing interest, and of the large number of school boards which have had to make changes - often quite drastic ones, in order to satisfy parents.

In our own community of Ste. Rose, for example, we have a bus that travels to Laurier every day so that students can attend a French language school. It is important to note that most of these students are from English-speaking homes.

I understand that the situation is the same everywhere in the province, and that competition for enrolment in French language schools is high.

A decision such as this on the part of the parents must cause some inconvenience to the families concerned, and must demand certain sacrifices from them. I am sure that these people hope for some return on their efforts.

It seems to me that Section 23 offers a guarantee that the efforts and sacrifices will not be in vain, and that opportunities for using what they have learned will be available to these students later in life.

Support and encouragement of this kind will also be very reassuring to the minorities, by offering them greater protection for their lifestyles. Manitoba takes great pride in its Folklorama festival and it would be a tragedy if that was swallowed up by the idea of the melting pot.

There seems to be a lot of hostility in certain circles when the French fact comes under discussion.

The seven points outlined in the French Language Services proposal certainly leave plenty of room for non-government organizations to do as they think best. As a citizen who was once an employee of the Provincial Government, I am certain that no government would be so foolhardy as to employ people on the basis of bilingualism alone, at the expense of competence and efficiency. That would be bad politics, and Lord knows, the government has no need of more criticism than it already receives.

The proposals seem very liberal, and the only thing that is missing is a little understanding on the part of all concerned.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - re ARNAL; Page 429.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Questions for Mr. Arnal? Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Arnal, do I understand you to say that you support the agreement as it was made on the 17th of May, and that you support the proposed amendments to Section 23?

MR. G. ARNAL: I support, first of all, the proposal of the 17th of May, but I also partially endorse the amendments which have been suggested more recently.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer, further questions? Mr. Arnal, thank you very much for appearing here today. I think there was an additional question.

Mr. Brown.

NO. 10 - English Translation of Ms. A. Saquet's presentation as recorded on Page 430; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MS. A. SAQUET: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I came from France. When I first arrived

in Canada, I thought I was coming to a bilingual country, but I soon found out that that was not the case. You cannot imagine what a great disappointment this was for me.

I would never have believed, when I first came to this country, that one day I would be standing before a committee such as this one to defend my native language - a language which I believed enjoyed equal status with English in Canada.

It is difficult for me to understand how a bilingual country could have countenanced the legislation of 1890 which abolished the use of French in the Legislature and in the courts.

But even more alarming, Mr. Chairman, is the legislation of 1916 which abolished French in the schools. That was truly an attack on the young, on those whose education ought to prepare them for the future. Fortunately, the government once more recognized French as a language of instruction in 1970, with the adoption of Bill 113.

Attacked on all sides, the French language in Manitoba has suffered greatly, to the point where, for want of sufficient numbers, we sometimes cannot get a French education for our children. That is the case in Laurier. After Grade 9, if our children wish to continue their education in French they must leave their families and go to the larger towns, in order to benefit from a French atmosphere and culture.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that successive governments in the history of Manitoba have contributed to the problem. The present government has negotiated an agreement regarding the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I support the agreement of last May which was negotiated with the intention of giving justice to French-speaking citizens of Manitoba.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the constitutional rights which the government is about to restore should be the subject of a referendum. That is not the right way of dealing with a question of minority rights. Besides, when the rights were taken away in 1890, the people of the time were not consulted by the Greenway Government.

I therefore support the resolution as it was negotiated last May, by the Manitoba Government and the Société franco-manitobaine.

Allow me to say in closing, that the Société franco-manitobaine has acted and has negotiated in the best interests of all Francophones, of whom it is the official representative.

Thank you.

No. 11 - English Translation of Father Tessier's presentation as recorded on Page 432; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

FATHER TESSIER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I would like to underline a few points in the debate which has been raging over the government's intention of amending Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

First, I don't know if the media is responsible for it, but it seems to me that we are making a big fuss about very little. Look at all the newspaper headlines, the editorials, the letters to the editor, the pamphlets, the

petitions, even these public hearings. Why such a fuss about the fact that we want to give justice to the French population?

What does the amendment to The Manitoba Act hope for, other than a freer expression of the French lifestyle in Manitoba? I do not see how this kind of development on the part of 5 percent or 6 percent of the population can threaten the majority.

Second, as for these public hearings, I don't think that they are a good thing in themselves. An injustice has been done, and must be put right. You don't ask people's opinion on a case that is already being dealt with by the courts. Why do we want to take a Manitoba-wide opinion sample before dealing with a question that is above all a legal one?

"French and English are the official languages of Manitoba," are they not?

Third, I would like people above all to remember the positive points about an officially bilingual Manitoba. Such a province would surely help Canada to remain the wonderful country that it is. And what an encouraging sign it would be for the nation's many minorities to see that the official minority of Manitoba had won the re-establishment of its rights.

All of this goes to say that I support the agreement negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 12 - English Translation of Ms. I. Archambault's presentation as recorded on Page 435; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MS. I. ARCHAMBAULT: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you wait one moment please while it's distributed.

MS. I. ARCHAMBAULT: Here is my brief. No questions, please.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I would like to make some points which should be taken into account when deciding whether or not to support the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

First, it should be kept in mind that the act which prohibited the use of French in the courts and in government has been declared unconstitutional. Given that fact, I cannot understand the government's hesitation, and the opposition of a large part of the population. I cannot understand how anyone can refuse to put right on "illegal" law. The opposition that is being shown goes beyond the bounds of rationality. If we do not eliminate "illegal" laws, what value can our judicial system have? If we continue to recognize this law, which is not legal, we must call into question our society, our government and all our institutions. It follows that the basis of our civilization itself will crumble. The seriousness of the situation is frightening. We must deal with our official languages problem, and we must do so without further delay.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I give my support to the agreement negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I cannot do otherwise.

Thank you.

No. 13 - English Translation of Mr. Arthur Milette's presentation as recorded on Page 435; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: One moment, please.

MR. A. MILETTE: As my small son often says to me . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. A. MILETTE: Mr. Chairman, my name is pronounced "Milette."

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, in my brief today, I will not be complaining about, or condemning anyone. For that reason, I will not be replying to any questions after the brief. I just want to present my brief and go back to work. Thank you.

I am here to express my support for the agreement negotiated in May 1983 by the Manitoba Government and the Société franco-manitobaine to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

If I support the agreement as it was negotiated, it is because I believe that it gives fair recognition to Franco-Manitoban rights; rights which have been ignored since 1890. I support the Société franco-manitobaine and the government of this province equally, as the negotiators of the agreement. The Société franco-manitobaine is the official representative of Franco-Manitobans, just as the government represents the provincial population.

It is quite fitting, Sir, that your committee should hold hearings in this region of Manitoba. I would like you to know that the towns of Ste. Rose du Lac, Makinak, Laurier, Ste. Amélie, Toutes Aides and McCreary represent a veritable island of French colonization in eastern Manitoba. Those colonists would be happy to know that the Manitoba Government is today preparing to restore the rights of the Francophones of this wonderful province that they so valiantly helped to build.

The French fact has always been a reality in Manitoba, as the history of the Ste. Rose du Lac region will testify.

That was an era of co-operation. The Spence family, the Neault family, the Sutherland family, the Ritchot family, I could even say the Riel family, all had one common goal - to build a home, a province, a country for themselves. If these people chose to give to their country a Constitution that was faithful to their different linguistic realities, it was for reasons of mutual respect.

The mutual respect which our ancestors taught us must be continued. The projected amendment to Section 23 is the concentrated expression of that respect, and we cannot but applaud it.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for having chosen Ste. Rose du Lac as a location for these public hearings. Once again, I reaffirm my support for the proposed amendment to Section 23, as negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government.

Respectfully yours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Milette.

JO. 14 - English Translation of Ms. Gisèle L'Heureux's presentation as recorded on Page 436; Hansard Vol. CXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MS. G. L'HEUREUX: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am happy to come before you today to express aloud my support of the agreement to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it was negotiated in May.

I am eager to reveal and share with you the pride that I feel in living in a province which finally recognizes French as one of its official languages. From childhood we have had to fight to safeguard the language that my ancestors handed down to me. When they came to Manitoba they certainly did not suspect that living in their language and culture would be a disadvantage for their descendants, nor that their joy and pride in belonging to one of the founding peoples would be belittled. Some had more difficulty than others in fighting assimilation and have thus lost the language, culture and wealth of a very glorious past. Fortunately, in spite of many laws established to our disadvantage, our stubborn will to safeguard our language and the wealth of our heritage enabled some to stand up to adversity and inculcate the pride of being Francophone when on all sides the structures of the future were being attacked and demolished. I am delighted to note that the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act will, in the future, redress the wrongs done to the Francophones of this province. They will be able to take advantage of the services and rights which have been refused them for the past three generations. Those generations, I would like to point out, helped to build Manitoba. Also, I am happy to be able to think that my descendants will be able to enjoy life in a province which respects their rights. I would be proud to tell them that we have not fought in vain since, at last, a responsible government is able to see, through this province's history, the necessity of redressing past wrongs. So, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I reiterate my support of the agreement, negotiated in May, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I would prefer not to answer questions.

No. 15 - English Translation of Mr. L. Saquet's presentation as recorded on Page 439; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. L. SAQUET: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

Laurier's older people of French origin, who have always spoken their mother tongue, and have worked to promote the use of French, support the agreement which was negotiated last May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act; the section which re-establishes French and English as official languages, and which defines the government's responsibility to offer services in French to the Francophones of Manitoba.

We, the elderly, also want to be assured of French Language Services in the area of health care, hospitals, homes for the aged, municipal and taxation offices; in public libraries, in telephone, hydro, police and railway services, etc. The need for the services that I mention will continue to grow, given the ever-increasing numbers of immersion schools and of students who are learning

French. Let us then give the young generation a chance to use the language that it is learning in the schools.

In 1890, were the people of Manitoba consulted over the changes that were put into effect at that time? So why should we have to ask the opinion of the public in 1983?

Section 23 should not be a political question, but a question of justice. We therefore urge the government, before it makes any irresponsible moves, to consider well the implications of its decisions.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as the spokesperson of the Senior Citizen's Club in Laurier, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to express our point of view on the agreement.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Saquet. Any questions from members of the committee? Hearing none - Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Saquet, in your second last paragraph, when you warn the government to reflect before it makes any irresponsible moves, do you mean by that, that they should not add new amendments, or did you only give them that warning to make sure that the proposed amendment is passed?

MR. L. SAQUET: Going back to the first paragraph, we support the agreement that was negotiated last May.

MR. G. LECUYER: I understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions by members of the committee? Seeing none . . .

MR. L. SAQUET: Mr. Chairman, would you allow me to tell a short anecdote about something that happened to me, concerning hospitals? It's still to do with language.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. L. SAQUET: A few years ago I was a patient in the St. Boniface Hospital. I had had an operation. One day an intern, a doctor, came to ask me if I would be an interpreter because he had to give some tests to a woman who was ill. If they have to go to other patients to be able to communicate between doctor and patient, something is not right.

Another incident, again to do with language. A few weeks ago, on a Sunday evening, my wife telephoned Winnipeg because she wanted to go there, to take the train, the CN. It was about 10 or 11 o'clock at night. In Winnipeg, the employees could not speak French, so he transferred her to an employee in Montreal. Of course the employees in Montreal had no idea at what time the train would be going by on our little line, or on what day. Those are the gaps that we have right now in our French Language Services.

Now, I'm willing to believe that CN services have nothing to do with what we are discussing today, but if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, and members of

the committee - this is a comment which I am making as a private citizen. I gave the seven best years of my life and a good part of my health in the last World War to protect so-called freedom and justice. Therefore, it is inconceivable that there should be politicians who are opposed to granting justice to the French Canadian people of Manitoba.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Saquet, for your presentation here this afternoon. Next on our list is Rose-Anne Verley. Please proceed.

No. 16 - English Translation of Ms. R. Verley's presentation as recorded on Page 440; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MS. R. VERLEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

The people of Manitoba are dismayed that the Manitoba Government has suggested amending Section 23 of The Manitoba Act in order to restore the rights of Franco-Manitobans.

I cannot fathom this dismay. I am unable to understand. I do not understand how one can so fiercely oppose a law which is intended to redress, I say redress, a terrible wrong committed 90 years ago. But on further thought, what law could return to Franco-Manitobans what they have lost during 90 years? It seems to me that the answer is obvious to any honest person.

Mr. Chairman, the present New Democratic Government is trying to give a second start to French life in this province, and it is right in doing so. For no government, political party or individual of a civilized country has the right to deny justice to the Francophones of the Province of Manitoba. Franco-Manitobans have been tenacious during all these years. We must not let them down.

I repeat: I support the agreement negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I hope, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, that you will not hesitate to declare yourselves in favour of this resolution. I place my faith in you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Verley. Any questions by members of the committee? Mr. Scott?

MR. D. SCOTT: I would simply like to say thank you for your brief and that I believe that it is because of people like yourself that the French language still exists in Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam.

No. 17 - English Translation of Mr. Gilbert Rioux's and Ms. Claudette Savard's presentations as recorded on Pages 446-449; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. G. RIOUX: Good afternoon. It is a pleasure to be in Ste. Rose. I am here on behalf of the Association des Commissaires de Langue française du Manitoba. Since 1918, the association has been the organization of French language school trustees in the province. In 1916, when French instruction in public schools was abolished, the trustees of French language schools

began to organize. The goal of their organization was, clearly, to ensure, with the support of the Association d'éducation des Canadiens français du Manitoba, that French instruction was maintained in schools having a Francophone population. In spite of legal prohibitions, the trustees of French-speaking schools struggled constantly for 65 years, vigilantly using consultation, negotiation, subterfuge, and much besides to improve the quality of French education in their schools. An immeasurable dedication and energy has been expended by our members in their years of work to justify the legitimacy of French instruction. Meetings uncounted have been called, where strategies for giving our young Francophones a French education have been hammered out. Meanwhile, our Anglophone colleagues have never had to fight for this fundamental right to instruction in their own language.

It would be pointless for me to give you a historical outline here of the evolution and the non-evolution of French education in the province. Since the start of these hearings, persons far more qualified than I have recounted the province's Francophone and French language education history.

How many times have Franco-Manitoban school trustees had to go so far as to advise teachers to act illegally, by telling them to hide their French books when the department inspector came visiting? How many times have Franco-Manitoban trustees come under pressure from their Anglophone colleagues to give up their struggle and to conform to the wishes of the majority? You must try to imagine, ladies and gentlemen, how difficult it is to work from inside a school board where the majority does not or will not understand the desire of a minority group - and one that continues to believe in its fundamental right to recognition as the official minority of the province - to consolidate its position.

I am sure you are aware of French Manitoba's recent educational struggles in the matter of the establishment of French language schools. This is in spite of the existence of Bill 113, which made French and English the languages of instruction in Manitoba. I am thinking of the Taché School, of Noel Ritchot in St. Norbert, of Précieux-Sang of Norwood, and of the French regional school in Ile des Chênes. These struggles reflect the problems that face parents, teachers, and even students, when they try to obtain satisfactory French language schools. And this, I repeat, is in spite of a bill that makes French and English the official languages of instruction in Manitoba's public schools.

What is stopping the authorities in education and government from following the lead indicated by the increasing enrolments in immersion programs? I am sure you realize that the parents who are enrolling their children in these programs hope that the children will become bilingual in the two official languages of this country. It is perfectly logical to assume that these future citizens will want to use the two official languages. Are we going to limit the use of one of these languages only to Francophone households and to French immersion programs? Why not envisage for future generations a province that is assured of the benefit of two official languages, by their entrenchment in the Constitution? Why not make French Language Services available in the rational manner proposed at the beginning of May 1983?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rioux, could I ask you to follow through your brief at a slightly slower pace. Those of us who are listening to the translation are noticing that the translator is having a little difficulty keeping up with your rapid pace.

MR. G. RIOUX: Pardon me for my French.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No problem. It's our problem, not your problem.

MR. G. RIOUX: You can understand, I'm sure, why our association has been and will remain skeptical about promises and alleged guarantees made by the authorities. Our experience tells us that it is indispensable for Francophone rights to be entrenched in the Canadian Constitution. It is essential that the law of the land should protect those rights from authorities who do not share our goals and aspirations.

Therefore, let it be well understood and made a matter of record that our association supports the agreement negotiated in May 1983 by the Société franco-manitobaine and by the federal and provincial governments.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rioux. Any questions by members of the Committee?
Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Rioux: Mr. Rioux, have you been made aware of recent amendments that the province proposed on the 6th of September to that agreement that was negotiated in May?

MR. G. RIOUX: Certainly, sir.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Are you in favour, then, of exempting municipalities and school boards from the proposal that is presently before us?

MR. G. RIOUX: I am in favour of the entrenchment of rights as agreed in May. And in May, nobody mentioned school boards or municipalities, and I respect the proposals that were made at that time.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would it be fair then for me to assume that you are not in favour then of the exemption of school boards and municipalities from those provisions?

MR. G. RIOUX: You're asking whether we are not in favour?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Of exempting school boards and municipalities from those provisions?

MR. G. RIOUX: Since 1970, I believe, your government has permitted French instruction in the schools. So we have our right to French education already, up to a point. As for the administration of our school boards, that's a different matter. And also, at the request of the parents - the parents aren't satisfied.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to know, since there have been amendments made to this, if your association has expressed any concern about the amendments that have been put forward that would exclude school boards from having their rights entrenched, as the suggestion of the Attorney-General would have a change made in Section 23.7?

MR. G. RIOUX: From the beginning, ever since there has been an agreement - since the agreement was reached by the Société franco-manitobaine, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government - from the beginning, school boards and municipalities have been excluded. So we are in favour of the entrenchment and the May agreement. We do not agree with the amendments proposed in June or September. We do not agree with those amendments. And that is the only reply I can give you, sir.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Graham. Does anyone else on the committee have any questions for Mr. Rioux?

Hearing none, I would like again to ask a question to follow up on the question asked by Mr. Graham, if I may have the indulgence of the committee.

Mr. Rioux, in terms of the question Mr. Graham has asked you, you replied, and I want to clarify this question with you, that you understood that the agreement between the Government of Canada, the Province of Manitoba, M. Bilodeau and the Société franco-manitobaine completely excluded school boards and municipalities. Is that correct, the agreement of the 17th of May?

MR. G. RIOUX: It was understood. It was implicit that school boards and municipalities were excluded - implicit. It wasn't written into the text.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that it was understood by all four parties to the agreement that school boards and municipalities were excluded?

MR. G. RIOUX: It was a concession, a negotiated point, a concession.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since that was agreed to, why would you, following up from Mr. Graham's question, take exception and disagree with an amendment which is proposed to put that in the actual text so it is clearer for those who were not sure?

MR. G. RIOUX: Because you have changed the text with your amendments to the first part of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madame Savard.

MS. C. SAVARD: Well, the thing that was implicit, the point is, it was a negotiated concession - and, as a school trustee, having been to many consultation committee meetings when I was president of the trustees last year, it was a point that was always coming up. And the explanation that we were always given was that it was a bargaining point. Now, as I see it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madame Savard, could you pull the microphone more closely to you? The interpreter is having difficulty. Could you begin again?

MS. C. SAVARD: When negotiations and consultations were going on between the Société franco-manitobaine and the Franco-Manitoban agencies, the question was always asked, "And what about the school board?" Well, in the text of what was negotiated in May, obviously there were concessions made. It was an agreement. Now the municipalities, the school boards were never mentioned, in the text of outside it, but in an implicit way we were given to understand that they were not included. Now I can see a difference since the amendment of September 6th, where there are two or three things - first, there's No. 1 which says that it's not clear if we just say that the province is bilingual and also No. 7 where it says "remove the word 'or pursuant to'" after "established by" - these are things which have been changed. It looks a little different to me now. Things have been changed, and not just the words that exclude the school boards and the municipalities. Words have also been changed in other places and that changes the idea, or the ideal, of the agreement a little bit. And for us, as an association, once we've said we don't agree with the amendments, then it's really not fair to take them apart piece by piece, because an agreement should be taken as a whole, and as a member of the Francophone community, I think that the amendments have to be seen as a unit. In my opinion, it is really unfair to start saying, all right, so do you agree with this part here or with that other part there. We are not here to negotiate an agreement. We simply state that we were in favour of the May agreement and that we are sticking to it. If the time comes to renegotiate, then we can look at the words, and maybe talk about it again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, further questions? Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to clarify what you said, if it is not already clear, since I think I understood quite well, but I am not sure whether your reply satisfied the Chairman. I understood - and you can say whether you agree or not - I understood you to say that what you support is the agreement as it was reached in May. It's not only the fact that it explicitly excludes municipalities and school boards that makes you disagree with the amendment of September 6th, but the totality of the subamendments that were proposed on that date. Am I right?

MR. G. RIOUX: Exactly.

MS. C. SAVARD: It's really not fair to take - I see it as an agreement, and at a public hearing - just to take a little word here or there, it's really not fair to our association to ask us to comment on a point like that.

No. 18 - English Translation of Mr. G. Wachsmann's presentation as recorded on Page 452; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 25 - 2:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Wachsmann, in your opinion, the simultaneous translation service provided here today, is it provided . . .

MR. G. WACHSMANN: I'm sorry, I did not hear.

MR. G. LECUYER: I will repeat the question. The simultaneous translation service which has been planned for and provided here today, is it, in your opinion, provided for me, who can communicate in both languages and understand both languages, if you wish to speak to me in both languages, as it was provided for Mr. Forest when he gave his brief, or is it for the others who were there who could not communicate in both languages, as it is provided for you here today and not for me?

MR. G. WACHSMANN: I think the answer is very plain. I think in a community where there are a large number of French-speaking citizens such as the community of Ste. Rose, I think that bilingual services and translation services are in order and are excellent. I think they're for the benefit of everyone, not just for my benefit and not just for your benefit, but for the benefit of everyone. I think I get more out of a meeting when I am able to understand what the person is saying. Similarly, that those who speak French, if it had been translated into French, could have been able to get more out of it. I think that is very acceptable and a very good level of applied majority rule. We're in a community where the majority or where many people speak French or are predominantly French. I think that's the kind of service I'm talking about. I don't think we need to entrench it in order to give it.

No. 19 - English Translation of Ms. J. Archambault's presentation as recorded on Page 455; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 26 - 7:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MS. J. ARCHAMBULT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I would say at the outset that I want simply to read my brief and not to answer questions afterwards.

Welcome to Ste. Rose du Lac.

Contrary to statements printed in the Winnipeg Sun, the Winnipeg Free Press and the Dauphin Herald a few months ago, the French fact is not dead in Ste. Rose.

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that your committee may discover just that; the Francophone reality which still exists in Ste. Rose. It is true that in this village only the bank and the post office have bilingual signs, but that does not mean that the people are no longer Francophones. You have to know what is going on within people. An individual's heritage is not illustrated by a little sign on a building.

The feeling of belonging to a culture is not expressed by the mere flow of ink from a Bic pen. This is a profound internal feeling that you must discover in individuals who hold dear their past and their mother tongue, handed down to them through many generations.

According to some, the removal of several thousand French titles from the stacks of the Ste. Rose Regional Library would mean there is no more interest in French in this region? That is untrue. First of all, those titles dated from long ago. They were old, outdated books. An inferior French service will never be used.

Ladies and gentlemen, we do want services in French. But please, let them be equal in quality to those offered in English. This is why I support the agreement negotiated in May between the Manitoba Government and the Franco-Manitoban Society, one which will ensure services in French to the French-speaking

population of Manitoba. I would add that the Franco-Manitoban Society is indeed the association which represents me and the whole of Manitoba's Francophone population. What the Franco-Manitoban Society negotiated is in the interests of Franco-Manitobans. The Manitoba Government has understood this and we cannot but support the steps that it has taken to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Ladies and gentlemen, I said a moment ago that I hoped that you might discover, here in Ste. Rose, the French fact. Several people who have come before you have given proof of it. Others will do the same shortly. I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that your discoveries will be as rich as those of Pierre Gauthier de Varennes de La Vérendrye who discovered, more than two and a half centuries ago, this wonderful part of the country, Ste. Rose du Lac and district.

No. 20 - English Translation of Sr. H. St. Amant's presentation as recorded on Page 455-56; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 26 - 7:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

SR. H. ST. AMANT: Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. In 1870 the inhabitants of the Red River Colony, of their own free will and as equals, incorporated themselves with the people of Canada. At that time we were Scottish, Métis, American Indian, English, French - The Manitoba Act and The British North America Act guaranteed, and continues to guarantee, the rights of the Anglophone and Francophone cultures. A few decades later, Liberal Governments - those of Mr. Greenway at the provincial, and Mr. Laurier at the federal levels decided to nullify the guarantees of the Constitution, against the judgment of the British Parliament, and in spite of the written intervention of Pope Leo XIII. This is not simply a case of Francophone rights, it is one in which we face the fact that a grave injustice has been perpetrated and has been endured for 93 years. More recently, with the adoption of Bill 101 in Quebec, we have seen the linguistic rights of our Quebec-Anglophone brothers diminished in their turn. The rights of Canadians, whether they be Francophones or Anglophones, are not for sale in exchange for political gain. As for the other cultural groups, how can they even dare to hope that they will be able to claim rights of this kind when rights already recognized by the Constitution are not being upheld? We should recall that before 1890, several multicultural Teacher's Training Colleges existed, which were suppressed for various reasons. And finally the French language schools were suppressed. In this century, with the restoration of the French language schools, we have witnessed the appearance of multilingual education systems. Other minority cultures need us, therefore, in order to uphold their rights, and we need them, so as to form a common front to remind governments of their duty to observe the Constitution.

An amendment has been proposed to us, that is saying a great deal. We must infer that the Constitution alone is not sufficient. That is a great pity, but it is clear, from listening to Mr. Sterling Lyon, head of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, that this is unfortunately the case. Is amendment 23 sufficient? Will it be sufficient in the future? Perhaps. But reading

over the amendment as it was presented by the new Democratic Government on the 4th of July, I very much doubt it.

What is this business of substituting "within such time as may be reasonably required," for the word "forthwith" as it appears in Section 23.8(4)? Does "such time as may be reasonably required" really mean "another 93 years of injustice?"

I therefore support the amendment that the New Democratic Government intended to formulate in May with the help of the Société franco-manitobaine.

Thank you very much.

No. 21 - English Translation of Mr. O. Pelletier's presentation as recorded on Page 456-57; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 26 - 7:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. O. PELLETIER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a moment please. Go ahead.

MR. O. PELLETIER: I find it ludicrous that we should have to debate the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act today. The services that this amendment guarantees us are services that should already have been ours many years ago.

Our beloved province was built, from the beginning, on a Francophone foundation. The voyageurs, the first inhabitants of St. Boniface (unfortunately now Winnipeg), the first farmers, the first delegates to the Canadian Parliament, were French-speaking Manitobans. At the time of their entry into Confederation, Franco-Manitobans were in the majority. They therefore assumed that their children would live their lives in the language of their parents, without a Constitution.

What misfortune has taken place, so that today I am obliged to stand before you to show my support for things that are already mine? I will tell you, gentlemen of the committee, we have been stripped of our rights by narrow-minded, intolerant people who have little concern for their neighbours' or even for their children's culture.

Today I urge you, gentlemen of the committee, to make the amendments to Section 23 a part of Manitoba law (I won't be offended, in spite of my earlier comments), so that my children and yours will not suffer the same fate that was served by Manitoba upon my parents and grandparents. It's true that laws can be revoked, but we will be vigilant in the future. We will keep away from the lion's den.

I support the agreement negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine with the Pawley Government, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Mr. Pelletier from the committee? Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: In English please. I am a new student in French, and I speak English better than I speak French. So excuse me. What is the reference to the

lion pit here? Is that a reference to the Leader of the Conservative Party, sir?

Page 457:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question?

MR. A. KOVNATS: A question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I have a question, and it will come a little bit later.

No. 22 - English Translation of Mr. H. Molgat's presentation as recorded on Page 457; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 26 - 7:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MR. H. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, allow me to share with you some of my thoughts about the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

The Société franco-manitobaine, having the interests of Franco-Manitobans at hearts, has negotiated an agreement with the Federal and Provincial Governments. In this agreement, justice and respect for the rights of Franco-Manitobans prevail. The proposals cannot but contribute to Franco-Manitoban development.

We are proud of the work of the Société franco-manitobaine, and of what it has accomplished. The Société deserves our confidence, and our support, for the work which it has done so well.

The agreement in question is very reasonable. It provides acceptable time limits for the government to make the few necessary changes. It is important to note that these time limits are acceptable to the government, as well as to the Francophone population. So why does the government now seem so reluctant to adhere to the agreement? If the situation is not resolved in a friendly way, the only real loser will be the Manitoba Government. If litigation were to be before the courts, Franco-Manitobans would be certain to win, and it would be the government that would find itself in trouble. "Legal Chaos" could turn out to be very costly for Manitoba.

We must do all we can to avoid such a situation. Let's make an effort to solve the problem before it's too late.

I support the agreement that was negotiated in May on The Manitoba Act, and I hope that you, Mr. Chairman, and you, the members of the committee, will do likewise.

Thank you.

No. 23 - English Translation of Ms. C. Gingras's presentation as recorded on Pages 457-58; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 26 - 7:00 p.m., Friday, 16 September, 1983.

MS. C. GINGRAS: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, before starting my brief, I would like to say that I don't want any questions.

After a moment of reflection, I decided, without hesitation, to come to present this brief in my own words.

I have been living in Laurier for 20 years and I am the mother of seven children. It is with great pleasure that I tell you that I am from Quebec. When I decided to come to Manitoba, I never thought that it would be so necessary to fight to safeguard our French language.

In my opinion, we, the French Canadians of Manitoba, have not come to ask a favour. We ask for justice.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is about time that the government redress the injustices done to Franco-Manitobans. Is it so difficult to understand that we have rights?

Looking backwards we recognize that our North American ancestors were French. Moreover, in 1870 when Manitoba entered the Canadian Federation, The Manitoba Act made French and English the official languages of the new province. It was with audacity that, in 1890, a bill was adopted which abolished French as an official language. However, I can say that we are victorious. In 1970, through Bill 113, French was established as an official language of instruction in Manitoba.

Since that time, continuous effort has been made to stifle the French language. The real question here is, "Do you have the right to do this?" Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the answer is no.

Personally, I must say that my mother tongue is very dear to me. I hope that I may never see the day when I would have to repudiate my ancestors, that is to say, to accept only partial recognition of French, to see French considered as inferior, and I would even dare to say, to think that French is a language that one ought to abstain from using in public. French is not a contagious disease!

I remember that when I first came to Manitoba, things were not always easy. I did not speak English and it was frustrating. Today I have managed to master English well enough and I am happy.

This is why I would like to see my children become bilingual. When I say bilingual, I mean that French and English be treated on an equal footing.

Mr. Chairman, my children attend Laurier School, a French school in the Turtle River School Division. After Grade 9 we were forced to send our children to St. Boniface to have them complete their French education. I would like to know what purpose is served by these sacrifices and efforts. I would like to be assured that my children will be happy and proud to speak French, their language. For this, we must obtain services in French in Manitoba. It will have to be possible for us to communicate freely in French when we, the Franco-Manitobans, go to school boards, municipalities, police stations, hospitals and many other places. We should also feel free to write letters in French, regardless to whom they are written.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that it is humiliating to go to a shopping center, pay by cheque and be made to write English above the French. That is almost an attack on our personality.

Franco-Manitobans must, at any cost, have their rights restored if the government truly wants Manitoba to be a thriving province.

Today it is my duty to support the agreement to amend Section 23, such as it was negotiated by the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Provincial and Federal governments in May.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Mme. Gingras.

Gentlemen, that concludes the list of individuals who had registered with the committee. I will ask one more time if any of those who have been absent have now arrived. Reeve Schmidt; Marvin Procyshyn; Adélaré Quimet; Ray Murray; Willis Ayers; Reeve Nestor Slonowski; Dave Dohan; Louise Dumont; Alfred Dressler.

Is there anyone else in the audience who wishes to make a presentation to the committee who has not registered with the Clerk? If you wish to make a presentation, please come forward.

Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman. This is just a comment. I simply wanted to thank Mme. Gingras for her testimony which I believe was very sincere and very personal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No. 24 - English Translation of Mr. O. Chartier's presentation as recorded on Page 566-67; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 31 - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, 20 September, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Omer Chartier. Mr. Chartier, I understand your brief will be in French.

MR. O. CHARTIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask for a 5-minute recess so that members of the audience can approach the technician beside the translation booth to pick up receivers so they can understand the English translation of the French.

Committee come to order. Mr. Chartier, please proceed.

MR. O. CHARTIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, my name is Omer Chartier and I represent the Village of St. Lazare as mayor. What follows here is my brief. Unfortunately, I apologize for not having circulated it earlier for translation purposes; perhaps that would have been easier.

Our little Village of St. Lazare is located on the border between Saskatchewan and Manitoba in a valley at the confluence of the Qu'Appelle and Assiniboine Rivers.

Two distinct characteristics unite and blend together to make our village a true Manitoba gem. First, it's unique geographical position always remains very dear to the memories of visitors. How can this magnificent valley, this dynamic village, cradled as it is by a picturesque circle of hills, be forgotten? But this is far from being the sole remarkable characteristic of our home - the village is very proud indeed to be home to a true Francophone community.

According to the 1981 census, 57 percent of St. Lazare's population recognizes French as its mother tongue. Despite its isolation, this French-speaking population has always done its best to impress its Francophone mark upon other parts of the province.

Our brief here today is a visible expression of this. But, if St. Lazare can be highly proud of its present day Francophone characteristics, it owes a tribute to the ardent work of the French and Métis pioneers who blazed the first trails.

St. Lazare was founded in 1875 by Father DeCorby. He named the mission after the village in France from which he came. At first, all the inhabitants were either Métis or Indians. Their contribution to the founding of our village is inestimable. In 1880 other families, such as the O'Keefes of Ontario, eventually joined them. Two years later, the Tremblay and DeCorby families arrived. In 1888, the Simards arrived and they were followed by the Chartier and Guay families in 1889. These families came from Quebec and France. In 1893, the Fouillard family arrived, followed by the Huberdeaus in 1903.

By that year, St. Lazare already accounted for more than 50 homesteads, 22 occupied by Métis, 28 by French Canadians. The historical role of Francophones in our village is, therefore, not in question.

The trials and difficulties that these brave people endured have been documented at length in the countless histories of the pioneer families of Manitoba.

Still, St. Lazare's history cannot be told without mentioning Fort Ellice. Fort Ellice was erected in 1831 on one of the hills overlooking the valley that cradles our village. This fort, built by the Hudson's Bay Company, was established primarily to carry out trade with the Indian tribes. But of equal importance, for more than 60 years, it was a main stopping-off point for the voyageurs who covered the endless distance between Fort Garry and the other forts farther west, such as Fort Esperance, which I haven't mentioned. Those voyageurs who were crossing the White Horse Plains expected to stop at Fort Ellice before continuing on to Fort Carlton. Fort Ellice and St. Lazare are thus inscribed in Manitoba's history as having been veritable gateways, opening towards Saskatchewan and the entire west, making the Carlton Trail to the west all the more practicable.

Having worked hard in this way to earn its rightful historical place in the creation of this province, the Village of St. Lazare claims its right today to express an opinion on a question that is as fundamental as the one presently the subject of these discussions. But we would hesitate to come here today, showing so much zeal, if our village were not a living proof of the Francophone dynamism for which it is well known.

It is true that our historical reality tells of the long voyages and the efforts of the French and Métis settlers who built St. Lazare. This reality is the very basis of another, more contemporary truth - the existence of French in St. Lazare in this the latter part of the 20th Century.

Given all these issues - excuse me, I mean, these facts - the Village of St. Lazare feels entirely justified in being represented here today to support the amendment proposal to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it was negotiated between the Société Franco-manitobaïne and the Government of Manitoba, and concluded in the month of May.

And let me say "justified," for we find it difficult to understand those people who hesitate to offer their support to this proposal which aims at reinstating the constitutional rights of Francophones, and all the more so, since all of this takes nothing away from our Anglophone friends. Indeed we are somewhat dismayed at the rather short-sighted attitude of those fellow Manitoba municipalities which reacted negatively to this agreement that binds them in no way at all.

Furthermore, we are pleased to learn that the municipalities that may take the brilliant step of offering services in French will have the costs of the services defrayed by the governments.

Why, then, do we have all this confusion which, surely, is based solely on fears arising from imagination run wild?

Mr. Chairman, the Council of the Village of St. Lazare supports the Government of Manitoba in its desire to adopt the resolution whose negotiations were concluded in the month of May. We are in agreement, Mr. Chairman, that giving back to the Francophone citizens of our village what is their right, without removing the slightest thing from their fellow Anglophone citizens, is a laudable action worthy of a just and honest government.

The French language is not dead in our village and the council I represent is fully aware of that fact. We want this Francophone dynamism to remain, for numerous future generations, one of the unique characteristics of the village we call our home. The proposed amendments to Section 23 will nourish this dynamism.

But above all, do not believe that our isolation limits our horizons. We can indeed see beyond the hills of our village. We see what such an amendment proposal means for all of Manitoba. Our province is rediscovering the true constitutional agreements of its origins. The province is rediscovering its historical reality which it is restoring in a tangible and real perspective. What could be simpler for a province wanting to be assured of a promising future than to reaffirm the essential aspect of its constitutional and judicial reality? Those numerous pioneers of days long gone by certainly had at heart the future of their new province. If they conferred specific rights upon certain segments of the population, it was because of mutual respect, that same respect that will be the ties that bind the future of our province.

This increased tolerance and happy awakening will promote the flourishing of the mosaic that delineates the multiple cultural framework of today's Manitoba. What better promise could there be for the future?

No, Mr. Chairman, the Village of St. Lazare is not only thinking of its own small island near Saskatchewan. The Village of St. Lazare is first, and above all else, a Manitoba village and it will be all the prouder to call itself so when the agreement concluded in May is adopted by the Government of Manitoba.

At that time St. Lazare will be able to quote again the words of Abbé Maillard, a pioneer missionary: "And that is how Saint Lazare, whose name exhales death, now inspires the idea of resurrection."

This brings to a close the prepared text, Mr. Chairman. I would like to allude to a few points that were brought forward during the three hours I have been here, that is, one fact in particular that was mentioned by, I believe, Mayor McKinnon of Virden, who, in response to a question from Mr. Graham, I believe, said that the French language had perhaps changed somewhat over the last 10 or 15 years. One thing that has not been mentioned here, and this goes back 25 years, is that, personally, when I went to school at home in our Village of St. Lazare, when the French class began, if an inspector happened to be around, an inspector from our province I mean, of course, we had to hide our

French books. This is not the case anymore and for that I praise the governments that have been in power since I left school.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No. 25 - English Translation of Mrs. L. Chartier's presentation as recorded on Page 571; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 31 - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, 20 September, 1983.

MRS. L. CHARTIER: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen and ladies. I am Lucille Chartier and I am the mother of a family who wishes to express her point of view.

My reason for coming before you at these public hearings is that I believe there is too much at stake to allow me to remain silent. The question goes far beyond the survival of the Franco-Manitoban population. It is a question that involves the whole of Manitoba's population.

The fate of the community depends on it. The laws that abolished the use of French in Manitoba have been declared unconstitutional. If we continue to respect unconstitutional laws, it means the end of our judicial system.

The basis of our civilization is anchored on the judicial system. We cannot, therefore, continue to observe laws that so threaten our society. These repressive acts which have no just basis, must be banished forever.

Franco-Manitobans have experienced injustice for 90 years. They have been patient all this time. We owe it to them to amend those acts which, little by little, are leading them to a sure death.

The Société franco-manitobaine has acted in the interest of the group it represents. The agreement concluded on May 17th means justice for Franco-Manitobans and also for the Provincial Government. It is an advantageous agreement for all the concerned parties.

I strongly support the agreement concluded on May 17, 1983. I hope, gentlemen, you will do the same.

Thank you.

No. 26 - English Translation of Mr. M. Deschambault's presentation as recorded on Page 571; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 31 - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, 20 September, 1983.

MR. M. DESCHAMBAULT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

The joy that I felt upon the announcement of the agreement concluded on May 17th was very short lived. Demonstrations of distrust, hatred and slander followed and now they have resulted in these public hearings.

Franco-Manitobans now find themselves at the mercy of a population that cannot grasp the significance of an injustice committed about 90 years ago. The injustice eludes them because it occurred so long ago that what it really means has been forgotten. The population no longer perceives the injustice and so it denies it. Denial is a defence mechanism used mainly by those who suffer from a feeling of insecurity. How can we accept that some people's insecurity should determine the future of others? This is quite a bizarre way to go about things, but it is accepted by many people.

Where will all this lead us? I have absolutely no idea. The only thing I am sure of is that the proposed agreement must, in the name of justice, be accepted without any further delay.

I support the agreement concluded on May 17th because it is just and beneficial. Those who believe in justice owe it to themselves to support the agreement negotiated between the Société franco-manitobaine and the Federal and Provincial Governments.

Thank you.

No. 27 - English Translation of Mr. G. Grenier's presentation as recorded on Page 604; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 33 - 10:00 a.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. G. GRENIER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as a native and current resident of a small Franco-Manitoban town, I feel it is my conscious duty to appear before you and attempt to convince you to keep and implement the agreement concerning Section 23 negotiated by the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Société franco-manitobaine.

My grandfather arrived in St. Leon in 1903. He had come from Quebec and had chosen to settle in St. Leon for two main reasons. Firstly, St. Leon and the surrounding areas were completely French. Given the fact that he did not speak English, it was very important to him to be able to live in French. Secondly, St. Leon offered the opportunity to live a better life, even if farming was a difficult way of life at the time.

My grandfather died without having learned English, as did many other settlers of various backgrounds. Manitoba was established as a bilingual province in 1870. Twenty years later the province repealed Francophone rights. Throughout this period, Manitoba continued to welcome settlers from various countries.

Today, Manitoba is made up of various cultural groups, all proud of their forefathers, many still speaking their language. Manitoba is a multicultural province - nobody can deny that. Nor can anybody deny that Manitoba is officially French and English. This was established in 1870 and confirmed by the Supreme Court decision on the Forest case.

The law is one thing - reality is another. Growing, working and living in French in Manitoba remains a challenge for Franco-Manitobans, although it is their right to do so in many cases. Many Francophones no doubt recall the French contests that were organized and held on a provincial level in order to maintain a certain standard of French. In 1967, the Roblin Conservative Government removed the "illegal" status by partially reinstating French as a language of instruction in our schools. This improved the situation somewhat. In 1970, Bill 113 established French as an official language of instruction equal to English. In 1979, the Forest case gave Francophones new hope. This, gentlemen, is the point at which we now find ourselves.

You have, no doubt, heard many reasons outlining why Francophones want Section 23 entrenched in the Constitution with the amendments agreed to on May 17th. You've heard historical reasons, legal reasons and emotional reasons. Mine do not differ that much, but I will take the liberty of explaining a few of them.

This section must be entrenched because history has clearly shown that governments change often. The status of a language is, therefore, always at the mercy of those persons making up the government. Instability slows progress in all areas.

The Franco-Manitoban community has attempted for quite some time to expand the use of French, not only to develop the language but because it is necessary. The use of French is a very important factor - something that is proven by the presence of French in the east of our country. In addition, the rapid growth of immersion schools in Manitoba suggests that other Manitobans also recognize this need.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, defending the agreement reached on May 17th is an emotional struggle. It is a struggle to defend the fundamental rights of all the Francophones who came to settle Manitoba and who left this beautiful province as their legacy to us. Justice must triumph.

Thank you.

No. 28 - English Translation of Mr. A. St. Hilaire's presentation as recorded on Pages 621-23; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 34 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. A. ST. HILAIRE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. My name is Albert St. Hilaire. I am Reeve of the Rural Municipality of Montcalm and am appearing before you today on behalf of this municipality.

As municipal officials, we have studied the matter carefully, and not in a state of fear, misinformation or impending confusion. Certain organizations and individuals invited us to present our views and opinions on the subject under discussion here today. I fear that these same people who would like to think of us as antagonists and prophets of doom and gloom will be disappointed.

Last year, the Rural Municipality of Montcalm celebrated its 100th anniversary. If you will permit me, I would like to present a few striking facts. The majority of Montcalm's residents have always been French-speaking. We, like many others, have struggled long and hard to achieve what we have today, and we are proud of it.

Initially, it would have been difficult to find a family that was not French speaking. Today 67 percent of our population is French speaking. This did not happen accidentally, it was planned. Most of the French-speaking families living in Montcalm today trace their ancestors back to New England, in particular the states of Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

These people originally lived in Quebec, and one might wonder how they came to settle in Manitoba. The answer is simple. They were told that with The Manitoba Act of 1870 they would be guaranteed the right to practice their religion and to educate their children in their own language. In addition, they would be able to communicate with a number of their MLA's in French, since 12 of the 24 members were French speaking at the time. They would also be able to leave behind the depression and factories of New England and begin a new life in a new province.

Today, we are discussing the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870. The current government is aware of the fact that past governments have been breaking the law. It does not want to perpetuate this injustice, and I would like to extend my congratulations to the government for this. The proposed agreement is not perfect. However, it is a

workable agreement that can serve to redress past injustices. The proposed agreement offers services rather than the needless translation of some 4,000 statutes. It is a practical agreement based on good old common sense.

Some people oppose the entrenchment of French Language Services because they fear it would remove powers from the Legislature and grant them to the courts. Well, so be it. I, for my part, feel that minority rights have not been well-respected by this Legislature and, as a member of a minority, prefer to entrust my rights to those whose duty is to see that justice is done, rather than remain at the mercy of those who in the past, but hopefully not in the future, allowed themselves to be influenced by a sense of intolerance, unfounded fears and a perverted sense of superiority.

In any event, our legislators will still be able to amend the agreement in the future if it proves to be unsatisfactory, as long as the two higher levels of government agree that changes are necessary.

With regard to the concerns of certain municipalities, I am at a loss to understand on what these concerns are based. The wording is clear, municipalities are excluded. Yet some people, for lack of a better idea, have suggested that there is a plot to encourage a plan other than the one that has been proposed. I think it would be fair to say that there are people who would be against this agreement, regardless of its contents.

There are still others who believe in the existence of a sinister plot to turn Canada into a French state and Manitoba into a French province. This brings to light a very blatant contradiction. Some people say that French Language Services aren't warranted because there are too few Francophones, while others fear that Francophones might take power. In my opinion, these ideas border on the ridiculous, and I would like these opponents to get organized once and for all.

Montcalm and certain other municipalities have been offering English Language Services for as long as I can remember. Yet this hasn't created any chaos. The Francophone minority did not offer these services as a matter of courtesy, but chose to recognize that the minority has a right to be served by its municipality in the official language of its choice.

Montcalm is located in the area that would be affected by the terms of the proposed agreement. We would certainly benefit from the financial assistance granted by the higher levels of government to enable us to offer better services, and would be grateful for this assistance. In Montcalm we are doing more than this - we are already offering services in the language of our minority.

I cannot help but make a brief reference to the call for a referendum. There are some who say that if we can have a referendum on the nuclear question, we can also have one on amendments to Section 23. These people have overlooked a number of points. The nuclear issue is one which concerns all of humanity, and a referendum held in Winnipeg on the issue would not provide a solution to the problem, it would simply give people the opportunity to express their opinion. Given the misinformation, as well as the lack of information that exist on the question of language rights, I fear that the effect of a referendum on this question would be to once again deny the rights of a minority to an official language of this country.

In a democratic society, is it fair to ask 95 percent of the population to decide the fate of a minority of 5 percent? A referendum decides matters by the sheer weight of numbers. If the United States had put the rights of its black population to a vote in and following 1860, I have a sneaking suspicion that these rights would have been voted down.

It is the duty of legislators to make decisions and in so doing to protect those who need protection because their numbers are not great enough. Let us not allow the rights of a minority to be decided on the basis of heated debates, or permit Manitoba to take on a notorious position in the eyes of other Canadians. If people really want to hold referendums why don't they have on on the willingness of Manitobans to pay taxes!

Not only Manitoba, but all of Canada is eagerly awaiting the outcome of this question. Manitoba can set an example and show that past injustices can be corrected. People will admire a government that can say, "This agreement may not meet with everyone's approval at the present time, but it is the best solution we have to deal with an old and complicated problem."

As a person who has been involved in municipal politics for 19 years, I would like to close with the following message. For a politician there are worse things than the prospect of losing votes; namely, losing the respect and faith of the people, and creating the impression that the opinions of those whose voices are the loudest matter the most, regardless of the issue in question or of the consequences. As Canadians let us make a fair and rational decision on this issue.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Reeve St. Hilaire. Questions for Reeve St. Hilaire.
Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. St. Hilaire, on Page 2, paragraph three of the French version of your brief you stated: "As a member of a minority, I prefer to entrust my rights to those whose duty is to see that justice is done, rather than remain at the mercy of those who in the past . . . "etc.

In the English version, Mr. St. Hilaire, I think there has been a word left out or a mistranslation, or a typing error, and would you not agree that in the equivalent paragraph in the sentence "Experience has taught minorities to trust the courts more than Legislatures, for my part I would rather . . ." - would you not agree the word "not" is to be placed right after rather? Rather "not" place if you were going to have the same translation as you have in French?

MR. A. ST. HILAIRE: Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lecuyer, to answer to your questions, this brief was typed yesterday. It was done very quickly, and being that our Assistant Secretary-Treasurer is on holidays at the present time, we had to get somebody in to do the typing and I do admit there's a few errors in my brief.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. St. Hilaire in order to convey in the English version what you expressed in the French version, do you agree that the word "not" would have to be inserted following "rather" in the English version?

MR. A. ST. HILAIRE: Yes.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you. Another question, Mr. St. Hilaire. Mr. St. Hilaire, you state you have consulted with the members of your municipal council in presenting this brief. Can I ask you if there are English-speaking members on the council?

MR. A. ST. HILAIRE: To answer your question, my municipal council is composed of two municipal councillors who are not of French descent, or not speaking French.

No. 29 - English Translation of Mr. H. Bouvier's presentation as recorded on Page 631; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 34 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. H. BOUVIER: Just a matter of order, I write my name with an "i" and not a "y."

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I am appearing before the committee here today as the councillor for the unincorporated Village of St. Leon. For those who may not be aware of what an unincorporated village is, it is a village that has not yet attained complete status as a municipality, but which is, nevertheless, autonomous in a number of areas. We have legal status in "The Municipal Act," our councillors are elected on the same basis as municipal councillors and we manage our own public finances.

Recently, certain municipalities and some municipal leaders have spoken out against the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. The Village of St. Leon would like to express here today, that it completely rejects the arguments brought forth by the municipalities as well as certain elected officials. We unequivocally support the original agreement reached by the Société Franco-Manitobaine, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government last May.

The Village of St. Leon was established in 1879, and was the first community in the Pembina Hills area. Our village has experienced a number of crises during its more than 100 year existence. It even came close to disappearing at one time. Despite this, our village survived and is among the most prosperous commercial centers in the area today. One of the traits which has distinguished our community more than any other throughout our history is the French fact. The majority of our citizens are Francophone and proud of it. We do not see that offering French Language Services creates any inconveniences. Moreover, the administration of our village is done in French. Couldn't the same be done elsewhere with just a bit of good will?

All we are asking is that the official minority of the province of Manitoba be treated with justice. I don't think that's too much to ask.

In conclusion, I would like to quote a few lines from a speech given by Mr. Lecuyer, the MLA for Radisson, in the House last July 15th:

"Personally, I cannot, in all fairness, accept for the generations to come less than that which is provided for in this resolution. Francophones of Manitoba have already lived 100 years of injustice. Never, never will

they give up the struggle. If they do not receive justice from today's government, they will not hesitate to continue the struggle to ensure that their rights are respected."

We support this view wholeheartedly.

I would like to congratulate the government in its effort to protect and assure the rights of the official minority. I cannot understand the people asking for a referendum on the rights of a minority.

No. 30 - English Translation of Mr. E. Lansky's presentation as recorded on Page 632; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 34 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. E. LANSKY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, if I am not mistaken, the last time I appeared before a committee of the Manitoba Government was in 1958 or 1959 here in Morden. Mr. Lyon was the Minister of Justice in the Roblin Government. At that time, my purpose as representative of the Chamber of Commerce in Carman was to attempt to keep the Land Titles Office in Carman. Unfortunately, Mr. Lyon is not here today. He may recall, however, that it was a lost cause. I hope that my appearance here today will be more successful.

No. 31 - English translation of Ms. A. McEachern's presentation as recorded on Page 638; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MS. A. MCEACHERN: Let me assure you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that I haven't lost my ability to speak French. And I guarantee you that I have no intention of losing it.

No. 32 - English translation of Ms. Marie-Blanche Oliviero's presentation as recorded on Page 640 and 641; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MS. M.B. OLIVIERO: I am going to speak in Canadian because it's my birthright. I am the ninth generation of our family on both my mother's and father's side to be born in Canada, and I congratulate the . . .

MR. R. DOERN: I think that there are some people caught off guard and there may be new people . . . perhaps you can explain to the audience that they can get a translation set or maybe we should take a two minute break.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. For those who either do not have receivers or are not familiar with the fact that they are available, we'll take a short recess. Anyone wishing to have a receiver so that they can understand the presentation being made can pick them up beside the translation booth.

(RECESS)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Madame Oliviero, please proceed.

MS. M.B. OLIVIERO: I will repeat what I said. I have decided to speak in Canadian because it is my

birthright. We are the ninth generation born in Canada, on both sides of our family, and I congratulate the Government of Manitoba for our being closer to realizing our dream of no longer needing to fight to speak French and for our children, all of the children of Manitoba, being able to speak French immediately upon starting school.

For me, French is really something I take for granted. Earlier, in Grey Municipality, it was said, we never ask for services in French. In St. Claude, the majority of people are 95 percent, so we're always speaking French. To our two councillors, there's one in St. Claude and one in Haywood, we always speak French. Whatever we have to ask, we ask in French and that works the same way as it works here today. The councillors make their report to the council and so, when the mayor says we never ask for anything in French, it's because we take it for granted. So, I think that we're maybe too French in St. Claude; that we don't ask for enough . . . but we certainly do need it. We should continue, we should be free to speak in either language.

I was raised . . . , we Canadiens, we didn't know what was better and the English language was for commerce. It was commercial. It was for making deals and that was the way we were raised. So I congratulate Mr. Pawley's Government for being closer . . . we don't have to defend anymore what's been given us.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Madame Olivier. Questions from members of the committee?

Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Just one question, I didn't quite understand what you were saying earlier in reference to services at the municipal level. Are you saying that, because 95 percent of the town is French, you're used to working in French, so when you speak to your municipal council representatives you're used to speaking French? Where this breaks down is that, between the council and the townsfolk there isn't any service or communication in French because only English is spoken on the municipal council?

MS. M.B. OLIVIERO: Yes, St. Claude is an incorporated town. It has four councillors and a mayor. I think it's just one thing, the same thing that's being done here today. I think that all the discussions are in French and then, on paper, it's written in English. So for us rural folks, both our councillors are French and when they go to Elm Creek, in Grey Municipality, it's still the same thing over again. So definitely, Grey Municipality is French. We communicate with - and I'm sure Fannystelle is the same - I'm sure in St. Claude and Haywood also, we speak to our councillors entirely in French, everything in the Town of St. Claude, too. We pay, I mean to the municipality, we go to pay our rates. We pay them in French, but they're written down in English.

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

No. 33 - English translation of Madam Adeline Fillion's presentation as recorded on Page 645; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MS. A. FILLION: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, before reading this brief, I have a comment

to make, since I'm speaking on behalf of two groups, I prefer not to answer any questions.

Because I read this brief in the name of a group, I prefer not having to answer questions.

On behalf of the Community of St. Joseph, I would like to present this brief on amendments to The Manitoba Act concerning bilingualism.

No. 34 - English translation of Ms. Jacqueline Fortier's presentation as recorded on Page 656; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, September 22, 1983.

MS. J. FORTIER: I am giving my brief in French and afterwards, I will not answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, an old Canadian song has a verse that reads, "Un Canadien errant, banni de ses foyers, parcourait en pleurant, des pays étrangers." (A wandering Canadian, exiled from home, wandered, alone and sad, through alien lands unknown.) These words are appropriate to our times, for the events of the last months have made me feel, like many other Franco-Manitobans, that we are wandering in a foreign country.

Members of the committee, we are weeping, not because we are defeated, nor because we are discouraged, but rather because some misinformed people want to stop us from obtaining what is, morally and legally, ours by right. We had an equal status in 1870, but what became of it? Political intrigue, majority rule, yes all these . . . (Inaudible) . . . have succeeded in stripping it away from us, so now what we are told is that only 3 percent speak French. What a farce!

And to think that people who say these things take themselves seriously! We are not asking for something that does not belong to us. Quite simply, what we ask is to be fully equal citizens; Francophone citizens equal in every respect to our Anglophone counterparts.

The song I quoted earlier on mentioned the term "Canadien." Yes, I am proud to be Canadienne, proud of my race and my ancestors. It was this country's Francophones who used the term "Canadien" long before the others, who called themselves British subjects or simply English. So no one today has the right to insinuate that French has no equal status in Canada, or in Manitoba in 1983, or in the years to come. To speak in those terms is merely a demonstration of profound ignorance of the history of our country and our province.

From sea to sea, Canada's entire history bears witness to the enormous impact of Francophones, of Canadiens. Just read a little of Canada's history; look at the exploits; the work of the explorers; the voyageurs; the priests, the monks and the nuns; the settlers. Yes, in Manitoba, as much as anywhere else, the French fact has existed for hundreds of years. These pioneer men and women were tenacious folk and our country was built, thanks to their efforts.

The song I quoted was sung by soldiers in 1837, 1838, in Lower and Upper Canada. The people had been defeated then yet, all the same, some positive results emerged from their sacrifices, from their defeat.

Only 30 years later, two great men from our history, McDonald and Cartier, one Anglophone and one Francophone, became fathers of a country that soon would stretch from sea to sea. People of different lands, of different faiths, of different tongues, could unite to build a country.

Can we, here in Manitoba in 1983, not follow their example? Have we forgotten the meaning of initiative, of justice, of fair play? For the sake of us all, do not repeat the mistakes made in 1890, 1916, and 1983. Instead, make use of this unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate that you can right the wrongs inflicted upon a whole people. It is your duty to do so.

I do not want to be a wandering Canadienne, lost in a foreign land. I do not want to inherit a folkloric language used only on rare occasions. I do not want to be French, nor to be told to speak white. In my forefather's land, in my land, I want to be an equal citizen. I entirely agree with, and unhesitatingly support, the agreement negotiated last May between the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba and Federal Governments.

No. 35 - English translation of Ms. Yvonne Pantel's presentation as recorded on Page 656-657; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Next on our list is Yvonne Pantel. Yvonne Pantel, please.

MS. Y. PANTEL: Since I am reading this brief on behalf of the Parents Association of Notre Dame de Lourdes, I would rather not answer any questions afterwards.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on July 16, 1970, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba unanimously adopted Bill 113, an act that formally recognized what has been taken for granted since Manitoba's entry into Confederation: that is, the right for those who so wish to enroll their children in a public school where the teaching would be given in French from kindergarten to Grade 12.

The mere existence of this right to a cultural inheritance does not necessarily guarantee that culture's survival. A perceptive and imaginative effort must be made to allow us to follow, as directly as we can, the road that leads us from the theory of rights to the manifestation of them, from good intentions to reality.

A French-language school cannot become a reality unless the following comes into play: first, individuals who are inquisitive about their identity; second, a home life where French-Canadian culture is fully nurtured; third, social and economic institutions that encourage an active participation in that culture and identity; fourth, a dynamic community where mutual tolerance and a feeling of belonging are manifest.

The most visible expression of the originality of a specific cultural group is the language it speaks. Franco-Manitobans bear witness to this particular cultural identity within a community made up of several cultural groups, the main one of which is English-speaking. In our community, our population is 95 percent French-speaking and that means we are privileged to have a

French-language school from Kindergarten to Grade 12. Thus, now more than ever, the school has a special role to play in the preservation and affirmation of this identity, and the school can do so only by taking into account the world in which the pupil evolves.

Despite the fact that these public hearings have been set up to give everyone the opportunity to express a viewpoint, they do not always attain their noble purpose. Quite the opposite, they encourage hostility and emphasize, more and more, the divisions which characterize our Manitoban community.

This summer, the government circulated a brochure by which it hoped to assuage the fears of opponents to the amendments. The brochure met with little success because those opponents are even more vociferous and they even managed to have these public hearings held. It would seem that the government is backtracking, or even completely sacrificing the principles upon which the agreement was negotiated.

Let us stop giving free rein to vehemence. Let us make the effort to put an end to the discord between French- and English-speaking Manitobans. All we need do is amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. The opponents will cease their war cries when they realize that the amendments affect them in no way whatsoever. The main priority must be the restoration of justice.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, we, the Parents Association of Notre Dame de Lourdes, give our support to the agreement negotiated in the month of May for amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Madam Pantel.

No. 36 - English translation of Mr. Paul Cenerini's presentation as recorded on Page 657; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. P. CENERINI: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the committee, members of the audience. I have not come here this evening to chastise you, nor have I come to launch into history lessons or rhetoric. God knows, you have heard enough of those already. No, I have come instead hoping to present to you a different viewpoint on the question before the committee today.

We are staff members of the only French-language secondary school in the southwest portion of the Province of Manitoba. We have deep convictions concerning French. We have been teaching almost entirely in French for about two years now. The experience we have with our Francophone students and their parents and, I might add, with the whole Francophone community of Notre Dame de Lourdes and St. Léon, is a solid one. We feel that we are in a position to clarify the matter before us in a mainly pedagogical perspective.

As school teachers, we see more and more tasks handed over to us by a society of very busy parents. In the past, it was the parent's duty to teach religion, morality, language and discipline to the child at home. As you know, this has changed today. The mother may work in an office; the grandmother may live in a

retirement home; the babysitter does not speak the child's mother tongue. Nonetheless, a parent wants what is best for the child. These days, that means competence in both official languages. After all, most jobs now are in the service sector where the country's two official languages are needed. We school teachers, therefore, find ourselves given the responsibility of teaching French to a student who, frequently, is not prepared for it and who sometimes rebels against it.

In fact, we have found that a large section of today's youth is ill-at-ease with its French-Canadian identity. We have had to stop and ask ourselves, why? No doubt, several explanations spring immediately to mind while others demand a little more unearthing. At any rate, here are a few that we would like to suggest.

When listening to various media, and being influenced by society in general, the Francophone student receives a very clear and unequivocal message about language: the French language is unwanted and undesirable in the Canadian west. This message comes across in the following ways: the public hates the Prime Minister of Canada; the concept of a bilingual Canada provokes hostile actions; the Association of Municipalities systematically rejects everything that has the slightest suspicion of French about it; school commissions go all out to delay the construction of French-language schools.

Year after year, every tiny French-language service must be struggled for by lawyers and judges. For the student, and often for the parent, it is clear that French is something evil, something to be avoided, almost a crime, if the student wants to be accepted by and participate fully in society. The student wants to appear normal, he does not want to be called a "fanatic." What follows from that is a desire to suppress his culture. And thus assimilation occurs.

What can be done to counter this loss of cultural identity, given, of course, that we agree the loss is deplorable? The treatment will certainly be complex and the remedies numerous. Ladies and gentlemen, you have one remedy there before your very eyes.

In a pluralistic society, a law must often be adopted which evolves out of compromise. Such a law is frequently based on a mutually acceptable minimum for all the special interest groups, who are often in conflict with each other. Once the law is passed and time goes by, the citizens begin to regard this act as a kind of standard on which their behaviour and attitudes are based.

For this reason, ladies and gentlemen, we urge you to entrench the constitutional amendments to which you had already agreed during the three-level negotiations of last May. We believe that such an action would send a clear message - that French is legitimate and acceptable in Manitoba. Our students, and their parents, would no longer feel like outlaws. We would, at last, have our place under the Manitoba sun, and we could live here in peace forever.

By entrenching our rights and protecting them with the legal arm of our system of government, they would ride above the political storms that bluster and blow from year to year. But we ask you to act quickly. Time is at a premium. Do not wait for wide demand from the immersion sector of the public before guaranteeing the rights of Francophones. You must protect your minorities, for the majority is more than strong enough to protect itself.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Cenerini.
Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: I would just like to thank Mr. Cenerini for presenting his views; yes, indeed, quite different views from those we have already heard, and spoken with a great deal of eloquence.

Thank you.

No. 37 - English translation of Mr. Olier LaBossiere's presentation as recorded on Page 658; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983.

MR. O. LABOSSIERE: Ladies and gentlemen, I have come here mainly to evoke past memories of British fair play, and not to accuse those who have not had the chance to research the subject.

From the very beginning of the Colony of Assiniboia, when the Hudson's Bay Company was the government, the rights of everyone, whether Indian, Métis, English or French, were always respected, and the Company Governors, English, French, Catholic or Protestant were also respected. Everyone worked, hand in hand, to bring about economic progress and development of the province. England's history gives evidence of the fact that she could free her numerous colonies without too much conflict or war.

The unfortunate thing is that today, 100 years later, there are still some narrow-minded and petty folks, some of them of British origin even, who no longer fully believe in the rule of fair play. With his list of rights Louis Riel, too, wanted nothing more than a democratic government that would assure the Indians, the Métis, the French and the English that they would all benefit equally from the right to land, language and culture. Those who persecuted Riel 100 years ago must not, indeed, be allowed to resurface and tear to shreds the rights of today's Franco-Manitobans, for history's judgment will be very very severe against those who give into their ignorance.

Gentlemen, is it not normal to expect of our leaders a broader outlook on things? I ask my compatriots from other ethnic groups, Mennonites, Ukrainians and others, is it not now time to inspire a climate of greater accord and harmonious coexistence? When you arrived at the beginning of the century, you were certainly insufficiently informed of the nature of our bilingual province. But, ever since then, you have endeavoured to support Francophone claims before the public hearings held on education and for that support we thank you and appreciate your efforts very much.

I want especially to speak to the government of today. You must not, at any price, yield to the pressure of certain groups who want to change the clauses of the agreement concluded, on behalf of the Francophone community, by the Société franco-manitobaine. You must not repeat the mistakes of our country's leaders who were in power at the time of the infamous act of 1890, and again in 1916. This would be absolutely unacceptable for people who have made great strides forward and who have benefited from the scientific study of our history.

Truth cannot be swept under the carpet. Succeeding generations will never forgive us for not having solved our problems. We must learn how to live in harmony in a province cut in the fabric of a rich mosaic of nations and founded on the heroic history of our Manitoban pioneers, Indian, French and English.

No. 38 - English translation of Mr. Raymond Labossiere's presentation as recorded on Page 664; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 35 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 22 September, 1983

MR. R. LABOSSIERE: Mr. Chairman, I will not be answering any questions because I am speaking on behalf of a group. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee; the citizens of Manitoba have been expressing alarm over the move by the Government of Manitoba to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, and to thereby restore the rights of Franco-Manitobans. I cannot understand this reaction. I cannot understand why the people of this province are putting up such fierce opposition to a proposal designed to correct - and I say correct - a great injustice that was committed 90 years ago. In the final analysis, what law could give back to Franco-Manitobans what they have been denied for 90 years? It seems to me that the answer to that question should be obvious to any man of good will. Mr. Chairman, the present New Democrat government is attempting to give a second chance to life in French here in this province - and it is right in doing so. No government, no political party, no individual in a so-called civilized country has the right to prevent justice from being done to the Francophones of the province of Manitoba. Franco-Manitobans have been persistent throughout all these years. We cannot simply forget them. I repeat. I support the resolution to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act negotiated in May. I hope, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that you will not hesitate to affirm your support for this resolution. I entrust this matter to you.

Thank you.

No. 39 - English translation of Mr. Robert Dubois' presentation as recorded in Page 709; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 37 - 2:00 p.m., Monday, 26 September, 1983.

MR. R. DUBOIS: Members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate very much this opportunity today to make my presentation in French to a committee of the Legislature. Somebody made reference here of their ancestry and their arrival in Canada. I would like to mention at this point that I am very proud of the fact that the Dubois family first came upon the shores of Canada in 1652, and that in 1980, 400 out of 650 of us celebrated the 100th Anniversary of the arrival of first Dubois in Manitoba.

Let me say, at this point, that there were many Polish, Ukrainian, French, English, Greek, all sorts at this 100th Anniversary of the Dubois.

Now I am here to say a few words that will echo those of my colleagues on the board of the Société franco-manitobaine.

You might think, at first, that everything has been said, but how can the expression of inner convictions

of a community be exhausted? The will and the desire of this community to have its rights recognized have become truly characteristic of the human condition.

Mr. Chairman, winds of change are blowing on the horizon. Winds which insist that we claim our rights, and which demonstrate that the Société franco-manitobaine is not alone in wishing to see the agreement of the 17th of May respected. The same desire is becoming more and more evident in the heart of Manitoba's Francophone community. And the desire is all the more intense for the more than 90 years of injustice that has passed. This is the expression of the intrinsic reality of a true community, in which people come together to proclaim their common interests and their common desires. What could be more promising for the future than that many such diverse groups should paint their own colours onto the sociocultural canvas of a new Manitoba?

And what does this coming Manitoba hold for us? If we believe the words of the writer and futurologist, Alvin Toffler, Manitoba will feel the effects of the Third Wave. At the end of the industrial age, we will see an era in which society will become de-massified. A de-massified society will give greater importance and a larger role to its minorities, to the many groups of which it is made up. Toffler sees a dominant position for the world's many minorities in the promise of a civilization better adapted to the problems, the resources and the technology of the next century.

We are speaking of a society at the forefront of technology and of social innovation, a society centred on the individual and the minorities. There are those who fear that, in seeking social diversity, we encourage the fragmentation and the balkanization of our society. This is a naive belief, held by the stubborn defenders of a past civilization, who see the desires of the minorities as threatening and selfish.

But Toffler hastens on to put all of this in focus, and I quote:

"The rising activism of the minorities is . . . among other things, a reflection of the needs of a new system of production which requires for its very existence a far more varied, colourful, open and diverse society than any we have ever known."

The Third Wave will, therefore, provide room for diversity, from which will spring social evolution; and the new democracy of the 21st century will be based on the minorities. But at the moment, our social evolution is blocked by the myth which holds that increased diversity aggravates social conflicts. This is false, and Toffler wants us to understand that, as long as adequate social provisions are made - and the resources and technology of the next century will make this possible - diversity can be the guarantee of a peaceful and stable civilization.

Let us stop this foolishness of accusing the minorities of selfishness when they make themselves heard. Let us cease this blind jealousy which was nourished by the old status quo of an old, outmoded civilization. Toffler continues the discussion as follows, and I quote:

"The answer lies in imaginative new arrangements for accommodating and legitimating diversity - new institutions that are sensitive to the rapidly shifting needs of changing and multiplying minorities."

The author we are quoting would surely be the first to condemn the plebiscite on minority rights which the City of Winnipeg intends to hold. For the futurologist, who has acquired a well-thought-out vision of the future, the vote and the search for a single national identity is nothing but an archaic ritual engaged in by primitives who have trouble communicating.

A plebiscite on the constitutional rights of a minority is, therefore, a sad regression within a society that is struggling to deny its own natural evolution. However, the circumstances that have now been created by brilliant technological innovations, along with the improved collective consciousness of the 21st Century will gradually bring the new civilization into being. The individuals who will make up this new civilization should be making efforts, as of this very moment, to modernize the system in its entirety, so as to strengthen the roles of the various minorities. These minorities should even be encouraged to manage their own affairs to a greater degree, and to define their own long-term goals. According to Toffler, this could stimulate a sense of community and identity in certain groups, while taking some of the pressure off the government agencies which are overburdened with a task that is in no way indispensable.

But if we have spoken to you today of the future, Mr. Chairman, it is because we believe that the agreement reached on the 17th of May will achieve its full impact in the context of Manitoba's future. We believe, Mr. Chairman, that this agreement, woven out of the rich historical reality of Manitoba, will come to its fullest fruition in its effect on the generations to follow, in the society of the future.

This agreement, which is faithful both to the past and to the future of the province, is also one that is fair and equitable to the whole population. It was negotiated around one basic principle to which we attribute such importance, that no one will ever be able to dislodge it from among our strongest inner convictions. This basic principle, Mr. Chairman, is the one which states that French and English are the official languages of Manitoba. Those same inner convictions assure us that this principle is the herald of a movement towards tolerance and respect, qualities that the province surely wishes to make a part of its future. Manitoba will thus be the precursor of a social transformation, and will make itself the envy of the entire country.

Thank you.

(Page 716)

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm going to make a few remarks in French. There are only going to be a few remarks so you don't have to go running for your earpieces, because it's not going to be of that great length.

I am a new student in French, Mr. Dubois. You speak French very well, and you are a fine representative of the Dubois family.

MR. R. DUBOIS: Thank you.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would like to ask my questions in French, but I am very much afraid of making mistakes in French. Will you allow me to ask my questions in English?

MR. R. DUBOIS: Absolutely.

(Page 717-8)

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much for your brief, Mr. Dubois. I found your speech this afternoon made a good contribution to the discussion. Thank you very much.

MR. R. DUBOIS: Thank you.

No. 40 - English translation of Mr. Rene Vermette's presentation as recorded on Page 738-739; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. VERMETTE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, the great majority of the student population of Red River School Division No. 17 is French-speaking. Indeed, over 80 percent of our students are Francophones and, in some schools, the figure comes close to 100 percent.

We know Franco-Manitobans; we know their aspirations; we know the history of their battle to obtain a French education for their children, and to claim their rights as French-speaking Manitobans.

Long before our school division was formed, the school trustees of the region were working to improve the quality of our children's French education. In spite of legal prohibitions, and cost what it might, they organized to ensure that their children would be educated in French. Today the Red River School Board pursues that same goal with the same tenacity, and it supports the efforts of those who wish to entrench Francophone rights in the Canadian Constitution.

We do not intend to describe to you today the history of Francophones and of French education in Manitoba. Others have already filled in the details of that story. Instead we would like unequivocally to affirm our unconditional support for the agreement negotiated in May, 1983 by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government.

As recent events in Winnipeg and across the province have shown the struggle of the past continues in the present. We are continually obliged to defend ourselves against those who, without any knowledge of the history involved, fear or oppose the use of French.

Our rights, already so fragile, are being threatened on every side by ill-informed people, by political pressure, by popular votes, and by unilateral proposals to modify an agreement that has already been signed. How can we have confidence in the authorities? How can we leave the destiny of our rights in the hands of a majority so full of fear? Impossible! It is essential for Francophone rights to be entrenched in the Canadian Constitution. It is time for justice to be done, and for our rights to be recognized and protected from the authorities, as from all those who do not share our goals and aspirations.

The Red River School Board, therefore, gives its unconditional support to the agreement negotiated in May, 1983 by the Société franco-manitobaine, the Federal Government and the Manitoba Government on the amendment of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Mr. Vermette, I want to thank you for taking the time to present this brief. I note in your comments that you have only referred to the agreement that was signed on May 17th. Since that time, the government has made some proposals to amend that agreement. Would you care to make any comments about the amendments that the government has proposed?

MR. R. VERMETTE: We do not support the amendments as you have proposed them, but as they were presented in May, 1983.

No. 41 - English translation of Mr. Guy Lévesque's presentation as recorded on Page 739; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. G. LÉVESQUE: . . . I am proud to be a French-Canadian. I feel sure, gentlemen, that you will see the light before it is too late. Thank you.

No. 42 - English translation of Ms. Irène Lemoine's presentation as recorded on Page 741; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. I. LEMOINE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Irene Lemoine, chairperson of the Parents' Committee at Pointe des Chênes School, and I will be speaking to you as the representative of that organization. Our committee represents 100 families - the parents of 317 French-speaking students.

Bill 113, adopted in 1970, legally recognized for those who so desired, the right to enroll their children in public schools in which teaching would take place in French from Kindergarten to Grade 12. The mere existence of the right to perpetuate one's culture is not a guarantee of its survival. To be effective, the French-language school needs the support of social and economic institutions that are favourable to the development of French culture and identity. But in Manitoba, such support is negligible and insignificant. To obtain services in French we have had to beg, to plead, to make special appeals, to do everything under the sun, and our exasperation is the result.

For example, simply to get swimming lessons in French for our pupils, we had to approach and put pressure on six centres in the region before we were finally satisfied.

Also the pre-kindergarten examination to evaluate the child's capabilities is made in English at the Health Centre. Obviously, the results are not worth much.

In the same way, the dental care offered at the school by the Dental Services Department is given only in English. And I could go on.

This all goes to show how we are swamped by the predominance of the English language in our everyday life in a way that endangers our distinctive Franco-Manitoban identity. The schools, now more than ever, have a specific role to play in the affirmation of that

identity, but they simply must have the support of social, economic and government institutions.

I, therefore, ask you to support the agreement negotiated in May, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, so that our children will not inherit the deprivation of their linguistic rights that our parents and grandparents suffered.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Lemoine. Questions by members of the committee? Seeing none, thank you very much for your presentation. Michelle Freynet-Arbez. Roger Legal. Roger Legal.

Please proceed.

No. 43 - English translation of Mr. Roger Legal's presentation as recorded on Page 742-745; Hansard, Volume No. XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. LEGAL: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, members of the committee, I address you today with a feeling of emotion that I can hardly control. I have a sense of participating in a truly historic event.

Generations of Franco-Manitobans to come will ponder the political happenings of the year 1983 as critical ones in the history of their people. Will the generations to come remember the year 1983 with scorn and bitterness, as we today remember those of 1890 and 1916? Will 1983 be added to the toll of grim dates that we would prefer to forget about forever?

The harsh injustices perpetrated against the Franco-Manitobans in 1890 and in 1916 dangerously threatened the survival of our people. Those acts, imbued with narrow-mindedness and bigotry, were able to suppress the guarantees of the Confederate agreement. In spite of everything, French Manitoba has not died, and I assure you, has no wish to die.

After 1916, we had to rely on our own resources, often flirting with the clandestine in order to survive. Then towards the middle of the century, a few rays of hope began to penetrate the sombre clouds that had darkened the earlier landscape. Little by little, Roblin's Provincial Government of Conservatives, followed by the New Democrats under Schreyer, gave us back some portion of the education rights that had previously been confiscated. But these were only laws of permission, which meant that we had still to count on the goodwill of the school boards.

Well they have almost invariably been hostile to us, and for every French-language school that we have finally obtained, we have had to fight a fierce battle. Remember the École Taché, the École Précieux-Sang, the École Noël-Ritchot, La Broquerie, and in the last five years, the notorious French regional school at Ile des Chênes, which the Seine River School Board has authorized and de-authorized so many times, and which the Lyon Government tried, with every means in its power, to oppose.

We are almost always at the mercy of a majority that is potentially hostile. It is only through great efforts of heroic dedication, or through ingenious subterfuge, or simply through fortuitous circumstances that we manage to obtain what is rightfully ours.

Speaking of fortuitous circumstances, the best example that comes to mind is that of the phenomenal

upswing in immersion schools. In the end, who is it that benefits the most from an expansion in the scope of French education? The figures speak for themselves. It is the Anglophones of the province, in their desire to become bilingual - and I congratulate them for it - who are taking advantage of French immersion programs so that their children can become bilingual. The phenomenon is quite extraordinary.

Right now in Manitoba, there are more than 9,000 Anglophone children enrolled in immersion programs. The number is already substantially larger than the number of Francophone children in French-language schools (about 6,000). And what does the future hold in this area? The current prediction is that the number of Francophones will go down a little more for a few years, because we represent such a small community, and because of a general drop in the birthrate, which also affects French-Canadians. On the other hand, Anglophone enrolments in immersion programs - which already number, as I have said, over 9,000 - are predicted to climb to such dizzy heights that by 1987, it seems, they will have approximately doubled, and will number about 18,000.

There are some predictions that before long, over 25 percent of the school-age children in greater Winnipeg will be going to immersion schools.

This is to say, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, that if justice alone cannot move the politicians, the very realities of politics demands a change in position. I would suggest to you here that you reflect on the situation, and realize that even the winds of political expediency will be blowing with us to disperse the sombre clouds to which I alluded earlier in my presentation. The voting public will tend less and less to be ferocious bigots who oppose what Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau recently termed "progressive legislation . . . typically Canadian . . ." when referring to the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which was the subject of the tripartite agreement last May.

Allow me to draw your attention to one last important point. Let us consider for a moment the question of the fate of our Francophone minority as it relates to that of the Anglophone minority in Quebec. Since the Parti Quebecois came into power, and appeared to threaten the cozy position of the Anglophone minority, isn't it true that the issue of Francophone minorities outside Quebec has taken on an entirely new aspect? Do you remember the apprehension and the tension that gripped the entire country just before the Quebec referendum? The interests of national unity were upheld on that occasion, but by a fairly small majority. There will be other referendums in the years to come, and the attitudes that the governments of other provinces adopt towards their Francophone minorities will undoubtedly play an important role.

Let us not neglect Manitoba's Francophone minority, in spite of the measures taken by the Bourassa and Lévesque Governments in the last 10 years. It was Premier Lévesque who once retorted that he would not put up with other provinces coming and moralizing to him about the Anglophone minority in Quebec until the Francophone minorities of the other provinces were as well treated as the Anglophone minority in Quebec. Think about it!

Well, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, there are so many arguments I could make.

I will be content, however, to summarize briefly what I have said, and to come to a conclusion.

First, grave injustices were inflicted on us at the turn of the century. In the area of education, partial corrections were made about half-a-century later; that is not enough. It is absolutely necessary that the structure of education administration be revised to give autonomy to Francophones.

Anglophones and not Francophones profit the most from Bill 133 through French immersion programs. The immersion phenomenon is so great, however, that we are justified in believing that bigotry and narrow-mindedness are diminishing. This means that you, the politicians, have an interest in adapting to the new political day that is dawning, quite apart from the question of seeing justice done.

Finally, let us keep the fate of our fellow citizens, the Quebec Anglophones in mind. Their future and the unity of the nation will depend in part on the action that Manitoba takes on this question.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I exhort you on my own behalf, on behalf of my children, and on behalf of the children that they will one day have; I fervently exhort you to recommend that the Manitoba Legislature adopt without delay the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, which was the subject of the tripartite agreement of last May between the Provincial and Federal Governments and the Société franco-manitobaine. Above all, do not disfigure the proposal with the intended modifications that were made public on the 6th of September. It is obvious, in my opinion, that these modifications would weaken the agreement to the point of banality.

If, in fact, the Manitoba Legislature adopts that proposal as it was drawn up in May, the one that was the subject of the tripartite agreement, then the year 1983 will go down in history, not as another dark date, but as a turning point of progress and enlightenment. No one will lose by it, and justice, which has been denied for almost a century, will be re-established.

Thank you for your kind attention. I wish you very positive and fruitful discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Legal. Any questions by members?

Mr. Doern.

(Column Two)

MR. R. DOERN: Well, I'll try again. Is there not an apparent contradiction in the sense that Manitoba appears to be moving, and has been moving as you indicate in your brief, towards bilingualism or greater degree of bilingualism when it appears that in Quebec there is a movement towards unilingualism?

MR. R. LEGAL: Without discussing this movement of which you speak, the position I took in my brief and the position that I maintain is that the Anglophone minority in Quebec is currently being infinitely better treated than the Francophone minority in Manitoba or in the other provinces. We would have to make enormous advances to equal their situation. When that happens, I think it will be necessary for the Quebec Government to take stock of the situation. I repeat the words of M. René Lévesque that I cited earlier, that

unless and until the Francophone minorities of the rest of the country are as well treated as the Anglophone minority in Quebec, we cannot presume, neither you, Mr. Doern nor I, can presume to offer them any advice.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Legal, the impression has been created, or let's say, there is an impression in the minds of many people that, while Manitoba is attempting to extend French Language Services, that the Quebec Government is doing the reverse. Is that also your impression, or is that an inaccurate impression?

MR. R. LEGAL: I have said everything I have to say on that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. DOERN: I would then ask you, in general, whether you think that, as legislators, we have first of all an obligation to pass the best laws that we are capable of for the benefit of Manitobans.

MR. R. LEGAL: Of course. I am not sure if I understood the question properly. Was Mr. Doern asking me whether the province's legislators had the obligation to pass the best possible law for the benefit of the citizens of the province? It seems to me that the answer to that is assuredly "yes." Perhaps I did not understand the question.

MR. R. DOERN: The reverse of that, the other side of that, is this, Mr. Legal. Do you think it is possible for Manitoba legislators to legislate for the benefit of other minorities at the same time, whether those minorities be in Quebec or in the United States or in Great Britain or in France or Germany, or are these simply additional ramifications that are not the first consideration of provincial legislators?

MR. R. LEGAL: In my opinion, the responsibility of the province's legislators is to thoroughly consider the question that we are discussing this morning. I drew some parallels, and made an analogy to another minority, the Anglophone minority in Quebec. I do not believe that we have a responsibility towards them at this time. Let us concern ourselves, as we ought to, with the Francophone minority in Manitoba. After that, maybe we can set ourselves up as an example, and offer good advice to the United States, to Quebec and to the rest of the world. It seems to me that we have a few things to accomplish before we get there.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Legal, then I gather that your view is that we shouldn't be attempting to influence or pressure or second-guess the P.Q. Government; we should, in fact, be making laws that we think are in the best interests of our people, including the Francophone community.

MR. R. LEGAL: Yes.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Legal, you mention in your brief that you feel there has been a significant change in the attitude of the majority

of Manitobans and I would, I guess, have to say to you that I would agree, especially with the younger ones, the younger parents who are now faced with the determination of whether or not to arm their children with the best possible tools to achieve later on, i.e. knowing the French language because it will be a predominant force, I would imagine, in the next couple of years in dealing with a lot of the major jobs that we're looking at.

I wonder, in your brief you talk about Anglophones in immersion programs. I wonder if you wouldn't agree that it isn't only the Anglophone community; that there are many people of German heritage, of Ukrainian heritage, and it is not an Anglophone-Francophone situation that's being developed here and that there are many people of other origins, other than Anglophone that are involved in the French immersion program or in French programs right throughout our province.

MR. R. LEGAL: I agree absolutely, and I used the word "Anglophone" in the sense of an English-speaker; that is, a person who uses English most of the time but, of course, that includes people of other ethnic groups, and doubtless in large numbers.

MR. R. BANMAN: You mention at the outset of your brief that you wonder what kind of historical significance this particular event has. As someone coming from a minority group who went through the 1916 school question and saw many Mennonites leave this area and move to Paraguay and Mexico and other places because they felt that was affecting their culture, as well as their heritage, in that kind of manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question, please.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder if you could tell me, in your opinion, whether or not the issue before us today and the feelings that are developing on both sides of the issue do have a lot of ingredients of that 1916 question. In other words, do you feel that the confrontation that seems to be developing on both sides is one which will have the implications and probably the divisive nature of the 1916 school question?

MR. R. LEGAL: It is very difficult to predict the future, as Henri Richard once said to a Radio-Canada interviewer who had asked him to predict the outcome of the Stanley Cup finals. Henri Richard replied, "My name's not Punch Imlach" and I also feel that I am not in a good position to predict in this kind of situation. In my opinion, it is very clear that we have an excellent opportunity to re-establish justice. What I said in my brief was that, in my opinion, no one would be the loser.

It's a question here of restoring to Francophones the rights that were guaranteed to them in the Confederative agreement, as well as at the time of Manitoba's entry into Canada. After we have done that, I imagine that there will be all kinds of repercussions which will also be valuable to the other ethnic groups.

MR. R. BANMAN: A final question, Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Legal, he mentions in the final statement in his brief that he supports the amendments

as negotiated between the Federal, Provincial Governments and the Société franco-manitobaine. We now have, of course, received certain amendments to that. What is his feeling with regard to the new amendments? In other words, if that is the package that is going to be brought before the Legislature, what will his stance be on that?

MR. R. LEGAL: I indicated very clearly, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat with all intensity I can muster, that in my opinion they are very negative modifications, and they destroy the profound and serious intent of the tripartite agreement in May. In my opinion, these modifications must absolutely be abandoned and forgotten. We must go back to the May agreement.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. D. SCOTT: I just want to say to Mr. Legal, thank you very much for your brief, and I hope the members of the Legislature will think about what you have said before they once again take up the subject in the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Scott. I would remind members, the purpose is for questions, not for other statements.

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Mr. Legal, you stated that you urged us with every ounce of your strength to resist the amendments. If we should fail in that and we have to deal with a package with the amendments in it, would you suggest to us that we accept it as second-best, or should you advise us to reject the entire package at that point?

MR. R. LEGAL: That is a very difficult question, and one which has far-reaching consequences. There would have to be a very detailed analysis of the modifications. Some are less injurious than others. However, my current position would be this: I would recommend that the Manitoba Government or the committee discuss the question with the official representative of the Franco-Manitobans; that is, the Société franco-manitobaine. As a member of that Society, I would subscribe wholly to any decision that could be reached between the government and the Société franco-manitobaine.

No. 44 - English translation of Mr. Louis Bernardin's presentation as recorded on Page 745; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. L. BERNARDIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I stand before you today to re-affirm my support for the Société franco-manitobaine on the Section 23 agreement that was negotiated last May with Mr. Pawley's Government. It is sad that even today I have to plead with you to obtain rights which are already mine.

I have had the opportunity of travelling in the United States, in Europe and in Asia. I felt I was fortunate in speaking both French and English. Of course, I was able to manage very well. Most Europeans speak several languages, and this only adds to the appeal of their culture.

I see no reason why we Manitobans should not master both languages, and live officially each in our own culture.

Like many other French-Canadians in Manitoba, I am sure that we will survive and that the beautiful French language will continue to embellish both our own culture and our province.

Thank you.

No. 45 - English translation of Paul Ruest's presentation as recorded on Page 745-746; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. P. RUEST: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the legislative committee, I stand before you today as a French-speaking citizen of Manitoba. I have come to share with you my personal feelings on the proposed amendments to Section 23.

The historic agreement which created our province also bestowed on it a bilingual character, recognizing English and French as the official languages of the Legislature, the courts and the enactment of laws. The Manitoba Act did not give the English language a more official status than it gave the French. The two languages were placed on an equal footing.

The 1890 act illegally threw out this founding principle of linguistic duality. The results were disastrous, particularly for French-speaking Manitobans. Their language having been illegally removed from the Confederative agreement, their purely provincial and local institutions could now be attacked, so as to deny the right to live in French in Manitoba. The 1890 act served as a springboard, a backdrop against which to justify such unacceptable legislation as the 1916 act on education in Manitoba.

The bilingual and denominational system of education could now be abolished without any pangs of conscience, since Manitoba was no longer a bilingual province. There was no obligation to offer government services in French, as Manitoba had become an English province in 1890. This new reality, of necessity, forced many Francophone citizens - victims of a more or less subtle genocide - to bow to circumstance, and to lose their identity through assimilation with the dominant group.

Others chose to oppose the repression of the new acts, and have continued to agitate for their rights up to this very day, and let me say that I am one of those. Still other Franco-Manitobans chose exile in Eastern Canada, leaving a native soil that had become hostile to their language and their culture. It is indecent to reproach Franco-Manitobans today for their small numbers when that is one of the cruelest consequences of the illegal act of 1890.

In 1979, the Supreme Court of Canada declared the 1890 act invalid, and by the same token re-affirmed Manitoba's official linguistic duality of Legislature, courts and enactment of laws, in the spirit of The Manitoba

Act. But the disastrous effects of the 93-year gap between the adoption of the 1890 act and its being revoked in 1979 cannot be ignored. That period saw the adoption of bills, the creation of institutions, and the establishment of government services, all inspired by an invalid act which characterized Manitoba as a unilingual, English province. It goes without saying that these laws, institutions and services were not designed to recognize or to promote the development of Manitoba's Francophone citizens.

Our current deliberations ought to lead us to consider the effects of the 1890 act, to identify and be sensitive to the wrongs that this act has caused and to ensure reparation. It is true that we cannot rewrite the history of our province, but we can try to correct the results of past injustices. That should be a concern that goes beyond party politics, drawing on a deep respect for the fair administration of a people's rights. The same concern should inspire those of our legislators who consider themselves true statesmen to protect the rights of minority groups by offering them some shelter from political intentions that are sometimes misguided.

The amendments to Section 23 that were proposed in May, 1983 by the Provincial Government at first appeared to me to be less than what was necessary. But after having given the matter some thought, I find them acceptable. On the one hand, they allow the government to avoid a great many legal problems, while appreciably reducing legal translation costs. On the other hand, these amendments guarantee to the citizens of our province the right to receive services in French from the Provincial Government, where numbers warrant. The amendments unfortunately do not re-establish things as they were before the adoption of the 1890 act. In fact, no measure of reparation could completely rectify the situation. But, in the final analysis, the proposed amendments were negotiated in good faith, and they take into account the realities of the current situation.

I, therefore, urge the government to proceed rapidly with the adoption of the amendments and what is more, I urge it to take any further measure to allow Manitoba's Francophones to regain as soon as possible the position that the Confederation agreement would have ensured them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Monsieur Ruest?
Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Ruest, you talk in rather strong language of a subtle genocide, and I was just wondering whether you see that this attitude or view may also be one held by members of other ethnic or multicultural associations.

MR. P. RUEST: Mr. Chairman, in reply to Mr. Doern, when I speak of genocide, I am referring to the period of entry into Confederation, when Francophones were a majority. I am referring to the 1890 act, to a time when there were still large numbers of Francophones in the province, and to the fact that afterwards the numbers diminished appreciably in direct relation to the climate that existed in Manitoba; one that was very unfavourable to the evolution of its French component.

In that sense, I said that the genocide was not very subtle.

MR. R. DOERN: I also wanted to ask you whether your concern could be put in broader terms in that there is, of course, tremendous pressure, first of all, I suppose on Canada from the American influence, and similarly on Francophones throughout Canada from the English-speaking influence of Canada and the United States; that these are simply normal pressures and what might be considered pressure of assimilation linguistically.

MR. P. RUEST: Mr. Chairman, in reply once again to Mr. Doern, I do not believe that in 1890, it was a case of typically American pressure towards the anglicization of Francophones. I believe that the responsibility rests squarely on the Manitoba Government and on its successors in power. As for the American influence, the extremely anglicizing influence of the North American continent, I thoroughly agree with you, Mr. Doern, that is a major concern, and it is one more reason to offer protection to Francophone rights if we are serious about wishing to ensure the survival of that community.

MR. R. DOERN: I suppose this is a rather broad question, Mr. Chairman, a general view, whether you have any view in regard to the position of other ethnic and cultural groups, whether you think they should retain their languages and customs forever, or whether you see assimilation as something that happens to other linguistic and cultural groups, but not to the French-speaking one.

MR. P. RUEST: Mr. Chairman, to reply to Mr. Doern once more, to have had to fight against assimilation is something I do not wish upon anybody.

I have every respect for groups, for the other ethnic groups in the province or in Canada or anywhere in the world who try to maintain their culture, their language, their social situation to as great a degree as possible. I would find it quite reasonable if government or governments in general would see these differences as enrichment, rather than as obstacles to the welfare of the country or of the province.

From that point of view, I see official bilingualism, and Canadian multiculturalism as truly a part of the wealth of our country.

MR. R. DOERN: My final question, Mr. Chairman, is this. In regard to the responsibility of the Franco-Manitoba community and all linguistic communities, to what extent do you think they have a responsibility to fund their own activities, and to what extent do you think the Provincial and Federal Governments should underwrite them?

MR. P. RUEST: Mr. Chairman, as a final reply to Mr. Doern, I have no personal responsibility for the question of the financing of any agency, and you should note that my speech was intended as a presentation by a private Manitoba citizen. I really have nothing to say on that point. I have tried to limit myself to my thoughts on Section 23, and I have no wish to prolong the discussion.

No. 46 - English translation of Mr. Jean Detillieux's presentation as recorded on Pages 746-747; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. J. DETILLIEUX: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, gentlemen of the government, when your government approached the Société franco-manitobaine with proposals for the amendment of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, the Société had our mandate, the mandate of Franco-Manitobans, to represent us in the long consultations that were to follow. We placed our faith in their ability to negotiate with your government and the Federal Government, amendments to Section 23 that would be acceptable to all Franco-Manitobans and which would guarantee the future governments of this province would treat us with justice.

The Société franco-manitobaine proved itself worthy of our trust throughout these consultations. It negotiated patiently, courageously and in good faith for many months. It was conciliatory, making those concessions which it judged reasonable. It is, therefore, unfair to say that the Société franco-manitobaine twisted your arm or that it did not give you time to weigh all the implications of the agreement.

At the end of May, when the terms of the proposed resolution were judged acceptable by the three negotiating parties, the Society once again consulted the Franco-Manitoban population which gave its hearty support and vigorously upheld the resolution which the Society had just negotiated with the Provincial and Federal Governments.

It is this resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act such as it was negotiated in May by your government and the Franco-Manitoban Society that I fully support.

Your government, gentlemen, had the courage to table this resolution in the Legislative Assembly, the courage to defend it against the attacks made by members of the opposition. We appreciate your act of justice, but we would like you to show this courage through to the end. You have already greatly disappointed us. The amendments to the resolution, proposed unilaterally on September 6th, have seriously shaken the confidence which your government had won among Franco-Manitobans. No concession imposed on us will succeed in pacifying those who are opposed to this resolution. They will be satisfied with nothing less than the total disappearance of the entire resolution.

The proposed amendments of September 6th attack the very substance of the resolution. If they are adopted, it will mean a new disaster, for with the Franco-Manitoban resolution thus weakened, the door will be left forever open to the injustices and calculated floundering of future ill-willed governments.

This, gentlemen, is why I strongly protest against the amendments of September 6th and earnestly ask that you support the resolution as it was negotiated in May.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Questions for the witness?

Mr Desjardins.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Detillieux, you speak of the amendments proposed on September 6th. Do you

realize that these amendments are not the proposed amendments?

MR. J. DETILLIEUX: Yes, I realize that, Sir.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But suggested only as possible and that even the party, the government caucus is not unanimous on this subject.

MR. J. DETILLIEUX: I realize this, Sir, but I am trying to show the Franco-Manitoba Society's objections to such amendments, which were not made in consultation following negotiations.

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

MR. J. DETILLIEUX: Thank you.

No. 47 - English translation of Dr. G. Lemoine's presentation as recorded on Page 748; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

DR. G. LEMOINE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as chairman of the committee of parents of Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, I have come before you today to express support of the resolution to amend Article 23 as negotiated by the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Pawley Government last May.

Almost daily, arguments are brought up in the press. What are we doing to democracy? Bilingualism - a sure road to division!

Everyone here recognizes that in a democratic country the last thing that people would ever give up is their insistence on the right to vote. But, on the other hand, there are situations which cannot be tossed about in a public poll. We are dealing with just such a situation. Moreover, what better way is there of making a mockery of the democratic system than to call for a referendum on a law which was illegally repealed long ago.

I do not want to bore you with such statements, but civilizations progress only inasmuch as tolerance exists in them. I am convinced that those who oppose bilingualism or perceive it as a divisive element are poorly informed. I speak here, in particular, to those ladies and gentlemen who oppose the constitutional recognition of our rights.

Let us move on to a social exercise. Imagine that you are in an entirely Francophone milieu. Let us even go on to imagine that the school inspector, who is French, does not wish to see any English books on the day that he visits your school (those who are older remember this.) And this in a context where formerly you had the right to learn English.

The years go by - then the government calmly gives you the right to learn English in school - and things improve - progress is made. Throughout the years, the French "Establishment" asks you, "Do you like English classes?" Some answer, "I do not know why he is asking me that; it was going fine before." And fighting breaks out in your ranks.

It is certain that there will be "squabbling." You are asked to respond in tribal fashion. If the whole "tribe"

does not stop work to unite like today, like this evening, it is concluded, "They are not even interested!"

At this point, I say: Do not ask if the Société franco-manitobaine speaks for everyone. It speaks so that Francophones will regain what was taken from them many years ago.

Thank you for having given me the opportunity to speak to you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No. 48 - English translation of Mr. Tobie Perrin's presentation as recorded on Page 749; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Proceed, Mr. Perrin.

MR. T. PERRIN: Mr. Chairman, honourable members, ladies and gentlemen, I am honoured to have the privilege of speaking to you on a subject which is close to all our hearts.

Allow me first to tell you that my family, the Perrin family, has been in Ste. Anne since 1875 and in Canada since 1755. If there are Canadians in Canada, we are proud to be among them. Through the course of the years, we have married into the Lagimodière family and even Riel's. I am the eldest in a family of 14 children. I had to leave school at the age of 13 because of my father's illness. My schooling, therefore, brought me to Grade 4.

There we were in 1916, a year of great ordeal for us, the French-Canadians of Manitoba. It was somewhat like 1755, the ordeal of the deportation of the Acadians. Our governments then, that is to say in 1916, expropriated us from our language in favour of English in a bilingual province. We did not have to hide in the woods as many Acadians did. We hid from the law. But we always had to be on the watch for the inspector.

That, dear friends, is the justice that we French-Canadians have had for close to 100 years. Riel, in his provisional government, showed justice to both languages. Riel was a Canadian, as we still are today. Do you want to take us back to the gallows where Riel breathed his last? If you want to restore justice, have the goodness then to adopt the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as they were suggested by the Provincial Government last May. This is the wish of a man who attended school before 1916 when the injustice was done.

I respect all of you, dear fellow citizens, and I thank you for your attention.

A voter from Springfield.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Perrin. Are there any questions from members of the committee?

As there are none, I thank you, Mr. Perrin, for having been so kind as to come before the committee.

MR. T. PERRIN: Thank you very much.

No. 49 - English translation of Mr. Gilbert Tétrault's presentation as recorded on Page 750; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Proceed, Mr. G. Tétrault.

MR. G. TÉTRAUULT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, a delegation of concerned citizens from La Broquerie came before the municipal council to ask that the municipality present a brief to your committee in support of the resolution as negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Having agreed to this request, the Municipal Council of La Broquerie communicates to you today a few comments on the subject of bilingualism in Manitoba.

The Municipal Council of La Broquerie needed no directive from the Provincial Government to see the need for bilingual services in La Broquerie. Since 1881, the personnel of the municipal office has served the public in French and English and sometimes even in German. The council takes it upon itself to continue to serve its population in the language they prefer.

For us, language is a means of communication and it is through communication that people come to know and understand each other. Language and culture should be the means of bringing Canadians together and not of dividing them. We believe that in areas such as the courts, education and health services, all Canadians should have the right and the opportunity to speak the language they prefer.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I hope with all my heart that the clamouring will cease and that at last everyone will behave as people ought, so that the rights of our fathers and their fellows, founders of this province, will be respected once more.

Thank you for your attention.

No. 50 - English translation of Mrs. Margaret Smith's presentation as recorded on Page 750; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 39 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 27, 1983.

MRS. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it goes without saying that the history of Franco-Manitobans has incessantly repeated itself for more than 100 years. Franco-Manitobans have been, and are subjected to persecutions, intimidations, abuses, insults. Anglo-Saxons have been content to follow the surge of ignorant and narrow-minded opinion for more than 100 years. In the course of all those decades, the Anglo-Saxon majority has done everything politically, legally, socially and economically possible to assimilate Francophones.

It is often heard, "We don't want French shoved down our throats," but I wonder if the opposite is not what is truly happening. "Who have been trying to shove English down our throats?" It seems to me that after 90 years, even if the Franco-Manitoban population is not in the majority, restoring the Franco-Manitobans' rights would be an act of justice and good faith towards all Canada's Francophones. We are proud of being Canadians. We can no longer have faith in political promises. We want to be sure of our rights. On behalf of the Ste. Anne Cultural Centre, I support the resolution negotiated in May of 1983 to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you. If possible, no questions.

No. 51 - English Translation of Mr. N. Ritchot's presentation as recorded on Page 758; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. N. RITCHOT: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, members of the committee. Why so much outcry from those who oppose Section 23? Why all the panic? Are they afraid of having to give up their comfortable position of lord and master?

Gentlemen, for 90 years we have accepted, we have endured, we have tolerated, and we have hoped that one day the Anglo-Manitobans would understand that others do not resemble them, that others have a different language, different priorities.

After 90 years of waiting, we see that today there are still too many who do not see the advantage of broadening their horizons by learning a second language, or at the very least by accepted that others might want to live somewhat differently from them, even if only in using a different language from theirs.

It is fortunate that we presently have a government of which at least some members show professional conscience, justice, integrity and leadership. May they deserve the same characterization when this conflict over Section 23 is finally and irrevocably ended.

To the Pawley Government I say, "bravo," and "hold firm to your course of integrity through this political debate."

I firmly support the resolution which was negotiated last May by the Société Franco-Manitobaine and the Pawley Government to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Thank you very much.

No. 52 - English Translation of Ms. C. Mulaire's presentation as recorded on Pages 759-60; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.4

MS. C. MULAIRE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I come to you with confidence for I believe in your sense of justice.

I am a French-Canadian. My ancestors were not recent arrivals in this country; the Gagnons arrived in Canada in 1640. And yet I cannot say that I feel "at home" in my province, Manitoba, for everywhere that I go, beyond my little village, I must use a language that is not mine.

You see, ladies and gentlemen, the French language is not merely a means of communication for me. It is part of me. I would not be able to detach myself from it without pain - I can speak another, of course, but it is the French language which best translates what I feel, what I think, what I am.

And if you are surprised that I can speak, read and write French, although it was prohibited by law to teach it during my school years, that is because I learned in spite of the law, in secret. My parents knew that they were in the right and that an illegal law could not take from them their fundamental right of remaining true to themselves.

You cannot have helped but notice that ours is a proud and tenacious people. We have survived 93 years of tyranny, oppression and conflict. We are not giving up and we are more than ever determined to demand a right which is our due. It is not a favour that we ask

of you, instead, we offer you an opportunity to show your sense of "British Fair Play."

I firmly and unhesitatingly support the resolution, as negotiated in May between the Société franco-manitobaine and the Federal and Provincial Governments, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

I allow myself to dream - just like Martin Luther King, I have a dream - that perhaps one day justice will be done and I will finally be able to say, with my fellow countrymen and women, "I feel good, I am at home in my province."

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

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Based on your original opening statement, I was wondering whether you think it is a realistic that some time in the future all Manitobans, or all areas of Manitoba, will be bilingual.

MS. C. MULAIRE: I am not asking you to become bilingual, I am asking you to respect the rights of Francophones. We do not ask Anglophones to learn French if they do not wish to do so. But we, the Francophones, would like to be able at least to have some services and to be able to use our language everywhere in Manitoba.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions?

Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Through you to Ms. Mulaire, you stated that you weren't able to receive instruction in French when you went to school. Was that correct?

MS. C. MULAIRE: We had education in French, but it was not because of government laws. It was because the teachers and parents provided it. It was added to the program.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Ms. Mulaire, would it surprise you if I told you I knew people who wrote departmental exams in French in the Province of Manitoba 40 or 50 years ago?

MS. C. MULAIRE: I have nothing to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Graham.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, that was all I wanted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members? Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Mulaire, are the departmental exams just referred to - are we speaking rather - are we not speaking then about 12th Grade conversational French exams?

MS. C. MULAIRE: Which existed at that time? Probably.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you.

No. 53 - English Translation of Mr. R. Freynet's presentation as recorded on Pages 760-61; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. FREYNET: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. The eyes of the entire country are on Manitoba. Will we project an image of tolerance and justice, or one of regressive conservatism? Some say that Section 23 is too costly. But this argument pales when one considers that it is a question of constitutional rights which have been illegally suppressed for close to a century. Other people fear that they will be forced to learn two languages. With Section 23, there is no loss of liberty. On the contrary more liberty is given to us. Once the services in French have been instituted, I am sure that the present controversy will die out. The difficulty lies in the prolongation of the transitional agony for the entire province with these public hearings and other delaying tactics. If Manitoba is in fact constitutionally bilingual, as was unanimously decreed by the nine judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, let us announce it without hesitation, and institute the services in French. I do not ask for charity but for simple justice. The courageous and positive initiative of the Provincial Government must be applauded. I encourage the members of all of the parties in the Legislature to support, without further attenuating it, the agreement concluded in May between the Société franco-manitobaine, the Province and the Federal Government. Let us go forth confidently and conclude this affair with no more delay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Freynet. Questions by members?
Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: I was just wondering if you could comment on whether or not you believe that a constitutional amendment, which is not an ordinary piece of legislation, but something that is significant and historic, should have widespread public support.

MR. R. FREYNET: I think that as far as the rights of the minority are concerned, it is my impression that the majority's support is not needed. That would be, in fact, tyranny by the majority, and the Constitution is there to protect the rights of a minority as well as those of the majority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. As I mentioned this morning, displays from the gallery are not permitted, either in the Assembly or its committees.
Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: I was also wondering whether you could understand that some people who are following the whole constitutional process in our province are somewhat suspicious of the fact that it appears to have been hammered out behind closed doors. I was wondering whether you had any doubts or concerns

about the process by which this has come forward in the public. Are you satisfied with the government's handling of the issue, or do you think it could have been better handled?

MR. R. FREYNET: I think that the government went to the right institution when they negotiated with the SFM and I am behind the SFM all the way. It represents me.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can put my question in a slightly other way. Aside from the SFM, do you think that some members of the public feel that a deal was struck behind closed doors and that the whole matter should have been more in the open and more open in the sense of involving more people or involving the entire population of Manitoba, rather than one segment?

MR. R. FREYNET: I think that these public hearings offer ample opportunity for expression.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members of the committee? Seeing none, Mr. Freynet, thank you very much for your presentation here today.

Sister Thérèse Cloutier; Raymonde Graham; Roger Lafrenière; Elaine Tougas, Elaine Tougas - keep helping me, Larry, I'll learn yet. Thérèse Bouchard; Normand Roy, Normand Roy; Father Laval Cloutier; Raymond Boily; Gérald Fontaine; Daniel Tougas; Maurice Prince.
Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: I note that I have seen Mr. Maurice Prince on the list and I wondered if there were two Mr. Maurice Prince's because I saw Mr. Maurice Prince appear at the Winnipeg hearings and as far as I recall, it is not permitted to appear a second time at the same hearings.

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, could I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Only members are allowed to speak to points of order.
Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we had a discussion of this the other day, and I just want to point out for your consideration that the Franco-Manitoban Society has had representatives, I believe, at every hearing, all eight. Manitoba 23 has been listed in all eight areas of the province. Mr. Eric Maldoff made a statement when he spoke, that he would be prepared to come back from Montreal with his entourage and make a submission later on. I also see this morning, I don't know if he's here now, Mr. Magnet, who was from Ottawa, who was present. I don't know whether he intends to speak. It would seem to me to be in order for Mr. Prince to speak, especially in view of his interest in the issue, and I think I'm looking forward to hearing from him. He should certainly stimulate some debate and interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Desjardins.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. It's not a question of the group that is represented. It is clearly - and in all the years that I have been a member of the House - the rules that you only have a chance to speak once in a presentation such as this. We are not going to different centres in Manitoba to give everybody a chance to speak more than once, it is to accommodate the people in different areas, especially when you have a list of 102 briefs that are people who have asked to speak. I think it is a very dangerous precedent if we were going to let the people start over, then it becomes a debate. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the committee would be very pleased if Mr. Prince would table another document or add to his original statement, but I don't think it would be proper to start the second round at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I am only calling attention to this question. I will gladly bow to the decision of the members of the committee. However, the point brought up by Mr. Doern remains which is that this is the same person speaking for the same organization the second time. If this organization represents some group, there can be no objective to one member or another of this organization appearing. In the other places that we have visited up until now, no one has spoken twice - the same person has not appeared twice.

No. 54 - English Translation of Mr. M. Prince's presentation as recorded on Pages 762-5; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, the brief that I have to present today is entirely different; that is, the information that I want to submit to the committee is completely different, absolutely different.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I'm prepared to allow Mr. Prince to speak on the caveat that there is no repetition of information already provided to the committee. If that occurs, I shall interrupt and suspend the brief.

Please proceed.

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislative Committee, last week Manitoba's Premier, the Honourable Howard Pawley, announced to Manitobans that as soon as the public hearings were finished and the Legislative Committee's work was done, the bill to amend Section 23 would be tabled without delay for a third reading at the autumn session of the Manitoba Legislature; the Manitoba Statute will be sent immediately to the Canadian Government in order to amend Section 133 of The BNA Act. The executive of the Association des Pro-Canadiens du Manitoba, worried about the future of French-speaking Canadians established in the west and particularly in Manitoba, has decided to inform the Government of Canada about the situation as seen by the descendants of one of the founding peoples of our country, Canada. I will now read to you the letter of September 26, 1983

sent to the Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, with copies to the Honourable Brian Mulroney, Leader of the Opposition to Mr. Ed Broadbent, Leader of the Federal NDP Party, to the Honourable Howard Pawley, Premier of Manitoba and to the Honourable Serge Joyal, Canada's Secretary of State.

"Honourable Prime Minister,

"Last September 6th, the Association des Pro-Canadiens du Manitoba presented to the Province of Manitoba's Legislative Committee a brief which made known our position on the proposed amendments to Section 23 of Manitoba's Constitutional Act.

"The amendments to Section 23, proposed by Manitoba's Attorney-General, the Honourable Roland Penner, are the result of a secret agreement which was negotiated by the Société Franco-Manitobaine in concert with the Government of Manitoba and Canada's Secretary of State, the Honourable Serge Joyal.

"Honourable Prime Minister, the future of a united and bilingual Canada is at stake. The position of the Federal Government runs counter to the linguistic and constitutional rights of French-speaking Manitobans; these rights are entrenched in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 and these proposed amendments permanently and irreversibly remove the right of all Manitobans to use one of the official languages of Canada.

"In 1980, the Federal Government advocated that Canada be united and bilingual from one ocean to the other, and three years later the same government is underhandedly negotiating the fate of the inalienable rights of French-speaking Manitobans in a secret agreement which robs the French language of its status of official language in Manitoba and thereby robs Saskatchewan and Alberta of the French language. These three provinces were part of the Northwest Territories, once a vast land which was inhabited by Native peoples, Métis and "Canadiens." It was this region that was the subject of negotiations, during 1869 and 1870, between Canada and the Provisional Government of Louis Riel, to bring the Northwest Territories into Canadian Confederation.

"The secret three-party agreement of 1983 betrays the constitutional rights of all the "Canadians" who have settled west of the Great Lakes since the beginning of the Nineteenth Century.

"Honourable Prime Minister, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 and Section 133 of The BNA Act of 1867 are identical. Section 133 recognizes the constitutional rights of citizens of Quebec to Canada's two official languages, English and French, and it ensues from this that in Manitoba, as in Quebec, Manitobans have a constitutional right to services in the language of their choice, and this without any amendment, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

"In 1971, the unicity project of Manitoba's NDP Government wiped the City of St. Boniface off the map of Canada, St. Boniface, the largest French-speaking city outside of Quebec, St. Boniface, where a social life organized outside the forts flourished in 1818. Today, in 1983, Manitoba's NDP Government is consistent with its past actions in proposing to the Canadian Government amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act; amendments which rob the French language of its official language status in Manitoba and the Canadian West.

"We firmly believe, Honourable Prime Minister, that the Canadian Government is duty bound to protect, without political compromise, the constitutional rights of the two founding peoples of Canada.

"Yours faithfully."

Mr. Chairman, we have included with the document that I have just read, the following supporting documents: the brief presented to the Manitoba Legislative Committee on September 6, 1983 by the Association des Pro-Canadiens du Manitoba; "Constitutionally Speaking" by the Honourable Roland Penner, Attorney-General of Manitoba, (note that this is in English only), dated July 1983; a brochure titled "Facts about French Language Services" (note that this is in English only), which was distributed to all Manitobans by mail; and, extracts from a 1982 R.C.P.O. survey of the preferred identity of "Canadians" living west of the Great Lakes which was ordered by Canada's Secretary of State and published in "La Liberté" on June 10, 1983. Mr. Chairman, I quote several lines pertaining to the question of our identity. "In the West, Francophones prefer to be called 'Canadiens' or 'Canadien-Français' in a large proportion compared to the other provinces!" Next is an article which was published on September 2, 1983 on Page 19 of the weekly newspaper "La Liberté" and concerns the reasons for which the French Consulate in Winnipeg was closed. I quote two paragraphs:

But the economic arguments were the strongest ones. "The reason for closing is simple," explains Mr. Vannini, "the French Government wants to cut back its public expenses." Eight French Consulates have been closed worldwide. According to the statistics, Winnipeg was one of the branches with the fewest French people registered.

How many? 900 Three-quarters of these were registered in Manitoba, the other quarter in Saskatchewan. "However, these statistics do not correspond to the number of Frenchmen living in these two provinces," as the former consul, who has just left Manitoba, points out. He estimates that around 4,000 French people, or people of French origin, live in the two provinces.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add here that for French-speaking Canadians living in Manitoba, the statistic for the province is given as 86,000 and in Saskatchewan I believe, if I'm not mistaken, I believe that the number is around 60,000. Mr. Chairman, the conclusion is obvious. Out of 150,000 French-speaking Canadians only 4,000, if one takes the rough figure given in the article, are truly registered with the consulate across Canada.

The last document which we have added is the following: it is a resolution passed by the Association des Pro-Canadiens du Manitoba at its May meeting. I will read the resolution to you and afterwards you may question me.

"WHEREAS Louis Riel's Provisional Government at Rivière Rouge in 1869-1870 negotiated the conditions of the entry of the Northwest Territories into Canadian Confederation, and WHEREAS the negotiations opened by the Canadian Government with Louis Riel's Provisional Government at Rivière Rouge resulted in the foundation of the Province of

Manitoba through The Constitutional Act of Manitoba of 1870; and,

WHEREAS Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 makes French one of the official languages of the new Province of Manitoba; and, WHEREAS The Constitutional Act of Saskatchewan of 1905, The Constitutional Act of Alberta of 1905, The Constitutional Act of the Northwest Territories of 1877 and The Constitutional Act of Yukon Territory in 1898 endow the French language with the official status established by Sections 133 and 93 of The British North America Act of 1867;

IT IS RESOLVED that we, the undersigned, are opposed to all amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 which would diminish or change the intention of the Fathers of Confederation on the question of Canada's official languages, as they were entrenched in Sections 133 and 93 of The British North America Act of 1867; and,

IT IS ALSO RESOLVED that we, the undersigned, are opposed to all the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 which were negotiated by the Société franco-manitobaine with the Honourable Roland Penner, Attorney-General of Manitoba; which amendments were presented at an Assembly held January 15, 1983 at St. Boniface College in order to inform the audience of the said document, and we add that if the said amendments are ratified in an amendment to the Canadian Constitution, these changes to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act would affect the historic and official status, as entrenched in Sections 133 and 93 of The Constitutional Act of British North America, of the French language in Manitoba and in the other provinces and territories of Canada and would thereby establish a precedent to the detriment of the English-speaking population in the Province of Quebec and the French-speaking population in Manitoba and elsewhere in Canada by limiting one of the official languages of Canada to the areas or districts where numbers justify it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Mr. Prince from members of the committee?

Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Prince, you say that the status of the official languages was part of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it was adopted in 1870, and you go further, you say much more, you say that without amendments, this section contains guarantees of services in the French language. Why then do you say that this amendment proposal removes all official status when in the proposed amendment, Section 23 remains intact except that services are added and the first section says, as presented in the House, "French and English are the official languages of Manitoba." So would you explain to me, Mr. Prince, how the proposed amendment removes its official status from the French language in Manitoba?

MR. M. PRINCE: Well, firstly, Mr. Lecuyer, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the fact that in Quebec, as I said a moment ago in the brief, Section 23 and Section 133 have essentially the same contents, and if in Quebec, Section 133 gives rights and services to the citizens of Quebec, the fact is that here in Manitoba, Section 23 should essentially give us those services. But what one seems to find is that we have a government which, for reasons that are difficult to understand, does not want to give us services in French.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I should stop here because it seems to me that I will never manage to understand this logic. Mr. Prince, how can you say, "the official status of the French language and services are removed when, specifically written in Sections 23(1) to 23(9), the added services are specified without having changed a single comma. Would you not rather use the word "adds" rather than "removes?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Order please. The question was argumentative and invites debate when it asks why and asks for a justification of a position. For that reason, I have to rule the question out of order.

Are there any questions for clarification?
Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Perhaps I made my question too long. So I will repeat it, and let us hope, without giving rise to any arguments. Quite simply, Mr. Prince, will you explain to me how, in your interpretation, the proposed amendment removes, do you not rather mean adds, since Section 23 itself has not been changed by a single comma?

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lecuyer. Section 23 as amended 23(1) becomes subject to all of the conditions and all of the amendments. Section 23 as such guarantees us all rights and services. But the instant that one reduces the section or limits the section by saying that Section 23, referring to such and such a subsection, means this and that, you have exactly what you have done to Section 23.

MR. G. LECUYER: A final comment, Mr. Prince. In your brief you made a reference to the 4,000 French people registered with the consulate, not across Canada but in Winnipeg. Do you understand, Mr. Prince, that the 4,000 in question are French nationals with French passports and not French Canadians from Manitoba and Saskatchewan?

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, if I might answer. I did not invent the article. The article is there, the article is published in "La Liberté" and the article is very clear. The article says that 900 are registered between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Nine hundred, that is to say, three-quarters in Manitoba and one-quarter in Saskatchewan.

The number of 4,000 is one that is not given by the French Government but rather one given by the French Consul and he says that the number of 900 is incorrect. Then one can conclude that the number of 4,000 is attributed to 4,000 French people registered in Canada. That is precisely what I said Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer. Further questions by members?
Mr. Desjardins.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to show Mr. Prince that the section, dealing with what is presently before the House, 23(7)3 says this, "The present section does not have the effect of derogating from the rights guaranteed by Section 23." Does it not seem that this is a guarantee that there is not question of derogating from the guaranteed rights?

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Desjardins a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions of members are not permitted.
Mr. Desjardins.
Mr. Prince, do you have an answer to the question?

MR. M. PRINCE: Yes. Section 23 becomes subject to amendments. Can Mr. Desjardins assure us that that is not the case?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, it is very clear. I need only repeat what I just said. The present section does not have the affect of derogating the rights guaranteed by Section 23.

MR. M. PRINCE: Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Desjardins and I will never come to any understanding on the question of Section 23.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: May I ask one other question, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Prince represents the Association de Pro-Canadiens. Could we have some information on this association: the number, how many were present at the meeting which you mentioned Mr. Prince, who proposed the resolution and who seconded it? I am particularly interested in the number.

MR. M. PRINCE: The resolution was adopted, as I said, in May and there were approximately 20 people. A Miss Lafortune moved the resolution and it was seconded by a Mrs. Forbes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And the number of members please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. M. PRINCE: The number - we do not have, as I explained to the Legislative Committee at the first hearing on September 6th, we do not have a registered membership, if you like. We have a loose membership. They are people that, when we have a cause to defend, we contact and then we get on with it.

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

Column 2, Page 766:

MR. R. DOERN: Are you suggesting then that the so-called injustices and lost rights that many Franco-Manitobans feel were a hardship for them have, in fact

in general, been re-established and that this legislation, rather than helping Franco-Manitobans, is in fact harming them?

MR. M. PRINCE: I would like to answer Mr. Doern's question in French for the simple reason that I want to give him my true gut feeling, exactly what I feel.

I am not a crybaby; you will not hear me mention the past, that I did not have this, and that I did not have that, and that I had holes in my shoes and whatever else you like. I am not interested in that, I look to the future. I am looking at what will happen to me tomorrow; that is what is important and I want Manitoba's Constitution to respect those rights. I do not want it to be amended; it is as simple as that.

No. 55 - English Translation of Mr. E. Kirouac's presentation as recorded on Pages 770-71; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. E. KIROUAC: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. Since the Government of Manitoba indicated that it wished to entrench some Francophones' rights in the Constitution, a strong opposition has been made itself heard throughout the province. This opposition, although an important sign of democracy, does not seem to me to be always well-founded. When one refers to the miniscule number of Franco-Manitobans with the aim of disparaging the May 17th agreement, one is forgetting that the Province of Manitoba would not have come into being with the contribution of the Francophone Metis. This, the province's legal obligation to its Francophone population escapes some, while others use arguments to exclude any entrenchment of rights in the Constitution. The latter say that when Manitoba became a province, there was no guarantee of services for Francophones and consequently there should not be any now.

The courts and Legislature should be bilingual - nothing more. If the government were to opt for this solution, if it were forced for some reason to do that, an injustice as great as that of 1890 would be committed towards Franco-Manitobans. This would be a denial of the first injustice, saying that it did not in any way harm the ability of French-speaking communities to develop and flourish; this is why I support the agreement concluded on May 17th; I find it advantageous to Francophones. It will permit them to begin once more to live in French in Manitoba yet without taking anything at all from the majority. Could there be a more equitable solution than this one? I doubt it, Mr. Chairman.

No. 56 - English Translation of Mr. R. Boily's presentation as recorded on Page 771; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. BOILY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. For too long, French-speaking Manitobans have found themselves in the same untenable situation: on the one hand, if we vigorously asserted our rights on the question of language, we were perceived as agitators and fanatics. But on the other hand, in failing to insist on these same rights we had de facto forfeited

them, so they said, for lack of use or of sufficient numbers.

We have now passed the stage when these rights are questioned. The country's Supreme Court has decided in our favour. The Government of Manitoba must now follow up this fact, by entrenching in the Constitution the amendments to Section 23, as they were negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Provincial and Federal Governments.

Some object to this project, maintaining that the price would be too great, speaking as if services in French were a gift given to the Francophone minority and paid for by the Anglophone majority. What could be more untrue? In fact, French Manitobans have always contributed and will continue to contribute, on an equal footing, to the province's revenues and therefore have the right, in return, to receive the same services. We are not beggars. We claim only what is ours. Furthermore, since when is the justice of a cause measured by the cost of the solution that it demands?

Others would have it that these amendments are unacceptable to the majority. To them, I answer that the extent of the opposition is exaggerated and that they underestimate the common sense, the intelligence and the sense of fair play of the majority of Manitoba's population.

I have just returned from the recent Manitoba Federation of Labour Conference which I attended as a delegate. I did not meet with any manifestation of antagonism towards the wording of the amendments to Section 23. In fact, all those speakers who addressed the question did so to support the government's project. Any antagonism was reserved for the referendum project proposed by the City of Winnipeg and certain municipalities. I therefore ask the committee to support the resolution as negotiated in May.

Thank you.

No. 57 - English Translation of Mr. A. Laurencelle's presentation as recorded on Pages 771-72; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. A. LAURENCELLE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

Allow me to introduce myself: Alfred Laurencelle from La Broquerie. The object of your deliberations today is the future of our people. Along with our history, the French tongue is part of the collective being of Franco-Manitobans. It is a precious part of our past, conserved through battle and withdrawal, by dint of perseverance and determination. Our ancestors paid the price of this resistance and today we still feel the urgency and the necessity of protecting this essential feature of our collective identity. It is no longer enough to resist collective annihilation. We must now begin - and quickly - to greet life with open arms.

We are of those who understand that the true quality of the human being is revealed in his fidelity, his sincerity and his love of what he is. You force us to become foreign to ourselves by imposing upon us feelings of guilt towards our language and culture, all the while hoping to create a more humane Canada where peace, harmony and unity should reign. Has it become a

distortion to believe that in order to better understand, love and appreciate others, one must first know, love and appreciate oneself as one is?

Listen to the words of those who want to attack our will to survive and you will quickly understand that the country's unity is not built up by attacking the life of one of its founding peoples. A people does not make a last will and testament, because it is never meant to die. How many times have we been left to the mercy of the majority to defend our rights? How many times have they taken delight in accusing us of being a burden on the public purse? How many times have they tried to convince Canadians that we were an obstacle to Canadian unity? How many times have we seen our fellow citizens reproach us as troublemakers? Our resistance, my dear friends, had to be conducted peaceably, keeping the respect of others in mind and always in the hope that one day someone would understand that we are within our rights and that our determination deserves a serious commitment from our leaders.

Finally on May 17, 1983 we were about to taste the fruits of our labours. Some even thought, wanted to think, that it was a great chapter in the history of French-Canadians. It is one, unfortunately, that will probably need tearing up before it has even been read and which will only have damaged our good relations, if we leave it in the hands of those who are blinded by the power-hungry. One does not grow a flower by refusing it all forms of sustenance on the pretext that that costs too much, while hoping that it will continue to share in nature's beauty.

Let those who fear paying for services in French with their own money know that we have invested too much to simply abandon the field without it costing you a little. Already an MLA has succeeded in collecting \$15,000 of anti-bilingualism funds by soliciting the province. It is so little when one thinks of how much French Canadians have had to pay to ensure a French education for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. We consider it high time that you restored justice to Franco-Manitobans by taking advantage of the opportunity offered to you. We strongly support the resolution to amend Section 23 as negotiated by Manitoba's provincial Francophone association, the Société franco-manitobaine and the two governments last May.

I thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Laurencelle. Questions by members of the committee?

Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: I fear that if I were to ask a question of Mr. Laurencelle, I would have to couch it in poetic terms, so I will abstain.

No. 58 - English Translation of Mr. L. Joyal's presentation as recorded on Page 772; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. L. JOYAL: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. It is with a soul full of bitterness and trepidation that I take the floor today. It is necessary to entrench our rights in the Constitution. This

responsibility must not be left to the good will of governments which are short lived and often dishonest. I speak with full knowledge of the facts.

My grandfather came to Manitoba in 1882. He had all his rights in a bilingual province, meaning services in French. In 1890, he lost almost all of them. In 1916, my father lost what was left of our rights. When they speak of hiding the French books while the inspector made his school visits, you think that it is ancient history, but I remember it with bitterness. In 1949, I was in the eleventh grade; the inspector intimidated us by saying that Louis Riel was a traitor and we were afraid to contradict him. Do you know of many traitors whose memory is honoured with a statue on the Parliament grounds? What a betrayal! What a traitor!

Finally my children are beginning to see a little justice. But it is with pain and difficulty, and by ceaselessly fighting that we finally obtain some services.

The former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Clement Atlee declared, "Democracy is not only government by the majority, but a government by the majority which respects the rights of minorities." Plebiscites are not held about minorities.

Diogenes, the Greek cynic philosopher, searched in broad daylight with a lighted lantern, for an honest man. He would not find any in Manitoba. But he would take the risk, not of having his lantern stolen, but of having it burned. Will we have even one statesman to defend Manitoba's Constitution, to uphold law and justice without worrying about political repercussions? This man would enter history as a saviour, not only of Manitoba, but of the whole Canada.

To conclude, I would like to quote the thoughts of a great Canadian:

"I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that by any mode whatever there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other; I believe that it would be impossible if it were tried, and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible. The statement that has been made so often that this is a conquered country is 'a propos de rien.' Whether it was conquered or ceded, we have a Constitution now under which all British subjects are in a position of absolute equality, having equal rights of every kind - of language, of religion, of property, and of person. There is no paramount race in this country, there is no conquered race in this country . . ."

These, my dear friends, are the words of our first Prime Minister of Canada, the Conservative, Sir John A. Macdonald.

Thank you.

No. 59 - English Translation of Ms. B. Freynet-Boily's presentation as recorded on Page 773; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. B. FREYNET-BOILY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, already, for more than a century, the Franco-Manitoban people have been the victim of unpardonable linguistic and cultural genocide. Indeed, the unconstitutional law of 1890 marks the beginning of an era of persecutions and injustices perpetrated on the Franco-Manitoban people. Unfortunately, that

era still continues 93 years later. This is why the Government of Manitoba no longer has the right to draw back before the challenge it faces today - that of the restoration of bilingualism in accordance with the agreement concluded in The Manitoba Act of 1870.

There are still those, Mr. Chairman, who oppose the idea of restoring the bilingual character of Manitoba. They maintain that the number of Franco-Manitobans do not justify the cost that such an act would engender. What an affront to the Franco-Manitoban population, in view of the price that it has had to pay because of the shameful act of 1890!

Indeed, that unconstitutional act, coupled with the laws of the time which governed immigration, gave birth to the monstrous phenomenon of assimilation which so decimated the ranks of the Francophone population that today it threatens the survival of this people whose contribution to the development of this province remains an incontestable fact of our history.

Mr. Chairman, a society such as the one in which we live demands that every individual or organization which hinders any law must face the punishment entailed in such an act. The legislators of 1890 committed one of the most ignoble deeds in the history of our province by violating the fundamental rights of one of the founding peoples of Manitoba. It is therefore up to this province's government to return to the Francophone people their linguistic heritage which was taken from them with such impunity in 1890. By taking up this challenge we could turn one of the darkest pages of our history and march towards the future on the very path which the Fathers of Confederation so ably set forth for all Canadians.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No. 60 - English Translation of Mr. A. Desharnais's presentation as recorded on Page 773; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. A. DESHARNAIS: Mr. Chairman, that we have lived for more than 90 years without our linguistic and cultural rights does not mean that we are resigned to living in this state. On the contrary, we are proud of our French language and culture and we want the opportunity to hand them down to our descendants.

In order to do this, we need the opportunity of being able to transact in French at least with respect to the essential services.

We do not want to take anything from the Anglophones nor from ethnic groups; we encourage them to flourish in their own culture. Some Anglophones argue against Section 23 using the additional cost of services in French as a reason. I would like to point out that the major merchants of Winnipeg and even Steinbach always have staff capable of serving us in French. They certainly do not do so at a loss.

The fact of bilingualism in Canada constitutes an important tourist attraction. Our neighbours to the south, for example, who do not have their own culture, like to visit peoples who live in their original culture. Folkorama is a notable example.

The Cultural Committee of St. Pierre-Jolys, in concert with the other cultural organizations in the province, works towards the development of many of our artistic talents by giving them the opportunity to express

themselves publicly. Already, several of our artists are developing on the stage while others have exhibited their creations in visual art competitions.

We are therefore pleased to support the agreement concluded in May 1983 between our representatives in the Société franco-manitobaine and the Federal and Provincial Governments.

The Cultural Committee of St. Pierre-Jolys,
Armand Desharnais, President.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Desharnais. Are there any questions from the members of the committee? As there are none, I thank you Mr. Desharnais and the Cultural Committee of St. Pierre-Jolys.

MR. A. DESHARNAIS: Thank you very much.

No. 61 - English translation of Dr. G. Archambault's presentation as recorded on Page 777-778; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

DR. G. ARCHAMBAULT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is deplorable that Franco-Manitobans must once more expend a lot of effort and energy to come and present to you briefs that are claiming what legally should be granted according to the agreement concluded in 1870 between the Canadian Government and Louis Riel, then leader of the Provincial Government for Rivière Rouge. This tiresome process can only discourage the most fervent and give grounds to the narrow-minded who claim that numbers do not justify the proposed changes; changes which, in my opinion, would rectify the wrongs of the past.

Every time Franco-Manitobans obtain schools, administrative services and structures necessary for their natural growth, it is, gentlemen of the committee, through memorandums, political pressure and demonstrations. When will the gentlemen of the government and of the opposition put an end to this unending struggle, this unrelenting nightmare, this malicious and flagrant injustice?

I deplore the fact that men in politics, or should I say children in politics, are playing for political ends with the destiny of Francophones, one of the founding groups of Canada, of the Canadian west and of the Province of Manitoba. This abusive attitude is upsetting, not to mention embarrassing for the whole country which champions justice and freedom beyond its borders.

In my understanding, the rights of Franco-Manitobans negotiated when Manitoba joined the Confederation of Canada represented unequivocal requirements of participation, as did the agreement of 1867 between Upper and Lower Canada. When Manitoba joined the Canadian Confederation, Louis Riel, leader of the Provisional Government for Rivière Rouge, required a guarantee of French language usage in the new Manitoban territory. The Manitoba Act made French and English official languages for the new province within the defined areas and offered two denominationally-based education systems. These agreements on two levels are a sign of respect; and this mutual respect between Anglophones and

Francophones at the time was the cornerstone on which a country was to be built, a country cognizant of the two realities, of the two founding groups.

When the whole question of bilingualism came up in Ottawa in 1969, all the parties - Liberal, Conservative, New Democratic, and Social Credit - voted in favour of the proposal, putting aside any political partiality in order to let a just, equitable and praiseworthy decision stand. Why wouldn't it be the same in Manitoba concerning the amendment question? Why do we have this fierce opposition, orchestrated by members of the Conservative Party and a dissident New Democrat. Resistance being shown to the proposed amendments is the fruit of your efforts and not, as you claim, the spontaneous reaction of the general public. If you had sided with the proposed amendments the reactions would have been minimal.

You are responsible for this reaction. You, gentlemen of the opposition, have awakened what is most base and contemptible in the general public. You have put groundless fears in the minds of men. You have made every effort to mount an opposition, even an anti-French feeling, rather than go beyond personal prejudice and vote with the government. This is deplorable and I regret this behaviour on your part.

Gentlemen of the government, you have yielded under political pressure. Changes you proposed in September alter the text of the May 17th agreement so much that our legal counsel tells me that the small changes and, I add incidentally, as you maintain, greatly dilute what had been negotiated by the SFM and endorsed by Franco-Manitobans and the Federal Government.

Why these proposed changes? Why this about-face? Why this retreat even before hearing what people have to say on the question? Nothing new is brought into the debate by these proposals because they are too technical, yet they greatly modify what the government is prepared to entrench. Those opposed to the amendments are as opposed now as in September when the changes were introduced. As I understand it then, you have not gained a thing. You have played politics with a very sensitive matter and have lost. You have lost the political field, your credibility and even votes. Yet your party has always stood up for the rights of the little people, of the disadvantaged and of minorities. Although I am not of your political persuasion, I still recognize that one of your strong points is the protection of minority rights. So I really do not understand how you have yielded to pressure from the opposition in introducing the changes tabled in September. I strongly encourage you to turn and go back to continue with the May 17th agreement. This is the only acceptable solution to the problem. The SFM negotiated in good faith and trusted you. Allow us to believe that the SFM was not mistaken, that it was right; that you are trustworthy, and that as a government you will do what must be done to correct the injustice committed in 1890.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Archambault.

Order please, order please. Some of you may not have been here earlier when I advised the gallery that displays are not permitted from the gallery in any form.

Questions for Dr. Archambault from members of the committee? Mr. Desjardins.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Archambault, you say that the government has yielded, has capitulated. Is it really fair when you are given affirmation, and I am going to - the text is in English so I am going to speak in English at this point.

You see the text of these draft amendments are subject to further amendments, which may flow from briefs presented to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and from technical advice received from Council, including the Legislative Council.

When you are given affirmation that nothing has been decided for certain, that there are no proposed amendments at the moment, is it fair to say that the Government has already yielded, has already retreated?

DR. G. ARCHAMBAULT: I agree perhaps that it is not fair (to say) that the government has already yielded, but it is giving the impression that it is going to perhaps yield.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Perhaps.

DR. G. ARCHAMBAULT: That is exactly why we are here, Mr. Desjardins, to make fair presentations. We want the government to follow the May 17th agreement.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I agree with your suggestion and even accept it wholeheartedly. But to say we have yielded is going a bit far, I think.

No. 62 - English translation of Mr. Rino Ouellet's presentation as recorded on Page 779; Hansard, Volume XXXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. OUELLET: My name is Rino Ouellet and I represent the Comité de parents des écoles françaises de La Broquerie (La Broquerie French Schools Parents Committee)

Manitoba is now at a very important crossroads. Either we straightaway accept and impose the American language and culture on everyone, or else we agree to stop, consider our roots and our past in Manitoba and make good use of all the riches that have been handed down to us.

The first solution is less expensive and is less challenging. The American melting pot may even seem quite tempting for those suffering from a chronic lack of imagination.

The second alternative, however, presents sizable difficulties. It requires us to understand that to know two languages is to know one more and not one less. It also forces us to take note that there is more than one way of thinking, playing, working, making a living and of governing oneself. It also requires us to recognize, respect and value these differences. It requires an effort to coordinate all these differences in order to have Manitoba move ahead in the one and same direction.

This is the choice we have in front of us today, and we will have to choose no matter how skillful we are as politicians, no matter how evasive we may be, a choice will be made and history will be recorded, as it has in the past. And in the ball presently being played, there will be gainers and losers, and I suggest that the

real gainers and real losers will not necessarily be us, the Franco-Manitobans - we only account for roughly 6 percent of the population and we are often reminded of that fact.

Gentlemen, all Manitobans will be either enriched or impoverished by your decision, and a decision whether to accept or to reject amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act will be a clear indication to the numerous other minorities in Manitoba, as well as to Francophones, as to whether or not they can truly contribute to this province.

Gentlemen of the Legislature, in speaking of amending Section 23, we are speaking well and truly of rights, of rights recognized in The Manitoba Act. Why then so much effort to stir up Manitoban customs? Why this wish to bring up and exploit unhealthy feelings? Would it be for mere political gains? Do certain politicians believe they can kill two birds with one stone, that is, win an election and manage to wipe out French-speaking communities in Manitoba?

Remember, gentlemen, that to win an election is one thing, and you are successful in that area, but to kill off Franco-Manitobans is another story altogether. We only need to consult our history.

The Constitution of Manitoba was violated in 1890. The Francophone minority survived that. Our opposition returned to the attack again in 1916 but this time in a more treacherous and vicious way, by depriving Francophones of the right to an adequate education. Moreover, Francophones had to suffer all sorts of humiliation, intimidating words and actions, discriminatory treatment, and that's not all. Yet we are still here and we intend to stay. It is true that we are no longer intact; we have become lame in several ways. Our numbers have been decimated; our pride has been wounded. We have often felt the need to live somewhat in hiding, so people will not know that we are Francophones and then we often lose confidence in ourselves. We are not intact but we are still here, possibly not because we necessarily want to stay here, but rather because we cannot do otherwise.

There is a spark in us that cannot be put out, a pressing need to be ourselves, and this spark shall not be put out. Do not tell us to go back to Quebec, do not send us to France, because we are not Quebecois, and even less from France. We are Manitobans; we are from here, Manitoba, and we want to live full lives here in Manitoba. We have not been killed off but we have been prevented from contributing the enormous riches of our culture and language to our province. By this very fact, other Manitoba ethnic groups have been prevented from doing the same. In claiming to unite Manitobans in this way, one has divided them and continues to divide them. It has been claimed that a homogeneous province would be more Canadian, or loyal and stronger. It's a bit like the gardener who would set out to have a fantastic garden by eliminating carrots, peas, beans and potatoes and then replace them all with cucumbers. This gardener would be an idiot. An idiot, and yet that is what many people are suggesting we do in Manitoba.

Explain to me, then, why a culture and a language living in a healthy manner together can be a detriment to a community. If I were happy and healthy would I be by this very fact removing happiness and healthiness from others? That certainly does not appear to be a

serious way of thinking. More precisely, if opposition to entrenchment of our rights came about strongly based on bigoted, ill-informed and unhealthy feelings, it is because there is not any logic that can stand behind this opposition. There only is an illogical but efficient strategy to grab hold of power or to hang on to it. For example, the argument is raised that the francophone minority does not merit rights due to small numbers - 6 percent of the population of Manitoba. Yet in 1890, we made up a much larger percentage and, not only were our rights not permitted, but they were also taken from us. What kind of logic is that? The same thing happened in 1916, at that time we were more than 6 percent.

Therefore logic, as I understand it, is when we form a strong minority, our rights are stolen from us and, when minority is reduced, our rights are withheld and we are hindered from enjoying them. There you have a logic that only bigots and dishonest people are able to understand. Excuse my frankness.

Another argument against recognizing our rights.

Let's not make this an English province or a French province, let's make it a Canadian province.

But in the same breath, and we are not given a chance to breathe, it is immediately added that the Canadian language is English; that the Canadian Queen is Queen Elizabeth II, that our police force is the Royal Canadian Mounted Police - and you can be assured that the word "royal" is not referring to Louis XIV - and that our military air force is the Royal Canadian Air Force. We are also told that the law for an Anglophone is not to know any other language, but that a good knowledge of English is essential for us and for all other minority groups.

Our system of Government itself, with a few slight differences, is a replica of the British parliamentary system.

Gentlemen, your English language, we have learned it; your culture, we have studied it and to a certain degree have assimilated it. We are somewhat of your culture. By these very facts we are your close cousins, we are happy with this. The institutions which are dear to you, we have adapted to them. What we regret, is not having had to learn your language and culture, but having to live with your continual rejection of what we are; and yet, we have a language and a culture just as rich, just as interesting and just as useful. Would it not be for you a sign of intelligence, good taste and courtesy to at least become aware of what is dear to us?

Possibly the most abused argument used to refuse recognition of our rights is the financial argument.

The cost of implementation would be simply prohibited. We are paying for this cost of implementation. When in 1890 and 1916 French was illegally banned from the Legislature, courts and schools, some significant savings were realized by that very action. So where has this money gone that is coming to us; this money that still belongs to us and perhaps with interest and which is owed to us?

Also, we often hear of costs for French as if we Francophones do not pay taxes and, as far as I know, Francophones do not have a tax exempt status simply because they are Francophones. Especially with education, we have often had to pay double education taxes when we wanted to get education in French.

What we are demanding is not charity but what we ourselves have already paid for. On the other hand, we are aware that the May 17th agreement made provision for federal assistance. We are aware that negotiated services are very limited. We know that the majority of the laws will not have to be translated and that a time extension has been provided for the translation of the rest. We know, in fact, that this May 17th agreement costs very little, in fact, for Manitobans. Moreover, we know that a more attractive and interesting province can bring significant returns in tourism.

As for the fear that entrenching our rights will provoke a tidal wave in our courts, you can be assured that we are patient, very patient. Our history shows, in fact, that we are poor clients of our judicial system. One only needs to remember that it has taken more than 85 years, 85 years, for one of us to decide to question the justice of an act as odious as the act of 1890.

Finally I would like to appeal to your sense of justice with a very practical proposition. I suggest a barter. Give us the rights and services - and you are in a position to do it - give us the rights and services which you think that we, as the official minority, should have. Then - and I'm serious about this - get in touch with the Government of Quebec. Explain to them what rights and services Manitoba's official minority has. Invite them to apply the exact same arrangement to their official minority. Reassure René that he will not need to worry because you will co-sign the bill of law and you will personally be over there to explain to their minority why they suddenly have to be treated this way.

And if you were to go there with something as diluted as was presented to us on September 6th, or as unsubstantial as was promoted by the official opposition, then may I suggest that you need only buy a one-way ticket and keep the rest for a coffin. What's good for the goose, in my opinion, is good for the gander.

To conclude, I would like to remind all Francophones that the struggle for justice that we have been pursuing for such a long time is a struggle for the dignity of all Manitobans. Manitoba needs us, let us remain faithful to ourselves and to the very end.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For those people who were not here when I made the admonition earlier I remind you, demonstrations of any form from the gallery are not permitted in committee. On occasion the Speaker has had to clear the gallery, I'm sure you don't want that done here.

Questions for Mr. Ouellet? Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciated your brief as well as your frankness.

You alluded to the fact that what happened in 1890 and 1916 did much to lead Francophones towards assimilation. Would you go so far as to say that steps being taken today to prevent entrenchment are therefore so designed that this way is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Lecuyer, you're providing the answer in your question, again, and just doing it in French doesn't help.

MR. G. LECUYER: Almost, almost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you rephrase the question to seek clarification of the witness's brief, please?

MR. G. LECUYER: At least it delays your interruptions, Mr. Chairman. Would the fact of not intervening to guarantee French services today, while we have the opportunity to do so, have an effect on Francophones, in your opinion?

MR. R. OUELLET: I think that the most important fact is that we would psychologically remain a practically illegal group in Manitoba. All the same there are some generations able to live with that, but there is a new generation coming, today's students. I think it is normal to want to live in an accepted way in Manitoban society. If the French language is not accepted and services not made definite services which allow youth to know they can address the Manitoba Government and be important and worthy enough to be served in French then I think that our children will certainly never have confidence to think it worth the effort to remain French here. They will become bastardized, they will become something other than Francophone. I do not know what will become of them but they will certainly set off in a direction in which they will not be forced to continually struggle as we are doing.

To illustrate, there are people within the adult population who are able to put up a five-year battle for a small school in Ile-des-Chênes. I think that children now in these schools are not prepared for this type of battle.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank-you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you. I was thinking that . . . Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was thinking that Mr. Ouellet was possibly going to tell us that at the end of the road we were all going to be cucumbers.

No. 63 - English translation of Ms. Michelle Freynet-Arbez's presentation as recorded on Page 782; Hansard, Vol. XXI, No. 40 - 2:00 p.m., 27 September, 1983

MS. M. FREYNET-ARBEZ: I won't be long. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, if we are here today it is because we must, once again, do everything in our power to ask our Government to grant us, in its great kindness what should be ours by right, something we were promised almost a century ago and which apparently is to be taken away from us, at least in part, if not entirely. I am speaking, in fact, of our fundamental rights.

Although it is encouraging to see all these people gathered today with the goal, for most of them, of asserting themselves and claiming these fundamental rights, it is nevertheless sad to realize that we had to resort to a demonstration of this size, which manifestation cannot even guarantee our success.

Franco-Manitobans are forced to be continually on their guard not to lose what little they have gained by

the sweat of their brow. When will they finally be able to benefit from being treated in a manner equal to that presently enjoyed by Manitobans of English expression, and to the degree they desire?

The amendments proposed by Société franco-manitobaine in its discussions with the Manitoba Government are very just and reasonable. That is why I support the resolution negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 64 - English translation of Ms. Agnes Dubois's presentation as recorded on Page 783; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MS. A. DUBOIS: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, Madam, I represent the Parents' Association of Noel Ritchot School in St. Norbert which is part of the Seine River School Division whose headquarters is here in Ste. Anne.

Last week I received a telephone call from your office asking whether Mr. Noel Ritchot would speak on behalf of our association today. I replied that, unfortunately, this would be impossible because he has been dead . . . since 1905 . . . And then it occurred to me that his absence really was a misfortune for it would have been entirely appropriate for this former Ste. Anne priest who, together with Louis Riel, worked on drawing up The Manitoba Act of 1870 and who traveled to Ottawa to negotiate the Act with Prime Minister John A. Macdonald, to tell us today what he thinks of entrenching an amendment on Franco-Manitoban rights in the Canadian Constitution. In 1977, after three years of unimaginable struggle to have their school built, the parents of St. Norbert asked the Seine River School Division to name the school after Noel Ritchot because they knew how much this native son of St. Norbert had contributed to the recognition of Franco-Manitoban rights.

Those parents, and the ones who came later, set a high value on the education in French of their children. Despite the fact that superhuman efforts have sometimes been needed to get results, we parents are delighted that we can openly support French-language education in contrast to our parents who had to do so in secret.

And like all good parents, we want to do even more for our children. We want the bilingual citizens who graduate from our schools to be able to say they are fully equal citizens, and we want their unjustly revoked language rights restored to them. What we want for them in the end is the chance to lead their lives just a little more fully in the French language.

It goes without saying, therefore, that we fully support the Société franco-manitobaine, our official representative, and that we endorse the amendments to Section 23, negotiated last May 24th by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Governments of Manitoba and Canada, and approved by the Franco-Manitoban people.

Thank you.

No. 65 - English translation of Ms. Laurette Thérberge's presentation as recorded on Page 784; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MS. L. THÉRBERGE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as unbelievable and inadmissible as it is,

the fact still remains that here we are today, at this late date, debating these amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. The services that this amendment guarantees us should have been secured a long, long time ago.

The framework of our beloved province was built on a foundation of Francophones - the voyageurs, the first farmers, the first politicians sent to the Canadian Parliament, were all French-speaking Manitobans. Francophone Manitobans were in the majority when our province entered Confederation, and so they took it for granted that their children would continue to live in their forefathers' language. They were gravely mistaken . . .

In 1890, a bill was passed that abolished French as an official language of the province, and we recall 1916 and the infamous Thornton Act - instigated by T.C. Norris - which made English the sole language of education in Manitoba. This was a flagrant injustice, that tore asunder the pride, the rights, and the future of an entire people. Oh yes, I remember 1946 at the Tuxedo Teachers' College. English was the only official language allowed on campus; French strictly forbidden. I confess I disobeyed; and I say this without shame, that was an unjust, abusive and disloyal prohibition.

Our rights were stripped from us by intolerant people, people who could not have cared less for our culture. The Canadian reality is such that this vast land we call Canada has two founding peoples, French and English, on an equal footing, and we are one of those peoples. We are not just another ethnic group.

Members of the committee, I ask you today to inscribe in Manitoba Law the amendments to Section 23 so that my children and grandchildren, and yours, need not submit to the same fate that Manitoba's history imposed on my father and grandfathers. The truth is that laws may be revoked but we shall be vigilant for the future. We shall steer clear of the "lion's den".

I fully support the resolution, negotiated in May by the federal and provincial governments and the Société franco-manitobaine, on amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 66 - English translation of Mrs. Marie-Joseph Fiset's presentation as recorded on Page 748; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MS. M. FISSETTE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, The Fédération des Aînés Franco-Manitobains represents 17 Senior Citizens' organizations across the province. It is the official agency representing the interests of Manitoba's older Francophones.

We need not tell you with what a lively interest we have for the past two years been following all the discussions between the Société franco-manitobaine, the federal government, and the provincial government. Among our members we have many elderly people who lived through the injustices committed in 1916 by the government of the time. We have all suffered a great deal from having to study our language in secret, aware that what we were doing was against the law.

Our organization includes a number of teachers among its members. They also lived with great emotion

and with troubled consciences through those difficult years. They looked on in sorrow while, gradually and irrevocably, the quality of French in our community deteriorated. Not one of them will ever forget the terror that an unexpected school inspector's visit could provoke. Our members all supported and were active in the valiant efforts of the 'Association d'éducation' to preserve our language and our culture.

Many of us have made great sacrifices to provide our children with a satisfactory French and religious education. We have sent them, at the age of 12 or 13 years, to boarding schools and private schools, which were too often very far from home. How many parents have had to forego the contribution that a young lad could make in tilling the fields, and helping with farm chores, not to mention the pain of losing, in a certain sense, a son so young. How many parents have bled themselves white to pay board for one, or two, or sometimes as many as six or eight sons, so as to provide them with a good French education, because the public system - which we nevertheless had to subsidize - did not offer one? How many good priests and nuns worked for years without any payment, but purely for love of our language and our people?

Isn't it time that justice was done? The revoking of Section 23 of the Manitoba Act has worked a great wrong to the French fact in Manitoba. Deprived of our schools, deprived of a legal right to our language, we have suffered losses in large numbers. On the one hand, assimilation has taken its toll; on the other, many of our most gifted have had to go to Quebec to be able to complete their studies in French, and many have never returned. If Manitoba's Francophones had been able to develop as well-rounded citizens, as was the wish of the Father of Manitoba in 1870, would we have seen such talented Franco-Manitobans as Gabrielle Roy, Henri Bergeron, Daniel Lavoie etc., leaving the province?

Franco-Manitobans have been made to pay dearly since the illegal annulment of Section 23. And now you, in government, have the power to restore to us some of the rights which have always been ours, but which have been denied to us for so long. Will you let yourselves be frightened and swayed by a small group of racist bigots who desire the total and utter annihilation of our people? Surely the era of 1890, 1896 and 1916 is past. Will you perpetuate the injustices of your ancestors?

The Fédération des Aînés Franco-Manitobains with its 17 affiliated organizations offers its unconditional support to the position of the Société franco-manitobaine and to the proposed amendments to Section 23.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Ms. Fiset? Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: Just that I believe that if the French language is still alive here in Manitoba, then it's due to people like Ms. Fiset. Thank you very much for your brief, Madam.

MS. M. FISSETTE: Thank you.

No. 67 - English translation of Ms. Dolores Legal's presentation as recorded on Page 785; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MS. D. LEGAL: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here today to express my views on the

question of amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

On Manitoba's entry into the Canadian Confederation in 1870, Louis Riel, the defender of French-language rights, demanded that French be one of the province's official languages. The Manitoba Act made French one of the official languages and guaranteed French-language education in Manitoba. However, in 1890 an unconstitutional bill abolished French as an official language in the province, and in 1896, and again in 1916, education in French was brutally swept away in Manitoba. These were two injustices perpetrated against the Franco-Manitoban people, the founders of Manitoba.

It is only in 1983, after so many years have gone by, that an effort is being made to rectify this deplorable situation and to propose amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. It is imperative that Franco-Manitobans have their rights restored and that French be recognized in all areas as an official language of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I strongly support the agreement, negotiated in May between the Société franco-manitobaine, the federal government and the Government of Manitoba, on amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions by members of the committee? Seeing none, thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

MS. D. LEGAL: Thank you.

No. 68 - English translation of Mr. Gérard Desrosiers's presentation as recorded on Page 785; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MR. G. DESROSIERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Madam, I was overjoyed a few months ago to hear that the present government was finally going to acknowledge the injustice which has subjugated a certain segment of the Manitoban population and that it was finally going to take that giant step which every Premier of Manitoba conscientiously vowed to take when he dreamed of becoming premier, but who then had to step backwards when faced with the clamouring of some ambitious martyr who took up the responsibility of safeguarding the one and only English language in Manitoba, out of fear that other languages would contaminate English, or even that French would replace it.

Madam and gentlemen, you see before you a typical product of the system our forefathers thought they had set up for good in Manitoba. I was born into an old Franco-Québécoise family of Acadian descent that settled in Manitoba in 1882. So firmly did my parents and grandparents believe that nothing could deprive them of their rights that they brought us up only in the beautiful French language, and I knew very well that if, one fine day, I were to need another language, I would be able to learn it when the time came. And if that other language were to be English, the learning would be easy.

And this is what happened. At 24 years of age I graduated from the Collège de St-Boniface as a

unilingual Francophone for all intents and purposes. Today, after some 30 years as a teacher, I am the principal of an English-language school after having participated actively in the creation of a Kindergarden to Grade 12 French-language school and, after having been the guiding force in the setting up of a French immersion programme for Anglophones and assimilated Francophones, a programme which is now well established from Kindergarden to Grade 6. People who grasp the advantage of being bilingual are not afraid of the effort they have to make to learn another language and, because we are an officially bilingual province in a bilingual land, let us not waver any longer, ladies and gentlemen: "Let us render unto Shakespeare that which is Shakespeare's and unto Franco-Manitobans that which is their due."

To those of you here present and who are in power and in a position to act, believe me when I tell you that you must seize the opportunity now before you to restore justice to an entire people, for if you do not act now you will regret it for a long, long time: "A contract is a contract."

I support the resolution, negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine with the Pawley government, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 69 - English translation of Ms. Gabrielle St. Hilaire-Mulaire's presentation as recorded on Page 786; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MS. G. ST. HILAIRE-MULAIRE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the "Éducateurs franco-manitobains de la Division scolaire de la Rivière Seine", an association affiliated with the local Manitoba Teachers' Society, appreciates this opportunity to present a brief to the Legislative Committee on the proposed amendments to Section 23 of the Canadian Constitution.

In 1870, the Manitoba Act recognized French and English as the official languages of Manitoba. In 1890 proposed legislation was adopted which declared English the official language of the province and promoted public schools over parochial schools. By abolishing public financial support to parochial schools, teaching in the French language was greatly diminished.

For twenty years, from 1896 to 1916, education in both languages was allowed specifically only when at least ten pupils spoke another language.

The Thornton Act of 1916 recognized English as the only official teaching language in the public schools of Manitoba.

On the passing of Bill 59 in 1967, the use of French as a teaching language was allowed for 50 percent of the teaching day.

Finally, in 1970 Bill 113 was passed thus restoring, to those who so desired, the right to enroll their children in public schools where the teaching would be given in the French language.

We believe that students who attend school in French deserve to live in a society that allows them to conduct their lives in French beyond the walls of those schools. A French-language school will better be able to attain

these goals in a society whose institutions promote the broadening of francophone culture and identity.

We can assure you that the francophone teachers and students who take advantage of the possibility of receiving an education in their mother tongue will also take advantage of the public services made available in French.

Let us now admit that the act forbidding the use of French in the courts and in the Legislature was ruled unconstitutional and illegal. It is high time we stop acknowledging an illegal law for if we do not, then how can we go on teaching our young people respect for society, for government and for the judicial system?

We support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it was negotiated in May by the provincial and federal governments and the Société franco-manitobaine.

We thank you for providing this opportunity to present our brief.

Thank you.

No. 70 - English translation of Mr. Gilles Hébert's presentation as recorded on Page 786; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MR. G. HÉBERT: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I represent a group of Francophones from St. Malo who are here tonight - more specifically, I represent Gilles Hébert, one of the descendants of Louis Hébert, Canada's first farmer. And even more specifically, I am speaking on behalf of Louis Préfontaine who took the time to prepare this brief.

First of all, let me tell you that my ancestors came to Canada in 1652 while those of my neighbour, Louis Préfontaine, came in 1686, and the same history could apply in as many cases as there are French-Canadians in St. Malo.

What a ridiculous spectacle it is to see Canadian citizens from such old families on the defensive as they claim the rights that were torn from them by a pusillanimous government 90 years ago. How much longer do those opposing amendments to Section 23 want this travesty of justice to continue?

We reject at the outset the untenable argument that claims our minority is far too small in number to warrant having its language rights entrenched in the constitution. Indeed, you might well ask how much more numerous we Franco-Manitobans would be today if we had not been subjected to linguistic genocide and the ravages of assimilation caused by the proclamation of the insidious Acts of 1890 and 1916.

For these very reasons we, the people of St. Malo, strongly and urgently support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as negotiated in May by the federal and provincial governments and the Société franco-manitobaine.

Thank you.

No. 71 - English translation of Mrs. Lucienne Boucher's presentation as recorded on Page 787; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MS. L. BOUCHER: Mr. Chairman, Madam, Gentlemen of the Committee, I'm the one hundredth person since

your hearings began and I really wonder why am I here? Like many others who are here, I can think of lots of other things to do rather than expend so much energy and time - doing what? To try, one more time, to justify the most obvious of truths which is this: as French-Canadians it would be normal for us to have the same rights and privileges as our brother and sister English-Canadians. Nothing more, nothing less. It's not the end of the world.

And yet, what a storm has been unleashed over Manitoba, and even over all of Canada, because a government, caught in a corner without room to move, tried to act on a constitutional guarantee for something that should have been normal and accepted a long, long time ago.

And just how did we get bogged down in this manner? Well, it's because an opposition party has decided to sound a political battle cry on this question and forsake the nonpartisan attitude it held until last May. Also because a government party that often jumps at the sight of its own shadow is promising to water down a proposal that took so much work to negotiate and which for us constitutes a minimum for survival.

So, we have to fight again and travel by hundreds and thousands to Ste. Anne on a Tuesday night in September hoping that our children, without having to travel in hundreds and thousands to Ste. Anne, will also be able to enjoy the same rights that your children, ladies and gentlemen of the government and opposition, take for granted every single day.

I don't claim to be an expert on constitutional law and I have no intention of launching into judicial interpretations, but I do know how to read! And I can read well enough to understand that the September 6th proposal puts me, as a Franco-Manitoban citizen, in a considerably different position from the one deriving from the May 17 proposal, and this change shocks and humiliates me.

Let's examine this famous Section 23.1 - "English and French are the official languages of Manitoba." As I see it, this means that for the first time my right to be fully Francophone, as well as a fully equal citizen of Manitoba, is recognized. That little sentence is a warm hand-shake from my compatriots who are saying to me: "Welcome to your land, you can be as Francophone as you like and a Manitoban, too." That's the positive and stirring symbolism of this statement.

But then what do I read? "As provided for in Section 23 and Sections 23.2 to 23.9 inclusive." What a load of gibberish! My two official languages get bound up, tied down, straitjacketed, corralled so they don't contaminate too much those adherents of English supremacy, the "faithful" of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. The sincere and friendly extended hand suddenly reveals a pair of handcuffs.

The Attorney-General is trying to make us believe that this doesn't alter the legal import of it. Unfortunately, I haven't enough expertise to contradict him on that score, but I do know one thing, the generous spirit of the original statement is now betrayed, its symbolism completely destroyed. It would be better not to have it at all.

In looking at this first change in conjunction with the others, anyone who can read will see right away that the entrenchment of language rights, far from being a stirring challenge to the province, turns into something

negative, to be confined and almost quarantined to avoid the spread of germs.

They would like to eliminate the words "central office." They're afraid that some fine day a slightly deranged judge might rule that one more office should offer services in French. What a catastrophe that would be! Instead of five hundred bilingual civil servants in Manitoba, maybe five hundred and one or even five hundred and two would be needed!

And then let's eliminate the word "forthwith" from the remedial clause. With three years to get ready, someone is afraid to request a delinquent office to hurry up a bit and obey the law.

And then, of course, we mustn't "include any municipality or school board." They're afraid of being contaminated by the French virus! Even the Société franco-manitobaine accepts that change because everyone seems to agree that this clause doesn't alter anything. Then, why is it there? To appease the Union of Manitoba Municipalities fanatics? We've seen what that means. To appease the irresponsible members of the Winnipeg City Council? We've seen what that means, too.

This little sentence of exclusion, which no one to my knowledge ever asked for, characterizes the petty and negative spirit of the proposed amendments. These are unworthy of the spirit of the intent of the May 17 agreement. Moreover, they have not succeeded in satisfying those unremitting opponents of the agreement. So forget about them!

Let's not delude ourselves. Real opposition to this proposal doesn't stem from people who are sincerely worried about the text, nor from people who are opposed in principle to the idea of entrenchment, apart from Mr. Lyon, of course.

As you've seen throughout your hearings, real opposition comes from people who are opposed to the very idea of services in French and bilingualism, from people who continue to reject the essence of the confederative pact, which is the guarantor of our country's future.

Mr. Doern knows all about this. It's not by chance that he chose "Against Bilingualism" as the title for his advertisements. He knows his clientele. They are people who see Canada as a country with one language, English, and they scarcely tolerate the minority in Québec. Never must the French language cancer spread beyond the borders of the Québec ghetto and contaminate the unilingual purity of the other regions of the land.

You won't change those people's minds just by tinkering here and there with the wording of the proposal. Ladies and Gentlemen, you vacillated on September 6th, but pull yourselves together now. You set out on a noble quest. Now stick to it. You were wise to avoid a Supreme Court case that would only have dealt with the legality of statutes and instead to modernize Section 23 so that it would mean something to us every day of our lives.

Don't misunderstand me. If I've spoken strongly about the September 6th amendments, it's because I've had to, but that in no way changes the high esteem which I have for a government, perhaps alone in Canada, which has had the courage to take the bull by the horns and honestly confront the question of the survival of its linguistic minority. There's not much that's politically

expedient in all this. Franco-Manitobans don't tip the electoral scales, and we know it.

For four months you've resisted the temptation to sigh and throw up your hands and give over your responsibilities to the Supreme Court. I say Bravo and thank you! Your wavering on September 6th can be forgiven.

I'd also like to say how much I admire the Attorney-General who has had, without a doubt, the most challenging task, caught up as he is between virulent opponents and sometimes the temerity of his own colleagues.

Well, the time for fearfulness is over. Stand firm! The eyes of all Canada are upon you. Circumstances in these past few weeks have caused this issue to extend beyond the borders of Manitoba. There is no doubt at all that your first responsibility is to Manitoba. But never forget that these circumstances have enlarged your responsibilities to include all Canadians. We can say without exaggerating that the very future of Canada depends on you.

The courage which members on the government side - I'd rather not discuss the others - have shown up until now gives me reason to believe that you will return to the spirit of the May 17th agreement and then persevere to the end.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions for Mme. Boucher? Mr. Penner?

HON R. PENNER: Thank you very much, Mme. Boucher.

MS. L. BOUCHER: You're welcome.

No. 72 - English translation of Mayor Roger Smith's presentation as recorded on Page 788; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mayor Roger Smith. Order please. Please proceed.

MR. R. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, in my capacity as Mayor of the Town of Ste. Anne, let me first of all extend to you a warm welcome to our humble, though proud, little town. Naturally, Mr. Chairman, this welcome includes everyone here tonight and we regret that we do not have a hall large enough to accommodate the whole audience.

Mr. Chairman, we are indeed much honored, in Ste. Anne, to be host to part of this hearing, this historical hearing that the government is holding across the province.

Last June, the Ste. Anne Town Council passed a unanimous resolution of support for the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act proposed by the provincial government. For the twenty years that the town has been incorporated, it has always offered services in both languages, even when the English-speaking population was relatively small. As far as official documents are concerned - minutes, financial reports, decrees and regulations - everything is written in English at the present time. We do not have model documents to study in French nor do we have the expertise required for good translations. Consequently,

we consider that the help in this area, proposed in the agreement with the federal government, will be very practical as well as instructive for Manitobans, the number of whom wishing to learn the two official languages of our country grows daily in a most remarkable way.

. . . (Next seven paragraphs in English.) . . .

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mayor Smith.

No. 73 - English translation of Mr. L. Robert's presentation as recorded on pages 798 to 792; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. L. ROBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I would like to begin by pointing out the presence here tonight of hundreds of Franco-Manitobans who came with me to claim their rights. Their presence in such numbers refutes, once and for all, the insidious myth that the Société franco-manitobaine is not representative of the Franco-Manitoban population. We are here because we are Franco-Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall some facts that have been forgotten or neglected during these last months, in the course of the long and bitter debates on the amendments to The Manitoba Act. What was this territory during the two centuries before Manitoba's foundation? It was an area originally populated by Indians and then by a few Anglophones who were employees of the Hudson Bay Company, and as of 1734 with the arrival of LaVérendrye, by an increasing number of Francophones. The first group of Scottish and Irish settlers arrived in about 1811, led by Lord Selkirk. With the exception of the unfortunate incident at Seven Oaks, all of these different founding peoples of Manitoba, Indians, French-Canadians, Scottish, Irish and Métis lived in peace and harmony for 60 years or three generations, until 1870.

And what was it that upset this balance, Mr. Chairman? It was the arrival, during the 1860s, of an increasing number of Ontarians, many of them Orangemen and Loyalists who had decided to settle the area and impose a new order, an order based on a single language and culture: their own. Their intolerant attitude and authoritarianism were not favourably met by the Red River Colony, and so they continued further west to Portage la Prairie. The historian, W.L. Morton, had the following to say about these newcomers to the colony, and I quote:

" . . . they so challenged all the fundamentals of the old order in Red River as to give the impression that they were trying to bring about anarchy. That indeed was to be the result, though it was not the intent, of their agitation."

(MANITOBA: A HISTORY, 2nd ed., p. 111)

This intolerance towards people of a different race and culture, this spirit of intransigence in establishing the Anglo-Saxon hegemony, has been rekindled within the Manitoba Conservative Party under the leadership of Sterling Lyon. If there is a desire to find an honourable and equitable solution to the current impasse with the Conservative Party, it is not at all evident. Even men

such as Bud Sherman, Jack Murta and Don Craik, who have intentions of entering federal politics, have remained silent on this question. Under the leadership of Mr. Lyon, the Conservative Party has become the spiritual heir to the Canadian Party, the party of intolerance in the 19th Century.

Faced with the invasion of a new mentality foreign to the Manitoba area, the Métis and Francophones had no other choice, in 1869 and 1870, but to react strongly. The establishment of the provisional government in 1869 led to the eventual adoption of The Manitoba Act which was proclaimed on July 15th, 1870. This act, Manitoba's constitution, confirmed the bilingual nature of the province, and its purpose was clearly to give both French and English status as official languages.

Mr. Chairman, the main guarantees of equality for the two official languages are entrenched in The Manitoba Act of 1870 and are as follows:

- 1) The formation of an Upper House or Legislative Council, which was to guarantee equal representation for both Francophones and Anglophones, regardless of changes to the representation of each group in the Lower House;
- 2) A bilingual Legislature that would informally develop a bilingual administration and public service;
- 3) Equal representation of English and French parishes in the Lower House or Legislative Assembly; this was accomplished through the establishment of an equal number of electoral divisions for English- and French-speaking parishes;
- 4) The establishment of bilingual courts.
- 5) The establishment of a denominational school system for the Catholic and Protestant residents in the Red River area.

Mr. Chairman, need I go into all of the sordid details relating to the subsequent subversion of The Manitoba Act following the onslaught of the Ontario immigrants in the 1870s? Let me simply recall the main decisions that were taken to humiliate the original Métis and French-Canadian founders of Manitoba and ultimately to abolish totally their rights in this province.

- 1) 1876: Abolition of the Upper House.
- 2) 1890: Abolition of French as an official language in Manitoba by adopting The Official Languages Act, making English the only official language. Also in 1890: Abolition of all denominational schools in Manitoba and creation of one single, non-denominational public school system.
- 3) 1916: Abolition of French and of all other languages as languages of instruction in Manitoba; creation of an "English-only" school system in the province.

4) From 1890 onwards and perhaps before: Systematic non-observance of the provisions for bilingual courts, bilingualism in the Legislative Assembly, and the informal creation of a bilingual administration and Civil Service, rendered those provisions inoperative.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, since the 1960's progressive politicians in this province have attempted to redress these historical wrongs. It was a Conservative Premier, the Honourable Duff Roblin, who partially restored the right to use French as a language of instruction in Manitoba in 1967. In 1970, the Honourable Edward Schreyer restored French as a language of instruction in Manitoba with the full support of the Conservative Party under the leadership of Walter Weir.

Other steps taken during the 60's and 70's with respect to French Language Services always received the support of all the political parties in Manitoba. In contrast to this, we have witnessed this year how fragile public consensus on this issue remains, and how much harm can be done when unscrupulous politicians decide to attack linguistic rights.

The Conservatives today, under Sterling Lyon, have but one argument, which we have heard repeated ad nauseam for the past several months: that a declaration of official languages and French services should not be entrenched in a Manitoba constitution. Mr. Chairman and members of your committee, French and English are the official languages of Manitoba, and the agreement we signed with the provincial and federal governments would simply provide a 20th Century application of principles enshrined from the start in our Manitoba constitution. In this context, the fight today against entrenchment makes no sense, unless the intent of the opponents of the proposed amendment is to limit French-language rights that were, in the eyes of the founders of Manitoba, to be fully guaranteed right from the start.

The Conservative Party today and its lackey, Russell Doern, are the true revisionists. They are the ones who want to abolish the rights that were acquired by Franco-Manitobans as founders of this province in 1870. Mr. Chairman, no referendum, regardless of its scope will change the facts on which this province is founded. It is unfortunate that the opponents of this agreement, which was negotiated in good faith with the provincial and federal governments over a period of eight months, have attempted to make the people believe that new rights are being claimed. All the available historical evidence proves this is not true.

People who believe that somehow new rights are involved have been sold a bill of goods, or have simply misunderstood the whole issue. That certainly would not be surprising, given the mean-minded and fundamentally intolerant nature of the opposition to the government's original proposal. I will not dwell on the motives of people such as Mr. Lyon and Mr. Doern who are attempting to peddle their interpretation of the current constitutional debate to the citizens of Manitoba. However, last May 27th, the Montreal Gazette did not hesitate to publish an editorial that read, in part, as follows:

"Sterling Lyon is living, breathing proof that minority rights need protection in the Constitution . . . Mr. Lyon's past record and present rhetoric make it plain that if he or someone of like mind were running the Manitoba Government, he would be stubbornly resisting the extension of French rights. The only way to guarantee them is to make such resistance illegal. And the only way to do that," concluded the Gazette, "is to entrench them in the constitution."

In a similar vein, I would like to recall the record of the Lyon administration with respect to the translation and passing of bills in Manitoba, following the decision on the Forest case in 1979.

- 1) 1980: Nine new bills out of 115 presented to the Legislative Assembly were translated.
- 2) 1981: Not a single new bill presented in French.
- 3) In the two years following the Forest decision, a single bill which was passed before 1979 and which dealt with family law, was translated.

As I mentioned earlier, we held intense negotiations with the provincial government and have been very disappointed by the turn of events since May 17th. Mr. Chairman, allow me to recall briefly the concessions we made in eight months of intensive negotiations with the provincial and federal governments.

First, we wanted Manitoba to opt into the new Charter of Rights and Freedoms of Canada as regards language rights so that we could enjoy a level of protection similar to that afforded other Canadians in other provinces. We were prepared to limit the application of this protection to areas in which numbers warranted it. However, the Attorney-General of the province refused to give in to this request and insisted that negotiations involve only the amendment to The Manitoba Act. Eventually, and with a great deal of regret we accepted the Attorney-General's position. That was our first concession.

Secondly, we attempted for almost a year to obtain some sort of guarantee that services in both official languages might be provided by those 30-odd municipalities and school boards (out of a total of 202) where most of us reside. The Attorney-General consistently refused to give in to this request, stating that he was not prepared to extend these constitutional obligations to organizations other than provincial government departments and agencies. We firmly believed, and still do, that it is reasonable on our part to ask that French Language Services be provided by the municipalities and school divisions which have a considerable number of Francophone taxpayers. Some municipalities now maintain that the authority of the law is not necessary, that the requested services will be provided on the basis of simple equity. This, Mr. Chairman, is a case of flagrant hypocrisy. Over the last 60 years, it is the municipal level of government that has been most reluctant to provide even a minimum of services in French. The City of Winnipeg is among the worst offenders. While it scrupulously meets the minimal requirements of The City of Winnipeg Act in terms of translation of official notices, it still does not provide adequate French language police, fire or parks and recreation services even in North St. Boniface, where 70 percent of the population is Francophone! Mr. Chairman, your committee is studying, among other issues, the provision of French-language services; perhaps you can enlighten us as to how we might obtain these services, without statutory compulsion, at the municipal level. We, at this time, are at a loss.

However, not wanting to appear overly-zealous, we also agreed to abandon this request for legally guaranteed services in our language at the local level. That was our second concession.

Thirdly, and most importantly, we agreed to let the province off the hook for a large portion of its translation burden. Francophones are taxpayers, too, and we are concerned about the extremely high cost of translating an enormous amount of legislation. We have agreed to limit the number of statutes that must be translated to approximately 400, rather than the 4,500 that should normally have been passed in both languages.

The savings in not translating laws, which have been repealed, has been calculated at a minimum of 25 million in historical dollars. Mr. Chairman, we are in a position to seek and recover those damages from the Manitoba Government at the Supreme Court level failing

ratification of the agreement of May 17th. The cost of this \$25 million or more solution would be borne by all of the taxpayers of this province including Franco-Manitobans. That was our third concession.

Fourthly, we wanted to have all statutes currently enforced, translated rapidly; the Attorney-General insisted upon the large safety-margin, and as much time as possible to complete the translation process. Again, we were accommodating; again we agreed, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Penner's request for a full 10-year period of grace to allow for translation of current statutes. That was our fourth concession.

The Lyons and Doerns of this province will say, "But you gained French Language Services." That attitude, given the history of Manitoba, is totally wrong-headed. It disregards the spirit and intent of The Manitoba Act of 1870 which declares Manitoba officially bilingual and ensures that French can be used in a Legislature, in the courts, in schools and in government administration generally.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with two visions of Manitoba. On one hand, we have that of the Conservative Party, a vision which is fundamentally authoritarian in its promotion of English, a vision which is unilingual and intolerant of other languages and cultures, a vision which has more in common with the American melting pot than with Canadian history and tradition. On the other hand, we have the original vision of Manitoba as fundamentally tolerant, both in linguistic and cultural terms. This original vision values diversity, both ethnic and cultural; and when faced with legislative decisions in the fields of language and culture, this original vision of Manitoba would rather err on the side of generosity and not intolerance. I might ask, Mr. Chairman, which of these two visions has the Conservative Party adopted? Which vision shall prevail? Will it be Mr. Lyon's vision of Manitoba or Mr. Mulroney's vision of Canada?

In this context, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank sincerely all of the ethnocultural groups which have indicated support of our position on this matter. They are part of a "new majority" in Manitoba, the majority which is not of British origin. And although many Anglo-Saxons have a much more tolerant vision of Manitoba than the Conservative Party, it is the other ethnocultural groups, along with the founders of this province, the Indians, the Métis, and the French, which constitute the majority of the people in this province today. It is their vision today which counts, and not the narrow-minded vision of Sterling Lyon.

Tonight, I wish to state, clearly and unequivocally, that the SFM fully supports the right of all ethnic minorities to develop their own cultural institutions within the context of official bilingualism in Canada and Manitoba. Further, we shall continue to support them in the future in promoting their own programs, should they meet with intolerant or unsympathetic attitudes at any level of government.

I would like to address for a moment the idea that bilingualism should be subject to a referendum. How would the population of Manitoba view the suggestion of submitting the rights of English-speaking Canadians in Quebec to the majority in that province? The kind of talk which wants to put this issue to a vote, at whatever level, is based upon a fundamental misunderstanding of 20th Century democracy. Indeed,

it is a great British political philosopher, John Stuart Mill, who first recognized the danger of minorities which was inherent in the concept of majority rule. Allow me to quote Mill tonight, Mr. Chairman, since he, above all others, defined democracy as most of us understand it today. Mill wrote, in 1859, and I quote:

"The tyranny of the majority is now generally included among the evils against which society needs to be on its guard . . . There needs protection . . . against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling . . . There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence: and to find that limit, and maintain it against encroachment, is as indispensable . . . as protection against political despotism."

You would no doubt like to know, Mr. Chairman, what the position of the SFM on the amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is today. Our position is clear and simple: the complete implementation of the agreement reached with the Pawley Government and the Federal Government last May 17th. We have not read or heard anything, either from the Legislative Assembly or at the public hearings, that would prompt us to change our position.

In drawing attention to our support of the May 17th agreement, we wish to underline the limited nature of our support. We support only the text deposited in the Legislature on July 4, 1983. That is the text which faithfully reproduces the tripartite accord. We would certainly not support a text diluted by substantive changes, such as that flowing from the September 6th amendments. Nor do we support a text diluted by changes to correct so-called "typographical variances." Our understanding of the May 17th accord is that the modifying clause, "established by or pursuant to an act of the Legislature of Manitoba," addressed only paragraph 23.7(1)(b)(iv). We do not understand that the modifying clause is addressed to all of paragraph 23.7(1)(b), and we support no amendment which would effect this major change.

All Manitobans look forward to closing this unfortunate chapter in Manitoba politics. That the political parties of this province could not have agreed on a just, equitable, and above all tolerant solution to the problem without having raised public controversy to its present level is a sad comment on political leadership in our province today. I sincerely hope that the comments I have made here today will contribute to defusing the controversy so that social and political life in this province may return to normal.

Mr. Chairman, neither past injustices, nor present difficulties have incited the Franco-Manitoban people to rebel. Franco-Manitobans are not bitter. Conscious of its future and its responsibilities, the Franco-Manitoban community intends to contribute to the development of a fair and prosperous society in which all communities can work and develop together in a bilingual and multicultural province with a deep respect for the identity of one and all.

Lastly, for all the Franco-Manitobans and their supporters who came in such numbers tonight, I would like to recall the dream that inspires us all and towards which we will continue to work, even if our numbers are substantially reduced because of the inequitable action of successive governments since 1870.

Our dream is to be able to use our language freely in dealing with the government outside of our homes and schools.

Our dream is to one day be able to appear before a committee such as this one speaking our language alone and being understood by all.

Our dream is that our fellow citizens in Manitoba once and for all stop questioning our identity and the fundamental role that our forefathers played in the foundation of Manitoba.

Our dream is to achieve complete equality with respect to all government institutions in our province, wherever there is a francophone presence. This dream will continue to inspire us more than ever after this evening.

We are here because we are Franco-Manitobans.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS of MR. L. ROBERT by HON. L. DESJARDINS on Page 793

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Robert, we have been told repeatedly that the Société franco-manitobaine does not represent Franco-Manitobans. Could you give me an indication of how many people here tonight, either in the hall or outside, support Mr. Prince's Pro-Canada Association and how many support the Société franco-manitobaine?

MR. L. ROBERT: It is very difficult for me to give you an indication of the support Mr. Prince's Pro-Canada Association has in figures, because I do not attend the annual meeting. I don't know if you would be able to find any Franco-Manitobans here who do attend. The SFM represents all Francophones in Manitoba who want to live in French in Manitoba. I invite you and members of the committee to go outside following the public hearings tonight and count the number of members we have here and I think your question will be answered.

No. 74 - English translation of Mr. Roger LaFrenière's presentation as recorded on Page 798; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. LAFRENIÈRE: Members of the committee, my name is Roger Lafrenière and I am a native of Sainte-Anne-des-Chênes. As a Franco-Manitoban, I would like to establish from the beginning that I am here as a member of a French linguistic group on equal footing with my Anglophone countrymen by virtue of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Attempts have been made in the past to abolish existing Francophone rights, but these attempts were declared illegal in 1979 despite pressure from a prejudiced society.

The Bilodeau case forced the government to begin negotiations with the SFM in order to avoid the inevitable chaos that would result from a judgment acknowledging the bilingual nature of the Province of Manitoba.

If the Government of Manitoba had previously respected the spirit of Manitoba's constitution, the proposed amendments would not be necessary.

On the other hand, the past has proven that we cannot rely on British fair play, or on the good intentions of governments to enforce constitutional guarantees.

This is why our only recourse is to entrench in the constitution the specific rights and clearly list the responsibilities of the said government towards the Francophone population.

Be advised, members of the committee, that we Francophones will not make any concessions on this point. We haven't been granted any favours by the process initiated at the request of the Government of Manitoba.

An agreement was reached by the federal and provincial levels of government and the SFM and I strongly urge you to respect this agreement which was reached following considerable debate.

Any attempts to weaken the constitutional guarantees given to the French language in Manitoba will provoke reciprocal action against the English language.

I support the resolution to amend Section 23 as it was negotiated by the SFM, the provincial government and the federal government last May 17.

Thank you.

No. 75 - English translation of Ms. Elaine Tougas' presentation as recorded on Page 798; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. E. TOUGAS: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as President of the Student Council, I am here representing the students at the Pointe-des-Chênes School.

As young French-Canadians, we are often referred to as "replacements." Although the term might bring to mind images of war, this is not the case at all. This isn't a war between French and English, we are not attacking you. We are only trying to extend our rights without removing any of your rights. It isn't even really a matter of extending our rights, but of restoring them.

You see, young people who speak French, those who speak it in their daily lives, are dedicated; they have to be. The Province of Manitoba doesn't encourage us to speak French. Many of the things we do are in English. Why bother doing them in French?

Why? Because a tree that has survived the ravages of time is strong and determined. It is a natural instinct; even if the tree is cut down, the roots will continue to grow.

Manitoba has grown as a result of the persistence of its people. Don't stifle the persistence that helped build this province. The identity of a people is an integral part of that people; without it, there is nothing left.

Thank you.

No. 76 - English translation of Mr. Normand Roy's presentation as recorded on Page 798; Hansard, Vol. XXXI No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. N. ROY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I am appearing before you to support the steps taken by the SFM. As a Franco-Manitoban, I hope to be able to communicate with my government and receive government services in French. I consider this right a sign of respect for the people who founded this country and who are still contributing to its development.

However, I sense a reluctance on the part of the government. The cost of French Language Services is

often cited as a reason not to grant them; the fact that we are a minority might also give rise to the notion that it is an extravagance to pamper a small percentage of the population with special services. Those who are not interested in promoting the development of cultures other than their own could easily find many more reasons against granting these rights.

I must admit that I cannot understand this mistrust. Are we so unworthy of your confidence? Do we present such a threat? Is it so disturbing to grant legitimate rights to a minority?

Ladies and Gentlemen, time has not done away with the French language either in Canada or in Manitoba. Why not grant Francophones the status they deserve and enable them to feel at home, and happy to work for the development of Manitoba's society?

I would like to conclude by giving my support to the amendments negotiated by the SFM and the Pawley Government last May 17th.

No. 77 - English translation of Father L. Cloutier's presentation as recorded on Page 799; Hansard, Vol. XXXI No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. L. CLOUTIER: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I have a few copies here of the same document which has been signed by about 125 persons in the area of Otterburne.

For Canadian unity . . .

For your information, I was born in Quebec and 27 years ago I became a Manitoban. I am very proud to be a Manitoban, but I still have at heart the unity of this country.

Manitoba must respect its constitution for the sake of Canadian unity.

Given that 1984 will mark the 450th anniversary - for your information Canada is more than 160 years old. We've had a form of government for 116 years, but Canada has existed much longer than that - please remember that - of the discovery of our great country by Jacques Cartier and the beginning of the establishment of French colonies on Canadian soil;

Given that the bilingual nature of Canada was acknowledged in the six Canadian constitutions - The Quebec Act, The Constitutional Act, The Act of Union, The B.N.A. Act - after our country was ceded to England in 1759;

Given that Manitoba's constitution, which brought our province into the Canadian Confederation in 1870, clearly demonstrated the intention of the Fathers of Confederation to maintain the bilingual nature of this province, which welcomed both Anglophone and Francophone settlers as well as immigrants of varying cultures;

Given that the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed the bilingual nature of our province in 1979;

And please listen carefully to the last one.

Given that Canada is one single country, and that the French language should not be relegated to "ghetto" status in Quebec, which would inevitably lead to an eventual division of this country as a result of the narrow-minded attitude;

We, the undersigned, Canadian citizens, residents of Manitoba, ask and claim:

1) That the Government of Manitoba respect the spirit of the Constitution of this province, as well as the

Canadian Confederation as passed in 1870 in all matters concerning the use of French and English as official languages of this province;

2) That the government respect and follow the terms of the initial agreement reached by the SFM, the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada, as presented to the Legislative Assembly last July 4, without restricting the general and specific aims of the agreement, and without limiting its application. For instance, if I may explain here, the word "forthwith" that is suggested should be deleted. I wish, Mr. Chairman, that you remember in the Chamber what you just said about a question a few minutes ago that Christmas was far away. Eternity is much farther away.

3) That the government formally repudiate any form of referendum which, on this matter, would only succeed in dividing the population of Manitoba and Canada even more over a right acknowledged by history and the constitutions of both Canada and Manitoba.

Thank you.

No. 78 - English translation of Mr. G. Fontaine's presentation as recorded on Page 799; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. G. FONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I have two briefs to present to you this evening; one on behalf of the town of Saint-Pierre-Jolys and the other on behalf of the Conseil économique de la Rivière Rouge.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on behalf of the Town of Saint-Pierre-Jolys, I would like to bring up several points concerning the debate which has been raging ever since the government announced its intentions to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

It seems to us that we are making much ado about very little. What is the purpose of the amendment to The Manitoba Act if not a certain blossoming of French culture in Manitoba? Also, we fail to see how this natural development and enrichment of 5 percent of the population constitutes a threat to the majority.

As for these public hearings, we don't believe that they are a help. An injustice has been committed and must be rectified. We don't ask people for their opinion on various cases appearing before the courts. Why, therefore, should we take a survey of Manitoba opinion before deciding a question which is fundamentally a legal one?

We hope that, above all, the positive aspects of an officially bilingual Province of Manitoba will be taken into account. It would certainly help this country to remain the fine country that it is.

And what an encouraging sign it would be for the many other minority groups in this country to know that the official minority of Manitoba had won its case for the restoration of its rights.

In other words, we want to assure you that we support the resolution negotiated last May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I'd like now to share with you some thoughts concerning the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

The Société franco-manitobaine, having the interests of Franco-Manitobans at heart, has been able to negotiate an agreement with the federal and provincial

governments. It is an agreement in which justice and respect for the rights of Francophones take precedence. The proposals cannot help but contribute to the prospering of Franco-Manitobans. This is why we are proud of the efforts of, and the work accomplished by, the Société franco-manitobaine. It has earned our confidence and support through a job well-done.

The agreement in question is very reasonable. It gives the government acceptable deadlines for making the necessary changes. It is important to note that these deadlines are fair to the government as well as to the French speaking population. So why does the government seem to not want to abide by the agreement? If the situation is not resolved between friends, the only real loser will be the government.

If the dispute were to be brought before the courts, the Franco-Manitobans would be assured of victory and the government would find itself in a fine mess indeed. The legal chaos could prove itself very costly for Manitoba.

We must do every thing we can to avoid such a situation. Let us make an effort to solve the problem before it is too late.

We, the members of the Conseil économique de la Rivière Rouge, support the resolution negotiated last May to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act and we hope that you, Mr. Chairman and the members of the Committee, will do the same.

Thank you.

No. 79 - English translation of Mr. Daniel Tougas's presentation as recorded on Page 800; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MR. D. TOUGAS: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, last May, I believed I had received a definitive answer to a question I had been asking myself for some time: "Ten years from now, will it be any easier and any more natural to live in French in Manitoba?"

Last spring, the federal government, the provincial government and the Société franco-manitobaine negotiated an agreement which seemed to indicate to us that, yes, the future looked bright, but now I am not convinced.

All the same, the province has taken some truly giant steps in the last decade toward what we might dare to call 'Manitoba bilingualism.' The young people of my generation are the first to have benefitted fully from an education received in French. Everyday at the university, I see first-hand the profound influence that the immersion schools have had with regard to the spread of knowledge and the development of the 'bilingual spirit.'

Bill 113, which was passed by the New Democratic Government in 1970 and which restored French as an official language of education in Manitoba, has expanded the horizons of thousands of Francophones, Anglophones, and members of other minority groups who have been able to benefit from it.

All these bilingual people are waiting only for the opportunity to profit from their new linguistic skill.

Manitobans have been patient. It is time now to follow up the progress that has been made in the field of bilingualism and to restore to the population that which is essential to its development.

I hope that the idea of a unilingual Manitoba will be inconceivable to my children and to the generations that follow.

This is why I support with conviction the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as it was negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Government of Manitoba.

Thank you.

No. 80 - English translation of Mr. Gérard Gauthier's presentation as recorded on Page 800; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MR. G. GAUTHIER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here this evening to speak to you on behalf of the graduating class of La Broquerie High School. In presenting this brief, we wish to categorically support the amendments of May 17, 1983, to Section 23.

When Manitoba entered Confederation in 1870, English and French were recognized as the official languages of the new province. But, over the course of several decades, our rights were violated. We were forbidden to speak French in the schools, in the courts, in the Legislature.

Consequently, we are demanding the rights which rightfully and constitutionally belong to French-Canadians as a founding people.

We, the graduating class, the workers of tomorrow and the builders of the country, are proud of our heritage, our culture, our history, our traditions and, above all, our language. We believe that with the passing of Section 23 as amended on May 17, 1983, we will be able to grow and flourish as a self-respecting community.

So you see that we are in agreement with the government's proposals of May 17, 1983. We would like to add the words of Louis Hémon, set down in his novel, *Maria Chapdelaine* and I quote: "These people are of a race that knows not how to perish . . . We are a testimony."

Thank you.

No. 81 - English translation of Ms. Valerie Vielfaure's presentation as recorded on Page 800; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. V. VIELFAURE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, we, the Grade XI students of the École Secondaire de La Broquerie would like to take our turn to present a brief in support of the amendments to Section 23 that were proposed on the 17th of May 1983.

As you are doubtless aware, the founding father of Manitoba, Louis Riel, obtained guarantees of a bilingual province for us in 1870. In creating this province, the Fathers of Confederation gave us the right to live full lives, either in English or in French.

If Section 23 is not put into force, we, the adults of tomorrow, must fear for our identity. If we are not permitted to develop freely in French, we are in danger of falling victim to the growing assimilation rate.

In the name of justice, restore to us our legitimate rights.

We, the Grade XI students of the École Secondaire de La Broquerie, firmly and unequivocally support the amendments to Section 23 of the 17th of May 1983.

Thank you for your attention. Thank you.

No. 82 - English translation of Mr. Donald Boulet's presentation as recorded on Page 801; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. D. BOULET: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a great privilege for me, Mr. Chairman, to stand before you as a private citizen, and to express my support for the amendments to Section 23 that were proposed on the 17th of May 1983.

As a member of a minority group that has been struggling as best it can to preserve its identity, in the face of "ultra vires" legislation of more than 90 years duration, I claim my constitutional rights, as they were accorded to the people of Manitoba at the time of our entry into Confederation in 1870.

In promulgating The Manitoba Act, Louis Riel and the Canadian Government of the time clearly intended to guarantee to French-Canadians the right to live and breathe in Manitoba, without always being obliged to crawl piteously up to the tables of the rich, and to beg on battered knees for scraps fit only for dogs.

In 1890, when the Brophy case was front page news in London; Canada reverberated with the cultural and emotional impact. The highest authority of the land, situated in England at that time, had declared that the anti-French legislation adopted by the Manitoba Government was unconstitutional. The London courts declared in fact, in language that was clear, precise, and unequivocal, that Franco-Manitobans had been deprived of their rights. English justice proclaimed that the legitimate rights of Francophones were being ignored.

Well, with that statement, all that we hoped for began to seem possible. We really thought that British fair play would triumph once again, as it so often had throughout the Empire. Democracy was alive and well! The English courts and the Canadian Government would surely see to the rectification of the wrong that had been done.

But, unfortunately, history tells us that the breakthrough we dreamed of did not occur. Instead of receiving apologies and reparation, Franco-Manitobans were the victims of yet more repression. All our struggles were in vain, until Georges Forest undertook to sacrifice himself in order to awaken a hypnotized and discouraged community. Since then, the realization of our hopes has seemed more possible.

I, therefore, urge you, Mr. Chairman, and you, my good members of the committee, to encourage the present government to lead the way forward, by promulgating Section 23 as amended on the 17th of May 1983. Tell the government to rise to the occasion, and to avoid retrograde measures. Assure our legislators that they do well in desiring to put right a wrong nearly a century old. This government can give new hope to a system which appears sometimes to be losing ground everywhere.

A wise man once said that no democracy can survive without a creative minority. Well then, let us give new life to Manitoba's electoral system, by recognizing a creative minority that will only improve the quality of our everyday life.

Yes, indeed, to live with injustice breeds friction and discontent. A bad conscience gives no respite. On the other hand, we read in Proverbs, and I quote; that

"righteousness, and judgment, and equity, yea every good path" are the roads to happiness. (Proverbs 2:9)

It is on this optimistic note that I will conclude, and I trust, Mr. Chairman, that your committee will demonstrate its understanding of historical and constitutional facts, and will endeavour to put our derailed train on its tracks, so that the province can at last see legitimate rights respected.

That, Mr. Chairman, is why I strongly support the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act proposed on May 17th, 1983. This is a grand opportunity to show the world that in Manitoba, or, let's say in Canada, a minority can spread its wings without being crushed by the majority.

Thank you.

No. 83 - English translation of Ms. N. Fontaine's presentation as recorded on Page 801; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. N. FONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would like to express my support for the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as they were negotiated by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government on the 17th of May 1983.

I believe that French is very important, and I hope to be able to continue to express myself in a language of which I am proud.

The government must restore to Franco-Manitobans their rights. The present situation is a regrettable one, and I believe that the Manitoba Government should resolve the conflict by adopting the May amendments.

Those of you who speak English, aren't you proud of your language? Don't you wish to express yourselves in English?

In the same way, we wish to express ourselves in our language; French. We don't want the English, as you don't want the French, to be forced to speak French, but to use a common expression, and I quote, "English is shoved down our throats . . . and has been for over 90 years.

When we walk the streets of Winnipeg, we are plagued by comments, such as, and I quote, "Speak White . . . Don't we have the right to speak our own language?"

I have no desire to force you to speak French, but please allow us to speak our mother tongue; the language of our fathers.

I hope that you of the government will be fair-minded enough to see that justice is done! I am counting on you for it.

Thank you for listening to me. I conclude by stating once more that I strongly approve the amendments to Section 23 of the 17th of May 1983.

No. 84 - English translation of Mr. N. Piché's presentation as recorded on Page 802; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. N. PICHE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am young, and no historian, but I know enough history to present this brief to you. I know that this is a long evening with its repetitions of things you have already heard, but I am going to repeat the same things once more.

I am delighted to have the opportunity of being here tonight to express my feelings about the amendments to Section 23, and to be a part of this historic occasion.

As you know, from the beginning of Canadian history, French-Canadians have had to overcome many obstacles, and to face many injustices. I am thinking, among other things, of the deportation of the Acadians in 1755, the hanging of Louis Riel in 1885, and the Laurier-Greenway agreement of 1896.

In May 1983, the NDP Government had righted the wrongs - and I emphasize the word "had" - in collaboration with the Société franco-manitobaine and the Federal Government. The Manitoba Government showed itself just and discerning in that agreement. It recognized the unconstitutional nature of the 1896 legislation, and realized that the Bilodeau case could bring the issue before the Supreme Court, and that all Manitoba laws would be declared illegal. At last, after 90 years without our rights, Franco-Manitobans had acquired them.

But, faced with opposition to the May proposal, the NDP Government backed down, and made changes, and those were presented on the 6th of September. The new amendments are not valid. They do not put us on an equal footing with the Anglophone majority, and that is where we should be, according to our constitution.

I think that this is the moment for me to say that I am proud of my culture, my traditions and above all, of my language. But I am even prouder of those ancestors of mine who persisted in speaking French and in teaching it to their children, even though they were surrounded by an Anglophone atmosphere. That shows how strong they were. By adopting the unconstitutional legislation of 1896, the government tried to promote the assimilation of French-Canadians. That I am here, reading out my brief, is living proof that the effort was not successful. And when I look at one of my assimilated compatriots, I ask myself, "Where is his pride? Isn't he still a French-Canadian by culture? Has he lost everything?" But I can see that very few of us in this room have been assimilated.

To conclude, I would like to emphasize the fact that I support the agreement of the 17th of May 1983, that the government so wisely granted to Franco-Manitobans. Now, they no longer wish to let us have the whole thing! Let us take a stand, and be proud to insist on our constitutional rights!

Thank you.

No. 85 - English translation of Mr. Jean Paul Lemoine's presentation as recorded on Page 802; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. J.P. LEMOINE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, you have already spent several weeks criss-crossing Manitoba, leaving every public hearing with armfuls of briefs. I am sure that during that time you have been flooded with history lessons, with instructive stories, and with eyewitness accounts, all bursting with conviction. Doubtless, by now, you have all the necessary information. The Supreme Court; unconstitutionality; referendums; legality; illegality; Louis Riel; the Federal Government; the media - everything is there, everything has been said. So why should I, Jean Paul Lemoine, have anything to say to you? First of all, I am a firm believer in perseverance. It is with the perseverance of a Franco-Manitoban that I take

this opportunity to repeat one more time that an injustice has existed for too long, and that it must be put right without further delay. I wish to state that I support the proposal to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it was negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government.

I stand before you, as well, to testify to my pride in the Francophone community. Gentlemen, you have only to look around you, even outside these walls, to assure yourselves that the Franco-Manitoban minority is not dead and, what is more, that it takes an energetic interest in its situation. It is a unique Manitoba community, and it is alive and well.

Allow me to conclude by telling you a story. It is the story of a child's remark, and of an innocent wisdom to which we adults ought perhaps to pay more attention. This is the scenario. My 5-year-old son is starting kindergarten here in Ste. Anne. I teach at the same school. One day he saw me in the hallway with a group of students. That evening at bedtime he said to me, "Daddy, I saw you at school." "Yes, Colin, I was going to the gym with a class of English children." "Oh, I didn't know that they were English. You know Daddy, when they aren't talking, they look a lot like us."

Draw what conclusions you please from that remark of a small child.

Goodnight, and thank you, and I wish you a very pleasant soirée canadienne.

No. 86 - English translation of Ms. C. Therrien's presentation as recorded on Page 802; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. C. THERRIEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on behalf of the École Secondaire de La Broquerie, we, the Student Council, firmly and unequivocally support the amendments agreed upon on the 17th of May 1983, by the Société franco-manitobaine and our New Democratic Government under the leadership of Premier Howard Pawley.

We find it absolutely incomprehensible that our own Manitoba Government could refuse to respect the very rights of Franco-Manitobans that were guaranteed to them so long ago when Louis Riel founded Manitoba.

We have lost all confidence in our government that claims to pride itself on the preservation of human rights. It does not promote human rights. On the contrary, it tears them down, even those that are more than 90 years old, as in the case of Section 23.

And as for those who are worried about the financial aspect of the situation, they should learn that human rights, acquired at the cost of so many hostile and frustrating encounters, cannot be assessed in monetary terms. They have a personal value from which everybody can benefit. For our rights which lay dormant will be awakened, and wide awake they will remain.

A tradition never wears out, it remains, and is preserved to the end of our days. And what better means of preserving the tradition of a language that is hundreds of years old, than by enshrining it in our provincial constitution, a constitution that is a part of every Manitoban?

There is another point that you should consider, ladies and gentlemen, and that is the future of the young Manitobans of today and tomorrow. It is unjust that

students who hope to make a career in the province's legal or political systems, should be forced to learn their neighbour's language, which is totally foreign to them. Their constitutional rights, as Canadians, to speak their mother tongue is stripped from them. Where is the justice in that?

And thanks to the ignorance of those who really believe that the "French Takeover" will occur, and of those inclined to shout "Speak White" in public to groups of Francophones who are only exercising a perfectly legal right, the rate of French assimilation will continue to grow - to the great detriment of French-Canadians. But if the amendments negotiated in May are accepted, French culture will continue to survive in a real and concrete way.

Let me finish with this: the government has the choice either to voluntarily accept Section 23 with the amendments negotiated in May 1983, or to be obliged to accept it by a force greater than itself - the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it is time to humble yourselves a little. You have been promising us legislation since 1890, but you have never kept that promise. We have waited long enough. Give us what we want, for not until then will true justice have been done.

Thank you. That is all I have to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There may be questions. Any questions? Thank you very much for your presentation.

MS. C. THERRIEN: Thank you.

No. 87 - English translation of Mr. Denis Fontaine's presentation as recorded on Page 803; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983

MR. D. FONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I do not intend to speak long on the historical question that gave the French language an official status in Manitoba, nor on the reactionary laws that followed. If only Franco-Manitobans had used a similar strategy, then perhaps they could have discovered the LEX TALIONIS which states quite clearly "an eye for an eye" and "a tooth for a tooth." If the French-Canadians of Manitoba had chosen to return the fire of justice with their own kind of fire, would they then be proud of having perpetuated a situation similar to the one existing today in Northern Ireland? I scarcely believe so.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, you must understand that our past claims were just and peaceful ones. In fact, what Franco-Manitobans want is quite simply the right to live in French just as you, gentlemen, have lived in English since you were born. You have a very grave responsibility in this matter.

I am giving this brief on behalf of the teachers of the Red River School Division whom I represent. As teachers, we vigorously promote the advantages of being able to communicate in several languages, and we especially, and continually, stress the importance of the two official languages of Canada and Manitoba. At this late hour, all these syllogisms probably do not matter much because we always come up against the blank wall of the English majority. Well, gentlemen, if

you, in your capacity as legislators of the Province of Manitoba, do not take the needed steps to rewrite our province's history, then who will? If you are too timid to promote the official languages, then who will? If you, as men in the know, do not dare make the first moves towards a better understanding, then who will do it?

When people shout from the rooftops that bilingualism is divisive, every MLA gets ready to count votes and to give in to the majority. If we are divided, it is really because the rights of Franco-Manitobans are not respected. If we are divided, it is because our leaders cannot grasp the importance of being able to communicate in one's mother tongue. And in the end, if we are divided, it is because the rights of Franco-Manitobans are not recognized.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, let me repeat that all of the teachers of the Red River School Division support the agreement, negotiated in the month of May between the Government of Manitoba and the Société franco-manitobaine, on amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I hope that you will declare yourselves in favour of this agreement and that you will promote the advantages of knowing several languages as we, who work in Manitoba's classrooms, do.

Thank you.

No. 88 - English translation of Mr. Roland Gauthier's presentation as recorded on Page 804; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. R. GAUTHIER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, some citizens of Manitoba are very upset because the Government of Manitoba proposes to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, thereby restoring the rights of Franco-Manitobans.

We do not understand how they can be so opposed to an Act that is intended to right the terrible wrongs committed 90 years ago. Yet, in thinking it over, what act could possibly return to Franco-Manitobans what they have lost over 90 years ago? The answer to that question seem obvious to me.

The present New Democratic Government is attempting to give a new lease on life to the French fact in our province, and the government is doing the right thing. For, in a civilized country, no government, no political party, no individual has the right to prevent justice from being done to the Francophones of the Province of Manitoba.

We support the agreement that was negotiated in the month of May on amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. We hope, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, that you will declare yourselves in favour of this agreement.

Thank you.

No. 89 - English translation of Mr. M. Lavergne's presentation as recorded on Page 804; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MR. M. LAVERGNE: Ladies, gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, and politicians. Since I am the President of the Student Council, I am speaking to you on behalf of the new regional French high school. Because we young people represent the future generation, we will be directly

affected by the decisions made on the question of Section 23.

On Manitoba's entry into Confederation in 1870, the Federal Government guaranteed to us that our province would be officially bilingual. Twenty years later these guarantees were swept away; the use of French in all the public services and in the schools, as well, was abolished. It has been only since 1970 that we have had the right to schooling in the French language. Our regional high school is the first of its kind in the Canadian West. But do we not risk losing everything because of all the political manoeuvring that is presently focussing on the question of French in Manitoba? We want to be able to use the language of our choice as was promised us in The Manitoba Act, and to feel at home doing so. We want to be able to work, without problems, in French once we are out on the job market.

Furthermore, we are opposed to the plebiscite in the October elections. That is a municipal intrusion into provincial affairs.

We, the undersigned, wholeheartedly support the agreement, as it was negotiated in the month of May, on amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. We are opposed to any changes that might alter the original intent of this agreement.

I would also like to submit a list of names that was signed by the entire student body of the new regional French high school.

Thank you.

No. 90 - English Translation of Ms. M. Beauchemin's presentation as recorded on Page 804; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 41 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 27 September, 1983.

MS. M. BEAUCHEMIN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Marjorie Beauchemin and I am President of the Parents' Association of a regional school that doesn't yet exist.

Yes, I'm sure that sounds quite funny. We've been fighting to have a French-language school for seven years now. If it had been an English school, I'm sure we would have had it a long time ago. The young people are sure they're going to get their school, but I'm really not so sure as they are.

I find it very comical that we French people always have to get what's owed us. Do you think that would happen if we were talking about an English school? Would there have been controversy, and then decisions, then more controversy? They're always putting it off until later.

It's funny, it's really funny, but it's serious, too. The young folks are waiting for this school. It's our school, it's our right to have it. And we insist . . . Oh, yes, they started building it. Some pile foundations are in place, but who's going to attend a school like that? We should put French in that school. That's what it needs, some French.

Thank you very much.

No. 91 - English translation of Dr. A. E. DeLayssac's presentation as recorded on Page 845; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 43 - 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, 28 September, 1983

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Very well, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee.

Gentlemen, I am grateful to you for the privilege of speaking here today. Allow me to appeal to your indulgence on this occasion. My knowledge of constitutional law cannot compete with the erudition of the Attorney-General of Manitoba, nor with his competence in that area.

With regard to Section 23, today's subject of discussion, the history of the Canadian province of Manitoba is neither so long nor so complex that it cannot be summarized by referring simply to a few important dates. It was in 1870, just over a century ago, that the Constitution recognized the entry of Manitoba into Canadian Confederation, and guaranteed it's inhabitants the equality of English and French. Despite those formal guarantees, the year 1890 saw the violation of the Constitution, and the beginning of French persecution in Manitoba. That was the year in which Section 23, which set out the linguistic rights of Manitobans, was, quite simply, repealed.

In 1892 and in 1909 that decision was declared illegal in two judgments handed down separately - at St. Anne in the Hébert case and at St. Boniface in the Durreault case by Judge Prud'homme, but to no avail. By a strange trick of fate, these judgments were lost, and only came to light again in 1978. In 1916, the Minister of Education managed to suppress the teaching of French in Manitoba's schools. That prohibition was to lie heavily on the province for over 40 years. By another arbitrary decision in 1968, French was struck from the list of admission and curriculum requirements at the university, and despite the efforts of our society, it has not since been reinstated.

At last, in 1979, our hopes were awakened by the now-famous Forest case. The Supreme Court of Canada abolished the iniquitous 1890 decision and restored the French language to its original status. All that now remained to be done was for the Attorney-General of Manitoba to enforce the law. If that had been done, we would not have to be here today. Unfortunately, the adjournments and unjustifiable delays which ensued meant that the government was once more taken to court for having failed in its obligations. I am speaking of the Bilodeau case of 1981.

Clearly, in assuming the heavy responsibilities of Manitoba's Attorney-General for the New Democratic Party, Mr. Penner has come into a weighty and particularly difficult inheritance. Since it was a question of redressing the wrongs done to Franco-Manitobans since 1890, it became difficult to openly treat them as enemies, as had been done before.

The Attorney-General understood this perfectly well and so as to avoid another Supreme Court case, he decided very shrewdly not to negotiate principally with Mr. Bilodeau himself, but with a third party, which turned out to be the Société franco-manitobaine, a faithful supporter of his party, and with which he could easily arrange secret meetings.

Given the Attorney-General's very position, we were led to believe, in early 1983, that implementation of Section 23 would find in him a powerful ally, and that it would be quite unnecessary to have further recourse to the Supreme Court. Soon after he became Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Howard Pawley made allusion to the noble task that lay before his Attorney-General, in such unequivocal terms as these: I quote Mr. Pawley, in a speech given in Winnipeg,

"The French language has a unique historical and constitutional position in Manitoba. The creation of Manitoba as a separate province and its early admission to Confederation were largely the work of French-speaking residents. As a result, this is an officially bilingual province as the Supreme Court recently ruled. Signed Premier Pawley, March 21, 1982"

Stirred by these fine principles, the French-Canadians of Manitoba did not hesitate for an instant in stating their position on the new Section 23, and the amendments which had been prepared in secret. At a meeting in St. Boniface on the 21st of May 1983, they voted almost unanimously in favour of a piece of legislation that the SFM urged them to accept with confidence.

What was our surprise, therefore, when a short while later, we read the following in "Constitutionally Speaking", and I quote:

"Manitoba is not going bilingual. The Manitoba approach will not make French a language of work within the Civil Service. A limited number of jobs, less than 3 percent of the total, require French to serve the demand where numbers warrant, but that is it."

And to continue;

"The map of Manitoba shows those areas of the province where there are substantial numbers of Francophones. It is these areas that may voluntarily join the French Language Services Program, or where the provincial government may offer additional language service where there is significant public demand. No municipalities or school boards will be required to join."

It is hardly necessary, gentlemen, to point out to you the difference between what the Premier said on the 21st of March 1982, "This is an officially bilingual province," and the statement of the Attorney-General "Manitoba is not going bilingual." The latter adds, moreover, that the procedure will not be a costly one. "Quite the opposite," and I quote from 'Constitutionally Speaking': "Quite the opposite. We save money. So we save 1.5 million in translation and we get 2.35 million, with total benefit close to four million."

Whatever the costs or the bargains to be had, you will agree, gentlemen, that no amount will ever compensate the French-Canadians of this province for the century of injustice they have suffered. On a cultural level, imagine for just one instant what it would be like if your children were forbidden to learn their language in school, and if your language was no longer an admission or curriculum requirement at university.

When the time came to claim your rights, would you allow them to be reinstated in one town, but not in the next one? To be less far reaching than they originally had been? By analogy, would there be two kinds of Canadians, one in St. Pierre, and the other in Brandon? What about the people who live just outside Winnipeg, as opposed to those who live downtown? It is clear that in our bilingual province, there can be no question of imposing restrictive measures. The Premier of Manitoba understood this perfectly, when, on the 21st of March 1982 he said to Franco-Manitobans, and I quote:

"Your adversaries are no longer, as they may have been at some point in history, restrictive

legislation, government indifference, or even hostility."

I cannot emphasize the point too strongly, that the present crisis is as much the result of the measures taken against French instruction that I mentioned earlier, as it is of the 1890 violation of the Constitution. It is unthinkable that in this day and age, French is still not required for admission to university, and is not considered important enough to be a curriculum requirement there. And this goes also for the other foreign languages.

"Even if it is insulting to young Canadians to suggest that somehow they are genetically or culturally inferior to the vast majority of young European or Asian or African university students for whom the knowledge of two or more languages is a fact of life."

Well, it is precisely thanks to our young people, to education and not to obscurantism that bilingualism will once again one day thrive in this province, and across Canada. In that spirit, the 'Société Canadienne du français à l'université', of which I am the President, has undertaken a crusade to have foreign languages reinstated in higher education. The reforms it recommends would be as advantageous to students as they would be to our federal and provincial civil servants, who have seen their role assuming such importance over the last few years.

We are aware, gentlemen, that your colleagues in the Legislative Assembly have consistently been sceptical of the poor results obtained by the federal government's bilingualism policy. Let us recall, however, that responsibility for the education of those same civil servants rests not upon the federal government, but upon the provincial authorities. Given the exclusive nature of that jurisdiction, we requested the Attorney-General on the 22nd of December 1982, to re-establish foreign languages in higher education by means of legislation. As we did not receive any response from him, we would like to know the reasons for his silence.

I would like to take this opportunity, gentlemen, to recall to your minds certain violent words uttered by Mr. Doern, MLA for the NDP, against French culture. On the 20th of June 1983, around 10:45 a.m., during a radio broadcast hosted by Mr. Warren on CJOB, Mr. Doern was heard to say that if any teacher dared one day to suggest that his child learn French - as a certain teacher had had the temerity to suggest to a pupil - "I would shoot the teacher."

We would like to know whether the Attorney-General of Manitoba will be taking Mr. Doern to court under the Criminal Code.

In conclusion, the members of our association acknowledge that the immediate implementation of Section 23 might give rise to technical difficulties, given the current state of the educational system. We therefore propose first that emergency action be taken to restore French in higher education. Later, it will be possible to proceed with the progressive implementation of Section 23 in its entirety, without the restrictions contained in Sections 23(7) and 23(8), and according to a schedule similar to the one established for the translation of statutes, that is, by the 31st of December, 1993. Given Manitoba's small population of about one million people, we estimate that the costs incurred by the proposed reforms would not be greater than those suggested in "Constitutionally

Speaking", and that the long-term benefits for Manitoba would be considerable.

Thank you, gentlemen, for having heard me with such attention. I venture to hope that this presentation has convinced you of the important role that education should play in the implementation of Section 23 of the Constitution. Please do not hesitate to ask me for complementary literature on the subject.

The members of the Société Canadienne du Français à l'Université, and myself, are happy to lend their support to this great and noble undertaking. I am ready to answer questions.

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

Mr. Banman.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, you mention in your brief that one of the things that the Society is sort of working towards is the re-establishment or reinstating of the second languages at the university. It's my understanding, and I just wanted to clarify, that the second language meant that a person could either have French, German or several other languages, but that there was a requirement for a second language at university entrance.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Exactly. You see, to get into university you used to need some other language, whether it was French, German, Russian, etc. That condition was removed in 1968.

For example, in 1968 there were about 1,500 students in first year at the University of Manitoba. When French was no longer required, after 1968, enrolments began to go down gradually, from 1,500 to 1,200, to 900, to 800, to about 300 in 1980 which proves, you see, that the suppression of French in university, or the suppression of the other languages, had quite a disastrous effect on the teaching of those languages.

MR. BANMAN: The point I wanted to make, and you did qualify the answer towards the end, that it wasn't only French that was dropped. It was not an act against the French language per se. It had to do with German, with Russian and with all the other languages and that we were all - someone of German extraction was involved in the same type of thing as happened to the Francophone community at that time.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: It was a decision made by the Senate of the University of Manitoba. First a task force was set up, which examined the situation for two years, and after much discussion what was called "The language requirement" as a condition for University entrance was lifted. And of course that requirement didn't apply only to French, as I believe I just pointed out, but to other languages as well; indeed to any language you were interested in.

MR. GRAHAM: Dr. DeLeYssac, to follow up on that same question, was that done by law, or was that a policy of the university?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: I don't think you can force universities to teach French. Do we force them to teach

Geography or History? No. I am simply stating that, unfortunately, Canada is one of the only countries in the world in which a second language is not required for university entrance. And what I am suggesting, which could improve the situation as much as the federal as at the national level, is that we re-examine the situation and try to re-instate living languages in the universities. From the figures I gave you, I think it is evident that the suppression of the language requirement was not only harmful to French teaching, but also to the teaching of other languages.

To give you an example: At the University of Winnipeg, there used to be a Latin Department. When the university decided not to require a language, well, that was it, the Latin Department disappeared. And that, you see, is the kind of thing that keeps on happening, which is quite regrettable, in a country as modern as ours, where we have facilities that are so much better than those of some other countries.

MR. GRAHAM: Are you in any way suggesting that perhaps we should be passing laws forcing universities to teach French?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Look, gentlemen, it's very simple. In order to implement a law, in order to have services in French, to have French-speaking civil servants, you have to be able to educate them, don't you? And that's exactly how we can support the implementation of Section 23, how we can make it more effective. For example, let's look at the federal government. You complain, gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly, that the history of federal bilingualism has been a fiasco, and you're right, it has been a fiasco. Look at the millions of dollars that have been spent. But what is forgotten is that civil servants must be properly taught. And how can they be properly taught if the second language - if both official languages are not emphasized in the universities? And that's the point I want to make in connection with Section 23. The re-instatement of languages in universities would benefit not only the students, the young people who are getting their education, but it would also benefit provincial and federal civil servants, because education is in fact under provincial jurisdiction and not under federal jurisdiction at all. And that, you see, is why millions of dollars have been spent - I have done some research on the subject. Two-hundred and fifty million dollars a year have been spent on the bilingual development program, when all we needed to do was to reinstate living languages in the schools and universities; to incorporate them into the curriculum, as we do with Geography, History, and other subjects. It is really a very simple suggestion, but I hope the Committee will consider it.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, through you to Dr. DeLeYssac, we're dealing with a specific problem that is amending a Manitoba statute - not a statute - we're suggesting that the Constitution of Canada be amended to change The Manitoba Act. Could you tell us what this has to do with the teaching of French at the universities, if you want the universities to remain separate and independent from legislation? I fail to see the connection between the teaching of French in the universities, which is under the control of the university, and what we do in this particular committee.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: All I am suggesting is that you consider the educational side of the question. We won't be able to implement any Section 23 without talking about education, and as for the Senate, well, there's a decision to be made there. Don't forget that we're talking about a bilingual province; didn't Mr. Pawley say it in his speech? "Manitoba is an officially bilingual province". It follows from that almost automatically that French ought to be reinstated in the universities, and I would not be talking about it if there was no legal side to it. There does exist a law, gentlemen, with which you are quite familiar. I am referring to The University of Manitoba Act. It is also a question of persuasion, it's a question of whether all the province's administrative bodies will be able to co-operate on this issue, to achieve some positive results that won't cost an enormous amount, because we are only talking about reforms.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lyon.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, to Dr. DeLeYssac, I'm interested in his support of the proposition of reintroducing French and other languages as an admission requirement at the university. Indeed I've had a letter from Dr. DeLeYssac on this point, I would be interested in hearing Dr. DeLeYssac's opinion, following upon Mr. Graham's question, as to just how the entrenchment of an extension of Section 23 of French Language Services, how that becoming entrenched into the Constitution of Manitoba for the first time would really have any bearing upon this other topic, which I regard as worthwhile and well worth pursuing. How would the entrenchment help the cause for which your group is famous?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Well, it's quite simple. If someone asks a provincial government employee, or a municipal employee, for services in French, how will the employee react if he or she does not understand French? The employee will certainly be a bit frustrated. The response might be, "Hey, really . . ." or maybe, "Look, I speak English, why don't you try someone else?", or something like that. Well that's quite a regrettable attitude, and it's due to the education system, in my opinion. Our association believes that it's a question of the future, of thinking of our young people. They are really the ones who are concerned in the bilingualism issue, in the issue of learning another language - whether it be the second national language or any other language, because, yes, as I said, it is not only a question of French but also of the other languages.

HON. S. LYON: You said, and I have no reason to doubt it, Dr. DeLeYssac, that in 1968 the Senate of the University of Manitoba abolished the requirement that was certainly there when I was going to university and, I presume, for many many decades that an entrance requirement to the University of Manitoba would be to have one language other than English: French, German, Latin, whatever the case may be. Do you happen to know how long that academic requirement for admission had been in force?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: I'm not sure how long it was on the curriculum. It seems to me, it went on for a number of years. I haven't gone as far. I know that the decision taken in 1968 at the University of Winnipeg - or Manitoba sorry - and 1969 at the University of Winnipeg.

HON. S. LYON: Is that - as you would describe it, a phenomenon - peculiar to Canada, or does that lack of a language requirement apply also to most of the major universities in the United States now?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Well, as I said, Mr. Lyon, as I said in my brief, it's a phenomenon, if you want to call it that, which unfortunately applies to Canada and the United States, although a few years ago there was a bilingualism law passed in the United States. Unfortunately, I must emphasize the fact that Canada is one of the only countries in the world in which a second language is not required for university entrance. So you see you have PhD's coming out of the universities who only speak one language, and these are the people, the elite, who will go and represent us abroad, in African countries, for example, because engineers, doctors, technicians, do represent Canada. Well, there you are, these people, this elite, are going to other countries with doctoral diplomas, and they are unfortunately unable to speak more than one language. Obviously, there are advantages to being on an equal footing with other countries. You know that we don't live only in terms of a single nation. We are part of the international community, and Canada's influence abroad is quite important, because we have engineers, you see, and technicians, especially in electronics, for which we are well known in Europe and Africa. We have experience in the medical field, in the oil industry, and that's one of the reasons for making sure that at least the elite of our society are able to speak a second language.

HON. S. LYON: I'm still interested in the first point, however, about how entrenchment of French Language Services is going to aid this altogether, I think, commendable cause on whose behalf you speak. Do you not find it rather ironic, Dr. DeLeyssac, that in the Province of Manitoba up to 1968 where there was no entrenchment or it was believed that the law did not support Section 23, where there was no entrenchment of limited bilingual services at all according to the law as we knew it then, the admission policy of the University of Manitoba with no entrenchment was more favourable to the French language than it is today, where you seek to have entrenchment to help French language instruction? Do you see not see the irony of the situation?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: What I see in the situation is that it's not a question of demanding in a categorical way. It's just a question of legislation, of co-operation at all levels, at the provincial, federal, municipal, and educational levels. And even without bringing in Section 23, I think we could get some results, don't you? Supposing we weren't talking about Section 23, well, we could get results quite simply by working in good faith; by establishing, with the co-operation of all concerned, a system that focussed on education.

Manitoba, after all, is only one small part of Canada. There are other provinces. What about Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec? Personally, I think that to be able to integrate oneself into the bilingual and bicultural currents that are so typically Canadian, and for which other nations envy us, is to be a good Canadian. I often visit Europe, for my research as well as for other reasons, and I've talked to people - it's happened that I've been talking to Spaniards or to Germans in the language of their country - I've been talking to them, and many of them say, "Oh! In Canada you are all bilingual!" That is not true, but it could be, if we made the effort to encourage education, and to look at the positive side of things. It would only cost what is really quite a minimal amount, since reforms don't cost the millions of dollars which you know that the federal government has spent, without consulting the provincial education systems. I do insist on that point, you see, provincial education is the key to the current situation.

COLUMN 2, Page 850

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Well, I would say that in every country, there is a principal language; take Holland, for example. In Holland, people speak Dutch; a lot of people speak German too. If you can speak Dutch, you can speak German. I myself can understand Dutch people very well, because I speak German. In Spain, too, you have other languages. Tourists go there, and if you are Spanish, or if you speak Spanish, as I do, well, you can talk to an Italian. There's no problem, these things are quite common in Europe. So you see in the European educational systems, a certain place is reserved for languages. When you go to university, or elsewhere, it's absolutely obligatory to understand another language to get into university. And it's not just a national question, the international question that we have already spoken of must also be considered.

COLUMN 1, Page 851

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: I would say, on a legal point of view, yes. On the broader scope, it's something different.

What I might say in a general way, about bilingualism in a province, is that there is utilization of both languages. Look, go to Zurich, say or Geneva, maybe, or any bilingual city. Well, people use both languages without worrying whether you come from this, that, or any other place. It's an issue that has a legal side, but also has an everyday significance.

HON. S. LYON: I'm interested in your view of it, however, Doctor, because this question has come to the committee's attention before with people saying, as you have said, that Manitoba was created as a bilingual province. Indeed, others have said Canada was created as a bilingual country. I have to ask the question then, well if Canada was a bilingual country from its inception in 1867, why then was it necessary for Mr. Trudeau to pass The Official Languages Act in 1968 or 1969? You can see the point I'm getting at. What does bilingual mean in that sense?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: It seems to be a personal opinion. As far as Canada is concerned, and in general terms,

Canada has been referred to as a bilingual country. From a legal point of view, obviously, some legislation on bilingualism was needed to make sure that this was respected, and as I said in my report, we know only too well how far behind the application of that legislation has fallen. From the studies that I have done, we saw what astronomical sums the federal government has spent, when all they had to do was to give priority to education. As I have said a few times already, we can't have bilingual employees or civil servants if there is no education system to train them. And that's one of the important points in the implementation of legislation on bilingualism, or in any country that calls itself bilingual.

HON. S. LYON: In the early part of your brief, you made comment to the effect, Dr. DeLeysac, that because, following upon the Forest case in 1979, the Government of the Day did not carry out the translations quickly enough, that Mr. Bilodeau brought the case that is now before the Supreme Court. Do you know that for a fact, or is that just your opinion?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Well, I'm not a lawyer, you know. I'm not a lawyer, but I do know that after 1979, with the Supreme Court decision - which should have a certain amount of influence in this country, - I thought that appropriate measures would be taken, not only at the provincial level, but at the level of the schools, the universities and in administration. and we can certainly deplore the fact that it took so much time. I would suggest in this case that we look toward the future. And that is the main aim of my presentation, to look toward the future; to try to get the co-operation of the schools, and to think, above all, of our young people.

The Honorable Attorney-General understood that when he suggested that the statutes be translated by the 31st of December 1993. In other words, you can't translate statutes overnight, just like that. It seems to me that the education question is a pretty similar one. We can't just say, "reinstate French", and that's it; we have to think of the future, and to consider the role of education as a parallel to that of Section 23.

HON. S. LYON: So you acknowledge the fact that no government and, indeed, no court can order something to be done that can't be done overnight; that is, to translate statutes, to bring up-to-date the French translation of all of the statutes of Manitoba, is a physical impossibility unless there is a time-span given in order to accomplish that task.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Exactly. I think that's just the point we want to make. We can't just deal with things over night. We have to look to the future, as much from the legal as from the educational standpoint.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed any further, Mr. Lyon, we have passed our normal hour of adjournment. I wasn't sure whether you had fairly lengthy further questioning. We could ask Dr. DeLeysac if he can come back.

HON. S. LYON: I've got only one more question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

HON. S. LYON: You are aware, Dr. DeLeysac, that Mr. Bilodeau's proposition, which is rather far-fetched, is that all of the laws of Manitoba passed since 1870 are invalid because they weren't translated into French. Do you agree with that proposition?

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Well, there's a problem there. Not being a lawyer like you, Mr. Lyon, not being a lawyer like you, it is quite hard for me to give you a magical answer, but it is obvious that the good will of the government, the co-operation of the administrative services, and many other factors could allow us to reach our goal at some definite future date, say 1993, as I have already suggested.

HON. S. LYON: You are aware, Dr. DeLeysac, that Mr. Bilodeau lost that proposition in the trial court and in the Manitoba Court of Appeal? It was rejected by those two courts — (Interjection) — No, he didn't. Forest won in both cases. You don't even know what happened.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Oh well, as far as that goes, I'm sorry, but I didn't bring my legal expert along. I can tell you, however, that there was a Supreme Court decision in the Forest case, and it seems to me that when all the factors are considered - when the Blaikie case in Quebec, for example, is considered - it would clearly be best to be able to implement the legislation within a time-period that is satisfactory to all concerned. And, of course, I am not excluding the question of education. You will perhaps excuse me for speaking of it so often, but it is a real issue. As I was saying a little while ago, if you approach an employee, perhaps a young person, who knows both languages, or even a third language, that person will be delighted to reply to you in your language.

In the same way I myself take pleasure, if I see a Spaniard who has come to Manitoba, or a German, or even a French person, I take pleasure in helping them as much as I can. It's a pleasure, a courtesy that we extend to other people, and in Canada's case, it is a courtesy that applies to our own fellow-citizens.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further questions by members of the committee? Seeing none, Dr. DeLeysac, thank you very much for representing your organization here and making your presentation.

DR. A. DeLEYSSAC: Thank you.

No. 92 - English translation of Mr. Michel Simard's presentation as recorded on Page 900; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 45 - 10:00 a.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MR. H. SIMARD: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the Collège universitaire de Saint-Boniface students association is concerned over the controversy surrounding the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. We are aware of the persistent

opposition to our request to have Francophone rights respected, and feel it is important to express our interests in this matter and to emphasize the importance of our rights. I would, therefore, like to make reference to the agreement reached on May 17, which ensures that essential French Language Services will eventually be provided. We feel that this agreement is a rational one from all points of view, and consider any resistance to it unjustified.

Our constitution is the mechanism which ensures the smooth functioning of our country and its provinces. It is for this reason that we cannot permit ourselves to use it unwisely. Ninety-three years ago, the Government of Manitoba illegitimately transformed what I referred to as "the mechanism which ensures the smooth functioning of our country and its provinces," our constitution. This transformation entailed the abolition of French-language services within the province.

The abolition of these services slowed the development of the Franco-Manitoban community. I use the word "slow" because it is difficult to maintain a language if it is not used. It is on this subject that we must ask ourselves some questions. If government services had been available in French, immigrants of differing cultural backgrounds might have adopted French in order to obtain the services they required. They would at least have had the option. I might have been here today on behalf of 6,000 students rather than 600! We are convinced that these objectives as well as others would have been attainable if our constitution had not been illegally changed. It is obvious that the abolition of French Language Services in Manitoba seriously retarded the development of the Franco-Manitoban community.

Today, despite the injustices that were committed in the past, opponents of the agreement reached on May 17 insist that it not be implemented. As students, we are surprised by this attitude, and this leads me to address the question of identity. Denying Franco-Manitobans their rights decreases and limits the use of the French language. It denies them the privilege of fully experiencing their heritage. It makes them hesitant and uncertain about their identity and without an identity, they are denied their freedom. It is similar to stealing something very precious from them. We will never deny other ethnic groups the privilege of expressing themselves in their own unique way, and in return we expect our heritage to be respected. Our country has experienced tremendous growth, prejudice is a thing of the past and the lack of respect that has existed among different cultures should never have existed. To perpetuate this attitude is to turn a blind eye to the originality of one's neighbor.

We must stop limiting ourselves because the future holds a world that is diverse in many areas. Who knows whether we might one day have an educational system that is so advanced that it will be possible to learn a number of languages at one time? We are heading towards a world of computers which increase the possibilities of accomplishing wonderful things. Our destiny is, therefore, difficult to foresee. It appears, however, that the young generation is aware of a solution that will allow cultural respect to prevail in Manitoba.

The amendments negotiated by the representatives of the Société franco-manitobaine on May 17th, 1983,

would be a step in that direction. To have our culture respected is something we deserve, it is our constitutional right. We are confident that justice will prevail and will ensure the continuity of the Franco-Manitoban heritage.

No. 93 - English translation of Mr. Renald Guay's presentation as recorded on Page 916; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 46 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MR. R. GUAY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the Comité des juristes franco-manitobain was established on November 21st, 1981, as a subcommittee of the Manitoba division of the Canadian Bar Association. The purpose of the committee is to ensure the integration of the French language into the practice of law in Manitoba. The subcommittee hopes to be able to shed some light on the matter in question through its participation in these hearings.

The use of French in the Debates of the Legislative Assembly, the Records and Journals of the debates, as well as in the courts, was never considered a privilege granted to Franco-Manitobans, but rather a fundamental right granted to all citizens and included in the constitutional act of Manitoba, The Manitoba Act of 1870. The right to use English and French in the Legislative Assembly and in the courts is entrenched in Section 23 of this same Act. The existence of such a constitutional guarantee is not at all surprising when one considers that in 1870, Francophones accounted for more than one-half of the population of Manitoba. In 1870, Franco-Manitobans negotiated with the federal government to have a clause, Section 23, inserted in The Manitoba Act. This clause, which was modeled entirely on Section 133 of The British North America Act of 1867, constituted a permanent guarantee for the use of French in the Legislative Assembly and in the courts, regardless of numbers.

As soon as the Canadian Parliament adopted the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was then approved by the British Parliament under The Constitution Act of 1867, Manitoba became a province with language rights entrenched in its constitution. In 1890, however, the Government of Manitoba unilaterally passed a new act, The Official Languages Act, which completely abrogated the language rights that were supposed to have been guaranteed and entrenched in the constitution. This act, which was illegal by nature, remained in effect for almost 90 years before the Supreme Court repealed it, supporting the decision in the Forest case by the Manitoba Court of Appeal, which had declared The Official Languages Act unconstitutional. The decision in the Forest case confirmed that Section 23 of The Manitoba Act guaranteed language rights that could not be unilaterally disregarded by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The Forest case gained ground with the handing down of a similar decision on the same day. In the Blaikie case, the Supreme Court upheld the decision handed down by Chief Justice Deschênes of the Quebec Superior Court. The honorable judge had declared that the adoption of that section of the Charter of the French Language that abolished English as an official language in the courts of Quebec violated Section 133 of The British North America Act.

As in the Forest case, the Blaikie decision declared the relevant sections of the Charter unconstitutional and ultra vires. The importance of the decision in the Blaikie case vis-à-vis the Forest case lies in the analogy that exists between Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870 and Section 133 of The British North America Act of 1867.

On the basis of the decisions made in the Forest and Blaikie cases, it is evident that the right to use English and French in Quebec and Manitoba are, and always have been, entrenched in the Canadian Constitution. In the Forest case, however, no details were given concerning the legal status of the laws passed in English only by Manitoba's Legislative Assembly.

By rejecting the appeal launched by the Government of Manitoba in the Forest case, the Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Manitoba Court of Appeal which made The Official Languages Act inoperative. The fact remains, however, that the Supreme Court neglected to answer two important questions which are raised by the Forest case. The first concerns the legal status of the laws passed during the period throughout which The Official Languages Act of 1890 was in effect; and the second concerns the consequences resulting from the breach of the rights entrenched in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

It was to answer these two legitimate and thorny questions that Mr. Roger Bilodeau adopted his position. His argument is as follows: all the laws passed in English only since 1890 are invalid. The decisions handed down by the Quebec Superior Court and Court of Appeal in the Collier and Asbestos cases respectively, serve as important precedents for the Bilodeau case, because these decisions state that the laws passed in French alone in Quebec are completely void.

Mr. Chairman, how can we ignore the fact that following the decision in the Blaikie case, Quebec's National Assembly remained in session far into the night re-enacting in both languages the laws that had been passed in violation of Section 133. The difficulties, if not the impossibility of rectifying this situation in Manitoba, are strictly practical in nature. This does not excuse the legal obligations. This conflict between practical impossibility and the moral and legal obligations inherent in this matter prompted the government to propose an agreement and compromise acceptable to all parties.

It seems important here to list the advantages of such an agreement to the provincial government, as well as to the citizens of Manitoba. The agreement gives the provincial government a 10-year period in which to translate public general statutes that have been passed in English only since 1890. In addition, the government is exempted from translating the majority of the private and municipal acts passed since 1890.

The advantage to the public would, therefore, be the right to government services in French, a right which would be guaranteed in the constitution by virtue of the amendments proposed last May. Bilingual services would be offered at the head offices of all Manitoba government departments, the courts, any administrative bodies of the Government of Manitoba, crown corporations, Manitoba Government agencies, the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer and the Office of

the Ombudsman for the Province of Manitoba. As usual, controversy abounds when the question of language is raised in Manitoba. This is why the amendments proposed in May have encountered considerable opposition from various sources. A certain degree of awareness on the part of these opponents would suffice to make them understand that a decision by the court could be even more serious than the consequences of an agreement that did not satisfy Mr. Bilodeau who would then be likely to demand a decision by the Supreme Court of Canada.

What might the consequences of a decision by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Bilodeau case be? To be honest, Mr. Chairman, even though all our members are lawyers, we are no more capable of answering that question than the members of your committee are. However, our professional experience indicates that the results would not be pleasant for the Province of Manitoba. A solution imposed by an outside authority is likely to displease everyone. It has been pointed out that the decision handed down in the Blaikie case, the tendency of the Supreme Court in the last years, the decisions in favour of minorities, Forest and Blaikie and the recent decision by Chief Justice Jules Deschênes of the Superior Court of Quebec in the Collier case could all have an influence on the decision in the Bilodeau case. It is quite possible that if a single situation occurred, the Supreme Court could well declare fiat justitia, ruat coelum - let right be done, though the heavens should fall.

The subcommittee of Franco-Manitoba lawyers, therefore, gives its support to this agreement, because it firmly believes that this agreement represents an honest, fair and equitable solution to a legal problem which has also become a thorny political problem.

We would like to conclude with an appeal to all the members of the legislative committee. The agreement in question deserves to be recognized for its full value within and beyond the boundaries of our province, because its importance and wisdom are historical in scope. Let's take advantage of the opportunity before us and join together to make this agreement an honorable and final solution.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Guay. Are there any questions of Mr. Guay?

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Guay, on the basis of the Supreme Court decision of 1979 and with respect to Bill 2 which was passed in Manitoba in 1980 with the aim of restoring Section 23, and which states that in the event of a discrepancy in the interpretation of a law that exists in both languages, the English version takes precedent. Would you say that this Act is constitutional?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Guay.

MR. R. GUAY: Mr. Chairman, this is very specific question. I do not recall whether this bill was passed in French and English, perhaps Mr. Lecuyer could advise me on this.

MR. G. LECUYER: In English only.

MR. R. GUAY: In English only. I believe, therefore, that this law could be attacked on the same basis as the others, because it was passed in English only. It is likely that the validity of this law could be challenged on that basis. But with respect to the original question concerning whether an English text can take precedence over a French text, I clearly have the impression that the legal trends currently existing in Canada would prevail, and that it is not, in fact, a question of one text being superior to the other. It is rather, a question of having a situation in which the court, all courts, reserve the right to read both texts in order to be able to determine the intent of the law.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Guay, since all the laws that have been passed since the Supreme Court decision in 1979 have not been passed in both languages, would you say that the restoration or the restitution of Francophone rights is more of a theory than a reality, would you say that these rights have in fact not been totally restored?

MR. R. GUAY: I believe that is entirely correct, Mr. Chairman, moreover, it is for this reason that our subcommittee has always pressured the Société franco-manitobaine, as well as Mr. Bilodeau, to attempt to find a practical solution rather than the historical or literal restoration of constitutional rights in Manitoba, which in fact are not adapted to the Twentieth Century.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you.

No. 94 - English translation of Mr. Marc Monnin's presentation as recorded on Page 917; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 46 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MR. M. MONNIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. M. MONNIN: . . . as vice-president of the Collège de Saint Boniface, I am presenting this brief on behalf of the Collège de Saint Boniface. The Collège de Saint Boniface is one of the oldest teaching institutions in the Canadian West. The Collège, which was founded in 1818 by Monseigneur Taché, is an autonomous secular corporation and includes a university division and a community division. In 1877, the Collège de Saint Boniface was one of the founding colleges of the University of Manitoba and is still affiliated with the university today. The Collège has been serving the French-Canadian community in Manitoba for the past 165 years. It was serving the community in 1979 when the Supreme Court of Canada declared the 1890 Act *ultra vires*, and confirmed the equal status of French and English in the Legislature and in the courts of the province in accordance with Section 23 of the Manitoba Act. The Collège is still serving the community today. In addition, it is also serving an ever-increasing number of Anglophones who feel the need to learn French.

For these reasons, the Collège de Saint Boniface unequivocally supports the agreement reached between the Province of Manitoba and the Francophone

community. It is an agreement which affirms the bilingual nature of our Legislature and our courts, and which also affirms the spirit of this bilingualism by granting Francophones the right to French-language services.

The agreement will finally enable the province to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities in a practical and reasonable way. We would also like to point out that Canada is officially a bilingual and multicultural country. By guaranteeing rights to its Francophone community, Manitoba will encourage the preservation and development of other cultures.

The Collège de Saint Boniface supports the adoption of the resolution to amend Section 23 because it believes that this amendment will assist in acknowledging the legitimacy and the reality of the Francophone element in Manitoba. The Collège feels that the adoption of this resolution will further its development and enable it to better answer the needs of a growing student population in the university and community divisions. The board of directors of the Collège de Saint Boniface, therefore, reiterates its unconditional support for the agreement reached by the province and the Francophone community concerning the amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

(English spoken in questions)

MR. M. MONNIN: Thank you.

No. 95 - English translation of Ms. Florence Bourgouin's presentation as recorded on Page 920; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 46 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MS. F. BOURGOUIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am appearing before your committee here today as a private citizen. It is my duty to my Francophone forefathers to express my opinion on the question of Section 23. We are in no way attempting to remove anyone's rights. In my opinion, we Francophones have been deprived of the equal recognition of our language and culture. We would like to regain this recognition, not only for ourselves, but for all the citizens of this province who can only benefit by having both founding languages of this province recognized as official.

Let's not go too far. We have known conflict far too long in Manitoba, throughout all the years that our rights were refused, let's remain united and stop being jealous of the rights of others.

I am in favour of entrenching the amendment to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act as proposed by the present government in order to compensate for the weaknesses and injustices that were inflicted on us by previous governments. Past oversights and injustices have clearly demonstrated the lack of responsibility of our leaders. The present government wants to put this province back on the right track. We can only applaud such attempts to do justice to Franco-Manitobans.

To conclude, I would like to say that I support the agreement negotiated by the Société franco-manitobaine and the province last May because it appears to be fair to the citizens of this province, and enables Francophones to regain the status they have been deprived of for 90 years.

Thank you for having given me the opportunity to present this brief.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Bourgozin.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to Ms. Bourgozin, did the Supreme Court decision of 1979, which is commonly referred to as the Forest case, not recognize the legal, constitutional rights that the Franco community has in Manitoba and, indeed, restore them?

MS. F. BOURGOZIN: Up to a certain point, but I don't think that it's been respected.

MR. H. ENNS: Surely the whole purport of the historic decision was to strike down the illegal act that a government in Manitoba had passed in 1890, and to restore the language rights that were agreed to at the time of Manitoba's entry into Confederation.

MS. F. BOURGOZIN: I'm not sure I understand the question entirely, but I'd like to answer by saying that if it had been totally restored the Bilodeau case would not have gone before the courts.

No. 96 - English translation of Ms. Rita Lecuyer's presentation as recorded on Page 921; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 46 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MS. R. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislative Assembly, I am speaking on behalf of Pluri-elles, an association of women whose goal is the education and fulfillment of Franco-Manitoban women. We have forty-seven members and our training programs and counselling sessions are open to all French-speaking women.

On behalf of the members of Pluri-elles, I support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the provincial and federal governments. The amendments recognize the following: French and English as the official languages of Manitoba; the legality of statutes in the French language; our right to receive services in French.

For us Franco-Manitoban women, the amendments to Section 23 ultimately recognize our right, and our families' right, to live in French in the province our ancestors helped build.

At the present time, the provincial government is responding inadequately to our needs concerning French-language services in many areas that affect us - health, leisure activities, social services, jobs and manpower. For much too long, the use of French has been restricted to the home, the school and the church. In order to obtain certain services and community programs in French, Franco-Manitoban women have frequently gotten together on their own to set up leisure programs, day-care centres and pre-kindergarten classes. To do this, they have applied to provincial government agencies that offered services only in English - the paperwork, the forms and regulations were all in English. Whenever we organize counselling sessions or training workshops for Franco-Manitoban women and we want documents in French or

organizational help or resource people who speak French, we have to call upon the Government of Québec - a costly and inefficient alternative time-wise - and the information we receive is not always appropriate, given provincial differences, such as our status as a minority group and completely different laws. In a bilingual country and a bilingually constituted province, it is inconceivable and unacceptable that we cannot make inquiries to our provincial departments and obtain services in French.

What we are asking is to be able to speak to and work with the departments and agencies of our own provincial government so we can improve our quality of life in Manitoba. Manitoba's history has taught us that we cannot always trust in the good will of government to protect the rights of minorities. For that very reason, Pluri-elles believes it is essential to enshrine the right to French-language services in the constitution so that they will be protected from the ups and downs of partisan politics.

Manitoba is our home and we want to live in French in our home.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Lecuyer. Are there any questions?

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Ms. Lecuyer, could you tell the committee when the association Pluri-elles was formed?

MS. R. LECUYER: Our organisation is fairly young. We organized formally a year ago. Before that, we existed as a sort of provisional and informal group. So, it's been a year since we've been together.

MR. H. ENNS: And you solicit or you attract membership to your group in what manner? Just by voluntary association, or do you have a membership? I assume that I couldn't be part of your group because I'm male, but could my wife or ex-wife become a member if she subscribed to the constitution of your organization and paid the appropriate membership?

MS. R. LECUYER: Our organization is open to all Franco-Manitoban women. So, if your wife speaks French, she would be welcome in our group.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Ms. Lecuyer, I'm interested in your comments that since 1979 you still have not been able to receive services for your group pertaining to women's issues from the Government of Manitoba. Prior to the '81 election, working at the Women's Bureau and the Department of Labour, I remember having many requests from French women's groups for those kinds of services. Are you saying that they're still not available?

MS. R. LECUYER: I think the services of the Women's Bureau are excellent as far as counselling for women and orientation programs for women who want to go back to work are concerned; but, as far as I can tell, at the present time there is no counselling service in French and the orientation sessions are given only in English. And that's exactly one of the things we'd like to have since we have several members who are right

at that period in their lives where they'd like to return to work and they need help. Right now it's up to us to find out; would it be possible to have these services offered in French?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Does your group see itself then as an advocacy group for services for women in French or are you more concerned about the group itself becoming aware of issues? Or do you lobby for the rights of other Francophone women who are not part of your group as an advocacy group?

MS. R. LECUYER: We see our role as one of being a catalyst, of identifying the needs of Franco-Manitoban women and, because we are such a group, of making sure these needs are met.

No. 97 - English translation of Ms. Janick Belleau's presentation as recorded on Page 925; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 46 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MS. J. BELLEAU: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, Réseau is a group of Francophone women from St. Boniface and Winnipeg whose interest lies in the advancement of women in the political, educational, professional, cultural and personal fields. My brief, gentlemen, is being given in my capacity as vice-president of this organization.

Let me answer the question that you are likely wondering about right now: what have women got to do with these discussions on Section 23 of The Manitoba Act? Gentlemen, women are concerned about these questions for the following reasons: Franco-Manitoban women - since what's at stake here is the future of the French fact - have always been involved in their childrens' education. For centuries they have borne the heavy burden of being "guardians of the language". Consequently, Franco-Manitoban women have stayed at home because they wanted to safeguard the milieu in which their children would experience life in French.

They took on their role as "guardians of the language" because the men were away working in the fields. The womens' movement did not exist at the time. But above and beyond all this, a second hard blow came down on them in 1916 when French-language schools disappeared because the Manitoba government unilaterally decreed in 1890 that only English was to be the official language.

Today, 93 years later, Franco-Manitoban women have gone outside their homes and are asserting the right, for themselves and their children, to live in French in Manitoba.

It won't surprise you at all, gentlemen, when I tell you that Manitoba Francophones have had it up to here with living a hidden life. Being a Francophone in Manitoba is a little like being a Black in the United States or a woman in Canada. There is always someone around to remind you that you are just a second-class citizen.

Gentlemen, a people's back may never straighten again from bowing down too low. Those people have to beg rather than stand up and demand; they lose their pride, their identity, their "joie de vivre". Those people assimilate; they turn English, thus losing their

self-respect and the respect of the majority which, ipso facto, acts as queen and mistress in a province that only half belongs to it when all is said and done.

If Section 23 were amended as was proposed on May 17th last, it would restore to Manitoba's Francophones the place that is theirs by right and would finally allow women to quit the traditional role they have always played. Freed from this "language guardianship" women could finally take care of themselves and ultimately play a more active role in the Manitoba community.

Before closing, gentlemen, allow me to reiterate how necessary it is to enshrine Section 23 as it was proposed last May. For, Lise Payette, the acclaimed politician, has rightly forewarned us that we must be wary of the moods of politicians.

You, gentlemen, who dream of your place in history need only think upon this one point: the fairness that the Government of Manitoba shows towards its official language minority may just belie that old saying that states that politics is simply the "art of the possible."

No. 98 - English translation of a portion of Mr. B. F. Quennelle's presentation as recorded on Page 928; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 46 - 2:00 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

(COLUMN 2, PAGE 928)

MR. B. QUENELLE: I would like to, Mr. Chairman, add a few words in French, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I would like to thank you, again, for the opportunity you have given me to present this brief on behalf of the Canadian Union of Public Employees. It should be kept in mind that some of our members are Francophones and every member, whether English or French speaking, expects the government to keep its word, which is that none of our members would lose or be removed from their positions. We are confident that by working together we will be able to find a solution which will bring us practical bilingualism, though limited to those who really want it.

No. 99 - English translation of Mr. Charles Gagné's presentation as recorded on Page 941; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 47 - 7:30 p.m., Thursday, 29 September, 1983

MR. C. GAGNÉ: Dear Members of the Committee, it gives me great pleasure to speak today on a subject that is at once very sensitive and very important to Manitoba's future. Since I am a fourth generation young Franco-Manitoban, it is out of respect and admiration for my ancestors that I would like to share with you my impressions on the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Since the arrival of my ancestors over a hundred years ago . . .

MR. G. LECUYER: Will we be allowed to listen to the presentation without the interference?

MR. C. GAGNÉ: Thank you. Franco-Manitobans have had to fight, organize together, and work to maintain and impart to their children the feeling of pride and kinship that springs from French, their mother tongue. I myself am a product of this hard work. As you heard

at the public hearings in Ste. Anne on 27 September last, I am not the only one who is carrying on our ancestor's work.

I am a young university student with a Baccalauréat from the Collège de Saint Boniface and I am now completing my master's at the University of Manitoba. I want to live and work in Manitoba and participate in its development. I want to live as a full-fledged citizen and I want the same for my children.

I totally support the government's initiative towards resolving the official languages question of Manitoba. The time has come to end the debate after 93 years of struggle, confrontation and hard work to restore linguistic equality. The amendment proposal is the answer to the problem because it recognizes both French and English as the official languages of Manitoba. Moreover, by offering essential services that reflect today's reality, the proposal recognizes the injustices of the past 93 years. After 93 years, the legitimate and legal status of Franco-Manitobans would be restored and enshrined in the Canadian Constitution.

Let me make clear, however, that the amendments to the amendments proposed by Mr. Penner water down the fundamental principle that makes French and English the official languages of Manitoba. If the government is sincere in wanting to restore linguistic equality to the two founding peoples and in wanting to demonstrate political good will in correcting this linguistic and historical injustice, then the amendments of September 6 must be rejected in favour of those of May 17 last. Amendment 23.7(b) excluding municipalities and school commissions and amendment 23.9 of September 6 can remain in place because they alter nothing in the original agreement negotiated by the Société franco-manitobaine and the federal and provincial governments.

To restore a right that would be subjected to conditions as they are set out in amendment 23.1 of September 6 seems incomprehensible to me. If the rights of a people are to be recognized, then they must be recognized fully without limitations. When limitations are imposed on the agreed terms such as those in the original agreement, then what is left is no longer a statement of principle, but instead watered down and unacceptable terms for the Franco-Manitoban minority. Such fundamental rights as "French and English are the official languages of Manitoba" cannot be lessened for one of the founding peoples, and especially not in the Canadian context where the full equality of the two people and the two languages is recognized.

I must emphasize that this problem faces us today because the Conservative government, when it was in power, gave up trying to find solutions to the problem. Since the government at that time did not take action as a result of the 1979 Supreme Court ruling, this debate on language had to be reopened so that the Supreme Court decision would be obeyed. I can understand why the Conservative Party refuses to accept the entrenchment proposal because it has never recognized the entire import of the 1979 Supreme Court ruling.

Four years later, the Conservative Party maintains that the French language services should be left up to the good will of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gagné, we are trying to translate and if you speak so fast, the translators can't keep up. Will you slow down. There is no rush.

MR. C. GAGNÉ: Thank you. I'm a little nervous, so please forgive me.

Four years later, the Conservative Party maintains that French language services should be left up to the good will of our elected officials and should not be enshrined in the Canadian Constitution. Yet, because of this very attitude, I maintain more than ever that French Language Services must be enshrined because the actions of the Conservative Party, when it was in power, leave a lot to be desired. For instance, let us examine the work done by the office of French Language Services that was set up during the Conservative Party's term of office as compared with the work done under the present government. We notice that the Conservative Party did not even establish a policy on French Language Services, it did not even think of offering documents in two languages, driving permits in both languages, nor even simultaneous translation in the House.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can thank the Conservative Party for where we are today. Thanks to them, we are debating the constitutional entrenchment of French-language services because they have shown us that "courtesy rights" boil down to no service at all in one of the official languages of this province.

It is only with the greatest of difficulty that I can understand the argument of certain people who claim that services in the two official languages would be too costly. Let us look clearly at the logic of this argument. If the government were to opt for what the Conservative Party and Mayor Norrie suggested, the costs could be far higher than what is thought. Should a favourable ruling come down for Monsieur Bilodeau without the Supreme Court declaring legal anarchy, but instead imposing a time limit on the translation of 4,500 legislative texts, the province would be obligated to defray the translation costs without any financial help from the federal government. The Conservative Party's and Mayor Norrie's option seems far more costly for the taxpayers than the constitutional amendment we have before us today. How can we believe that translating 4,500 such texts would be less expensive than translating 500 statutes, while at the same time receiving 2.5 million dollars in help from the federal government and the minimum of services in the main offices of the provincial government. As a taxpayer, I question the rationale of this argument, for it appears to me that offering services in both official languages would be less expensive than translating 4,500 statutes.

Mr. Chairman, the briefs against the constitutional amendment that have been given before these public hearings have "fear" as their premise. The briefs against the constitutional amendment express a fear that French would become the working language of Manitoba; a fear that unilingual Anglophones would no longer be employed by the provincial government; fear that the costs would be too high; and fear because a few municipalities are worried that bilingualism is a cancer that will someday take hold on them.

Mr. Chairman, how can we accept arguments against this matter when fear is the only justification for them?

The reality of this amendment and the reality of Canada is such that the majority language will always be English and that total bilingualism in Canada will occur only when the English-speaking majority of Canada and the French-speaking majority of Québec want it to happen.

The sensitivity of this present debate further demonstrates that it is time to protect the official minority of this province. Despite the political stakes involved, we must put aside partisan politics and, above all, we must not let this debate decide on the re-election or defeat of any political party. Many other opportunities for partisan actions will arise, but there will be very few such chances to restore the linguistic equality of this province.

Given this country's history, it is utterly logical and indispensable to recognize the rights of Manitoba's official minority and to enshrine those rights in the Canadian Constitution. The time has come to right your ancestors' wrongs and create in this province a sense of belonging based on respect of linguistic and minority rights.

For this reason, I urge the Manitoba Government to hold firm to its principles and reject the September 6 amendment. I also encourage Manitobans to set aside their differences and their distrust so that a solution to a very difficult problem may be adopted; a solution that rewrites what must be rewritten.

Thank you.

No. 100 - English translation of Dr. William F. Shaw's presentation as recorded on Page 961; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 48 - 10:30 a.m. Friday, 30 September, 1983

(COLUMN 2, PAGE 961)

DR. W. SHAW: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, language rights exist in Manitoba now. The Supreme Court decision in the Forest case declared that Section 23 must be respected.

However, the decision of the Manitoba Court of Appeal in the Bilodeau case stated that the Supreme Court decision was directory, not mandatory. We want the Bilodeau case to be heard by the Supreme Court because we believe that our Constitution is mandatory.

It is also clear that Section 133 is still mandatory in the province of Quebec. In the new constitution, the government of Canada gave rights to Francophones at the federal level and in the province of New Brunswick, but the rights of Anglophones in Quebec were not dealt with.

If you introduce a resolution on language rights in Manitoba, it will establish the precedent that the provinces can take the initiative. Indeed, you will lend credibility to Bill 101 and to the right of a province to legislate in the area of language rights.

You need to accept that the danger exists that this form of intervention by a provincial law can occur in Manitoba, even with the constitutional guarantees, in the same way as we have experienced it in Quebec. If we want to establish true language guarantees in Canada, they must be applied uniformly, the same way in Manitoba as in Quebec. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the federal government and the Supreme Court to establish the requirements with regard to language rights as defined in the Constitution.

By its actions, the federal government has made it clear that it does not want to intervene in Quebec, but, at the same time, it is very active in promoting provincial initiatives. It is difficult for Manitobans to accept the extension of language rights in Manitoba as long as Bill 101 exists in Quebec.

The proper route would be to proceed with the Bilodeau case and make the Supreme Court and the Government of Canada take action. In this way, the language rights of Canadians will be clearly established and the guarantees of Manitobans will be strengthened. Otherwise, you are going to see the determination of language rights according to the whims of provincial legislative bodies and Canada will continue toward a policy of two nations.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - DR. W. SHAW:

(COLUMN 2, PAGE 982)

DR. W. SHAW: Two wrongs don't make a right.

(COLUMN 2, PAGE 985)

DR. W. SHAW: In fact, amongst that group of thinkers, anyone who doesn't live in Quebec in his old stock, old guard québécois is a person who has been assimilated. They are already lost. It's unfortunate because that's a Parti Québécois phenomena.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm unclear about something that comes out of the P.Q., and that is, are you saying that they do not care about the French-speaking populace outside of Quebec, but that they continually appear to use them for political purposes?

DR. W. SHAW: Unquestionably, they are using this as a Catch 22 situation where they win if they lose, and they win if they win. For example, if they can make media out of the fact that there is a delay in the passage of this resolution they will say, "See, outside of Quebec, we have no rights." And if you pass it, they'll say: "See, outside of Quebec they've shown that we have the right to act in the language sphere."

(COLUMN 1, PAGE 987)

MR. W. SHAW: It says, under the second paragraph of this ad, it says: "The Charter will not attack the foundations of Bill 101 and will not change the status of French as the official language of Quebec. I'll read the first sentence if you choose: "At last the right of Francophones outside of Quebec to French schools will be guaranteed by the charter in the same way as that of Anglophones in Quebec."

No. 101 - English translation of Dr. Winnifred Potter's presentation as recorded on Page 1031; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 51 - 10:00 a.m., 3 October, 1983

DR. W. POTTER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I am Dr. Winnifred Potter. I am . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We weren't aware you were going to be speaking in French.

DR. W. POTTER: Excuse me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you allow the members just a chance to put on their headsets? I would remind

members of the gallery, if you wish a headset, you can sign one out with the technician behind the translation booth.

DR. W. POTTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin in French. I am Dr. Winifred Potter. I am the head of the Freedom of Choice Party, which is a small party in Quebec, duly registered and authorized by the act to govern the financing of political parties in Quebec.

It is a party that is fighting for choice for all Francophones and Anglophones of Quebec, all the choices of language concerning education and the language of work.

And I am also a school trustee, a trustee of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal. That is to say, I am a trustee of the largest Protestant school board in Quebec. But I am here before you as an individual. I am not a spokesperson for my board, nor for the party of which I am the head. I am here as an ordinary Quebec citizen and mother.

I know that today we are discussing the future of all the official minorities in Canada. And I, as a Canadian and a Québécoise, take a great interest in this subject because all of us, all Canadians, belong to a minority.

(COLUMN 1, PAGE 1034)

DR. W. POTTER: . . . It said, "Many federalists in Quebec strongly believe that the imposition of the criterion of the mother tongue would needlessly furnish arguments for the separatist movement at this time."

(COLUMN 1, PAGE 1036)

DR. W. POTTER: . . . We all have "a belonging to a minority because we are all Canadians".

No. 102 - English translation of Mr. André Fréchette's presentation as recorded on Page 1093; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 53 - 7:30 p.m. Monday, 3 October, 1983

MR. A. FRÉCHETTE: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the Association of Professors of St. Boniface University College has entrusted me with coming this evening to express its determination to fight to see that the agreement reached in May between the SFM, the Manitoba Government and the Canadian Government is fully respected.

The Association of Professors of St. Boniface University College considers the draft amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to be no more and no less than a denunciation of the agreement, a political maneuver in which the inalienable rights of Francophones are put at risk in anticipation of future elections.

Our support for the Société franco-manitobaine is also a warning to any government that might attempt to repeat the injustices of the past.

Fortunately, the time when the Franco-Manitobans were alone in the struggle to preserve their language and identity is forever past.

The question of our language rights must no longer be subject to short-sighted politics or to the whims of changing governments.

Today, after 93 years of political blackmail and harassment of all kinds, we have at last obtained the

right to flourish publicly, in our language, without having to resort to clandestinity.

We intend to protect this right!

We are determined that French will once again occupy the place that has been its due since the day when, on an equal footing with English, our language gave birth to the Province of Manitoba through the voice of our forefathers.

In 1870, our ancestors set up democratic institutions on a bilingual basis. They knew what "British fair play" was. Twenty years later, treachery and arbitrariness destroyed the legitimate aspirations of our people.

The assimilation and acculturation were such that we can rightly talk of cultural and linguistic genocide, for, sad to say, 60 000 of our people were lost.

The agreement on Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is an advancement for all the citizens of our country and of our province in particular.

It assures each linguistic minority that it can live on Manitoban soil in accordance with its potential and its aspirations.

The Anglophone majority should be pleased with an agreement that does not threaten it in any way and which, on the contrary, should be profitable to it if it takes advantage of it.

As a matter of fact, is it not highly profitable for any young person to know a language as universal as French?

Immersion schools prove that many of our Anglophone compatriots have understood that national unity and the future of our youth depend upon an education in which communication on a global scale has become a must.

Increasingly, this communication demands the knowledge of several languages. How, then, could we not encourage the expansion of French, one of the most widely spoken languages in the world?

How can we comprehend this antagonism towards French when in the most backward countries, children speak two or three languages fluently? Isn't the queen bilingual?

Our province's plurality of coexisting cultures should prompt us to take advantage of this wealth rather than continuing to live in isolation.

May we hope that a new day is dawning on our horizon!

The university community of St. Boniface College, in reiterating its support for the agreement and in rejecting the draft amendments, intends to pursue its educational work.

The government authorities, whose responsibility is to educate the general public on a matter that is so crucial to the fate of our community, can, if they are sincere, count on our full cooperation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fréchette. Questions for Mr. Fréchette from members of the committee. Mr. Lecuyer.

MR. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the second paragraph on page two, Mr. Fréchette, you refer to 60,000 of our people who were lost. Could you explain this a little further for us?

MR. A. FRÉCHETTE: It's obvious, Mr. Lecuyer, that if you look back at our history since 1890, the simple

fact that the law prohibited instruction in French in our schools made possible an assimilation and acculturation that caused many of our people to lose their language and live exclusively in English.

MR. LECUYER: Some people, Mr. Fréchette, have come here and told us of the benefits that this resolution amending Section 23 of The Manitoba Act could bring to other cultural minorities; others have expressed their fears or a completely opposite point of view to us. Could you elaborate a little on the advantages for other cultural groups of the province of Manitoba that you see in this resolution?

MR. A. FRÉCHETTE: I think it's evident that if the second official language of Canada isn't respected in Manitoba, in one of the provinces of Canada, how can the other ethnic groups who would also like to live their culture, I suppose - if this group of Francophones outside of Quebec can't live in their language, how can we expect a minority group from another ethnic community to be able to live in its language and proliferate its culture? It's in this sense, Mr. Lécuyer, that I was referring to acculturation.

MR. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No. 103 - English translation of Mr. Vic Savino's presentation as recorded on Page 1102; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 54 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

MR. V. SAVINO: A little French and a little English, Father Malinowski. A little. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, good day. My name is Vic Savino. I'm here to defend the honor of the province of Manitoba. I would like to speak to you in French today, but unfortunately it isn't possible for me to make my entire presentation in French.

No. 104 - English translation of Mr. Lucien Loiselle's presentation as recorded on Page 1106; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 54 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

MR. L. LOISELLE: Good day, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to mention that the English version is in the second half of the text.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Lucien Loiselle, past president of the Centre culturel franco-manitobain. Through my presence here today and through these few remarks, I wish, on behalf of the Centre culturel franco-manitobain, to reiterate our support for the Société franco-manitobaine in its negotiations with the government of Manitoba. The Société franco-manitobaine is the official representative of the Franco-Manitobans. In the discussions and negotiations pertaining to Section 23, its role has been to ensure that the Franco-Manitoban minority enjoys the same privileges taken for granted by the anglophone community. We maintain that this is not asking for too much.

Our intention today is neither to begin the discussions anew nor to renegotiate with the government. The Société franco-manitobaine, as the official representative of the Francophones of Manitoba, has already negotiated a satisfactory agreement with the

two levels of government. It remains for the government to bring this issue into the legislature so that the amendments - need I add, the original ones - to Section 23 can be voted upon and put into practice.

Now is not the time to draw back, but rather to continue on the path of mutual respect so that here, in Manitoba, we will become comfortable with the reality of national bilingualism and the multicultural wealth of our province.

But in all this project of recognition, we must not forget the importance of the guarantee of French language services by the government of this province. The sense of belonging that this will stimulate in the Francophone will inevitably be translated into song and music.

This intensification of French life that will be initiated by the amendments to Section 23 will thus have a positive influence on the artistic and cultural development of the Francophone community of this province. We feel that this is very healthy for Manitoba, for art knows no boundaries and thereby becomes an ambassador for its place of origin. I ask you, have we a better way of sensitizing others to the cultural diversity of our province?

This cultural enrichment will definitely be a tourist attraction. Our province, located in the centre of North America, already enjoys recognition in the tourist industry for its Francophone flavor and cannot fail to gain when the French language and culture in Manitoba expand to new horizons with the amendment of Section 23.

Last year, the Centre culturel franco-manitobain featured a major musical production entitled "Les Batteux". Among its many themes, this play recalled the crisis of 1916, when French was abolished as a language of instruction in the schools.

At the Centre culturel franco-manitobain, we work in the world of art and culture. They are, in part, the reflection of the daily reality of Franco-Manitobans. We believe that any effort to enhance the quality of French life in Manitoba will be reflected by our art and culture which will develop new quality and authenticity.

Therefore, it is important to us to endorse every step taken toward the recognition of the rights of Francophones. A person whose rights are respected will translate this fact into pride and inner joy. Art and culture convey the collective feelings of a people, so these feelings will be a sure inspiration for future artistic creation.

Theatre, song, music, in a word, all arts have always been closely related to the Franco-Manitoban reality. The Franco-Manitoban has always expressed a great deal of himself through creative activity, thereby sharing with others an important part of his life and identity as a French Canadian.

Today, we are speaking of returning to the Franco-Manitobans another essential component of their identity, that of the recognition of their linguistic rights. To this we say 'Bravo', for the more complete French life is in Manitoba for those who choose it, the more vigorously will the Francophones celebrate their art and culture.

Many sad historical realities in the life of Franco-Manitobans are re-lived through art and culture. Sad are the stories that will be told to future generations through music and song.

The presence of our Francophile friends is increasingly felt at the productions of the Centre culturel franco-manitobain. Thanks to immersion programs in the schools, access to our language and our culture is now available to increasing numbers of Anglophones every year. We welcome these people warmly but we hope to be able to present, in the near future, productions with themes of hope and celebration for the years ahead. We would like to leave behind us the themes based on past struggles to preserve our language and culture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Loiselle, could I ask you to just slow down a little. The translation is having trouble keeping up with you.

MR. L. LOISELLE: Very well, sir. Excuse me.

We are now offered a unique opportunity to put the Francophone community back on the road to a promising future. After having been denied their rights for over 90 years, the Francophones of this province will have the opportunity to carve a brighter future for themselves in their own language and culture. If we widen the basis for the use of the French language, Francophones will be freer to live their heritage as an integral part of this province's history. All this will have a positive effect on art and culture, which are of particular importance to the Centre culturel franco-manitobain.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment to Section 23 is fair. It is fair because it offers an equitable solution to Franco-Manitobans after more than 90 years of injustice. It is fair for the anglophone majority because it takes nothing away from them. In our view, the present government must act rapidly and make this amendment a reality. All suggestions of a referendum must be dismissed for, in 1890, when the rights of the francophones were removed, there was no question of a referendum.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I reaffirm, on behalf of the Centre culturel Franco-Manitobain, our support of the agreement as it was negotiated between the government of Manitoba and the Société franco-manitobaine.

Thank you.

No. 105 - English translation of Mr. Rhéal Teffaine's presentation as recorded on Page 1106; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 54 - 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

MR. R. TEFFAINE: I have texts here, Mr. Chairman, if someone wants to distribute them. My name is Rhéal Teffaine. I am . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you wait till they are distributed please.

Please proceed.

MR. R. TEFFAINE: My name is Rhéal Teffaine, Mr. Chairman. I am the president of the board of directors of the Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba.

La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba is an organization composed of 29 caisses populaires in Manitoba which, together with their branch offices, serve 35 different localities throughout the province.

This network provides financial services to approximately 30,000 Manitobans, the great majority of whom are Francophones.

It was in 1937, in the community of St. Malo, that the first caisse populaire or credit union was created in Manitoba. Over the last 46 years the caisses populaires have offered their members a variety of financial services in French. This initiative was taken to fill an economic as well as a cultural void created by the injustices arising from the unconstitutional law of 1890 which denied Franco-Manitobans all rights to receive services in their native language. This law forced our forefathers to unite in order to preserve their culture, which is deeply rooted in the heritage of this province. Injustice often stimulates the imagination, and necessity as we all know is the mother of invention. The result was the creation of a completely democratic financial system that would soon play an important role in the regions that it served. The caisses populaires are well-established in St. Boniface as well as in most French communities such as La Broquerie, St. Malo, Notre Dame de Lourdes, Laurier, St. Claude, St. Jean-Baptiste, St. Pierre, and others. In spite of the economic crisis of the last two or three years, total assets now stand at over \$129 million and, with the current economic recovery, will no doubt increase substantially over the next few years.

The caisses populaires have played an important role for Franco-Manitobans, especially during the difficult years when other financial services were not available, particularly in rural areas. We, therefore, represent an important economic force and La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba, is well-known at the provincial as well as the national level. La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba has every intention of maintaining this role in the years to come, providing financial services in French, not only to its traditional clientele, but also to the many students who will be graduating from immersion schools. Having realized the importance of the Francophone clientele, chartered banks have already started offering more and more services in French. It is our wish that the government of Manitoba follow in this same direction.

Given the history of our organization, I must indicate that the action taken by La Société franco-manitobaine is without a doubt very supportive of our objectives. So much so that, had they not taken the initiative, La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba would have found itself in a situation where it would have been difficult not to take action. If both official languages of Canada have equal status in Manitoba, let it become manifest once and for all that we can count on a judicial system that will permit the registration of legal documents in both languages. Above all, Mr. Chairman, we are justified in expecting services in both official languages from our provincial government. To expect less would be to ignore the historical pact that gave birth to this province.

In this context, if an agreement providing services in French is not forthcoming you can expect, Mr. Chairman, a series of legal challenges by La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba. We wish to state, however, that we much prefer a political solution as opposed to a judicial imposition. We consider La Société franco-manitobaine to be very representative of the interests of all Franco-Manitobans and, ipso facto, of

the great majority of the 30 000 members of our 29 caisses populaires. The agreement that it negotiated with the provincial and federal governments to amend Section 23 is, in our opinion, reasonable and fair and protects the interests of all Manitobans. In view of the injustices of the past, The Société franco-manitobaine could have been much more demanding in its negotiations, but it chose to address this thorny and emotional issue with great moderation in order to achieve a fair and honest agreement and avoid the expenses and divisiveness created by a judicial conflict. Not only is the position taken by La Société franco-manitobaine reasonable; it also provides a rational, logical and astute means whereby the government can satisfy all legislative and judicial requirements, thereby enabling it to respect the constitutional provisions within a reasonable time.

La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba Inc. is ready to cooperate with La Société franco-manitobaine and the government in the application of this agreement in order to ensure that all taxpayers of this province enjoy the full benefits of their constitutional rights. Whether it be through the Land Titles Office, the Personal Property Registry or the Corporations Branch, caisses populaires members will avail themselves of services in French. We are not dealing in abstract terms, Mr. Chairman, but rather with the fundamental rules governing any civilized society.

However, in the event that the government ignores our legitimate requests and fails to act before the end of the year, La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba Inc. would have no alternative but to compel the provincial government, through the judicial system, to provide services in French. We are confident, however, that such a situation will not arise, and wish to express our congratulations to the provincial and federal governments, as well as La Société franco-manitobaine, for the manner in which they have dealt with such a delicate issue while respecting the interests of all Manitobans, will not have been extended in vain.

Thus we unequivocally support the proposed agreement because we strongly believe that it represents the aspirations of the vast majority of sincere citizens of this province. We are also aware that many non-Francophone groups support this agreement as recent debates have clearly demonstrated.

We believe it to be crucial that the government proceed with the enactment of the agreement before the end of this year and we hope that all members of the Legislature will act accordingly. In our opinion this agreement will be beneficial to all Manitobans and will contribute greatly to a united Canada.

No. 106 - English translation of Mr. Guy Savoie's presentation as recorded on Page 1118; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 55 - 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

MR. G. SAVOIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have come before you today, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as the president of the Fort Gibraltar Foundation and as a member of the Red River Brigade, as well as a past president of the Festival du Voyageur.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that it is easy for me to introduce myself as a Canadian of longstanding. The Savoie family landed

at Port Royale in 1652. I have with me here a family tree that shows that I am a 12th generation Canadian. I could leave it with you, although I'd like to have it back.

I am proud of my race, proud of my history, proud of my culture, and above all, I am proud to be a Canadian. Perhaps I'm telling you how proud I am to be a Canadian in order to reply to Mr. Godin and others that, through the years, we have continued to exist and will continue to exist. There's no doubt about that either; you had Mr. Toby Perrin who spoke to you at Ste. Anne. My paternal grandmother was Mr. Perrin's aunt.

I could go on telling you the history of my family; I could also continue by telling you that as a young man, I had the opportunity, when I finished college at St. Boniface College, to apply to and be accepted by the RCMP and serve for eight years all across Canada, in Vancouver, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan. I left in '62 and settled in Brandon, where I was a businessman. I carried on my business in Brandon for over eleven years, almost twelve. It's important that I tell you that, because at a certain point my wife and I noticed that when we spoke French at home to our six children, they either replied to us in English or asked us to repeat in English what we'd said in French. So at a certain point we saw that it was very important that we sell our business and return to our home town of St. Boniface, hire tutors and give them instruction in French. And today, I'm proud to say that my whole family is perfectly bilingual.

No. 107 - English translation of Mr. Taibi Soufi's presentation as recorded on Page 1134; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

MR. T. SOUFI: Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairman . . .

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: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, good evening.

I come as an adopted son of Manitoba and, in particular, as an adopted son of francophone Manitoba which welcomed me 15 years ago.

I would like to begin speaking about Section 23 of The Manitoba Act by reminding you of these two lines of Louis David Riel: "You suffer when you hear a French-Canadian name. You try to stifle it through persecution."

For someone such as I, who came to this country so full of promise for all the underprivileged, these lines seemed slightly exaggerated.

I have come here to testify that for 15 years I have witnessed an outrageous persecution of the francophone youth entrusted to me. I have also taught Anglo-Manitobans. It is on behalf of my students, on behalf of young people that I speak to you this evening.

First, I would like to ask you the following question: you who are representatives, you who have been elected

by the people of Manitoba, who represent one of the provinces, the province of Manitoba, what is your responsibility to young people? A French writer said: "We are heirs of those who have died, partners with those who live, and the benefactors of those to come." I have not found these words confirmed here. The heirs of those who have died, certainly. Are we partners, and to what end?

The question, or questions, then, that occur to me this evening are: what has been the role of educators in the last 15 years, and perhaps since 1890, when Franco-Manitobans were deprived of their language and muzzled so that their language might be banished from the streets and find its only refuge in the home and in the heart? How are young people to be educated if their leaders toy with a natural and sacred right of a community? What becomes of a democratic and free country that claims to be a champion of moderation and a promoter of peace on the international scene when it is not capable of doing justice to a group of its own people?

Once again, of what use is this kind of education if education is, indeed, the promoter of all universal human values? Of what use is the knowledge we are teaching if knowledge is to reveal truth and promote justice?

When I arrived here in 1968, young people of 14 or 15 years of age and up to 18 years would ask me: "Can mathematics be done in French? Are there science books in French?" And I then became very sad and I said to myself: this fine province, this beautiful country of Canada, how was it possible to take away the rights of a whole section of the founding community of this province, which welcomed all refugees of the world, also in keeping with Louis Riel's dream? How is it that they have been kept ignorant of their brilliant culture and of their heritage that began, not a century ago, but several millennia ago? How could such a civilized and democratic country flout the sacred first-language rights of the children in my care?

I could have chosen to go to the Anglophone majority and would have perhaps now held an important position in one of their universities; but this was not my ideal. I was born to educate and to attempt to make each individual aware that he is absolutely unique and irreplaceable, not only in his own eyes but also in the eyes of the community. I began by showing them that the French language, like every other language, was worthy of respect and of conveying a culture in which it has proven its genius; it has given birth to geniuses of whom the entire human civilization is proud. I then tried to show them that their values of love and fraternity left no room for sectarianism, nor for racism, nor for xenophobia, but only for an open, free, and fraternal humanity.

But how can you impress human values upon the mind of a young person who cannot even speak to his representatives, to those who represent him as much on the provincial scene as on the federal, in his own language without encountering difficulties?

How can one say that there is no racism, that there is no xenophobia, that there is no disdain, when those who claim to be politicians - of one party or another, I am not here to promote a conservative party or any other - are not even capable of respecting their own constitution?

How must an educator respond to such objections? What is politics? I have always thought that politics was as the Greeks, who gave birth to western civilization, defined it: the art and science of leading human beings to virtue and of leading all citizens, regardless of social conditions, to happiness.

How is it, then, that Franco-Manitobans have had to suffer and have had to hide themselves in order to continue to survive in their language? I would like to recall, if I may, an experience my wife had four days after our arrival. She had gotten lost in Eatons and was desperately looking for an exit. She spoke in French, which she, too, thought was a universal language, just to ask for the way out of Eatons. But she spoke in vain and finally, in desperation, took refuge behind some coats and began to cry. I must ask you, then, a question. Is the government of Canada, and are the governments of the other provinces so very insensitive that they can actually propagate abroad to other nations the claim that Canada is bilingual? Another equally disturbing question: how is it that in our universities and in our schools, where we have all the facilities to learn various languages and absorb different cultures - something that would be an absolutely incredible enrichment for Canada, which would then become an exemplary nation for all of humanity - how is it that we shut ourselves off and glory in the fact that we are unilingual? This is to the shame of a nation as civilized, as advanced, as humanitarian and as humanistic as our country.

The education of young people requires support from governments. What is this support? Fifteen years ago only French and geography could be taught in French; the rest was strictly forbidden or at least tacitly banned. Then we had to fight to have 50 percent French instruction. Then we had to fight to have 100 percent French instruction.

I have not come to give a sermon. I have come simply to ask, in view of the ideal we have chosen as educators, that you do justice to one of Canada's founding peoples who have every right, even more than anyone else, to see their culture develop and flourish.

I was not born French; I was not born English; I am not of French culture only; I do not favor one culture above another. What I am asking is simply that you respect the political ideal that we are first and foremost human beings.

When I heard the speeches in defense of francophone rights, very often I was saddened. Very often - and I might add that I belong to another culture - I held back my tears, tears not only for myself, but because to defend the cause of the French is to defend the cause of all human beings. If, today, for example, we are asking that the agreement signed May 17th be respected in its entirety, it is to demonstrate that politicians keep their word. Because, if the leaders do not keep their word, do not expect the citizens to be punished for the laws they break, and do not then come and put them in prison for crimes that are less serious than the crime of taking away from a people its sacred right, and of committing a cultural and linguistic genocide. And more than that, of hanging its martyr and throwing him behind the parliament building instead of erecting his monument here at the entrance where it should be.

I pay tribute to Louis Riel, yes, to David Riel. In fighting for his nation, he fought not only for Francophones,

for French Canadians, and for the Métis, but also for a cause that surpassed these.

For a sensible man, for a true politician, to defend the rights of minorities is to defend each man's rights. It is not a question of partisanship. The question, I repeat, goes beyond party spirit, beyond partisan spirit.

What is natural must be honest. The citizens expect you to be honest with them.

And now I will perhaps go on to another aspect. Reference has been made to inflation and the economic aspect. There is much hesitation because French Canadians have finally discovered, through the struggle of Mr. Forest and other struggles before and since, that the Supreme Court could make you translate every law and thus bring the province to bankruptcy. But one has forgotten that some things cannot be reduced to monetary terms, that you can never bring back the assimilated and those who are forever lost to the francophone community and to the entire Canadian community.

If a human being develops his full potential he does not fall into the misery that French Canadians have known, because it is true and cannot be denied that French Canadians have had the lowest standard of living in Canada, next to the Indians, the natives. A decade ago they had the lowest standard of living. How did this happen? It is not that they were less intelligent, nor that they were less sensible, nor that they did not work as hard - they cleared, they uprooted, they prepared the land - but it is simply because they were not permitted to fully develop in their language and in their culture. Their economic situation, therefore - if we are to speak of inflation today - reflects the historical situation they were placed in, and they should be the first to cry out.

Instead, they have been kind to the province; not only have they shown clemency, but they have also been incredibly generous to the province and to all its inhabitants.

Other peoples have rebelled; they have taken up arms. Fortunately for us, we live in a country where there is no talk of arms. But how long will the patience of the Métis and of French Canadians last? How long will a democracy get away with mocking the most basic components of its constitution?

To go back on one's word after concluding an agreement, just for an electorate, is cheap politics, short-sighted politics. The person who becomes involved in politics must consider the whole of Canada, from one ocean to the other, and must consider the future. And if you wish to provide for those to come you must, ladies and gentlemen, question your consciences and say to yourselves: "Today I have accomplished a task that is not for me but for my grandchildren. When my son, whether he be Anglophone, Francophone, German, Ukrainian, or of any other language or race, is happy on Manitoba soil, this province will then have become an example to all of Canada.

We have the opportunity to create a society that is humane, not one that is purely idealistic but one in which a human ideal is incarnated in this province. To do this, we must rid ourselves of prejudices. We must rid ourselves of prejudices that have roots in the past. We must go beyond history and return to humanity.

In closing, I would like to quote Louis David Riel, once again: "We are born, thank God, for noble ideas,

for acts of honor and sincere devotion. We aspire to true virtues but your false government weighs continually upon us and clips our wings. We must hope for a true government!" I would like to pay homage to the present government, not merely to counter the opposition, but simply because the present government has realized that it must correct past injustices.

Manitoba can and is capable of setting an example, I repeat, of national unity, Canadian unity; and not only of that, it can set an example for Russia, for the United States, and for all the peoples of the earth, by showing that people from all horizons have finally found refuge in a country that recognizes and respects not only its constitutions but the individual and sacred rights of the human being.

You are no doubt going to ask yourselves the question, does he, too, want to promote the unloading here of a multitude of cultures? Why not, I would answer? If it meant that each person could speak his language and preserve his culture, then yes. But no other community came here to colonize or to conquer, apart from English Canadians, French Canadians, and the Métis. They are the founders, the others have the same rights, as I understand it, the same duties as every other citizen. But we came, including myself who does not belong to either of the two language groups, knowing very well that there were two official languages: English and French.

I am not about to ask that my language be included in the Constitution. Yet I would be very happy, and I think that my students will also be very happy, to reach out to everyone, assured that the word given was to be respected.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Soufi. Mr. Lecuyer, questions.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask your permission to perhaps break the rules just for a moment to tell Mr. Soufi that I greatly appreciated his remarks, his very humane remarks. They are a testimony from one whose mother tongue is neither French nor English, and who is not a native of Manitoba, but whose country, Algeria, was kind enough to welcome me during my three-year stay there where I taught, as a Franco-Manitoban, my second language, namely, English. And I would simply like to point out to my colleagues that in the same school where I was teaching my second language, besides French, English was taught, and Arabic (as first language), as were Russian, German, Spanish, Italian, and some other languages that I do not recall at the moment. At least ten languages were taught in the high school where I taught and I think this is typical for all of Europe. But in this case here, we are talking about a developing country. If, then, a developing country can see so far and so wide, its testimony is all the more convincing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. T. SOUFI: Thank you, Mr. 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: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

No. 108 - English translation of Mr. Georges Forest's presentation as recorded on Page 1142; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

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 Mr. Joseph Bruce, president of the Union Nationale Métis Saint-Joseph du Manitoba, who is here to speak on his behalf for the union nationale métis.

I would like to draw your attention, ladies and gentlemen, to the fact that Louis Riel is here with us this evening. Would you stand please Louis? This is Louis Riel IV. Louis Riel, the great-nephew, I believe is the term, of Louis Riel.

Mr. Chairman, as the last speaker to appear at these public hearings I will be summing things up with my presentation here tonight. I would like to point out, in particular, the fact that in 1869, Louis Riel, as the official representative of his provisional government, which represented all the groups of the Red River Valley, had asked the Canadian Government to include among other things in the list of rights, that English and French be recognized as the official languages of Manitoba. The many years that have passed since that request have provided us with a history which, unfortunately, too few people are familiar with. This history is culminating in the serious effort that is being made today to correct all the harm that has been done over the past ninety years.

I heard someone say earlier on this afternoon that French-Canadians have not suffered, and they seemed to imply that the corgulence of Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Robert and myself indicated that we had not suffered. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman. We have certainly learned how to survive. But as the professor, Mr. Taib Soufi, so eloquently said a few moments ago, it was cruel of the Manitoba Legislature in 1890 to deliberately carry out what some have referred to as a form of cultural genocide against the French-Canadian people or against speaking French in Manitoba.

The Métis group which I am representing here tonight, in particular, was victimized. As vice-president of the Union nationale Métis and on behalf of our president, Joseph Bruce, this Métis group, about whom the book you have in hand, "Hold High Your Heads," was written and which is the first history of the Métis nation written in French, has presented a copy of this volume to Mr. Lécuyer. It is a gift from the Union nationale du métis on this occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge you to read this history as soon as possible, it will help you understand the role played by the Métis nation in founding this province and the difficult times they lived through even when drawing up a treaty with other French-speaking people. You will find one episode in particular in the English text, "Hold High Your Heads," in the introduction given by the author, Antoine Lussier. Mr. Chairman, Lussier makes reference to the difficulties that existed in 1916 when, as the Member of the Legislature representing St. Boniface, Joseph P. Dumas, had himself initiated proceedings in French before the Manitoba courts. Conscious of its responsibility to guide the destiny of this small people numbering 30,000, the Association d'éducation des Canadiens français du Manitoba,

established in the spring of 1916, was attempting to be the sole spokesman of the French-speaking people. Unfortunately, the lines of communication between the Métis people and the Association had not been well established, resulting in a division which I believe still exists today. Mr. Dumas and the Métis people believed that it was through the courts, and only through the courts that the right that had been so cruelly removed in 1890 could be restored. The Association d'éducation had told everyone not to support Dumas, his lawyer Dubuc and all those involved in the matter; they had no right to represent the French-speaking people.

I will read the minutes of the meeting held on July 16th, 1916, in order to consign them to the minutes of your committee.

"A meeting of Métis from St. Vital and the surrounding area, held to discuss and study matters affecting Métis interests.

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

"Mr. Joseph Riel is appointed chairman and Mr. Patrice Beauchemin is appointed secretary of the meeting.

"Mr. Chairman invites Mr. Camille Teillet to present the main issue which prompted the meeting, to which Mr. Teillet replies:

"A meeting of the French speaking citizens of the province took place last February 27 in St. Boniface to protest against the persecution which we had suffered at the hands of the Norris Government. The meeting was a success both in terms of the order and the enthusiasm that was displayed; unity among the various sectors of the French population seemed assured; political parties were abolished; the motto 'EVERYTHING FOR OUR LANGUAGE' was adopted. A committee was formed and named the 'ASSOCIATION D'ÉDUCATION.' Some of our people, two or three out of fifty, I believe, were appointed to this committee; that was very few. We should perhaps have hoped for greater representation, but the Métis, accustomed to these types of injustices, forgotten injustices, did not protest. They accepted the fact. Maintaining unity was necessary in order to succeed and we were prepared to sacrifice our pride to save our language. Everything went smoothly for awhile. For a number of weeks, two very serious matters had aroused public opinion and created tension between the French-Canadians and French Métis. This tension heightened and threatened to irreparably break the unity indispensable to success. These matters are the Dumas-Baribault proceedings and the Association's attitude. The facts are publicly known and we have all heard about them. Consequently, we will only give a brief and succinct analysis from a Métis point of view.

"The proceedings initiated by Mr. Joseph Dumas, member for St. Boniface, are intended to have the terms of the treaty concluded between the provisional government of the Red River and the Canadian Government in 1870, and approved by the British Parliament, respected. This treaty made the printing of court documents in both languages mandatory. That is to say that the purpose of the Dumas-Baribault proceedings was to recover for us the official status

of the French language. Once this were achieved, it would be difficult not to have an official language taught in schools. The attitude of the member for St. Boniface did not seem to please the Association d'Éducation which, through its president the Honourable Judge Prendergast, declared in an article that was circulated through the press that it vehemently condemned the Dumas proceedings, that it had decided not to take advantage of the treaties and not to seek federal intervention, that it was giving up the struggle for language and that it was limiting its work to schools. The president condemned Dumas saying that he had not received the authorization of the Association to launch such proceedings, that the Association represented the 30,000 French speaking citizens of Manitoba and that a dozen French-Canadians had absolutely no authority. The Association alone should act.

"What position should the Métis people take under these circumstances? Should we remain faithful to the Association d'Éducation or should we support the Dumas proceedings? I do not believe that it is possible for a truly Métis soul to hesitate. We cannot in turn support the Association d'Éducation nor can we disapprove of the Dumas proceedings. The reason for this attitude is that the Member for St. Boniface, a Métis, merely asked the government to honor the promise made to the Métis in 1870. He is making this request to the government and we are hopeful that he will take his request to the British Government in London. We cannot support the Association d'Éducation for two reasons. Firstly, because the Association did not have the right to condemn a man without knowing what his methods were. It could have limited itself to observing him and allowing him to act. What harm could he cause? Secondly, the Métis cannot abandon their struggle for language. The French-Canadians are free to relinquish the legacy left them by Montcalm, as well as the freedoms gained through the loyalty and heroism of their fathers in 1775 and 1812 and through the martyrs of 1837. They are masters of their own attitude and we have nothing to say about it. But do they know what it means to ask us, the Métis, to abandon the struggle for our language?

"It is asking the Métis to forget and to declare as null and void what their calm and dignified resistance obtained for them in 1869-70; it is asking the Métis to forget the persecutions they suffered. It is asking the Riels to forget the scaffold of Regina, the injustice of which has been magnified through time, and the heroism of which will be glorified in the future, similar to the stake at which Joan of Arc died and as a result of which she has become the palladium of France in its monumental struggle against despotism; it is asking Lepine to forget the exile and the nightmares that brought visions of the gallows to him, and the chains that made him groan in agony for long periods in dark prisons; it is asking the Goulets to forget the vision of the trail of blood crossing the Red River; it is asking André Neault to forget the relentless pursuits by bloodthirsty criminals, it is asking him to ignore his hands and feet which were in chains at one time and to ignore the deep scar left on his head by the bayonets of Wolseley's soldiers; it is asking the Lagimodière, the Harrisons, the Beauchemins, the Delormes, the Carrières, the Champagnes, the Proulx, the Larivière,

the Touronds, the Vermettes and many others to forget the persecutions and misery they suffered; in a word, it is asking the Métis to forget one of the most significant chapters in their history by renouncing their traditions forever. There is no doubt that they were not thinking of all these things when they took their stand, for they would have adopted a different position otherwise. I am convinced of this."

I will pause here, Mr. Chairman, to point out that Mr. Camille Teillet, who was the secretary at this historic meeting, was the father of Roger Teillet, the Member of Parliament for St. Boniface, and the grandfather of Léo Teillet, who I believe presented a brief to you a few days ago. Mr. Camille Teillet was married to Sarah Riel, a descendant of Louis Riel, the miller of the Seine River district.

The brief continues as follows: "What should we do? Take a stand on the Dumas matter; and I believe the only position we can take is to support the principle, the idea that we must claim what was won by the Métis nation. We leave the responsibility with Mr. Dumas. Being unfamiliar with his methods we remain convinced that he will bring honor to the Métis nation and that he will firmly reject any schemes that would debase a man. This would reflect on the nation to which he belongs. For the moment, we can only congratulate him for his idea and wish him luck, convinced as we are that he will see this matter through to the end. This position puts us at odds with the Association d'Éducation, a situation we deeply regret, but for which we feel we are not to blame. With a little more judgment and discretion, and we must add, with a better knowledge of history and of the facts, the association would not have made these mistakes in regard to us. We will remain on our guard; however, let it be known that we harbor no sentiments of hatred and jealousy. We want the Métis nation to remain united, faithful to its traditions and its past. We have resolved to fight with all our might to preserve our distinct race. We want it always to remain Métis-French-Canadian. Those who dream of assimilation can mourn their dream - it will not come true. We will remain what our fathers were, and we will teach our children to follow in their footsteps. It is important for the Métis nation to have a national organization under these serious circumstances. In order to establish such an organization, we will form a committee and name it the Comité national métis, which in turn will appoint a sub-committee."

Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the minutes cover the formulation of a resolution that was passed on to Mr. Dumas. The pages of history, which I do not have with me this evening, reveal that Mr. Dumas replied as follows in a letter written by his own hand: "I expected no less from a Métis."

Mr. Chairman, there is another experience which I must relate to you and which is very current. Some of you have heard the expression which refers to the small remainder of three or eight percent of French-Canadians as an endangered species. What steps are taken to protect such animals? Firstly, hunting is prohibited. However, a manhunt for the French people in Manitoba is taking place and it requires no licence. Anyone at all, in offices, on the street, and elsewhere can insult and discriminate against rights that are entrenched in the constitution, but which are not respected.

Another similar situation, Mr. Chairman, involves someone who is in the audience here tonight and who is the victim of various social injustices at the hands of his superiors because he is Métis and because he is French speaking. This type of situation is occurring more and more today as a result of the debate that is circulating through the press. Mr. Chairman, if the proposal you are planning on presenting to, and passing in Manitoba's Legislative Assembly does not explicitly state that French and English are the official languages of Manitoba, period, this injustice will continue.

I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the amendment which was dropped on us last September 6. You will notice that few of the people who presented briefs to you based their arguments on the amendments, in the belief that it was not over, that other changes would be made or that the changes that had been made were not very clear.

Permit me to dwell on this point for a few moments. To begin with, a resolution was proposed and amendments were later added to it. I made reference a few moments ago to the fact that the amendment, known as Section 23.1 and which limits the declaration of the two official languages as stipulated in Section 23 or Section 23.2 to 23.9 inclusive, is out of order as far as I am concerned. This was not a part of the agreement reached on May 17 and to which I, as an individual, committed myself last May 24 in St. Boniface. As for the remainder of the agreement, for what it's worth - I find it rather inconsistent to have introduced a new section known as Section 23.9.

In my personal presentation, which was made earlier on about the 8th of September I believe, I read at length the remarks made by the member Harry Enns, with respect to the position of ethnic groups in Canada and in Manitoba in particular. I did not realize at the time that what Mr. Enns was saying in his text was that perhaps next year certain ethnic groups would lobby to have their rights entrenched, and that this trend would continue year after year. Of course not!

What appeared to be a sympathetic exchange, if nothing else, between ethnic groups and the Société franco-manitobaine is turning out to be a race to have the credits, being claimed by all the ethnic groups, entrenched with the support of the Société franco-manitobaine. The situation is becoming very confused. This confusion should not be taken seriously. There is no basis for it, either in the proposed resolution or in what the federal government can be expected to grant. Imagine us having to entrench 32 languages in Manitoba's constitution with the approval of the federal government. What would happen in the other provinces? In particular, we dare believe that the province or area represented by Louis Riel in 1869 included all of the territory in the northwest, which was later divided into the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905.

Those of you in public life are no doubt aware that within a few years Saskatchewan and Alberta are going to be told by the Supreme Court of Canada that they must recognize French as an official language in their distinct provinces. What can the French and English speaking citizens of those provinces who want French Language Services expect, if we here in Manitoba with an entrenched right such as that constituted by Section 23 have resolved to give only crumbs?

This is why, Mr. Chairman, if you find it necessary to go back to the tripartite agreement which you signed, or on which you shook hands last May 17, I am prepared to live with the services in the designated areas in which there is a significant demand. For I hope that before too long, and as a result of the initial declaration making both French and English the official languages in Manitoba, French will be a compulsory subject as of grade one in Manitoba. Then, in three or four generations, services will be available everywhere - in Dauphin, Brandon and all the other communities.

You've already heard me talk about my dream and I won't dwell on it tonight. Mr. Chairman, some people say that there is a great deal of work to do, and I make reference here to the noble, I might even say splendid brief presented by Professor Soufi, who provided us with what might be called an outsider's point of view, because he still lives his own culture while at the same time taking part, along with his children, in the Canadian culture which is in the process of developing. He brings the knowledge, as Mr. Lecuyer said, of a man who was a member of a university at which no less than 10 languages were taught.

Mr. Chairman, it is in this perspective that we must look toward the future. Based on the two official languages and with the contributions of all the other languages and cultures, the Canadian culture will be the richest in the world in future generations.

Mr. Chairman, it surprised me greatly when I heard Mr. Hutton, Reverend Hutton I believe, make reference on page 6 of his brief to minority rights. He says a new concept is being presented here. I agree with him. However, I do not interpret this new concept in the same way he does.

I see it in the following way: my language rights in Manitoba do not fall under the category of minority rights, they are equal rights. I live my life as part of a minority, but my rights are absolutely equal rights. It is not my fault that I am part of a minority. That is due to the events which occurred in 1890. If the events of 1890 had not occurred, many more Québécois would no doubt have come to Manitoba - whether people liked it or not.

Mr. Chairman, it is not too late. You know as well as I do that many people came from Quebec to settle in Manitoba. Some even go to British Columbia, where they become the victims of cruel discrimination, as we heard on radio and television lately. It is time to act. Since Manitoba was the first of the provinces to enter the Canadian Confederation after the initial union in 1867, it is this province that must provide an example. The example given in Manitoba will be one for all the world to see. We have learned this afternoon that the three political parties at the federal level have politely, I hope, but with as much pressure as possible, urged you to carry on. No one will be the poorer for it. Everyone will gain by it. We must ignore the troublemakers and all those who have solutions that seem to turn back the hands of time or necessitate the rewriting of the constitution every year to echo what the voice of the people, what democracy demands of us.

Mr. Chairman, I have already discussed minority rights. I will not deal with the entrenchment of rights, I have already discussed that topic. I would like to say a word about the referendum. It's a bombshell! Such

a referendum is dangerous. I am prepared to accept either of the decisions - to allow the Manitoba Legislature to resolve the matter or to take the Bilodeau case to the Supreme Court. But will the councillors be able to contain it in the Legislature or at City Hall, wanted another question, one which in my opinion would have had a disastrous effect. We are pleased at this time not to have the question as they wanted it.

Mr. Chairman, there is much hope for the future. I myself have been involved with this constitutional question for so long that I have grown tired of it. I would like to go on to other things. I am already looking ahead in spirit.

Our country has a future, I say this for those I heard again this evening talking about when Mr. Trudeau will retire or when he will be replaced, our country will certainly get a new leader. And we wish him luck. In order to demonstrate that I am non-partisan, and I say this on behalf of the Union nationale Métis which is absolutely non-partisan, I personally got two tickets to attend the reception that the Manitoba Conservative Party is holding for their national leader, Brian Mulroney on October 19.

I would like to say to the members of the Conservative Party who are here this evening that I have no intention at the present time of joining your party. But I would like to ask you this question. Can you make room in your political party here in Manitoba for a French-Canadian? If you tell those in your ranks, both on the provincial and federal level, such as Dan McKenzie, to withdraw, adopt a more moderate position or keep quiet, I will interpret this as a sign that you want to make room. Mr. Mulroney, I am certain, would be very

pleased by such a move. This is what I see - I see the need for a balance between the two large political parties in the country. Let the Conservative Party lose votes in the West, for saying to its extreme right: "You've gone too far in speaking out against the metric system and the French language issue; please give your support to another party." Maybe this way the Liberals will win some seats in the West. There is nothing wrong with wishing good luck to the opposition in a democracy. And I wish good luck to the Conservative Party in Quebec, because you know as I do that Ontario is sensitive to Quebec. The conservative voters in Ontario will be more likely to vote for Mulroney if they know the party is adopting a strong, national and vibrant policy for the country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I am still addressing the Conservative Party and it is unfortunate that Mr. Sterling Lyon is not present now, I see he has left his papers here once again. On the evening of the reception for Mr. Mulroney, I will ask Mr. Lyon to introduce me to his leader. I want to assist this political party in looking toward the future, because this is very important. There are others who feel the same way I do.

I recently saw in our newspaper, *La Liberté*, the remarks made by Mr. Camil Chaput who indicated at the reception held by the Société franco-manitobaine in Ste. Anne that there was a certain uneasiness. How many other Conservatives feel uneasy here in Manitoba? This is not natural. It is not natural at all. Something must be done, and I am prepared, members of the Conservative Party, to help you trace this new route if you will accept my help.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will conclude by saying that you have heard many briefs. You have heard, and I would like particularly to draw the attention of my friend, Russell, to this, of the dog in the manger.

**ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
PRESENTED, BUT NOT READ**

(Numbers correspond with listing on Page 1153-4;
Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., 4 October, 1983.)

11. Mme. Irène Lecomte, Ste. Rose, Manitoba
12. Ms. Hélène Montsion, Comité culturel de Ste. Rose
19. Ms. Mariette Bosc-Saquet, Laurier, Manitoba
20. Mr. Jean-Louis Saquet
21. Mr. René Saquet, Laurier, Manitoba
22. Mr. Jacques Saquet, Wasagaming, Manitoba
26. Ms. Marie-Joséphe Fiset, Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains
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, Éducateurs 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. Rachelle Ouellet, Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba
54. Comité Culturel de La Broquerie
55. Father Gérard Clavet, Clercs de Saint-Viateur résident 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 Tétraut
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 Beauchémin, 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; Mr. André Plamondon, S. Zélie Ruest, Ms. Lucie Dupuis
80. Denise & George Perron
81. Lise & Roberte Boily

82. Ms. Cécile Bérard
93. Omer Fontaine, Ste. Pierre, Manitoba

No. 11 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Irène Lecomte as recorded on Page 1157; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

It is at History's beckoning that I come before you today to express my support for the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. In all fairness, those who should be here are the legislators of 1890, and they should be asking for our forgiveness.

I wish to tell you of my brothers and sisters, my parents, my grandparents, and their parents, too, who have always been proud to call themselves Manitobans, Canadians. Some amongst them were happy to put their trust in the men in power. How unfortunate for them that throughout our history there have been jealous people who could speak only one language; unscrupulous people who chose to eradicate a language they did not understand rather than offer themselves and their children a far broader horizon - this being the opportunity to learn French, the language of an apparently vanquished people.

I am pleased today to see that this same Legislature is ready to bring justice to thousands of loyal Manitobans. Let me assure you that I am following these hearings with the utmost attention.

Give our pride a place in this the province of our birth by recommending that the resolution to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as negotiated in May, 1983, become law.

Thank you.

(I am a member of the Cultural Committee of Ste-Rose-du-Lac) Even though it is impossible for me to attend on September 16, I would like to be heard nonetheless.

No. 12 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Hélène Montsion as recorded on Page 1157 of Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Franco-Manitobans have been totally deprived of all their rights in spite of the fact that these rights had been guaranteed to them. This truly cultural genocide has diminished their numbers so seriously that annihilation threatens them today. And now that the question arises of giving them back their rights, they are reproached for being too few in number to justify that very step.

This situation is the ultimate injustice. It is an absurdity that ought not exist. Franco-Manitobans face the humiliation of being forced to kneel down and cry out for their rights as a beggar for his meal. You may think that this depiction is an exaggeration. On the contrary, however, it is only too real. It portrays a people's humiliation, a humiliation born of the intolerance of some and of the hatred of others.

If our goal be justice, then we must support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated in May. I, for one, support it wholeheartedly. It is the only solution that justice allows.

No. 19 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Mariette Bosc-Saquet as recorded on Page 1160-1; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

The Société franco-manitobaine has been an excellent representative of the Franco-Manitoban population. Throughout its negotiations with the government, the Société's whole effort has been directed towards ensuring the survival of our people. The proposed amendments are one way of encouraging a new beginning for French-speaking Manitobans.

It is imperative that the rights of Franco-Manitobans be restored. I therefore support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the provincial and federal governments.

No. 20 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Jean-Louis Saquet as recorded on Page 1161; Hansard Vol. XXXI, No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

It is imperative that Franco-Manitobans be given back their rights. I therefore support the resolution to amend Section 23 as negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the provincial and federal governments.

No. 21 - English translation of written submission of Mr. René Saquet as recorded on Page 1161; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

On July 16, 1970 the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba unanimously adopted Bill 113, an Act that formally recognized what had been taken for granted since Manitoba's entry into Confederation: that is, the right, for those who so wish, to enroll their children in a public school where the teaching would be given in French from kindergarten to grade twelve.

The mere existence of this right to a cultural inheritance does not necessarily guarantee that culture's survival. A perceptive and imaginative effort must be made that will allow us to follow, as directly as we can, the road that leads from rights to realizations, from good intentions to reality. A French-language school cannot become a reality unless the following are in place:

- 1) individuals who are conscious of their identity;
- 2) a home life where French-Canadian culture is fully supported;
- 3) social and economic institutions that encourage the natural outgrowth of that culture and identity;
- 4) a dynamic community whose institutions allow comfortable integration and the development of a feeling of belonging.

In closing, I would simply like to say that I strongly support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated in the month of May between the Government of Manitoba and the Société franco-manitobaine.

No. 22 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Jacques Saquet as recorded on Page 1161; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

When we take a close look at the historic events that the French-speaking people of Manitoba have had to suffer through since this province's entry into the Canadian Confederation, it must be acknowledged as a fact that language rights have been snatched away from Franco-Manitobans. Eighty years were needed before a Manitoba Government could succeed in restoring French to a status of equality with English in Manitoba's schools. Thirteen years later another government, claiming to be of and for the people, is seeking to restore to Francophone Manitoba the language rights that were illegally taken away in 1890.

As is demonstrated by the great popularity of immersion schools in urban areas, it would seem that many English-speaking people want their children to be bilingual. Consequently, why should the use of Canada's two official languages be refused at the provincial level if more and more people want to use the two languages?

With your permission, I would like to compare the situation in Manitoba to a super highway (our schools prepare young, bilingual people in a model school system) whose only access is by a twisting on-ramp (these bilingual people have limited access to services).

I do not wish to minimize the task before us, but it seems obvious to me that if we still believe in justice, then justice must be given to Franco-Manitobans. I strongly support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated in May of 1983 between the Government of Manitoba and the Société franco-manitobaine.

Thank you

No. 26 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Marie-Joséphine Fisette as recorded on Page 1163; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

The Fédération des Aînes Franco-Manitobains represents 17 Senior Citizens' organizations across the province. It is the official agency representing the interests of Manitoba's older Francophones.

We need not tell you with what a lively interest we have, for the past two years, been following all the discussions between the Société Franco-Manitobaine, the federal government, and the provincial government. Among our members, we have many elderly people who lived through the injustices committed in 1916 by the government of the time. We have all suffered a great deal from having to study our language in secret, aware that what we were doing was against the law.

Our organization includes a number of teachers among its members. They also lived with great emotion and with troubled consciences through those difficult years. They looked on in sorrow while gradually and irrevocably the quality of French in our community deteriorated. Not one of them will ever forget the terror that an unexpected school inspector's visit could provoke. Our members all supported and were active

in the valiant efforts of the 'Association d'éducation' to preserve our language and our culture.

Many of us have made great sacrifices to provide our children with a satisfactory French and religious education. We have sent them, at the age of 12 or 13 years, to boarding schools and private schools, which were too often very far from home. How many parents have had to forego the contribution that a young lad could make in tilling the fields and helping with farm chores, not to mention the pain of losing, in a certain sense, a son so young? How many parents have bled themselves white to pay board for one or two or sometimes as many as six or eight sons, so as to provide them with a good French education, because the public system - which we nevertheless had to subsidize - did not offer one? How many good priests and nuns worked for years without any payment, but purely for love of our language and our people?

Isn't it time that justice was done? The revoking of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act has worked a great wrong to the French fact in Manitoba. Deprived of our schools, deprived of a legal right to our language, we have suffered losses in large numbers. On the one hand, assimilation has taken its toll. On the other, many of our most gifted have had to go to Quebec to be able to complete their studies in French and many have never returned. If Manitoba's Francophones had been able to develop as well-rounded citizens, as was the wish of the Father of Manitoba in 1870, would we have been such talented Franco-Manitobans as Gabrielle Roy, Henri Bergeron, Daniel Lavoie, etc., leaving the province?

Franco-Manitobans have been made to pay dearly since the illegal annulment of Section 23. And now, you in government have the power to restore to us some of the rights which have always been ours, but which have been denied to us for so long! Will you let yourselves be frightened and swayed by a small group of racist bigots who desire the total and utter annihilation of our people? Surely the era of 1890, 1896 and 1916 is past. Will you perpetuate the injustices of your ancestors?

The Fédération des Aînés Franco-Manitobans with its 17 affiliated organizations offers its unconditional support to the position of the Société franco-manitobaine and to the proposed amendments to Section 23.

Thank you.

No. 39 - English translation of written submission of the Teachers from École St. Malo as recorded on Page 1169; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

As Section 23 of The Manitoba Act (1870) states, Manitoba entered Confederation with bilingual status. After The Official Languages Act (1890) was adopted, English became the only official language of the province. For a century, as a result, Francophones have been completely deprived of their rights. In 1979, the Supreme Court of Canada declared the provincial Official Languages Act unconstitutional, and upheld The Manitoba Act (1870). Following the adopting of the Canadian Constitution in 1981, the Manitoba Government has had to find means of putting Section 23 into practice.

The reinstatement of French as a language of the courts and the Legislature is perceived as a threat, because it changes the status quo. It represents, however, no more than the due respecting of our rights, as Francophones living on Manitoban soil.

We, the teachers of St. Malo, work in a school division that enjoys the highest Francophone population percentage in Manitoba. The schools are French, and the school boards also work in French. But we cannot use French with the official administration. It is important for Francophones to obtain some control over their social and economic institutions. The amendments, as proposed in May 1983, would be a big step in that direction.

Section 23 must be respected so that the language and culture of pupils educated in the French-language schools of Manitoba may flourish. We strongly support the agreement negotiated in May 1983 by the Société franco-manitobaine and Mr. Pawley's wise government on the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

The undersigned are teachers at the École St-Malo who support the agreement, as negotiated, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act: Rita Rioux, Hélène Hébert, S. Berthe Alarie, Jacqueline Mireault, Colette M. Béard, Denis A. Fontaine, Marcelle Desrosiers, Gisèle P. Marion, Léo Lafrance, Aline Gosselin, Colette Préfontaine.

No. 40 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Doris Hogue as recorded on Page 1170; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Has no one ever thought of drawing a parallel between Latin, the language of scholars, a phonetic and linguistic masterpiece that became what we call a "dead" language by force of circumstances, and the fact that certain governments in the past, who were to go down in history for their efforts to make French a "dead" language, accorded it the impact of the language of a great civilization, by prohibiting its use? They learned that it is futile to try to subdue an entire population. Those for whom French remains a living language and, more, a language of action, will not be subdued.

In fact, gentlemen, don't you think that it was unrealistic of them to have believed that by prohibiting the teaching of a language, and by refusing to offer services in it, that the language of a founding people, who have weathered worse storms, could be swept off the map? I don't have to remind you that the road of the first pioneers was not exactly strewn with flowers. How can we fail to recognize the drive, the perseverance, of a population which continues to value the culture and language transmitted to it by its ancestors from so far away?

We must also take social and technological evolution into account and realize that we are no longer in the era of colonization when Manitoba lay isolated on the Prairies, but in an era of universal communication.

It is unthinkable that we could let ourselves be swallowed up, when at last, thanks to modern communications, we hear from all sides the voices of our Francophone brothers and sisters, who support us in our struggle to rectify past injustices, and to have our rights respected.

Also, since nowadays everything is public knowledge, you must expect to be judged, to be condemned and criticized for irresponsible acts that perpetuate a great injustice, or to be congratulated and acknowledged as responsible keepers of justice who have restored their rights to a population that has been without them for so many years.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am happy therefore, to be able to address you today in French - a living language - in order to give my support to the agreement negotiated last May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 41 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Gilbert Fournier as recorded on Page 1170; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Ever since the Manitoba Government announced its intention of righting the wrong to Franco-Manitobans that has existed since 1890, a storm of protest has been heard. It is doubtless because the injustice has existed for so long, that any change in the status quo is perceived as a threat. The reinstatement of French as a language of the courts and the Legislature is, however, inevitable.

The questions remains as to what services should be offered to the province's Francophone population. This is the point at which people start to get frightened. They think that the services will cost too much, and that all Franco-Manitobans are bilingual anyway, so there is no need to provide the same service in both languages. A bilingual province in which it was impossible to communicate in French with a government for essential services, would be a laughing stock.

The government understands this very well. That is why, in its agreement with the SFM, the French services that are deemed necessary have been enumerated.

Unfortunately, harmony between two parties excites jealousy; hatred and anger in others. The government, however, must not weaken in its intentions, which are fair to everyone. I fully support the resolution negotiated in May by the provincial and federal governments, and the SFM to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 42 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Gisèle Loyer as recorded on Page 1170-1; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I speak to you tonight as a French-Canadian who is proud of her language and her culture. Also I would like my children to be able to make the most of their rights as French-speaking citizens.

I do not understand why there is such intense opposition to a measure which will rectify an injustice committed 90 years ago. The present government must take every step necessary to right this wrong, and must not weaken in the face of opposition.

We must all learn to live with other people's differences. A majority has no right to trample on a minority, or to deny it its existing rights. It is time for Franco-Manitobans to assert their rights, and to take

back what is owed them; i.e., the right to express themselves in their own language, everywhere and at all times.

That is why, in all justice, your duty is to support the entrenchment of Section 23 in The Manitoba Act. Give us our rights, as proposed last May! Act bravely, courageously, and with confidence, for bilingualism in Manitoba will go far!

I am convinced that your priority is the reinstatement of justice. And we are here tonight to bear witness by our presence to our support for you in that task. French and English will soon be the official languages of Manitoba. That is why I, as a private citizen, firmly support the resolution negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government.

Thank you.

No. 43 - English translation of written submission of The Club de Bicolo as recorded on Page 1171; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We present this brief as the leaders of The Club de Bicolo.

Our club is designed for children ages 4 to 14 years. It has been in existence for eleven years, and today numbers 7,200 members, from all over the province. These young Francophones and Francophiles enjoy the Games Page which appears each week in our newspaper, La Liberté. They participate enthusiastically in the various competitions that we organize for them.

We cannot remain indifferent to the present controversy over our linguistic rights. On behalf of these youngsters, we count on our open-mindedness and your sense of responsibility to redress a wrong and to rectify an illegal state of affairs that has existed in our province for nearly a century. Franco-Manitobans have suffered long enough, through the ignorance or the ill will of successive provincial governments since 1890. It is high time that reparation was made.

The current legislation must be changed. By restoring to this province the bilingual status that it originally had, and by offering essential services in both official languages, the government would at last be seen to be just and equitable. As adults, isn't that the kind of example and instruction we would like to give our children, who are watching us closely, and who will follow in our footsteps?

On their behalf, we support the resolution negotiated in May by the federal and provincial governments, and by the Société franco-manitobaine to amend The Manitoba Act, and to restore to Francophones what is due them.

We venture to believe in your courage and your sense of justice.

Thank you.

No. 44 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Yvonne Lagassé as recorded on Page 1171-2; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my opinion on the questions of bilingualism in Manitoba.

The survival of French in Canada is very important to me. That language is the heritage which I received from my ancestors, and I wish to pass it on to my children, and to all my descendants.

I thank God that I was born in Canada, and I am proud of my ancestors, who were courageous enough to leave France 400 years ago, to become part of the colony on the banks of the St. Lawrence River. That colony was already well established by the time the French King signed the Treaty of Paris.

Fortunately for us, Lord Durham was a man of honour. He wished to grant justice to a conquered people, and we were allowed to keep our language and our religion. Bravo for Englishmen of his calibre!

My parents were both born in Quebec. My father loved the land, and moved to the area of Estevan, Saskatchewan, where he set up a homestead in 1909. The neighbours round about came from many different European countries. They all learned English to be able to communicate with each other. I have very fond memories of those people.

When I started school I spoke only French, my mother spoke no English. If I still speak French today, it is because she insisted that her children should speak the language of their ancestors. "This may be the only inheritance you will ever get from us," she used to say. She was right.

At school, my brother and I were forbidden to speak French together, so we learned English. I went to a little country school until 1934, when we left Saskatchewan for Ste. Anne, Manitoba. That was when I got the chance to learn to read and write in our language.

The Fathers of Confederation safeguarded the linguistic rights of the two founding peoples of our country. However, members of the Manitoba Government had chosen to ignore that clause of our Constitution, and had passed a law prohibiting French instruction in Manitoba. Were the honourable members ignorant of the fact that an entire people existed in Manitoba, who could not bow to that unjust law? Finding themselves powerless before the government, they organized the "Association d'Éducation Française au Manitoba," which worked effectively with parents and educators to maintain French education in the province.

I will always be grateful to that association and to my teachers for giving me a somewhat deeper acquaintance with my mother tongue, which allows me today to publish my books. (Stories that my father told me when I was a child.) It allows me also to communicate every day with my neighbourhood friends and to participate in all that goes on. I can also appreciate all the events on TV and radio that are broadcast in English. It's wonderful to be bilingual! I wish that all Canadians could be.

In 1941-2, I taught in the little country school of Ste. Anne Centre. I had 34 pupils from 6 to 14 years old. Of these, there were eight who did not speak French. Fortunately, the parents did not oppose French instruction and the trustees asked me to teach French.

I knew that when the inspector came around, it might be a good idea to hide the French books and to pretend that I was teaching only in English, as people did at that time. But I decided I was going to be straightforward about it, and I admit that I was a little curious to see what would happen. So when he arrived at the beginning

of October, he found French words written on the blackboard, and French books on my desk. That started up quite an argument!

"Do you realize that you are violating Manitoba law? And do you realize that I could take your teaching permit away?" (I had not yet received my teaching certificate.)

I replied that the parents and the trustees had asked me to teach French, and that I was doing my best; and that if a law existed that prohibited French teaching in this school, where 2/3 of the students had French parents, then that law was not justifiable and should be abolished because it stripped children of a linguistic heritage to which they had a right. As for me, I was doing what I could to transmit that heritage to them, and if I were an inspector, I would be in a position to do even more.

He started to laugh, and said, "You would lose your job. I hope that you will change your ideas. Just this once, I will let it pass, but on my next visit I will have to do my duty."

So I understood that I would have to play the game, but at the same time I had shown that I would not back down when I knew I was in the right. I don't think pupils should be learning French at the expense of English, because they need English. I know that we are all capable of learning both of the country's official languages. If I could, anybody could, given the opportunity.

I am sure that all bilinguals are happy that they are so. Nowadays, we are all really world citizens. People are doing more and more travelling. Those who speak more than one language surely have an advantage over those who speak only one. European countries recognize the importance of giving their citizens the chance to learn languages other than their own. In Canada, we are very fortunate. The two official languages of the country are also world languages. Can't we make an effort to rid ourselves of our prejudices and to take a broader view of the situation? We are all citizens of a great and beautiful country which enjoys international respect. Our fellow citizens who immigrate to this country are delighted to find here a people who live a good life, in peace. This is a country in which human rights are respected, and where minorities are protected by the Constitution. Let us throw off our prejudices! Let us all work together to hasten the day when all Canadians will feel more united, when everyone will be familiar with both official languages - which should not prevent anyone from learning their own native language.

Now I would like to talk about the translation of laws from English to French. It's true that it would cost Manitoba a lot, but good things never come easily. We must always pay for our mistakes. If the laws had been enacted in both languages, starting in 1916, as the Constitution requires, we would have paid the cost little by little, and we would not now have to pay it all at once. I am sure that Franco-Manitobans are ready to contribute their share to the cause. It would also be a good opportunity to do a review of existing laws, and to consign to the wastebasket (probably a good many wastebaskets would be needed), those that are no longer useful. Who knows, we might find forgotten treasures in such a housecleaning. Remember, too, that it will keep the translators out of the breadline for a long time to come.

Can you see the bright side now? Bravo! I am delighted.

Thank you for attention.

No. 45 - English translation of Mr. Léo Nadeau as recorded on Page 1172; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

If I venture to speak a few words to you at these public hearings, it is because I believe that what is at stake is too important to allow me to remain silent.

Not only is the survival of the Franco-Manitoban people at stake, but, far beyond that, an issue which concerns the entire population of Manitoba. The fate of our community depends on it. The legislation which prohibited the use of French in Manitoba has been declared unconstitutional. If we continue to respect unconstitutional laws, we face the collapse of our judicial system. The foundations of our civilization rest on that judicial system. We cannot, therefore, continue to observe laws which thus threaten our society. We must banish forever those repressive laws, which have no legal basis.

Franco-Manitobans have been the victims of injustice for 90 years. They have been long-suffering, and have waited all that time. We owe it to them to amend the laws which are leading them little by little towards certain annihilation.

The Société franco-manitobaine has acted in the interests of the group it represents. The agreement reached on the 17th of May is fair to Franco-Manitobans and also to the provincial government. This agreement is to the advantage of all parties concerned.

I strongly support the agreement reached on the 17th of May, 1983. I hope, gentlemen, that you will do the same.

Thank you.

No. 46 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Louis Fiola as recorded on Page 1172-3; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I would have preferred not to appear at these public hearings, but I feel that there are a few things which must be said.

I find it regrettable that Mr. Pawley's Government should be reprimanded for wishing to grant justice to Franco-Manitobans. I am saddened also by the lack of historical knowledge shown by certain Members of Parliament, and by a number of my fellow citizens whom I hear repeating that the province has been working perfectly well in only one language - English - for a hundred years. If you ask me, that kind of talk is ignorant and narrow-minded.

We, Franco-Manitobans, have paid double taxes to subsidize our private schools, and have expended a great deal of energy on many committees in order to preserve our culture, our language, and our rights; because of injustices committed by the majority, and by our politicians.

I believe it is high time our governments gave us back our rights and saw justice done.

The government which has the courage to grant us justice by making Manitoba a province where the two official languages stand on an equal footing, will be admired for its sense of justice. By taking that step, the government will foster an atmosphere of open-mindedness, and one day all our citizens will come to

know the rewards of speaking both official languages, as well as any other languages they may wish to learn.

To conclude, I would like to state that I support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it was negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government.

Thank you.

No. 47 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Carmen Catellier for Éducateurs Franco-Manitobains of Red River School Division No. 17 as recorded on Page 1173; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Since I am here on behalf of the 'Éducateurs Franco-Manitobains' of the Red River School Division, I am going to take a teacher's point of view. I am sure that you all know your history, but let us look at things from the point of view of a youngster getting a lesson in Manitoba history. It is our young people who will see the consequences, for good or ill, of the decisions made by those who govern. Governing bodies have the privilege and the responsibility of shaping youth's future. This is what a Red River 12-year-old has learned and understands about the rights granted to Manitobans when the province entered Confederation:

Manitoba, our province, was founded and given its early impetus by French-Canadians. The history of our province is full of stories of the exploits and adventures of these early inhabitants. Where would we be today without the contribution of people like LaVérendrye, the voyageurs, Noel Ritchot and Louis Riel? The stirring debate which led us into Confederation owed its successful conclusion to the conviction and persistence of the many Métis and Francophones involved. The right to use both official languages in the courts, the Legislature, and in education was granted to the inhabitants of the new province. Later, various political groups, anxious to protect their own legislative power and under pressure from a possibly more powerful and wealthier province, on two occasions withdrew the right to both official languages that had been so honorably acquired in 1870.

Franco-Manitobans have continued to survive, in spite of repressive legislation, and they continue to work with conviction and tenacity for the restoration of their rights. They rejoiced when, in 1968, Canada saw the adoption of The Official Languages Act, and when, in 1970, the right to instruction in both languages was restored under the Schreyer Government, a full century after it had in fact been acquired. But education rights are not enough. We must correct the legislation that was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1979. We must restore The Manitoba Act - and especially Section 23 - to its proper position.

I teach in the school division which has the highest Francophone population percentage in Manitoba. You must realize that the schools are French-speaking, the school board works in French, and that our rural municipalities conduct their meetings in French, but unfortunately we cannot use our everyday language to deal with the official administration. As educators, we believe in the importance of the Francophone right to administer those institutions which contribute to the survival and development of Franco-Manitobans in our own language. The amendments that the parties

concerned would like to make to the constitution seem to us to represent a big step in the right direction.

If the members of the committee disagree strongly with this short history, we have teachers in the Red River Valley who would be glad to offer a course in history, as it was lived by our ancestors.

The Société franco-manitobaine negotiated an honourable agreement with the government in May of this year. On behalf of the Red River 'Éducateurs Franco-Manitobains,' I would like to say that we support the agreement, as negotiated, to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

No. 48 - English translation of the written submission of Ms. Yvette Fluet-Gagnon as recorded on Page 1173-4; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have been feeling quite distressed in the last little while. It is legitimate distress, since once again we find ourselves in the position of pleading with, and protecting ourselves from a majority which seems to want to close its eyes and its heart to us, to deny our very existence. They tell me there is no reason for it, but I have only to listen to the media and I tremble. As a Francophone, I remember how, as a schoolgirl, I was forbidden French instruction, and I am afraid that history will repeat itself - that once again our right to live in French and to learn it will evaporate.

No doubt, as members of the committee, you have learned a little history in the past few weeks. I am sure you have heard very precise accounts of Manitoba's history. We cannot change history. We can omit certain facts to present them in any way we like; it makes no difference. The dates, the events, the words and their results have been recorded forever, and we cannot change them.

Given that fact, I find myself wondering, "What will the historians have to say about this epoch in Manitoba's history?" Will they say that the government of the time, in its wisdom, declared the province bilingual and entrenched Francophone rights, so as to correct the mistakes and omissions of previous governments? Or will they say that once more Franco-Manitobans fought to obtain their rights, and once more they failed, because of an insecure and unjust government?

The first possibility will obtain if the agreement of the 17th of May is respected. If this government returns to that agreement without weakening the amendments, it will gain a place of honour in history, and it will have begun the process of restoring the confidence of the minorities, which nowadays is at a very low level.

I am a mother and, like all mothers, I hope that life will be kinder to my children than it has been to me. As a Francophone, I cannot but see the agreement of the 17th of May as a guarantee that it will. With the agreement entrenched, perhaps my children will be able to be proud of their identity, knowing that they will not have to submit or to clamour for their rights, and beg for the things that Anglophones take for granted.

On behalf of my family, I approve and strongly support the amendments to Section 23 as they were negotiated on the 17th of May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government. The agreement guarantees us equal treatment. It is a fair proposal, and I believe in it.

No. 49 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Gilbert Legal as recorded on Page 1174; Hansard Vol. XXXI No. 56, 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I am the principal of the École Secondaire de La Broquerie and I stand before this Committee of the Manitoba Legislature as the representative of the students and teachers of that French-speaking secondary school.

We have followed with great interest the three years of legal and political developments on the question of the linguistic rights of Franco-Manitobans. We rejoiced at Mr. Georges Forest's victory in the Supreme Court of Canada, but at the same time we deplored the fact that he had to spend so much time and money to obtain a right that ought to have been constitutionally guaranteed from the beginning. Neither did we appreciate the attitude of the Lyon Government of the time towards the Supreme Court's decision in the Forest case. Such total mockery of a Supreme Court decision is, in our opinion, an outrage to the court, and shows similar bigotry to that which provoked the Manitoba school question in 1896 and the abolition of the bilingual schools in 1916.

Of course, we were proud of and greatly encouraged by the steps taken by Mr. Pawley's New Democratic Government last spring, relative to the Bilodeau case and of the unceasing representations of the Société franco-manitobaine. Our representative, the Société franco-manitobaine, negotiated in good faith, and on behalf of all Manitoba's Francophones accepted an agreement which was also acceptable to the provincial and federal governments.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, you must not capitulate! You have a unique and historic opportunity to put right a state of affairs which is intolerable to us, and humiliating for you. We have suffered insult and injustice for a hundred years, because our ancestors would not let their language and their culture die. Yes, we are still here, still standing, and here we will remain. We are strong in the same fighting spirit that inspired our ancestors, united in solidarity with the SFM, and above all convinced that the Supreme Court will grant us justice once and for all. We are more than ever unshakable in our demands for our rights. We want total equality of linguistic rights and we will not be satisfied with anything else. That means a network of institutions and a range of government services comparable to those available to Anglophones.

And so, as I conclude, I urge you to live up to your responsibilities. It is a pity that this question of constitutional rights and of fundamental equalities should once more have become a political issue. I urge you to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated by the Société franco-manitobaine, the provincial government, and the federal government on last May 17th. Any weakening of this bill will be considered an affront to Manitoba's Francophone community and will therefore be unacceptable. I repeat, you have the unique opportunity of correcting an historic injustice. Don't let it pass you by!

No. 50 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Hubert Balcaen as recorded on Page 1174; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I am here in response to the invitation that was extended to the Manitoba public, in order to express my unequivocal support for the Agreement in Principle that was reached in May of this year by the S.F.M. and by the provincial and federal levels of government, on the proposed amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

The three reasons for my support are given below:

First, I believe that these amendments have been needed for a long time, in order to put right a wrong that is now nearly a century old. From that point of view, they represent a very important step. They are important, too, for the official language minority which has suffered the ravages of assimilation for decades, and has been more and more consistently deprived of the linguistic and cultural oxygen which it needs for its survival; let alone its development.

Second, the proposed amendments to the Act allow for services to be provided in the two official majority languages of Canada. Since I live in one of the regions concerned, I would like to be able to take advantage of such services, while remaining confident that the majority will not suffer because of it. It is pointless to enter into a discussion of costs here. The official literature that has been available since May is quite explicit on the subject.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the May agreement was negotiated upon the basic principle that "English and French are the official languages of Manitoba." I am convinced that this principle can promote tolerance and respect in Manitoba. I venture to believe that by accepting the amendments to Section 23 as they were agreed upon on the 17th of May, Manitoba could become a shining example, and the envy of the nation.

Thank you.

No. 51 - English translation of written submission by The La Broquerie Curling Club as recorded on Page 1175; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I would like to underline a few points in the debate which has been raging over the government's intention to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

First, I don't know if the media is responsible for it, but it seems to me that we are making a big fuss about very little. Look at all the newspaper headlines, the editorials, the letters to the editor, the pamphlets, the petitions, even these public hearings.

What does the amendment to The Manitoba Act hope to achieve, other than a freer expression of the French lifestyle in Manitoba? I do not see how this kind of development for 5 percent or 6 percent of the population can threaten the majority.

Second, as for these public hearings, I don't think that they are a good thing in themselves. An injustice has been done, and must be put right. You don't ask people's opinion on a case that is already being dealt with by the courts. Why do we want to take a Manitoba-

wide opinion sample before dealing with a question that is essentially a legal one?

Third, I would like people, above all, to remember the positive points about an officially bilingual Manitoba. Such a province would surely help Canada to remain the wonderful country that it is. And what an encouraging sign it would be for the nation's many minorities to see that the official minority of Manitoba had won the re-establishment of its rights.

All of this goes to say that I support the agreement negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you

The La Broquerie Curling Club: Chairman, Oscar Gagnon; Directors: Estelle Taillefer, Rita Nadeau, Gil Tétrault, Jean Normandeau

No. 52 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Jeannine Kirouac as recorded on Page 1175; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

In 1890, the use of French was abolished in the courts and in the Legislative Assembly. In 1916, French education was banned from Manitoba public schools. In spite of these repressive measures, Franco-Manitobans continued to survive.

In 1970, the Edward Schreyer government allowed the creation of French schools. Less than a decade later, French Immersion schools were appearing on the scene. Meanwhile, Georges Forest won in the Supreme Court by having the 1890 Act which outlawed the use of French in the courts and the legislature declared unconstitutional. In 1983, the provincial and federal governments and the Société franco-manitobaine signed an agreement to return the French language to its former status.

This brief summary of events shows the trend. French is on the rise. Good things are in store.

To those who are afraid of a French takeover in Manitoba, I would like to say that it's impossible as we are only 6 percent of the population. All we want is respect for our rights.

In closing, I would like to say that I wholeheartedly support the resolution to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, as it was negotiated between the Manitoba government and the Société franco-manitobaine last May.

Thank you

No. 53 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Rachelle Ouellet as recorded on Page 1175; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

It's not a matter of coming here to beg that our rights be respected, but rather to demand it. I dare to demand it, not in a spirit of confrontation or with a desire to rehearse all of the injustices, but with the purpose of having that which is best in us acknowledged.

I believe that we francophones have been short-changed in the past. I believe that the agreement proposed on May 17 would help create the kind of relationships which rules out all traces of paternalism

and condescension from the majority, and of mistrust or fear from the minority. The sooner we are granted equal dignity and freedom of expression, the sooner we will be able to serve all Manitobans.

Manitoba can only win by respecting the agreement of May 17th. Mutual exchange and enrichment would be all the more possible. This is why I support the original resolution to amend Section 23 - without the recent changes.

No. 54 - English translation of written submission of La Broquerie Cultural Committee as recorded on Page 1175; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

The resolution to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, as negotiated in the month of May, is more than a means of compensating for the injustice which has been perpetuated for a long time now. It's an opportunity to acknowledge that we have equal dignity, an opportunity we wouldn't want to miss!

The changes proposed in the May 17th agreement will thus do more than give us back that which is essential to our survival and evolution. It will allow all Manitobans to profit from what they hold most dear and will make possible a more fruitful exchange.

The changes proposed in the original agreement contain nothing that is a threat to the Anglophone majority. They don't take anything away from Anglophones. The majority has everything to gain by recognizing us for what we are. Only in this way will we be able to serve everyone.

It goes without saying, as well, that entrenching our rights can only mean a step forward for other ethnic and minority groups as well.

The current government can no longer hesitate to rectify unconstitutional legislation which inhibits a better understanding of, and greater participation by, all Manitobans.

Therefore, we support the original resolution amending Section 23 - without the recent modifications.

No. 55 - English translation of written submissions of Father Gérard Clavet as recorded on Page 1176; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Congrégation des Clercs de Saint-Viateur de La Broquerie, I must confess that we are stunned to see that Manitobans could so violently protest the redress of damage done to rights acquired at the time of the province's formation. In fact, looking back over the province's history, we see that in 1870, Louis Riel, head of the Provisional Government at Red River, demanded guarantees for the French language in the new Manitoban territory before accepting to officially become part of Canadian Confederation. The Manitoba Act then made French and English the official languages of the new province and offered two systems of education based on religious differences.

From 1890 on, these rights were violated and damaged. All efforts to correct this anomaly failed. In 1916, the government led by T.C. Norris adopted the Thornton Act which abolished bilingual schools and

made English the only language of instruction in Manitoba. The French minority strongly opposed this unjust action and has relentlessly fought ever since to see justice triumph. It seems that immigrants who have come from other countries to seek their fortune in Manitoba don't understand the situation. This is why a great majority of them are violently opposed to the idea of francophone rights being restored. Those who have taken the time and the trouble to inform themselves know that at the end of the forties and again twenty years later, the government allowed the use of French as a language of instruction.

Thinking, open-minded people also know that this was followed in 1970 by Bill 113, passed by Ed Schreyer's New Democrat government, which established French and English as the official languages of instruction in Manitoba. In 1974, an organizing body called the Bureau de l'Éducation française, was set up within the Department of Education. Our leaders, better informed and less prejudiced than the masses, understood the important role of justification and rectification incumbent upon them. How is it, then, that so many people are opposed to recognizing Bill 113, adopted unanimously by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on July 16, 1970?

All the same, this Bill acknowledged legally what had been taken for granted ever since the entry of Manitoba into Confederation - the right of those who so desired to register their children in a public school in which instruction would be given in French from Kindergarten to Grade 12. Anyone opposed to this would undoubtedly have to possess feelings of jealousy and hatred, or simply be so full of prejudice that ignorance would destroy any potential for understanding. No threats seem to be looming on the horizon for the other ethnic denominations. They shouldn't, therefore, have any fear of losing the rights that are theirs. They can live in full security and develop themselves, all the while letting others do the same. Who knows if the future doesn't have times in store for them when they might require the co-operation of those they are now persecuting.

We think it's imperative that the rights of Franco-Manitobans be restored without infringement upon the rights of the rest of the population. We also want to point out that we support the resolution negotiated on May 17, 1980 to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of the Committee won't at all hesitate to declare yourselves in favor of this resolution. I am counting on you.

Thank you.

Réal St-Pierre, c.s.v.; Gaétan Lefebvre, c.s.v.; Gérard Clavet, c.s.v.

Saint-Viateur clergymen residing in La Broquerie, Manitoba

No. 56 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Pierre Palud as recorded on Page 1176; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

The proposed amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act are causing a lot of controversy between Manitobans these days. But why all this fuss? Isn't it true that, today, Franco-Manitobans are only demanding rights that, according to the Manitoba Act of 1870, have been owing to them for more than 90 years?

It should be noted - keep this in mind - that what Franco-Manitobans are demanding takes absolutely nothing away from the other ethnic groups in the province; just the opposite. So why are there so many people against the proposed amendments? What are they opposing? We fail to understand why so many people want to oppose amendments which, on the one hand, take nothing away from them and, on the other hand, seek only to correct injustices committed by former governments.

Furthermore, we all know that the Act which forbade the use of French before the courts and in the government of this province has just recently been declared unconstitutional. How can the people of Manitoba oppose the amendment of an Act which, in the eyes of the Supreme Court, is illegal? Isn't it completely ridiculous for us to have to come here today to demand rights which already belong to us?

It goes without saying, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that our New Democrat government is quite right in wanting to ensure the survival of the French language in Manitoba. It's our government's duty to correct the error committed during the time of the Greenway government. It is thus imperative that Manitobans support their government in the restoring of justice.

What we ask you now, gentlemen of the Committee, is that you recommend entrenchment in the Manitoba Constitution of the amendments to Section 23, as they were negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Pawley government. All this to say, gentlemen, that we strongly support the resolution to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 57 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Claudette Lavack as recorded on Page 1177; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Dear friends,

The use of French in the courts and in the Legislative Assembly was abolished in 1890. In 1916, instruction in French was suppressed in the public schools as well. Franco-Manitobans continued to exist in spite of these measures.

We have had French schools since 1970. Enrollment in French Immersion schools is increasing; these students are proud to learn a second language and we, as educators, are equally proud to teach it to them, while the same time, showing them that they can be just as proud of their mother tongue, whatever it may be.

We dare to hope that soon, wherever they go in Manitoba, these students will have the opportunity to put their second language to use.

I'll close by saying that we strongly support the agreement to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act as negotiated by the Société franco-manitobaine and the provincial and federal governments last May.

No. 58 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Hubert Bouchard as recorded on Page 1177; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We are stunned by the controversy arising over the amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

We don't understand this determination to oppose a bill which would correct the wrongs committed at the end of the 19th century.

The current provincial and federal governments and the Société franco-manitobaine were quite right to come to an agreement to restore rights and services in French to Franco-Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, the French language is a beautiful one. We want it to be used; we want services in French; we want Manitoba to be bilingual.

This is why, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we are insisting that we support the resolution negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 59 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Gilles Normandeau as recorded on Page 1177; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

My name is Gilles Normandeau and I am principal of the Pointe des Chênes à Ste-Anne School in Manitoba. Speaking on behalf of the teachers in this school, I would like to emphasize how unfortunate it is that we have to defend rights granted to us when Manitoba joined the Confederation in 1870. It seems inconceivable in a democracy like ours that governments could have, by means of prejudice and cultivated hatred, infringed on rights justly acquired after frank and honest deliberation between the Provisional Government for Rivière Rouge and the federal Government.

In 1870, the Manitoba Act clearly specified that French and English were the official languages for the new Province. The Act even offered two denominationally based systems of education.

It is beyond our understanding how some people, seemingly without wanting to stop and think seriously, claiming to be "of good will" and wanting the province of Manitoba to progress, can waste precious time and energy in perpetuating a wrong.

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, the New Democrat Government is trying to right a wrong that has exist for 90 years. In a civilized country, how can one not support a government which strives to understand and rectify a lack of justice?

For this reason the teaching staff of the Pointe des Chênes School wishes to support the resolution negotiated May 17th, 1983 to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my desire is that you will not hesitate to support that resolution. I am counting on you.

Thank you.

No. 60 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Armand Fréchette as recorded on Page 1177-8; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

It is on behalf of the elders of our parish in La Broquerie that I am here for the survival of the French language.

The controversy raised by the proposed amendments is foreboding indeed. A large number of Manitobans have dared to express contempt for changes whose very impact escapes them. They fear the worst. They see themselves threatened by these changes, as moderate as they are. It is essential not to let ourselves be swayed by all this emotionalism fuelled by ignorance itself. Anyone refusing to respect the rights of Franco-Manitobans demonstrates a narrow-mindedness which can only lead to the cultural impoverishment of Manitoba. Ever since 1980, Franco-Manitobans have been heroically putting up with injustices perpetrated by governments acting beyond their jurisdiction. Today's New Democrat Government has the long-dreamed-for opportunity to right the mistakes of the past, to return to a wronged people what is essential for their natural growth. Let us not wait any longer - 90 years have already tragically slowed down the development of the Franco-Manitoban community. Let us start acting while this community is still showing signs of life.

The Société franco-manitobaine has capably represented the Franco-Manitoban community. Throughout the negotiations it only wanted to ensure the survival of its own people. The proposed amendments are one means of bringing about a new beginning for Manitobans of French expression.

It is imperative that Franco-Manitobans be given back their rights. I support, therefore, the resolution to amend Section 23 as negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine, the federal and the provincial Governments.

Thank you.

No. 61 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Léonard Desharnais, for the Chamber of Commerce, St. Pierre, Manitoba as recorded on Page 1178; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

In the province of Manitoba we can still find francophone communities that are very much alive, schools which teach French language to Francophones as well as to Anglophones, and a distinct Franco-Manitoban culture.

In our province there still are strong French sectors despite injustices imposed on them during the last 90 years. Why not give the opportunity to some to work in French, to be given services in French and to use French in daily living?

What is now being heard on the media regarding the rights in question, along with all the uproar arising from these hearings, is causing fear, wrong ideas and false impressions among the non-Francophones in Manitoba. The truth of what took place in 1870, 1980 and 1916 is not being understood.

The city of Winnipeg is proposing a referendum concerning French language survival in Manitoba, and using misleading information at that. Perhaps the Mayor of Winnipeg should include in his referendum a question on Seat-Belt Legislation.

Today Franco-Manitobans are requesting that control of their destiny be taken from the hand of politicians and that Section 23, with the amendments as negotiated, be entrenched in the Canadian Constitution.

The St-Pierre Chamber of Commerce supports this resolution.

Thank-you.

No. 62 - English translation of written brief by the personnel of St. Joachim de La Broquerie School as recorded on Page 1178; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We the staff at St. Joachim de La Broquerie School would like to inform you of our strong conviction to support the resolution to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act as negotiated in May by the Manitoba Government and the Société franco-manitobaine.

In 1870, when Manitoba was just beginning, an agreement was signed which recognized both French and English for use in the Legislature and the courts, and that all public documents be published in these languages.

In 1890, use of the French language in the courts and legislature was abolished. Later, in 1916, the use of French for teaching in public schools was prohibited.

Is this not a serious injustice against Franco-Manitobans? Our rights were wrested from us by people who were scarcely tolerant and hardly concerned about their neighbours' or even their children's culture.

We consider the amendment to the Manitoba Act not to be a threat to anyone, but rather a natural development of French life in Manitoba. This would be a boon to our province, something of which we can be proud.

The present Government wants to put this Province back on the right track of its constitutional commitments. Such action would receive our highest praise. We request that the rights of our forefathers be respected.

Thank you.

Norman J. Lavack, Principal; Jeannine Kirouac; Yvette Gagnon; Georgette Gérardy; Henri Bisson; Lucille Bisson; Florence Torculte; Carmette Gagnon

No. 63 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Norman Barnabé as recorded on Page 1178; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

While these public hearings are intended to give everyone a chance to speak, this worthy goal is not always being reached. Rather, they are spreading hostility and increasingly bringing attention to the growing divisions in our Manitoban community.

This summer the Government distributed a pamphlet hoping to thereby allay the fears of those opposed to the amendments. This pamphlet was not enough since those opposed are still vociferating and have even managed to have these public hearings held. It would seem that the Government is in the process of backtracking, if not completely sacrificing the principles on which the agreement had been negotiated.

Let us stop giving free rein to bitter antagonism. Let us make an effort to put an end to the discord between Manitobans of English expression and those of French expression. To amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act is sufficient. Those opposed will stop being quarrelsome as soon as they realize that the amendments will not affect them in any way. Our priority must be the reestablishment of justice.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my hope is that you share in my opinion. The resolution as negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act must be supported. I support it and am proud of it.

Thank you.

No. 64 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Aimé Gauthier as recorded on Page 1179; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

I would like to express a few ideas that should be kept in mind when we decide whether or not to support the proposals to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

First of all, we must remember that the Act which had prohibited using French in the courts and the Legislature has been declared unconstitutional. With this in mind I cannot understand the indecision shown by the government, nor the opposition coming from the majority of the population. I cannot understand how one can refuse to rectify an "illegal" Act. Opposition being shown goes beyond the limits of reason. Of what good would our judicial system be if "illegal" Acts are not eliminated? If this Act which is not legal continues to be enforced we must, again, question our society, our government and all our institutions. It's obvious that the very foundation of our civilization would crumble. The seriousness of such a situation is frightening. Our official language problems must be sorted out amongst ourselves and we must not put it off any longer.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, we give our support to the resolution negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 65 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Lyse Desharnais as recorded on Page 1179; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

It is with regret that our Committee feels the need to present this brief.

In accepting to hold these public hearings, you are demonstrating a very careless attitude. You are now in a position where you can remedy an injustice which has affected the lives of many generations of Francophones, yet you are wavering in your duty.

We are delighted that our children still have certain rights regarding their education in French, but we could like them to be able to use French outside our homes and schools. Gentlemen, if you enforce the laws as stated in Section 23, our children will be able to do this.

The main point in all this is that we, the Comité de Parents de l'École Élémentaire de St-Pierre (St-Pierre Elementary School Parents Committee) support the resolution to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act as negotiated in May by the federal Government, the provincial Government and the S.F.M.

Thank you.

No. 66 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Aimé Tétrault, as recorded on Page 1179; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, October 4, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

My name is Aimé Tétrault. I was born and raised in La Broquerie. I am a co-owner of several businesses

and manager of La Broquerie Lumber Ltd. We offer bilingual services to our clients since all of our staff is bilingual. Being a manager of an enterprise, it is my belief that amending Section 23 of the Manitoba Act would certainly be useful for all bilingual enterprises in Manitoba.

An injustice has been committed and must be rectified. I believe that the present Government of this province is duty bound to enforce an agreement and to thus make up for the weakness of all the preceding Governments. I use the word "weakness" because all these governments, having allowed this injustice to continue, have demonstrated their serious lack of responsibility to the francophone community; a community whose past involvement in building this province needs no retelling.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my hope that you share my opinion. The resolution as negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of the Manitoba Act must be supported.

Thank you.

No. 67 - English translation of written submission of La Broquerie Figure Skating Committee as recorded on Page 1179; Hansard 56 - 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

We support the resolution to amend Section 23 as negotiated last May by the Société franco-manitobaine, the federal and the provincial governments.

With the removal of French language usage from the courts and the Legislative Assembly beginning in 1890, injustices have been done to Francophones. The present Government has probably realized this fact.

It is our belief that young Francophones can continue to grow with great pride in their identity if French language services are more accessible to them.

Gentlemen, consider for a moment how a bilingual province would exemplify the fact that minority groups are respected in our country and that rights established in a constitution are not to be put down or removed!

Thank you.

Signed: Cécile Fournier, Chairman; Jacinthe Mireault, Secretary-Treasurer; Dolores Sicotte; Denise Normandeau; Yolande Tétrault; Jennifer Granger; Diane Turenne.

No. 68 - English translation of written submission of Mrs. Irma Gauthier as recorded on Page 1180; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., 4 October, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

The controversy raised by the proposed amendments is foreboding indeed. A large number of Manitobans have dared to express contempt for changes whose very impact escapes them. They fear the worst. They see themselves threatened by these changes, as moderate as they are. It is essential not to let ourselves be swayed by all this emotionalism fuelled by ignorance itself. Anyone refusing to respect the rights of Franco-Manitobans demonstrates a narrow-mindedness which can only lead to the cultural impoverishment of Manitoba. Ever since 1980, Franco-Manitobans have been heroically putting up with injustices perpetrated by governments acting beyond their jurisdiction. Today's

New Democrat Government has the long dreamed for opportunity to right the mistakes of the past, to return to a wronged people what is essential for their natural growth. Let us not wait any longer - 90 years have already tragically slowed down the development of the Franco-Manitoban community. Let us start acting while this community is still showing signs of life.

The Société franco-manitobaine has capably represented the Franco-Manitoban community. Throughout the negotiations it only wanted to ensure the survival of its own people. The proposed amendments are one means of bringing about a new beginning for Manitobans of French expression.

It is imperative that Franco-Manitobans be given back their rights. I support, therefore, the resolution to amend Section 23 as negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine, the federal and the provincial governments.

Thank you.

No. 69 - English translation of written submission of Mr. Jacques Trudeau as recorded on Page 1180; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, 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 Section 23 of the Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 70 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin as recorded on Page 1180; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Here we are together again, the Francophones of Manitoba, engaged in yet another struggle for our rights. It seems we're always up against the same thing; it's time that Francophones of Manitoba get justice.

I, hereby, support the resolution to the amendment as presented in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

We are confident that you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, will not hesitate to support it as well.

Thank you.

No. 71 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Michèle Lagimodière-Gagnon as recorded on Page 1180; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Entrenchment of the amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as called for by a tripartite 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 represents 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 sub-sections 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 witnessed during the past months.

Entrenchment of Section 23, as proposed in May, will make Manitoba a truly just, a truly bilingual province.

No. 72 - English translation of written submission by La Ligue St-Gérard de La Broquerie as recorded on Page 1181; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Ligue St-Gérard de La Broquerie, I would like you to know how proud we are to be French-Manitobans.

We are proud of our language, our culture and our traditions.

We are thankful to our parents and our grandparents for passing on this rich heritage.

We want to give our children and our grandchildren the chance to live as Franco-Manitobans.

We hope that the Franco-Manitoban flag will continue to adorn our province for many generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it's for this reason that we support whole-heartedly the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, as negotiated in May by the Manitoba Government and the Société franco-manitobaine.

Thank you.

Antoinette Bissonnette; Rose-Marie Nadeau; Gisèle Gauthier; Lorraine Dumesnil; Diane Turenne; Michelle Seidler; Giselle Tétrault

No. 73 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Georgette Gérardy as recorded on Page 1181; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I would like to underline a few points in the debate which has been raging over the government's intention to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

First, I don't know if the media is responsible for it, but it seems to me that we are making a big fuss about very little. Look at all the newspaper headlines, the editorials, the letters to the editor, the pamphlets, the petitions, even these public hearings.

What does the amendment to The Manitoba Act hope to achieve, other than a freer expression of the French lifestyle in Manitoba? I do not see how this kind of development for 5 percent or 6 percent of the population can threaten the majority.

Second, as for these public hearings, I don't think that they are a good thing in themselves. An injustice has been done, and must be put right. You don't ask people's opinion on a case that is already being dealt

with by the courts. Why do we want to take a Manitoba-wide opinion sample before dealing with a question that is essentially a legal one?

Third, I would like people, above all, to remember the positive points about an officially bilingual Manitoba. Such a province would surely help Canada to remain the wonderful country that it is. And what an encouraging sign it would be for the nation's many minorities to see that the official minority of Manitoba had won the re-establishment of its rights.

All of this goes to say that I support the agreement negotiated in May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

Thank you.

No. 74 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Raymonde Graham as recorded on Page 1181; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

The founders of Manitoba, dreaming as they did of a bilingual country, would undoubtedly find themselves as concerned and confused as I am by the proportions that this thorny question seems to have assumed today. After briefly reviewing our history, who could deny that our fine province was destined to be bilingual?

The current provincial government, attuned to the realities of this country, is preparing to render justice to a people whose rights have been continually eroded by 90 years of irresponsible government. The people in power now have a unique opportunity to redress the wrongs done to the French-Canadian people and, at the same time, to restore Manitoba to its former character and give it an enviable status within Confederation. It cannot be denied that restoring the rights of francophones is the only solution if we want our children to live in a province governed by tolerance, peace and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to justify these public hearings; they strike me as being a waste of time, energy and money. We've been told that their purpose is to give the public a chance to express itself; however, they are more conducive to creating new divisions than to fostering unity.

The whole country is closely attuned to what is happening here and everyday we reveal to them our most hostile and intolerant side. These attributes can hardly be a source of pride to a people that calls itself 'friendly'. So let us stop this fratricide and save our energy for the job of restoring justice - the only solution to the problem of maintaining peace in this country. The wrongs of the past are forever engraved on the hearts of French-Canadians faithful to their motto. The amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is essential if we want to avoid the situation deteriorating to the point where events take an uncontrollable turn.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I would like to remark here that the future smiles on people who act boldly and that new prospects will open up for a bilingual Manitoba making it the envy of the rest of Canada. In the name of history and even more, in the name of human rights, I support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated in May by the Société franco-manitobaine and the Manitoba Government.

Thank you.

No. 75 - English translation of written submission of Sr. Thérèse Cloutier, sgm. as recorded on Page 1182; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Last month, the Parish of Sainte-Anne celebrated the 100th Anniversary of the arrival of the Grey Nuns in Ste-Anne-des-Chênes. They came in 1883 to serve as instructors of school-aged children and aids to parents in all matters relating to social, cultural and religious life. They are still here, and they sense a great feeling of oneness with their fellow citizens.

Over the course of the last hundred years, they have participated in all activities and efforts to further and to protect the parishioners' cherished rights and have joined in all the necessary battles to preserve these rights whenever a blinded and defiant majority tried to take them away.

This May, after much deliberation, it was resolved that Section 23 of The Manitoba Act would be amended. At the time, we believed that the government would finally show justice towards the official minority group, unfortunately, the government laid down some changes on September 6th. If these were to be included in the amendment, they would render the agreement negotiated in May almost meaningless.

We are, therefore, obliged once again to assert our willingness to defend our rights. This is why I want to express my solidarity with all those who want Section 23 of The Manitoba Act amended as negotiated last May between the Manitoba Government, the Federal Government and the Société franco-manitobaine.

Thank you.

Nos. 76, 77, 78 and 79 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Thérèse Bouchard, Mr. André Plamondon, Sr. Zélie Ruest and Ms. Lucie Dupuis on Page 1182; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I have but one thing to tell you today. I totally support the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as negotiated in the month of May between the provincial and federal governments and the Société franco-manitobaine.

There is nothing to negotiate; these are our rights. They are legally ours. We need the entire package.

There are 60,000 Franco-Manitobans! You must speak to us!

Thank you.

No. 80 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Denise J. Perron and Mr. Georges G. Perron as recorded on Page 1182; Hansard XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I would like to express a few ideas that should be kept in mind when deciding on whether or not to support the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

First, it must be remembered that the act forbidding the use of French in the courts and the government has been declared unconstitutional. Given this fact, I cannot understand this refusal to rectify an "illegal"

act. The demonstrations of opposition have no basis in reason. Of what value can our judicial system be, unless it can eliminate "illegal" acts? If this law, having no legal force, continues to be obeyed then our society, our government and all of our institutions must be re-examined. It goes without saying that the foundations of civilization itself would consequently collapse. A situation as serious as that is frightening. We must settle the official languages problems on our own and we must do so without any further delay.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I give my support to the resolution negotiated last May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I cannot do otherwise. Thank you.

No. 81 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Lise Boily and Mr. Roberte Boily as recorded on Page 1182; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

A bilingual province in a bilingual country. What is so complicated about that? What could be simpler? Once again, human beings are turning a deaf ear, they are rebuilding the Tower of Babel and taking serious pleasure in shouting each other down. Most of these fine people are ostensibly Christians; their moral code is, supposedly, to love their neighbour. Poor self-righteous Manitoba!

To get down to facts, the history of this province clearly shows that a grave injustice directed towards the French-speaking residents of Manitoba was committed in 1890. Last May, 93 years later, the New Democratic government did what it could to right this wrong. Sadly, we are not dealing here with a fairy tale ending, for this agreement succeeded only in re-kindling old antagonisms and creating new disputes. A whole Pandora's Box of imaginary problems was opened, created by deplorable and exaggerated emotions. It is sad to realize that in our province fellow citizens do not want to live harmoniously. Such negative attitudes can only lead to a world which, sooner than later, will destroy itself, armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my brief is intended to state my support for the resolution negotiated last May to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and I express my support in

the hope that the people of this province will one day learn how to live together in linguistic harmony where the French and English languages will be officially recognized in mutual good faith.

No. 82 - English translation of written submission of Ms. Cécile Bérard as recorded on Page 1183; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

My name is Cécile Bérard and I represent the Ligue Féminine Catholique - Ile-des-Chênes section.

Being proud of our heritage and anxious to fulfill one of our objectives, which is to promote French culture in our homes and communities, we strongly support the resolution negotiated last May by the Pawley government and the Société franco-manitobaine to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

We firmly believe it is high time to rectify the injustices that were committed more than ninety years ago.

Thank you.

No. 93- English translation of written submission of Mr. Omer Fontaine as recorded on Page 1194; Hansard, Vol. XXXI, No. 56 - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 October, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

For me, as for many other people, these public hearings are providing the opportunity to express our views on bilingualism in Manitoba.

I, therefore, have every confidence that the opinions we express will be studied seriously by you.

For 93 years, Franco-Manitobans have heroically endured an injustice done to them by a government that was hostile to Francophones.

This injustice and illegality have gone on long enough. You have today both the opportunity and the responsibility of redressing this wrong by restoring to our province the bilingual status it had at the beginning and by offering essential services in the two official languages of our country.

I, therefore, support the resolution to amend Section 23 as negotiated in May by the federal and provincial governments and the Société franco-manitobaine.

I place my trust in your sincerity and in your sense of justice.

Thank you.