



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

STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PRIVILEGES
and
ELECTIONS

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. Phil Eyler
Constituency of River East



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 61 - 8:00 p.m., FRIDAY, 27 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS
Friday, 27 January, 1984

TIME — 8:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Phil Eyler (River East)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Anstett, Bucklaschuk, Lecuyer and Mackling, Messrs. Enns, Eyler, Filmon, Harapiak, Kovnats, Nordman and Scott

WITNESSES: Mr. Len Killoran, Private Citizen
Reeve Allan Beachell, President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities,
Mr. Dennis Heeney, Private Citizen
Mr. R. S. Pinnell, Private Citizen
Mrs. B. MacKenzie, Private Citizen
Mr. J. Schwartz, Private Citizen
Mr. S. J. Lye, R.M. of Portage la Prairie
Mr. Don Pfrimmer, R.M. of Roland

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

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

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. We have a quorum. I will be calling the list of names as they appear in order on the Clerk's record. I would ask that only those people who are from out of town would come up tonight?

Mr. Conrad Kelly; Mr. Abe Arnold.
Mr. Kovnats on a point of order.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think that what the situation is, and I would love to hear Mr. Arnold's presentation, but I think that we had made arrangements so that only those out of town - or at least they should be given some preference this evening and I don't think Mr. Arnold was aware of it. I think if you make him aware of it he would be most co-operative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kovnats.
It was agreed at the previous afternoon meeting Mr. Arnold that people that are out of town, due to the weather conditions, would be given priority tonight.

MR. A. ARNOLD: Do you have some out-of-towners here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll will be going through the list to see.

Mr. P. Hildebrand; Mrs. V. Friesen.

A MEMBER: You are calling out-of-town names, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know where these people are from.

Mr. Len Killoran. You are from out of town Mr. Killoran?

MR. L. KILLORAN: Yes, I'm from Woodlands. Is that considered out of town?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. A. ARNOLD: Could we find out how many there are from out of town tonight so I can have an idea how long we have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could those people from out of town please raise their hands? Okay, I believe that will pretty well take up the evening Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Killoran.

MR. A. ARNOLD: Why wasn't this told to us this afternoon?

A MEMBER: At 5:30 p.m. it was.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Abe, I think that possibly we will be back at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and you should be about the first.

MR. A. ARNOLD: If you want to hear me I could be on tonight, a little later, but not . . .

MR. H. ENNS: More important, the Chairman of Manitoba Rights and Civil Liberties could learn something by listening tonight, could learn something by listening to some of the representations tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Killoran is on right now.

MR. A. ARNOLD: Well, I'm prepared to wait a little while, but I'm not prepared to wait two more days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Mr. Enns, order please.
Mr. Killoran.

MR. L. KILLORAN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Len Killoran, I'm from the Woodlands. I am a Canadian and I believe in one working language for our country, and respect for all others.

To start out with, I feel that the Speaker made an error this afternoon. At the opening of the meeting I think the speaker should have called all the committee to attention, and all the public, and asked to stand and

bow their head in silent prayer because we have just seen death of democracy in Manitoba.

On this bill, I have been told I can only speak on Bill 115, nothing on 23. Well, that is similar to talking about water skiing, but not referring to the water. So being as I am not much of a politician and not much of a speaker to boot, I may have to be corrected occasionally. First of all, my speech isn't going to be a 40 minute one.

On Page No. 1 of Bill 115, it says it is presented by the Honourable Mr. Anstett. The term "Honourable" seems a bit odd when used in reference to this man who has defied the wishes of over 78 percent of the people of Manitoba. Only in Manitoba you say!

A little further down, on the first page, it says "HER MAJESTY, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba." I would say this is blatant slander to use Her Majesty's name in reference to such a stupid legislation as this. The whole NDP Party should hang their heads in shame when they show so little responsibility and concern to the people of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Did you learn something here? You'd have learned lots from this presentation, wouldn't you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. L. KILLORAN: Would you like to speak? If you can't keep quiet you can have the chair.

If this bill isn't stopped it will prove the most expensive piece of legislation ever passed in Manitoba. I was figuring up this afternoon and I figured roughly there was 150 people in this room, and taking at a minimum a \$10 an hour salary for an 8-hour day, the first 30 minutes of bickering and arguing cost \$750.00. That is only the start. To go further on, everything that is touched will be costing money, starting with this pamphlet - 14 pages. If it is printed in one language there would be 7 pages. Also, it isn't only the paper, it's the translation and all that goes with it.

Also, these people that come here today from out of town and local, they all are spending money. Myself, it is costing me at least \$15 a day for gasoline only to come in here, because each one of us has a view. If we had a responsible government we wouldn't need to be here today.

To get going farther, they are going to have an ombudsman with staff, language services counsel plus staff, and all the rest of it. Now, I am not educated and all that, I don't know what half of them are talking about in here, but it's costing money. Everybody in this room and everybody outside that window, it is costing money and it is doing no good.

This French language bit - oh, I'm sorry - I shouldn't speak about Bill 23, but all right, Bill 115 - what is that going to do for anyone of us? It's not going to do a damn thing except cause more division in this province. It is doing nobody any good except a very small minority that I would say is paid off by the Federal Government.

I look to the left of me - how many are getting involved in that? What right have they to tell me what I should be doing in regard to the French language which isn't doing anybody any good? I would ask, how many members on my left are bilingual? I am not; I have

nothing against the French language or any other. Any person that can speak two or more languages is a lot better educated person than I am and I'll be the first to admit it.

The other day I got my car filled with gas and I have some signs in my car windows "no bilingualism" - and he said, "I guess you're not very popular in St. Boniface." I said, well I wasn't too impressed one way or the other. "Well," he said, "I can speak four languages, but I'm not considered bilingual because I cannot speak French." So I asked him what he was doing pumping gas and he said, "I've got to eat."

To me this party on my left is only creating dissension, causing trouble. It's going start right, you know, French families among themselves over the supper table, and what have they got that they can stand up with pride and say, we've done something when they have only divided the place; and then they set out in this Bill 115 to say how they're going to do it.

I think I have pretty well covered the hidden costs. We never will know what the hidden costs are. The anguish among families, that can be much greater than the monetary loss, by far it can be greater. Also, right in this building. I was standing downstairs before and looking at the dome, I was thinking of what a beautiful building. I was thinking of coloured pictures and then thinking of some of the performances I have seen in the Legislature in the last couple of weeks. To me, Mr. Chairman, if that was at a cattle auction, the auctioneer would call the auction off and send them all home.

I am thoroughly disgusted with the performance of our government. They seem to show, or at least maybe I am old-fashioned, they seem to show little disregard for decorum and one thing or other, they're wandering around, they're scratching, well so on and so and so forth. Some of the remarks, the chit-chat back and forth, this I thought was a Parliament. But anyway I'm learning and I am not impressed.

That is about the extent of my talk. It's going to cost us all an awful lot of money. It's laid down there perfectly how it's going to take the money out of our pocket, but what good is going to do us?

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Killoran. Seeing none, thank you for coming here today, Mr. Killoran.

MR. L. KILLORAN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next out-of-town person on my list is Reeve Alan Beachell and Reeve Ray Sigurdson.

MR. A. BEACHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Alan Beachell, President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. I would like to thank you for showing consideration to the people from out of town. While I don't live too far out of the city, there are a number of people here tonight from municipalities and I would like, if I could, just to ask them to stand to show that there are a number of people here from your rural municipalities that would like to hear what we're saying. Is that agreeable, Mr. Chairman?

As you know, it's a very miserable night and had a lot of people this afternoon, some of them have gone

home and I don't blame them for that, but I do want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this evening and present our views. We, as members of the U.M.M., are very much opposed to any extension of French language rights in the Province of Manitoba. This position has been quite clear by the number of briefs presented on behalf of the municipality, and also by the very large percentage of votes against the government proposal in the recent plebiscite of October 26, 1983.

At our annual convention held in Brandon in November of 1983, a resolution was passed by at least 98 percent of the delegates that language rights remain as they are, and that the Provincial Government should hold a referendum if changes were going to be made. Mr. Chairman, our stand has been consistent, but the government fails to listen to the large majority of people in Manitoba.

The proposed bill leaves much to be desired. We, the members of the U.M.M., believe it is only setting up another bureaucracy which will be expensive and is not needed. I realize it states that municipalities and school boards are excluded, but I do not believe you can have all government offices and Crown corporations providing services in both languages without it affecting municipalities and school boards.

I am dismayed at the government forcing closure on this issue. We hear of things like this being done in some countries, but I never thought I would see the day when the Government of Manitoba would force through legislation that is opposed by 80 percent of the people of Manitoba. This, Mr. Chairman, is something that the people of Manitoba will not tolerate or forget. This is certainly a "black day" in our history.

We, as members of the U.M.M., understand that no Legislature can go on indefinitely debating one bill. We do feel, however, that when the large majority of the electorate oppose the legislation, then it should be dropped and not forced through by the government majority.

The Federal Government spent two years bringing home the Constitution and entrenching the Charter of Rights while the economy of the country went to hell. Mr. Chairman, this government is doing the same thing with the French language issue when they should be spending their time trying to improve the economy of the province and lowering the level of unemployment.

This bill will cost the province a lot of money that is unnecessary. The Language Services Advisory Council, as it is to be called, only has power to recommend to the Minister. Mr. Chairman, there have been enough recommendations to the Minister that have been ignored. Why set up another board whose recommendations will be ignored unless they agree with government policy?

Some of the concerns that we have with this bill are:

1. Where it states under communications and services "Every person has the right to communicate in English or French with and to receive available services in English or French from any quasi-judicial body of the government", does this mean Courts of Revision and will it include planning boards that hear applications for rezoning?
2. Where it states language service areas mean a municipality in which the French language is the

language first learned in childhood, and is still understood by at least 800 residents or at least 8 percent of the residents does this mean, in a municipality with a population of 1,000, that if 80 people understood French they could have services provided in French?

One other concern, and it's not in my brief, Mr. Chairman, is that if Bill 115 is passed in the Legislature before you pass the resolution, then our legal opinion is that everything is entrenched, and I want some clarification on that.

Mr. Chairman, this language issue is dividing our province. English can be spoken by nearly everyone in the province and so it would seem reasonable that it should be the working language. There are still many that feel that the province would be serving the people of Manitoba better if there was one language across this province of ours.

This would not prevent anyone from doing business in their own language if they so desire. I believe it is sad because of a deal with one group who I'm sure doesn't represent the French-speaking people of this province that we have all divisiveness. We have got along well for 100 years, and I believe if the language issue had been left alone, we would not have the problem we have today.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and members of the committee for allowing us the opportunity to present our views on Bill 115, and would ask that you give them serious consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Beachell.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Beachell, you have been following this evolution from the beginning, and you will recall the original Penner-Pawley proposals, and I believe you gave a brief on that a few months ago. This bill and the related amendment are supposed to be a major improvement or a step forward. Do you perceive that, or do you see it as just a recycled proposal?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Well, Mr. Doern, not being a lawyer, I'm not sure. I have looked over these things and the more I look at them the more confused I get. But I honestly think after hearing Mr. Green today and I would have to agree with the things that he said - I know he is a smart lawyer and whether he's for government or against it, I don't care - but it seemed to me that he put forward a pretty reasonable proposition today, that really there's more in the bill today than there was before. I don't know whether there is or not. I have to admit that as a layman it's very difficult for us to make a decision, but I am concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Under Section 16 which you alluded to, the right to communicate, the government keeps saying that the legislation will not include municipalities and school boards, etc. Do you think, and you did make some comment on this, but do you think that the municipalities can resist pressure on them, given

Section 16 which talks about the right to communicate, and presumably despite so-called guarantees in the bill, people would come forward in certain municipalities, either naturally or artificially stimulated, and would begin to demand services from municipalities on the grounds that Canada would then be a bilingual nation and Manitoba would then be a bilingual province and, therefore, the municipalities should logically become officially bilingual. Do you think that there will be greater pressure on municipalities with the passage of this legislation, or no affect as a result of this legislation?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I have to think there would be greater pressure on municipalities. I don't think you can have two levels of government that are bilingual without the third level having a fair amount of pressure put on it. That's not a legal opinion, that's my opinion.

MR. R. DOERN: Well we're more interested in your opinion. My third question is, you said that the legislation and the proposals and the debate and the process, etc., etc., whatever, either some or all of those is dividing the province - those were your words. I was wondering whether you have had any specific illustrations from your own municipality, or whether any particular cases of this were drawn to your attention by members of the municipal association.

MR. A. BEACHELL: I had cases drawn to my attention. We don't have them in our municipality. I have to admit that I don't know whether we have any people there that are, we have two or three that probably speak French, but certainly it's not a concern in our municipality; but I know, talking to some other people, it is dividing families, it is dividing communities. I don't know whether this is the fault of the government or whose fault it is, but certainly there is divisiveness there.

MR. R. DOERN: Can you give us any specific illustrations or any particular cases that come to mind?

MR. A. BEACHELL: No, I don't think I would want to at this time. I have two or three cases that I could mention but I don't want to mention names or anything on that.

MR. R. DOERN: Are you aware of any French-speaking Manitobans in municipalities who have indicated that they never were for this legislation, never favoured it originally and are especially pained by it now and do not want it to proceed?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I have talked to several that feel that way. I also talked to a lawyer friend of mine who lives in a French community and he has indicated to me that there's certainly that feeling in his area; and again, I won't state the area.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Beachell, just for the record, let me acknowledge the fact that

I think this is not your first appearance before a committee such as this, but your first appearance as President of the Union of Municipalities which, of course, is a union of many people that represents very many Manitobans.

Throughout this debate, dating back to last summer, there has been the question of who is funding whom in some of the presentations, some of the costs involved in this whole question. We are aware, of course, and it's a matter of public record, that the Federal Treasury, that is, we taxpayers, are to a very substantial degree funding the efforts that are supportive of the government's proposal. We believe we have asked that question, of those that appeared before this committee last summer, July and August. It was a standard question that members in the opposition asked; I think it is of interest to know where organizations that are formed to make presentations known for this committee, are they receiving any particular funding. I don't know, but I ask you now, as president of the Union of Municipalities in the Province of Manitoba, and you have taken a strong position . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: I am coming to the question. Have you, as a Union of Municipalities, raised or taxed your municipalities, your people, to pay for any form of advertising programs or any costs associated with your position that you have taken with this whole matter?

MR. A. BEACHELL: No, I would have to say, Mr. Enns, in all honesty, that we hired a lawyer that cost us some money. I think you can look at our books. It cost us \$2,500 for the legal opinions that we got during the summer, and that was paid out of general revenue of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities that was passed at a meeting of the convention and they agreed to it. No problem there, but that's what we paid - \$2,500 for legal fees, I want to make that known.

MR. H. ENNS: I am genuinely seeking information. The president of the Union of Municipalities of Manitoba has put on the record that, yes, they have laid out \$2,500 for some legal advice that is to help this president represent the views of most, or all . . .

MR. A. BEACHELL: It was to give us legal advice so that we knew what the act was saying. This is what we asked for and that's what we got.

MR. H. ENNS: That is as compared to the \$108,000 that was paid for additional legal advice provided by the taxpayers of Canada to the SFM?

MR. A. BEACHELL: As I understand.

MR. R. DOERN: And then ignored.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I like to keep things in perspective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?
Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes. Mr. Beachell, in Paragraph 3 on the first page of your brief, you make reference

to your belief that the provision of limited services and communications from the Provincial Government in specific areas, and from principal administrative offices, is somehow going to affect municipalities and school boards, and I would ask you how you see that happening, in view of the very specific exclusion in the amendment, which I won't refer to any more than to say that it is there, and Section 30(1) of the bill which reads: "This act does not apply to (a) any municipality in the province, or any board, agency or other subordinate body thereof; or (b) any school division or school district in the province, or any board, agency or other subordinate body thereof."

How do you see this happening? I believe that you do see it happening because you have said so in your brief. Mechanically, how do you see that happening in view of those kinds of exclusions?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Mr. Anstett, I think I asked the question in my brief: What about courts of revision, and what about the boards of planning districts that sit on rezoning? Now this is something that we asked for legal advice on and he couldn't say; he said he thought it was a possibility. I am bringing that forward to you. Also, as I have said, I don't think you can have two levels of government that are bilingual and one that is not without some pressure on it.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I know it is not appropriate for members of the committee to answer questions that have been asked, but I would make a commitment to provide Mr. Beachell an answer to that question that he has asked in his brief with relation to the Blaikie (2) decision, which is the only way it is impacted, not by anything that's being done in the bill or the resolution, and I will provide that information separate from this hearing.

My second question is: In view of the fact that the proposal which we have before us first was made public on December 15th, I am wondering if there has been a meeting of the UMM executive board, or of the - I know that there hasn't been a convention since December 15th. What is the authority for the position taken by the UMM president tonight? Is this an executive board position, or is it simply an extension of the position taken in November and applied to the new proposal without a specific decision on the new proposal which no longer proposes to expand services by amendment to The Manitoba Act, but rather simply by provincial statute?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Mr. Anstett, I would have to state to you that I believe you know we had a meeting on December 14th; we got this on the 15th. There hasn't been an executive meeting since, but we are taking the stand that our membership suggested we should take. You know, I have to say to you, sir, there have been so many changes in these bills that really we don't know what the hell we've got to date.

HON. A. ANSTETT: So the specific proposal made public on December 15th and presented to the Legislature on January 5th has not been considered by your executive?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Not as a membership. We sent out to all the executive the proposed bill. I did contact

them the day before yesterday and said we are presenting our brief and do you feel this is the route we should go, and I have to . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: You did contact them?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I have contacted them, but in all honesty, Mr. Anstett, I don't think most of us understand the bill, and I am getting more confused today after listening to a very respected lawyer get up and explain it. I have a lot of respect for Sid Green. If he is right, then certainly you are wrong. That's all I can say.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I don't intend to suggest that Mr. Green is right or wrong. I think there are differences of opinion, and I have one question that relates to something in your brief and also to which Mr. Green referred. It relates to the final section in the act. It reads: "This Act, except Section 34 and this section, come into force on a day fixed by proclamation, or January 1, 1987, whichever is the sooner, and Section 34 and this section come into force on the day this act receives Royal Assent."

Would you agree that, as laymen, we would interpret that to mean that this act doesn't come into force until it receives proclamation? Is that how you interpret that?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I would suppose that is right, but I wonder, if it's not coming into force until - that is, three years down the road - why all the rush?

HON. A. ANSTETT: But you would agree, then, it doesn't come into force until it is actually proclaimed? That's how you interpret that statement?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I would hope that is true because if it comes into force before you pass the resolution then everything is entrenched.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I wanted to make it clear that we agreed on that. You agree that it's possible this bill might be entrenched if it was proclaimed before the resolution came into force?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I don't think it's possible, I think it's a certainty.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Okay. Would you agree then that this bill would not be entrenched if it came into force after the resolution was proclaimed?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, I would think that is true the way the resolution reads, yes.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Would it satisfy your concern on that point if a specific amendment was made to the bill to provide that it could not be proclaimed till after the constitutional amendment came into force?

MR. A. BEACHELL: I think, Mr. Anstett, we're missing the point here. In all respect to you, sir, I think you've got to realize that the people aren't prepared for what you're proposing, and they're not going to accept it. You can't legislate a language, and this is what we've

got to understand. I feel sorry for you in your position, I really do. I think they handed you, well I don't know what, and I think it's too bad, but really things have gone so far that I don't think it matters what you try to do today. I think you've got to drop it and let's start from Square One again.

I think I'm speaking for the municipalities on that, I don't know, but I feel this is right.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Beachell, I certainly accept that sentiment and I think you do reflect your constituency on that score in terms of the message that came out of your convention and that feeling. I accept that as their view on the earlier package and I accept your statement that your executive feels that view hasn't changed since the new proposal was released on December 15th.

But my question is, and I have no doubt that message comes through loud and clear in your brief, but my question is your concern, following on Mr. Green's statement, about the possibility that this bill might be entrenched, would that be addressed, would that specific concern be addressed if an amendment was put into the bill saying it couldn't come into force till after the proclamation of the amendment?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Well, I would have to say I think that would certainly alleviate some concerns, but in all honesty I have to say that we've had so many amendments that I think really we're confused at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Beachell, I just missed the \$2,500 worth of legal advice. Was that on the original proposal, or is that on the current bill?

MR. A. BEACHELL: No, that was on the original proposal.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I see.

MR. A. BEACHELL: If you would like our fees on the current bill it cost us \$150 the other day. — (Interjection)

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, Mr. Chairman, I wonder, Mr. Beachell, you have indicated that your concerns are whether this act would apply to the Court of Revision. Did your legal advice give you any indication as to whether it would or would not?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Yes, he said there was certainly a possibility.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Did your current legal advice indicate whether the municipal board would fall under this act?

MR. A. BEACHELL: We didn't ask that, but I felt that the municipal board would at any rate because I think it states that, that any board of the government.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Anstett has taken pain to explain Clause 30(1) that indicates the act does not

apply to any municipality in the province or any board, agency or other subordinate body thereof. Did you get legal opinion as to whether that would exclude local planning district boards or a function of two or three municipalities offering the service of planning?

MR. A. BEACHELL: The legal opinion we got was that he wasn't sure on that. I guess we could follow it further.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Beachell, I appreciate that some of the opinions you have responded to and offered to us tonight have been without the full meeting of the executive . . .

MR. A. BEACHELL: That is right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . would you like to have the government hold over this bill? I think you put it quite bluntly when Mr. Anstett explained the proclamation date as being January 1, 1987 - what's the hurry - would you feel more comfortable, Mr. Beachell, in representing the Union of Manitoba Municipalities if you were able to come here two or three or four weeks from now after meeting with your full executive, to discuss this bill in a very formal fashion?

MR. A. BEACHELL: Well, yes, I would have to agree because if we are going to come with a statement that we can definitely say this is the views of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and mind you I'm speaking as their president tonight and I think I'm presenting their views. But certainly it's open to criticism if they wish and I think most municipalities probably haven't seen Bill 115. All our executive have seen it, but I don't know whether it was sent out to each municipality. I couldn't answer that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Beachell, I just want to thank you for your frankness in dealing with the issue this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for Mr. Beachell? Seeing none, I would like to thank you on behalf of the committee for coming here tonight, Mr. Beachell.

The next out-of-town resident on my list is Mr. Dennis Heeney.

MR. D. HEENEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Dennis Heeney and I am appearing today as a private citizen. I don't have copies of my brief. I only received a copy of Bill 115 yesterday, so I've not had time to prepare a formal statement. I do have some notes that I will place before the committee and you can put on record.

To begin with, I would have to say that what I would have liked to have said, Mr. Green said much better than I could say and I agree 100 percent with what he has said. I'd just like to cover a couple of points from maybe a different perspective than he did.

I understand that we are to make this presentation on the basis of Bill 115 and its contents, but I find that I have difficulty to confine my remarks to the contents of the bill for two reasons:

1. Since I just received a copy yesterday, it would be difficult to make very meaningful comments based

on that short period of time, and in view of the fact that this is a new and a different proposal;

2. To debate or comment on this bill is to give it some credibility, and since I am opposed to any extension of French language rights or services beyond those stated in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, therefore, since this bill is designed as an intent to fulfill one of the options that is facing the government and since they have not yet voted on which option they intend to pursue, I feel it's relevant to discuss other aspects of this issue that pertain to this bill, because certainly it is one of the most controversial, confusing, and divisive issues that have ever been discussed in the history of this province.

So if we look at the options the government has, one is here faced with a court challenge regarding the interpretation of Section 23 which raises the question as to what might happen should this matter proceed to court. I believe it's fair to say that Section 23 is very clear and that all statutes must be published in both French and English. The unknown quantity, however, is how the court might interpret the permitted use of French language in the courts and the Legislature. The government are concerned about this interpretation in the board sense due to the legal advice of Mr. Twaddle, and others, or I assume Mr. Twaddle.

I do not feel that the majority of Manitobans, including myself, share that concern. Should they be fully informed of the implications of either court action or out-of-court settlement, then they might also share that concern. They are not fully informed, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that is not the fault of the people but a lack of responsibility on the part of the government who have the responsibility to see that the people they represent are fully aware of the laws and intended laws that will apply to those people.

In considering an extension of French rights and services, we should consider that in a democratic society rights flow from the people, through the government, back to the people. There is a fine line, I would suggest, between rights and privileges. Historically - and I think we in this debate have constantly referred to history and the historic rights of the French people - so historically, whether we like it or not, we must remember that what the French now consider as rights were first granted as a privilege for the historic fact is that in 1763 the French were abandoned by their mother country by the Treaty of Paris and left in limbo at the mercy of their British conquerors who could have been vindictive, executed them, banished them, whatever; but instead they chose to be generous and granted the French people the special privilege of retaining the use of their language, their culture and religion, while at the same time asking only that they be subject to the same laws as all other subjects, British and otherwise.

It is from these initial privileges, then, that all subsequent privileges and/or rights and services have flowed.

The British North America Act and The Manitoba Act made those privileges a right for the French minority, but The Manitoba Act, in Section 23, see these rights in a different light than the Federal Government or the governments of other provinces.

Section 23 permits the use of French in the courts and the Legislatures, and since the law was written

114 years ago by people long since dead and in an environment vastly different than the present, then in fact the government is concerned that court interpretation might interpret Section 23 of 1870 to include situations as they exist today, which would include such things as quasi-judicial bodies, boards, commissions, etc. Some of these were not even in existence at the time that the law was written. So it would seem to me that, on the basis of that, there would be a good argument to suggest that the application of the law of 1870 should apply as the situation was in 1870, not as it is in 1984; and that is the danger of having an entrenched and extensive all-encompassing Constitution instead of a very brief Constitution and having the rest dealt by legislation which is a living, changing thing and evolves as people and history evolve.

Section 23 goes on to say that statutes shall be published in both languages. I would suggest that in 1870 this was intended as a courtesy to the French so that they would better understand the law as it applied to them. Section 23 does not say that statutes shall be enacted or administered in French. It simply says "published." To suggest that a court, the Supreme Court of the land could read into this part of the section that this would mean that the government must provide French services in various government agencies such as Crown corporations, etc., in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is simply ridiculous.

I don't know what this court will say; neither do you, neither does the Manitoba Government nor anyone else. The problem and the reason for the vast opposition from the majority of Manitoban citizens is that in their opinion they have less fear of allowing the court to interpret Section 23, as it is, than they have of the Manitoba Government who are attempting to guess what might happen and, because of some fear or some other reason, are then offering the French some additional rights and services which they might not have to.

The Manitoba Government are subjecting themselves to appeasing the demands of a small French activist group, highly financed and supported and promoted by Mr. Serge Joyal, the Federal Secretary of State, and the whole Federal Government, who have no jurisdiction on language rights in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the government may feel that they are making the best deal for the people of Manitoba and history might indeed prove that to be the case, but I believe that the people of Manitoba do not feel that this is the best deal; and since the present Pawley Government have no mandate from either the people of Manitoba, the NDP Party of Manitoba, then they have no right - and we're hearing a lot of discussion on rights today - to proceed to amend the Constitution without the expressed wish of the people.

In a democratic society the people have the right to make those decisions whether they are right or whether they are wrong. The present decision is being made by the majority of the NDP caucus, not by the party, the SFM and the Federal Government. It is not a Made-in-Manitoba solution; it is made in Ottawa, funded by Ottawa and funded by the NDP caucus of Manitoba.

I am, and I remain unalterably opposed to any extension of French language rights beyond those that I feel were intended in Section 23. I would challenge

the government, therefore, to consider seriously, in view of the divisiveness and confusion that surrounds the whole issue, to withdraw the resolution and the bill, or to suspend for at least one year any further action in the Legislature and hold public meetings to fully inform the people of the two options that are open to them; and if they then can convince the people that their option is in the best long-term interest of all of the people of Manitoba, then, and only then, should they proceed.

One of the very real fears of the majority of people who have some knowledge of the present proposal is that while the government may feel they are acting in the public's best interest and may feel that results will occur in a manner that they foresee, the fear remains that once this matter is placed in the Constitution, then the interpretation and the results of the legislation will be out of the government's hands and the court's decision might well be substantially different than the government wants or intends. The more that is placed in the Constitution, the more opportunity there is for challenge and misinterpretation. The net result would be, or could be, that future Manitobans would be bound by the government's present proposal which at this moment is anything but clear. I feel we have no right to bind future Manitobans to anything which is right or wrong unless it is crystal clear and readily understood by all of the people. Such is not now the case.

One of the obvious problems I would see is that if both languages are to have equal status, and since two court cases within recent years clearly showed that some laws, through interpretation, assume different meanings due to the very nature of the language, then the question that needs to be addressed is which one has precedence in the case of a conflict? Would it be fair to have a bilingual law that could exonerate one individual if applied in French and convict him in English? I think not. Surely, this adds to the confusion which we do not need but is extremely dangerous as well. A logical conclusion to my mind then is to return to the obvious or layman's interpretation of Section 23 and not provide future extension of services or languages that would add to the confusion.

The only fair way to decide whether that support exists would be to hold a public referendum or a general election. In this way the onus is on the government, representing the French minority, to provide the people with all of the facts, the reasons, etc., to support their position, but it should be the ultimate right of the people to finally decide. You simply cannot legislate love.

I would remind those of you who need reminding that Christ said we should love one another. He didn't say we must. That decision was, I think, left to someone greater than us.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the government has a terrible responsibility, because if you are wrong - and I believe you are - then it is not you who will suffer for this wrong; it is the people of Manitoba of all ethnic backgrounds now and into the future for many years who will suffer, and I wonder if you can live with that decision. I hope you can.

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

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Heeney, one of the, I suppose, most interesting, perhaps idiotic, but one of the most interesting sections in the bill has to do with the establishment of a language ombudsman and an Advisory Council. We don't know what the ombudsman is going to look like, whether he's going to wear tights and have a cape with a large letter "O" on his chest, swing from a vine or what. Did you, in your study, look at that proposal and do you have any observations about the value, if any, of an ombudsman or the dangers thereof?

MR. D. HEENEY: I think it would certainly depend on who that individual was and under what his terms of reference were. I know that the terms of reference are in here but then they are subject to the direction of the Legislature. However, I think that the best ombudsman is the people themselves and that, given the opportunity, they would do what is most expedient and I think work the best. It proves that in local communities. If there's a need for bilingual services those needs are provided for the people on a basis of courtesy, but once they are legislated then it becomes a problem people resist because they don't like to be told what to do. We see that the ombudsman could cause some more problems than already exist.

MR. R. DOERN: Are you saying, in effect, that there is no need for an ombudsman or that elected representatives fulfil that general role?

MR. D. HEENEY: First of all, I would say that there is no need for an ombudsman because there is no need for this bill or this constitutional amendment. I'm simply saying that I believe that in an area where bilingual services are desired that they are supplied as well as to meet the need voluntarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Mr. Doern

MR. R. DOERN: Is it because of your position that you have your position on the bill, or on what basis was it that you circulated a resolution to have the Minister of Municipal Affairs removed from his office?

MR. D. HEENEY: I guess the basis mainly for that was the fact that - there's an old story, I'm not sure how it goes, but this fellow had a mule and when he wanted to take him to the field he went out and hit him over the head with a two-by-four and his neighbour said, what did you do that for? He said, the first thing I had to do was get his attention. So I think that primarily we wanted to draw the government's attention to the fact that we had made our opposition known through official channels in several ways and it had been ignored by the government. We felt that we had to do something before it was too late to bring it to their attention, and we felt that this was one way of doing it, a way that we took no pleasure in doing because we felt it was really not our concern to tell the Premier who he should appoint, but at the same time when he appointed an individual to the job of having to speak in front of the House on a matter on which we were strongly opposed to we felt that that would not be good for the future

relationship of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Provincial Government.

MR. R. DOERN: How many municipalities have supported that resolution?

MR. D. HEENEY: There were 31.

MR. R. DOERN: Have you forwarded that information to the First Minister or to anyone in the government so far?

MR. D. HEENEY: Yes.

MR. R. DOERN: What was their response?

MR. D. HEENEY: I'm not sure, I think they were rather upset which I can appreciate the fact that they were. I suppose the best way to answer that would be to ask them.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Heeneey, in that letter to which Mr. Doern refers you took a very strong opposition against the new government proposal that was released on December 15th and urge resistance to that proposal, in addition to urging the Premier to . . .

MR. D. HEENEY: Not exactly. Our opposition was to any entrenchment, the original proposal and the amendment, and the bill, whatever, from the beginning.

HON. A. ANSTETT: My question is, how could you take that position if you first saw the bill yesterday?

MR. D. HEENEY: Because we took the position that we got no further extension of any kind and no constitutional amendment, period, so regardless of how many proposals you make, or how many times you change it, we're opposed to it because we're opposed to any extension.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You expressed concern about divisiveness in the province and I personally share that concern. I'm very seriously concerned about it, and I think a great deal of damage has been done and I concur with you on that. I'm wondering why you feel, on that basis, that it would no be better to be done with it either way than to wait a year and allow the thing to fester and create more damage. Do you think a year's delay would just increase the divisiveness that you and I both feel is unhealthy for the full social fabric of this province.

MR. D. HEENEY: Personally I would rather see you withdraw it entirely but, in the event that you are going to proceed, I would ask you to seriously consider taking that year and, whether or not that divisiveness would increase would be up to you because I think it would be up to you to then go out to the people and convince

them that what you are doing is a good thing. If you could convince them and get their support then God bless you, but I don't think you can. I would certainly say that you should try and you haven't.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You believe then that the divisiveness would be reduced if we waited, rather than increased; is that what you're saying?

MR. D. HEENEY: I don't think it would get any worse if you waited. I don't know how much worse it can get without having a revolution, but if you were to go out there I think at least it would show some good faith on your part that maybe you're not so sure that you're right and you're willing to go out and explain to them why you think you must do this, because I can't figure out why you think you must do it and I don't think many people can. Had you not changed your position so many times, and I appreciate the fact that you have because I think that indicates that you are somewhat responsive to the concerns of Manitobans. Therefore, I would ask you to further consider that maybe you have made a total mistake. In the event that there is the two options of going to court and taking our lumps, let us do that if the people of Manitoba so wish. I think that they should have the choice of whether they want to take the chance on going to court and accepting what the court says Section 23 means as to what you think it might mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Seeing none I would like to thank you Mr. Heeneey for taking the time to come here tonight.

MR. D. HEENEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next person on my list from out of town is Mr. R.S. Pinnell.

MR. R.S. PINNELL: I speak as a private citizen. After what I have to say, I might not hold that right.

Mr. Anstett, I have never in my life seen such a disgusting display as you put on this afternoon when that fellow - his name escapes me at the moment but he is No. 6 on the list - was standing at this podium. Do you realize that that man is a Polish veteran? He fought in the Italian campaign. Do you realize the hell that he went through with Monte Casino? He admitted that he had an alcohol problem. There was no need for your display at all, absolutely disgusting in my eyes. Now that I've said it.

This government was elected by the majority of the people in Manitoba, or were given a majority. They were given this majority and we were promised to have open government and the many things that went with it, including the chicken in every pot. Now it turns out that we find that the chicken has been plucked and we are the people that are finding this out, that we've been plucked with this Bill 115.

I have not any prepared statement here but, as I see it, this SSFM this is - I will say it now - they appear to be a very subversive group and somehow, in their mixed-up thinking, they feel that they are in the short end of the stick, and the only way that they can keep their culture and their language is to have it legislated

and under no circumstances can any government legislate language, linguistic, morality or any such thing like that. That is an evolution that we must grow into. We've grown into this evolution; we've come away from the time of kikes, and as Mr. Green said, bohunks, the rest of that, those days are almost past us. But what is happening with this bill as I can see it, and I have asked people and I have asked Francophones whom I've done business with, that they are getting a backlash from this, in the SFM's words, "les autres", meaning the others, anyone who is not French is "les autres", that they are getting a backlash from the so-called English people in their businesses, and they've been told that. In a few years down the line this might become very great.

The last thing we want in this province is what is set up in this bill, is little isolated areas that are designated Francophone. What you are doing now is what had happened in Ireland in 1917 and God knows they've had trouble with it ever since. I can't fathom why this has gone this far, whatever brought this on? I think the people of Manitoba demonstrated at the demonstration last night, and it appeared that everyone you spoke to, they wondered why? Why the rush for this? Who is benefiting from it? What are the benefits?

I think when Lloyd Axworthy came to Winnipeg with his package of goodies two or three months ago, we're paying a high price for an Air Canada Building, which was rightfully ours in the first place, they're just bringing it back in a different form. They took it away from us years ago and now they're bringing it back. Is that the price? Are they the conditions or is this a condition to that? We don't know. I'm asking now.

I'm just at a loss for words to speak over this bill. I've grown up with every nationality possible. I've had no problems. Sure, they spoke funny to me. They had different languages, they had different accents, that made no difference to me. I speak to a man as I find him, and I treat him as such.

The group over in St. Boniface, this SFM, you are taking 500 people and you're listening to them, when 78 percent, or 77, whatever they are - I don't like quoting figures because they can misconstrue it - but it was a whopping majority on the plebiscite that was last October, and you are paying no attention to that whatsoever. There has to be some deep-seeded root for all this. I do not understand it and I don't think any of the Manitobans can understand it. It's too bad there isn't more Manitobans come forth to this committee and express their feelings on this.

I woke up the morning of closure, I turned the radio on, it was Robbie Burns' birthday, then I listened and this closure was evoked and immediately went through my mind, it was Robbie Burns' birthday, but the death of democracy in Manitoba, with closure. It was a shameful act to do, and if the other side wishes to ring the bells, I have said before, let them ring till hell freezes over, I will even assist them at ringing the bells if necessary. It's bad legislation. There is no reason for it.

Entrenchment I don't believe in, because entrenchment means in perpetuity. If you would have spent as a farmer as much time and money protecting my interests, not only mine, but 100,000 other farmers in Western Canada on the Crow bill as what you're spending on this, you would have picked up a lot of brownie points, definitely.

But be that as it may, that is past, that's history. I'm one for fighting my own battles. I do not need government to help me in anything. I'm only here tonight to express my disgust and my disregard for the whole bill, the whole concept of it. As I have no prepared statement, I can't pick my points up as I go through them.

Mr. Green, I was going to point out, he stole a little bit of my thunder on me, and I'm glad he did because he put it more eloquently than I could, but he brought up the country of Belgium. Need enough be said.

The other morning my wife woke up crying. She came from Holland - she emigrated into this country from Holland - she woke up crying when she heard that we had closure in this Parliament. She says, my god, I came to this country, it was the land of promise. There was nothing that couldn't be gained. We had the freedoms far greater than the country that she had left and he says here we have lost those freedoms little by little. We seem to be chipped away at every corner, that we're losing this. I have nothing against the Francophones, nothing whatsoever. You haven't got the majority of the Francophones that are backing this bill, no way.

If you wish to do something good to the people of Manitoba, you should call a special plebiscite for the Franco-Manitobans themselves and let them decide their own destiny because if you have ever studied or seen the English language of 500 years ago, it would be unrecognizable by today, if that language had been entrenched. You see, languages change.

Now, the word "evolution" has been bandied around here a bit. Now I can go back perhaps to Darwin's theory of evolution where we came from the so-called ape or monkeys, but you wish to do it in the stroke of a pen, chop the tail off.

I have nothing further to say, except that I will close and I will stand up straight and tall that I'm a Canadian. Oh, before that, I would like to interject that if the yardarm out at the front of the steps here, I would like to run up the signal similar to what Nelson ran up on his yardarm before the Battle of Trafalgar, but I would change the wording of it - Now is the time for all Manitobans to come forth and be counted.

In closing I will say that I stand up as a Canadian, I stand for one country, one flag, one language, and one province. God Save the Queen.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next out-of-town person on my list . . .

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a couple questions of Mr. Pinnell. Would he answer some questions? Mr. Pinnell?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does Mr. Pinnell wish to answer any questions?

MR. R. DOERN: Would you answer some questions?

MR. R. PINNELL: Oh, sure, I will answer some questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: You made reference in your remarks to the demonstration that was in the Legislative Building last night, and I guess you were there for an hour, or a couple of hours. Would you say that the people who attended fairly accurately represented the feelings of the majority of Manitobans?

MR. R. PINNELL: I would say so. It was a very good cross-section of the people within a 40-50 mile radius of Winnipeg, except to the east. I would say yes.

MR. R. DOERN: Could I ask you whereabouts you live? Are you a Winnipegger or out of town?

MR. R. PINNELL: No, I am not. I live at Warren, Manitoba.

MR. R. DOERN: Right. Could you indicate whether your views are an accurate reflection or an approximate reflection of the people in your area?

MR. R. PINNELL: Well, sir, I was one that helped orchestrate that little cavalcade that we had here about a week ago, a car cavalcade. We made 325 phone calls within a radius of about 45 to 50 miles from my home, many of them long distance calls, and I only received one negative answer. Everyone was willing, but to light the fire underneath them I managed, with help, we got 66 out on 30 below-plus weather, but I only found one that was against this bill; he wasn't against or wasn't for, but he said, I would not touch it, I will have nothing to do with - whatever the government does, he would be quite satisfied with it.

MR. R. DOERN: You also made reference in your remarks to the ringing of the bells, and there are two views of that. I guess one is that the bells signal an obstruction of the political process, and the other one is that they signal a defense of democracy; and you are saying that when you hear the bells ringing that's music to your ears.

MR. R. PINNELL: It is under these circumstances. I think that the government should listen, and they should listen to the people. We have done everything; we have tried votes, phone-ins, the open-line shows. The pulse of the province has never been read. Well, it may have been read but it's certainly not being listened to. I don't know what else we can do. We are trying to go about it the normal, democratic way through the various stages and steps. We have now, apparently, I understand today we have approached the Lieutenant-Governor. I hope that it will be settled there. I understand we can go to the Governor-General, and I have also taken information on it that it can go to the Crown.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To Mr. Pinnell. Mr. Pinnell, yes, please. You made reference to the ringing of the bells. Might I point out that there was a member of the opposition who, for four days, tried to stand Bill 115, was not allowed to do so, which

necessitated the ringing of the bells. The reason of the request to stand Bill 115 really isn't significant at this time, but it was requested and denied by the government and necessitated the ringing of the bells.

Do you believe that the ringing of the bells, because of the reason of Bill 115 not being allowed to stand, justifies closure?

MR. R. PINNELL: No.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you.

MR. R. PINNELL: This is a form of discussion, not concentration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Pinnell, thank you for your presentation this evening. You have answered, in part, the question on the bill about the necessity of using closure on a bill; a bill can be amended, and the position has been made that closure doesn't matter. Would you think it is part of modern democracy, to you, for any government to use closure on a constitutional amendment which has little likelihood of ever being reversed by future parliaments?

MR. R. PINNELL: No.

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Sir, I was going to move a point of order earlier. The Honourable Member for Niakwa, the Honourable Member for Elmwood, prefaced their questions with statements and then asked the witness to comment or confirm the accuracy of their views, comment, etc. That is not the purpose of questions to the witness.

The purposes of questions to witness are to clarify some statement that the witness has made where there may be some doubt as to the meaning, the intention, and those statements reflect the witness's comments about the bill, the matter before us.

Now, I didn't interrupt then, but the Honourable Member for Pembina who, I might say, is more of a seasoned member of the House, having been but recently in government, prefaced a question to the witness by a comment about a matter that is not before the committee, and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to draw the attention of members that in putting questions to witnesses, out of respect for all of those we want to hear, that questions should seek to clarify statements that the witness has presented, not merely to try and embellish or add to the presentation by making a statement and asking the witness to confirm that view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mackling. I would hope that all members of the committee are familiar enough with the rules that they will confine their questions to the substance of Bill 115.

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, to the same point of order, this committee has been called on a rather hurried note to deal with the bill that most people have

never seen because it has only been before the Legislature some two short weeks.

The purpose of having Manitobans come to this committee, Mr. Chairman, is to address the bill in substance and, hopefully, to give to the government members the strongly held feelings that they have on this issue, and that they believe their democratic rights are being trampled by this government through closure; and if people cannot come to this committee and feel comfortable in expressing their opinions, their feelings, about this bill, this issue, and the way it is being handled, then I suggest that this government really does not care about anything the people of Manitoba wish to try and tell them.

HON. A. MACKLING: I recognize out in the audience there people who we want to hear tonight because they don't live in Winnipeg . . .

MR. R. DOERN: Well, then quit taking what is time on committee.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, then members of this committee should not be presenting statements to witnesses and asking them to comment on it. Let's hear from the people who are from out of Winnipeg, that have travelled here, and they want to present their views. They don't want a comment on the views of the members at this table.

MR. R. DOERN: Is that a point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, it certainly is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard with a question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, if I might thank Mr. Pinnell for taking time this evening to come here, to wait all afternoon, and, in my estimation, present the government members present - albeit there's only six of them - feelings that reflect your personal feelings and the feelings of many Manitobans. You have made a moving presentation; you have done it without a prepared speech and prepared notes, and you indeed should be congratulated by this committee, by members of the government and by Manitobans who have an opportunity to hear you and to read your words. Thank you, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any questions for Mr. Pinnell?

The next out-of-town person on my list is Mrs. B. MacKenzie.

MR. D. ORCHARD: He's a real Manitoban and I'm glad he's with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Those are real Manitobans; not a bunch of phony imports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. MacKenzie.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, like Mr. Heeney, I just received Bill 115

last night, so I've had some time to peruse it, but not sufficient really, to my liking.

However, I would like to preface my dealings with Bill 115 with a few historical facts about our province. Firstly, in 1870, the population of Manitoba was 11,963, of which 558 were Native Indians, 1,565 were white people, 4,083 were English-Indian and 5,759 were French-Indian, making a total of 11,963. I ask why should the present one million population of our province be held to ransom for the 11,000 souls who had no say in how the provincial act was written? If the act said then that French or English may be used in debate, etc., then the act should have remained changed as it was changed in 1890 and remained that way in perpetuity.

Also, there was much intrigue at the time as there is at the present time, and never, I don't believe, was this ever mentioned during our discussions. The Catholic religious element lent their support to the French cause because they related their French language to the religious control of the people. The secretary for Mr. McDougall said, and I quote, "The full story of intrigue, subterfuge and plotting that went on in business, religious, military and political circles far beyond the Red River has surely never been surpassed or ever equalled in any other time or place." Just as today, the intrigue is mind-boggling. The NDP Government have told the public lies; the SFM have lied. Will we ever really know the truth?

Before I begin, I must state that the original amendment to Section 23(1) has not been changed and the NDP Government still want that clause to read the same, that English and French are the official languages of Manitoba. I object. This province was never conceived as a bilingual province and should not be made a bilingual province at this time.

At the time of the inception of Manitoba into the dominion, one of the members in Manitoba said this, and I quote, "We feel confidence in the future administration of the government of the country under Canadian rule. At the same time, we have not been consulted in any way as a people in entering into the dominion. The charter of the new government has been settled in Canada without our being consulted." That was in 1870. Doesn't this prove that the people were right in changing the act in 1890? Manitoba became a province of the Dominion of Canada on May 12, 1870, and the election of the first legislative body did not take place until December 30th of that year, 1870; and the Legislature did not open until March 15, 1870. Does this not convey to us what transpired then was not necessarily what the people wished?

Bill 115, defining the operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, is a disgrace to our democratic, political system. No. 1, definition of an "agency" is convoluted and ridiculous; one I presume that this government in power at the moment thinks they are writing "agency" and "complainant" in such simplistic terms that the stupid Manitobans may understand. We only understand too well. They mention Lieutenant-Governor and the Crown to add dignity to their words, but they have proven that they have little respect for the Crown's subjects.

"Language services area means a municipality in which . . ." etc., etc., and it goes on in Bill 115. The municipalities, I thought, were exempt from the French

language use; and court - will a court be absolutely free from coercion?

No. 2, advisory council of 13 members - "Language Services Advisory Council." These are appointed by the Minister. What Minister? Will the business of this Language Services Advisory Council be conducted in French? These questions are only rhetorical questions, but food for thought.

Presiding officer, elected from members; meetings at least two a year, quorum to consist of more than six members to conduct business as this will give an advantage to any pressure group.

Function - I object to the mention of language again - that's (a). (b) - They should not be able to amend this act.

Advisory Status Only - The Minister rules supreme and in the final issue, his decision will stand.

I think that Mr. Jewers said today that he felt that the Ombudsman would have absolute rights, authority, but the way I interpreted it was that the Ombudsman would not have absolute authority and that the Minister would have the final say, and this I object to.

After reading over No. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, right up to 15, I thought, why bother with an Ombudsman? It is a duplication of service. Also, his hands are really tied. He is appointed by the Standing Committee of the Assembly on Privileges and Elections, so therefore he's answerable to the government in power. If this were a responsible, democratic government, perhaps his appointment by these means would not concern us as much, but I feel that his decisions could not help but be controlled and contrived by the present government.

Every item in Bill 115 deals with language and language rights. I believe Manitobans are sick to death of all the valuable time and expense that has been put into changing our Manitoba Act. Gentlemen, I beg you, forget about this legislation and call an election and get on with the necessary, straightforward business of running our province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mrs. MacKenzie?

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: I just have one question, Mrs. MacKenzie. You obviously know a lot about history or you have done a lot of research on it. Did you ever teach history?

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: No, I didn't, Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: My question to you is this - and I believe you made some reference to understanding the legislation, etc. - it's been said on a number of occasions, months ago by Mr. Penner, and as recently as yesterday or today by the Premier, that people who oppose this legislation either don't understand it or misunderstand it.

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, just when we had the last witness, I made the point that there are many people out here that want to present their views to the

committee. I think it's an abuse for a member of this committee to present a statement of facts to a witness and say now, how do you concur with that, or what do you think about that, or how do you relate that to what you've said, etc. It is not for clarification.

There are people out there who want to present their views about this matter. I'm here to hear them, not Mr. Doern, and I want you, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that members are to ask questions for clarification of what the witness has said, not to comment about what Mr. Penner has said, or what Mr. Lyon has said on this issue or someone else has said, but what the witness has said, what the person who has come before us has said on this issue.

If there's some doubt about what's been said or their viewpoint, we want to hear that. We don't want to hear Mr. Doern presenting statements of other people and asking the witness to comment about them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern to the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Mackling would keep his mouth shut, I think the — (Interjection) — business of the committee would be a lot smoother — (Interjection) —

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . Mr. Chairman, I ask the honourable member to withdraw that — (Interjection) — because I spoke on a valid point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Just a minute, I have the floor. I'm on a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . and my point of order is that Mr. Mackling has continually interrupted the proceedings of this committee. He's insulted the audiences. He's taking up a lot of time making protests. If he would be willing to listen to some of the questions, then I think the business of the committee would be a lot smoother.

I had one question to this person. I was in the process of completing that question and — (Interjection) —

HON. A. MACKLING: You're making a statement.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . I intend to ask it again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kovnats, to the same point.

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

Mrs. MacKenzie, at no small amount of danger and some inconvenience, stayed over the supper hour rather than trying to return to her home which is out of town, and would have had to drive over very treacherous roads to get home and I think that she should be extended every courtesy and every assistance in the questions that are asked her and not be criticized by members of the government who are trying to bull this meeting. I think that people are here to be heard and should be allowed to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Very very clearly you ruled with regard to questions earlier, that the

purpose of questions in committee was to seek clarification of the material contained in the brief with respect to Bill 115. That was your ruling. I don't see how you have any choice but to ask Mr. Doern to either rephrase his question with regard to Bill 115, or to cease and desist from engaging in a line of questioning which is not conducive to the purpose of this committee.

The reference from the Legislature to this committee was very clear, and that reference is to consider Bill 115, not extraneous material that Mr. Doern might want to raise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I made it very clear that I want to hear what Mrs. MacKenzie says, and I want to hear what other witnesses out there have to say. I've recognized some of those people — (Interjection) — in the audience and I didn't come here to hear Mr. Doern make statements and ask witnesses to comment on them. That is an abuse of not only the rights of this committee, but those whom we want to hear. In no way do I want to criticize Mrs. MacKenzie or any other witness, nor have I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we started off this committee meeting by being defeated on a motion to allow or for presentation to be made in the normal manner to this committee. I knew when I made that argument that most presentations would be brief and to the point.

Mrs. MacKenzie did not in any way extend the 40-minute limit that was imposed upon us in this committee by the government members. Mrs. MacKenzie's statement was brief and to the point. Now what the government members are saying is that my colleagues cannot ask further questions that we'd like to ask her. — (Interjection) — Sir, I think that is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . really abusing a privilege. We are not over the time limit of her presentations and surely, my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, ought to be allowed to ask the questions that he wants to ask.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon to the same point.

MR. G. FILMON: Further to the same point, Mr. Chairman. I was following along the question and Mr. Doern was only partially through it. He was referring to a statement that had been made in the House just during the past couple of weeks, presumably regarding this bill, and I think it was a legitimate entry into a question on the bill and until I've heard the question, I can't make that decision.

I don't know, Sir, how you can make that decision when half-way through the preamble to the question, the member is interrupted and not allowed to proceed. So at least until the question is asked, I suggest to you that you allow the question to be put and then you make your decision, not before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doern to the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put my question. I'll rephrase it to Mrs. MacKenzie . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

I've been asked to rule on a point of order. I cannot rule on a point of order until after I have heard the member, Mr. Doern's question. However, I would advise that questions should be phrased in such a way that they elicit information and opinions from the witnesses before this committee, they should not be prefaced by "do you agree with statements by" such and such or so and so.

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask Mrs. MacKenzie, since she has studied Bill 115 obviously to make her presentation, I'd like to ask her as an individual citizen whether she feels that the bill is comprehensible, can be understood by an average person in regard to its thrust or its detail, or do you have to be a lawyer or a university professor to be able to comment on it.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: I think that it's very convoluted. I didn't hear Mr. Green's speech this afternoon. — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

I hope the members of the committee will not interrupt the — (Interjection) — Order please.

Mr. Lecuyer on a point of order.

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know what the Member for Niakwa is . . . all of a sudden what his problem is, but I haven't even talked to him. — (Interjection) —

MR. A. KOVNATS: And I enjoy it that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: Then if you have problems, health problems or something else, would you control yourself?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

This should not be a forum for this sort of remarks. I hope that members of the committee will not interrupt the witness.

Mr. Kovnats.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister made a very disparaging remark concerning the person who is making the presentation, and I called him on it and that's all that happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lecuyer.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, may I — (Interjection) —

MR. A. KOVNATS: What the honourable member said is she doesn't appear to know what she's talking about . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: . . . or something similar to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. Please allow the witness to answer her question.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: I am a parliamentarian, not a registered parliamentarian, but I am a parliamentarian and . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: . . . I believe that the Legislature uses Bourinot . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Mr. Kavnats, I must call you to order.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, if you're going to call me to order, you'd better do the same thing to your colleague across the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: I regret that I've caused so much confusion.

Mr. Lecuyer and I had a misunderstanding I think the last time I was here and presented a brief, and possibly that's why he feels the way he does.

Yes, I felt that it would take a lawyer to interpret it properly. As a parliamentarian, I certainly could not interpret it and wouldn't even attempt to; and, as a private citizen, I certainly would not attempt to interpret it. It would take a lawyer. I think that there are so many and/or's in this Bill 115 that it should be completely put aside and something more comprehensive put to the government. Actually it should be scrapped; it should be completely wiped out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mrs. MacKenzie, you made reference to Section 5(1) of the bill, and you felt that the Advisory Council should not have the authority to amend the act. Could you tell me how you interpret the statement: "The council shall advise the Minister on the proper administration of the act . . ." etc., ". . . shall advise the Minister with respect to (b) the advisability of amending the act."

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Was this the advisory status only?

HON. A. ANSTETT: The Advisory Council, Section 5(1) - "shall advise the Minister with respect to (b) the advisability of amending this act or the regulations." How do you interpret that provision as giving the Advisory Council the power to amend the act?

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: That is to do with the Ombudsman, is it not? It's to do with his author . . . - no, wait a minute.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Section 5(1).

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Yes. "The council shall advise the Minister on the proper and efficient administration of this act, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the council shall advise the Minister with respect to the provision of sufficient resources, including employees who are functional in both English and French, to meet the requirements of this act."

That is just a little bit ridiculous in my feeling that you should even put English and French in there. It has no significance as far as I'm concerned.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I'm sorry, maybe you missed my question.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Perhaps I didn't.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You said, and I have written it down, that you objected to the council being given the authority to amend the act. I am asking you how you can interpret the words, "shall advise the Minister with respect to (b) the advisability of amending this act or the regulations," how do you interpret that as giving them the power to amend the act? You made that statement; I am asking you how you came to that conclusion.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Well, Mr. Anstett, perhaps I didn't give that enough consideration, but my feeling was that the Minister, again, he is going to have the advice of the council, right? That is what this statement says. But if you have six members which will constitute a quorum, can't that be a group who are a pressure group and put pressure on the Minister to have this changed? This was my feeling.

HON. A. ANSTETT: My second question is: You said why have the Ombudsman; he has no power, his hands are really tied . . .

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Mr. Anstett, it would appear, to me that it goes full circle. In the beginning you state . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: I hadn't finished my question.

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Oh, I'm sorry.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I just said you said that why have the Ombudsman; he has no power, his hands are really tied. My question then is: Do you feel that the role of the Ombudsman then is a - I take it from your statement - not a powerful role, not a language policeman or anything like that, but someone who has no power, has advisory capacity. Is that what you mean by that statement, just for clarification?

MRS. B. MacKENZIE: Well, I felt that it seemed to go full circle. The way I read it was that in one instance you say that this man is going to have the power, but then it's taken away from him because the final decision is made by the Minister. Is that not so? So, actually, why have him if the Minister is going to make the final decision?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Would you agree, or do you know whether or not the powers provided to the Ombudsman

proposed in this bill are virtually identical to the powers provided to the Ombudsman of the province under The Ombudsman's Act.

MRS. B. MACKENZIE: It doesn't seem to state that, Mr. Anstett. As far as I am concerned, this is a completely separate Ombudsman. He has to be French and he has to be able to police the French language, and I object. As a matter of fact, I am French and I speak the language but I refuse to speak the language at this point in time because of the situation in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order. Order please. Expressions of approval or disapproval are not permitted by the audience.

Are there any further questions for Mrs. MacKenzie? Seeing none, on behalf of the committee, I would like to thank you, Mrs. Mackenzie, for coming tonight.

The next out-of-town person on my list is Mr. Joe Beer. Mr. Joe Beer. Is Mr. Beer present?

Mr. J. Schwartz.

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, much has been said in the past several months regarding the entrenchment of the French language in Manitoba, but never has it been proven that there is a need or even a desire by more than a few to have Manitoba declared a bilingual province.

Where does the government supposedly find the large numbers of people who want the Constitution amended? I believe that the majority of French people in Manitoba wish to carry on in the same manner as they and their ancestors have for the past 113 years. They've been able to retain their language and culture without interference from anyone; they are good citizens of this province, and live in harmony with their non-French speaking neighbours. With the present language controversy, many now feel that ill feelings and animosity will develop.

The plan for the entrenchment of French as an official language in Manitoba could probably be found in Pierre's book entitled "Dirty Tricks for Western Canada." I am sure the pressure to implement this plan against the wishes of the majority is coming from Ottawa, along with the money to promote it. The answer to the question of why the Government of Manitoba would sell out the people who elected them is still to be revealed.

It has been stated on numerous occasions by this government that they are considerate of the rights of minority groups. That being the case, perhaps they will consider my rights as a member of a minority group; specifically, the veterans of World War II. Three of my brothers and I volunteered for active service and fought for this country. We did so because we believed Canada to be a good country worth fighting for. At no time were we told, or did we suspect, that at some time in the future that we or our children would be discriminated against because we can only speak English, the universal language of this world. This discrimination is already evident as being bilingual is now a major factor in many jobs whether it is actually essential or not. This situation will worsen in the future if French becomes an official language in Manitoba.

In conclusion, should this ridiculous bill come to a vote then I appeal to Mr. Pawley to pick up the reins,

show the people of Manitoba that he is still the Premier. To prove this is so he would be well advised to free the government members to vote in the entrenchment of the French language as their constituents obviously wish them to with a loud and forceful no, then they would truly and democratically represent those who elected them.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to express my views on this matter. I sincerely hope that the government will seriously consider all presentations in the interests and harmony in this province.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Schwartz, I'd like to question you on the one statement that you have made when you asked in your short brief, and I remind all members of government, this is not a 40-minute brief and I would like to have the privilege of asking some questions to this presenter without interruptions. Where are the people that are requesting this change in the Constitution? I may not have it quite right, but I think that's something that you asked.

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: Yes, I would like to know where they are.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Schwartz, I want to ask you that question. I know you, of course, you are an active, successful businessman in the northern part of the Interlake. I know of your service to the community in the Interlake and, like myself and yourself, we don't happen to be part of the Anglo or French community, we are of that other group, but that have lived very harmoniously in the Interlake.

We have had - and I don't know, sir, and this is the question I'm arriving at - particularly during the early meetings of this Session, a series of what I say orchestrated organizations to come and appear before this committee; that, for instance, suggested that all Mennonites support the position of this government. When we asked what that group consisted of we found out it consisted of 14 members of the Mennonite community, true enough — (Interjection) —

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You made a ruling that questions were to be relevant to the bill which is before us. I think it's incumbent on you, Sir, to ask members who are asking questions to respect that ruling, and discussions of hearings last September or the resolution are clearly out of order in that context.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, by longstanding traditions, the questions that committee members ask are relevant to the presentation made, relative to the presentation made, and his presentation is on the bill. I'm asking relative questions.

Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns, please, I would like to rule — (Interjection) — Order please, order please.

I take a little bit more latitude with the general public when it comes to making presentations on this bill. The public is not as well versed in the rules of this House as the members of this House. I'm sure that Mr. Enns knows well enough what the purpose of the committee is. I would hope that he would abide by the rules of the House and restrict his questions to subject matter related to the bill at hand.

Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Schwartz, you asked where are the people that are requesting the change in this Constitution, and in Bill 115, are requesting or pressuring this government for the bill? We have had, in the course of this committee hearings, representations made that the Jewish community is requesting it, that the Ukrainian community is requesting it. We know, of course, that the French community is requesting it through SFM, not the French community totally. I have suggested to you that the Mennonite community is requesting it. I'm asking you, Sir, as a person that has lived in the north, in the Interlake country, in Ashern, that has worked with many of these various ethnic communities of which you, Sir, are part of, have they called on you? I'm asking you to answer your own question that you asked of the government. Have you been pressured, have you been asked for these changes to be made?

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: No. I certainly would wonder where these people are because I travel around a fair amount; Fisher Branch is a French community; Ste. Rose is a French community. We don't have as many French people in our area as there are at those two places, but the ones in our area all signed the petition against it. The people in Fisher Branch and Ste. Rose don't want it. Where are the large numbers of people that want this? I don't know where they are.

Furthermore, certainly not all the Mennonites are against it. My wife is Mennonite and she's not against it.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can answer that question more eloquently than Mrs. Schwartz can, but that is the question at issue.

What is the push, what is the pressure, why is this government doing this?

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

Mr. Doern.

MR. R. DOERN: I had two questions, Mr. Schwartz. You talked about your concern about "bilingual discrimination", — (Interjection) — Does that strike you as funny?

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: No, I was laughing at the Honourable Member for Lakeside rolling his tongue at me, I thought that was funny.

MR. H. ENNS: I didn't think I was rolling my tongue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Schwartz. Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: In your remarks, you talked about your concern about "bilingual discrimination", is your concern in regard to yourself, your business, or are you thinking of your children or grandchildren here?

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: I'm thinking of not only my children and grandchildren, all the children that will be living in this province in the future. It's already hard enough for them to get a job if they're not bilingual, and by being bilingual, I'm not talking of the Mickey Mouse type of French courses that we learn in school. That's what's suffice to read the other side of the bean cans, but if the French language becomes an official language the requisite is going to be for jobs for people who can speak French fluently so that it can be understood, and that is my concern.

I can see a great hardship coming to young people finding a job in this province in the future. I don't need one anymore, I've got one for the time being handling these two sticks, I don't need a job, a lot of young people do.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Schwartz, just again on that same point of "bilingual discrimination" as you describe it. Are you saying then that the unilingual Manitoba, the person who speaks one language, or the person who speaks two languages, but not French and English, will be at an unfair disadvantage if this legislation goes through?

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: Yes, there can be no doubt about it, they're already at an unfair disadvantage where federal jobs are concerned. If you phone up Air Canada in Winnipeg the first thing that they do is answer the phone in French. What in the hell sense does this make in a province where the official odds are that one in 19 might understand it, and that one would probably understand the English better.

MR. R. DOERN: Right on.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just further to that question, and taking advantage of your history and understanding of the Interlake, we are a relatively sparsely populated part of the country and it is questionable whether or not our school divisions can offer the French immersion courses that the wealthier school divisions can offer in Fort Garry, or in St. James, or even some of the bigger communities like Portage la Prairie or Brandon, but in Woodlands, or in Ashern, or in Inwood, it's highly unlikely that we will be able to put together the numbers to offer a French immersion course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question.

MR. H. ENNS: Does that not lead in your opinion to the kind of discrimination that you, I think, suggested was going to happen to our children in terms of their

opportunities for future job applications with the governments at either provincial or federal level?

MR. J. SCHWARTZ: Yes, definitely. I would like to make one more comment. I became a school trustee in 1966 in the Lakeshore School Division. At that time, French in our schools consisted of from Grade 9 up. In the first year that I was a trustee, I suggested that we should be teaching French in the elementary school where kids would learn it better and would be more able to speak it than learning it at an older age.

I received opposition from the board members, but after several attempts they agreed to let me do this in Ashern. We put in a French teacher and taught French in the elementary school, and inside of a year the people were demanding it in the other schools, but they don't want it by legislation, they want it by choice.

I make this point so that you know that I have absolutely no ill feelings toward French people. Some of my best friends are French, and I think it's very unfortunate that this issue is causing the divisiveness that it is in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Seeing none, Mr. Schwartz, I would like to thank you on behalf of the committee for coming here tonight.

Order please.

Mr. S. J. Lye.

Mr. Mackling on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, the Honourable Member for Elmwood is concerned about the hour being 10 o'clock, but out of deference to those who have come, who are from out of town, I think the committee should continue so that we can hear some of these folks from out of town. They've sat for hours. Surely we can inconvenience ourselves to hear them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would tend to go along with what the Minister of Natural Resources said, but perhaps we could have an indication of how many more out-of-town presentations there are to be made, and then, if indeed it's too many to be handled today and not to discriminate against any one of them, could the Chair ask how many more out-of-town presentations are here tonight, and then I think the decision or the suggestion made by the Member for Elmwood makes some sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You did say point of order, Mr. Chairman. I don't think it matters how many there are. I think what matters is how many we hear, so that those individuals don't have to come back. I don't think it makes sense to say well, if there's 10 more, we'll send all 10 home and ask them to come back tomorrow. If there's 10 more and we can hear five of them, that's five that don't have to come back tomorrow. Would like to hear as many as possible, particularly those who travelled a long distance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's agreed then that we will proceed for awhile yet? (Agreed)

Mr. Lye.

MR. S. J. LYE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislative Committee.

Incidentally, Mr. Enns, before I begin my little brief, that's what the school board thinks of our area too, that we're wealthy. They make us pay up, too, far more than we want to.

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this evening to express our ideas about bilingualism and Bill 115.

First of all, I would like to refer you to three resolutions that my council passed this past summer, which I believe gives me the authority to be here today and to represent the Municipality of Portage la Prairie, the largest municipality in Manitoba.

Our first resolution No. 83157 reads:

"WHEREAS the Provincial Government has reached accord with the Federal Government, and the Franco-Manitoban Society for Manitoba to become a bilingual province, and

"WHEREAS council of the R.M. of Portage la Prairie are concerned that should Manitoba be declared a bilingual province, bilingualism will eventually infiltrate both school divisions and municipal corporations, and

"WHEREAS the cost of administration and translation of municipal business and records would place an added taxation burden on all municipal ratepayers",

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that council strongly oppose Manitoba being declared a bilingual province.

The second resolution No. 83193 reads:

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT a referendum be held on the question of bilingualism in Manitoba during the municipal election which we did in the Municipality of Portage la Prairie."

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, it was approximately 1,675 voted on bilingualism and 85 percent voted against any change.

Resolution No. 82210 reads:

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT this council authorize the Reeve of the Municipality to prepare and present a presentation to the hearing that will be held in regard to the bilingualism bill that is proposed at the Manitoba Legislature, that we are opposed to bilingualism in the Province of Manitoba."

I therefore think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I am representing the electors of the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie. There are certain aspects of Bill 115 which I am concerned about. With your indulgence I would like to refer to those sections now, Mr. Chairman, and I'm very reluctant to pretend that I know too much about this bill. I only got it yesterday afternoon and if I had it for a longer period of time, there are others here that have gone through it and done an excellent job.

However, there are a few paragraphs that I would like to question. On Page 2 it says, "At least 8 percent of the residents." Now, whether they be French or English, I think that is a very small percentage to request that bilingualism be instituted in that area.

In regard to Page 3, in the composition of the council that is supposed advise the Minister, we see two senior officers from the Crown corporations, and two senior officers from the departments - they could be either French or English or Ukrainian or whatever, which I

think is good - one senior officer from the Civil Service Commission, two representatives from the Franco-Manitoban community, and two members of the public who are not members of the Franco-Manitoban community. I happen to be English, Mr. Chairman, where do I fit in here?

On Page 4, and 4(2) - Six council members are considered a quorum out of 13. I think that is a minority in my count.

On Page 7, (16) and (17), they go on to say the administrative office of any Manitoba court, quasi-judicial body of the government, or Crown corporation, agency of the government, and if all these are taken into account, as I mentioned before, if a person of French descent wanted to push his language and he walked into our municipal office, I doubt if we could refuse him to be heard in his French language if he really insisted. Peculiar things have happened before and I think that's leaving it wide open for it to happen again.

Of course, on Page 8, under (19), they can complain to the Ombudsman, but then the Minister could override those complaints if he wished.

Who is to say, on Page 9, whether the complaint is frivolous or vexatious or whether it was made in bad faith? Who is going to decide that? And mentioned here today, whichever the sooner. Well, I hope it never happens, Mr. Chairman.

I have a few remarks here that I would like to bring before your committee, Mr. Chairman. It's in regard to the minority. We have heard a great deal about the minority. I thought that we were in a democratic country and I think that we have treated the minority reasonably well in Manitoba; but since when, in a democratic country, was the person receiving the minority votes elected? It seems that this government was elected because they received the largest number of votes.

I am rather perturbed, Mr. Chairman, that at a meeting of about 600 people in St. Boniface, with more than, they tell me, 100 people opposed to any amendment, this meeting should dictate to the elected Government of Manitoba what they should do or what they should not do about changes in our Constitution. It is time your government worked toward amending our Constitution so that these people who break the law and then go to the Supreme Court to escape, I think they should have to pay the penalty the same as the rest of us.

I had a telephone call the other evening from a lady in Portage who had married a person of French descent. She had two children and was almost beside herself because of the hate and bitterness that was stirred up over this foolishness. I assured her that I, for one, was not antagonistic against her or her children, but against Trudeau and his henchman, Serge Joyal, and anyone who forced this legislation into law against the wishes of the majority of the people. She told me she would like to write to the Premier, but she said she couldn't put it into words.

It seems to me that we have been too complacent far too long over bilingualism and the metric system. The metric system has cost this country billions, and this problem they call bilingualism would cost millions, so let us put a halt to it immediately. We have a lovely country and its bountiful resources and composed of many ethnic groups. Let us keep it pleasant and peaceful as it has been for the last 100 years.

We expect there will be a federal election in the near future, the result of which will probably be less pressure from Ottawa for such things as bilingualism which the people do not want.

Finally, gentlemen, I would like to add that we are endorsing the stand taken by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities opposing any change in Bill 23 or 115. We would like to add that, in our opinion, this government is putting the Minister of Municipal Affairs in an untenable position in asking him to oppose the wishes of the Manitoba electorate and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and expect him to be able to carry on a dialogue with the union, its members, in the future.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I just ask that you, this government, reconsider your stand on Bill 115.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions for Mr. Lye? Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Reeve Lye - Sid - you had mentioned a resolution authorizing you to appear before the committee tonight, passed by your council. I believe it was No. 21083. Was that correct?

MR. S. LYE: 83210, yes.

HON. A. ANSTETT: 83210?

MR. S. LYE: Yes.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Sid, could you tell me if you or your council had had a chance to read the bill before that resolution was passed?

MR. S. LYE: No.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you very much.

MR. S. LYE: As I said, Mr. Anstett, I only received this bill yesterday afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Reeve Lye, we members of the Legislature have only received this bill some 10 days ago. — (Interjection) — Okay, do you want to add another five days to that?

The point that I am asking the reeve, who has had so many years of experience and it is not his first occasion that he's appeared before a committee of the Legislature, would he deem it reasonable that we have had - this bill is here before us now as a result of a rule imposed upon us that hasn't been done in 54 years - closure. Closure has brought this bill before this committee. We have hardly had the time to examine this bill, just as you and your council have not had sufficient time to pass and review the bill and study the bill in order for you to make your appearance here. Do you think that is an appropriate way, a normal way for a government to press forward on legislation of this sensitive and delicate nature?

MR. S. LYE: Are you trying to put me on the spot, Mr. Enns?

MR. H. ENNS: Of course.

A MEMBER: The question is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe Mr. Enns is aware that his question was out of order, referring to matters of procedure. The issue before the committee is Bill 115.
Mr. Enns.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was trying to put the reeve on the spot, if you like, by suggesting that his council had not had time to review the bill before his council authorized him to make his appearance before this committee. That shows you the short time frame that all of us have had to deal with this bill and yet this bill is here as a result of closure.

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

MR. H. ENNS: You want to call that out of order?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, there has been a misrepresentation here in this committee. It's been made several times and to be quite honest, I am getting a little sick and tired of it. That bill was tabled, distributed to the public and to members on December 15th. There were half a dozen technical changes made, it was distributed again on January 3rd. It was distributed in the House, tabled and available for public distribution on January 5th. To describe that time period as 10 days or maybe 15 days is a misrepresentation of the facts and the member deserves to be corrected without a doubt, even if his question is out of order. Let's get the facts straight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon to the same point.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, just to get the facts straight since the Minister wants to do that.

On December 15th a draft of the bill was distributed to the public through the media. I'm sure that no member of the public got a copy of that draft bill which was a speculative offer to the opposition, at that point in time, that no one took seriously because it was the fifth of a series of different proposals. Later on, on the 2nd or 3rd of January another draft that contained changes from the December 15th proposal was then issued in the Legislature. It did not appear in final printed form until the 5th of January, at least.

So, let's get the record straight and not suggest that this bill has been in the hands of anyone in this room in its final form since the 15th of December because that's not true and I am sure that the members of the public who are invited here to make a presentation before this committee could not have obtained the final written form of this bill before the second week of January. So let's get the facts straight and not start twisting the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mackling to the same point.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. This committee is here to hear the witnesses,

not to have statements of fact put to the witnesses and asking them to comment on it. If members wouldn't do that we wouldn't be engaged in arguments about what the facts are that are being stated to the witness.

Now the witnesses are here to make presentations and there are people waiting to make presentations from out of town. I want to hear what they have to say, not members around this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Enns to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: To the Minister of Natural Resources, I didn't raise this question. It was the Minister of Municipal Affairs that attempted to cause some embarrassment to the Reeve and to the presenter of this presentation that by asking that specific question as to what resolution of Council 8023 - or something like that - because he wanted to know, he wanted to be able to say that Mr. Lye and the Council of Portage la Prairie had not had an opportunity of reviewing this bill prior to the Reeve's presentation here. It was the Minister of Municipal Affairs trying to be too cute by one-and-a-half and embarrassed Reeve Lye here that has raised this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anstett to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member knows the rules. He knows that the imputing of motives to other members in the House or in committee is strictly against the rules. He is imputing motives to me. I asked a perfectly innocent question and then the member chooses to impute motives as to the purpose of my question.

Mr. Chairman, on the point of privilege I ask that the member withdraw any allegation of motives on the part of my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member did not have a strictly phrased point of privilege. However, the point is well taken. Motive should not be imputed in this committee.

Mr. Enns, do you have a question for Mr. Lye?

MR. H. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Mr. Scott.

MR. S.J. LYE: My closest neighbour is a Frenchman - just eight years out France. We get along fine. I wished I had never seen this bill.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Lye, do you wish to answer any further questions?

Mr. Scott.

MR. D. SCOTT: I have one short question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lye, you made reference to not wanting to have Manitoba declared a bilingual province. Was your council, or did your council take a position when Bill 2 of 1980 - and the bill was titled the very same as this one is, An Act respecting the operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act - . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The subject before the committee is Bill 115 of this Session, not Bill 2 from 1980.

Order please. I'm sorry Mr. Scott, the question is out of order.

Are there any further questions for Mr. Lye? Seeing none, thank you Mr. Lye for appearing here tonight.

The next person on my list is Mr. Winston Simpson. Is Mr. Winston Simpson present?

Mr. Travis McCullough - these are out-of-town people. Reeve William Roth; Reeve John Loewen; Mayor Lansky; Reeve Manson Moir; Mr. John Bartley.

MR. D. PFRIMMER: My name is Don Pfrimmer, I'm standing in for Reeve Bartley, Councillor of the R.M. of Roland.

Mr. Chairman and committee, thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak here. The Council of the Rural Municipality . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me sir, could you repeat your name please, it's not on the list?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Don Pfrimmer and that is spelt P-f-r-i-m-m-e-r, and it's pronounced Frimmer - the "P" is silent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, you may proceed.

MR. D. PFRIMMER: . . . The Council of the Rural Municipality of Roland question the reliability of a government that has spent so much time on an issue that is antiquated as the need of French language entrenchment into the Constitution.

In this day and age, I do not see any of the MLAs horses hooked to hitching post outside of the Legislative Buildings, but that is from the same era as a need for a French language in this province.

When Manitoba was formed, the French-speaking populace composed a majority of the people but since that time that figure has reduced to approximately 6 percent, and even this 6 percent is not totally in favour of forced French language services. Therefore the population in favour of the government's action becomes even less of a percentage than the 6 percent figure.

If this legislation is adopted, current government employees who cannot speak French will be denied advancement and unilingual persons will not be hired for Civil Service positions, therefore a very small minority of the population will be eligible for these jobs. There is no reason to assume that a court case charging discrimination will not occur if services are not offered in French at municipal or school division level and that will be changed also at a later date.

The government is using this issue as a red herring to keep the people of Manitoba from seeing how little they are doing about the problems of inflation and unemployment which are in dire need of their time and energy.

In a democracy we remind you that the government is elected by the people to do their bidding and the current government is completely ignoring the directives from the electorate and are therefore indulging in the practices of a dictatorship. Canadians need to be

unified, not driven apart by their government, and it is time that everyone became Canadians and not hyphenated Canadians.

In closing, I call on all Manitobans to stand up and be counted on this issue or bear the consequences of a government who completely ignore the wishes of the people; and, just at closing, what freedom will be taken away from us next? We really feel this; this is what our municipality feels. They are scared that they cannot go on believing that government is just going to do whatever they wish without the wishes of the people. I am a councillor in the RM and I'll tell you, if people don't want something, we don't do it. We don't. We want to understand. I would have feeling for you people if you came to me with something you really didn't want. I wouldn't want to harm your children in the future or my children or my grandchildren.

Thank you again.

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

Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Councillor Pfrimmer, were you here this afternoon to hear Mr. Doer's brief on Bill 115?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Yes I was.

HON. A. ANSTETT: You said in your brief that you believed that unilingual civil servants would be denied jobs and promotions. On the basis of Mr. Doer's brief, which I believe indicated that he didn't think that was the case, as a representative of the MGEA, and on the basis of Section 16, 17 and 18, which are the three sections that provide for limited services, actually the limited capacity to provide services and communication in English and French, those three sections, were in either Mr. Doer's brief as a spokesperson for Manitoba Government employees, or in 16, 17 or 18, do you see any indication to back up that statement that you made?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: I haven't got a copy right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the meantime, I would like to remind Mr. Anstett that he should not be referring, in his question, to briefs made by other people.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Where do you see that in those three sections?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Just refer to that number again, please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: 16, 17 and 18.

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Okay, it says, "Every person has the right to communicate in English or French," but how do I know, how am I guaranteed, because I can't speak French? How am I going to be guaranteed that somebody comes along and I can be so kindly removed

from the job? Oh, you didn't do a good enough job, but I can be removed on those grounds, not because I couldn't speak French, that wouldn't want to surface, let's face it. And how am I guaranteed that down the road that some other government may not interpret it slightly different than you are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions?

Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon.

MR. G. FILMON: Councillor Pfrimmer, following up on the question that was raised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, again on the point that's made in Mr. Doer's brief, it says specifically, "It is the MGEA's understanding that the right to communicate with and receive available services in English or French from specified work locations, means that those offices must have the capacity to provide this service."

He went on to point out that there was no assurance that meant anything at this point in time.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: I don't know that our rules say, what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, but if the reference was out of order for me, it certainly is for Mr. Filmon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon, would you care to rephrase your question without referring directly to . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'm just following on because, although he was cautioned not to ask the question, he continued to ask the question.

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Who's asking the questions here? I'd like to know and I'd like to hear it plainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Filmon. Order please. Mr. Filmon, would you care to rephrase your question?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Would you be quiet please, I want to hear the man.

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: On a number of occasions tonight we have had witnesses speak to the members of the committee. I think witnesses are not aware that protocol is that we do not address the members of the committee, they will address the Chair about all the committee members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pfrimmer, I would like to advise that the rules of the committee do not provide for dialogue with members of the committee. The purpose of the committee is to have members ask questions of you for clarification.

Mr. Filmon, do you have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll just, for clarification, say to Councillor Pfrimmer that in Section 16, 17 and 18, the whole concern that has been raised by you and others rests as to what the interpretation will be of available services and the right to communicate in French and English. Are you satisfied, sir, that that right to communicate is anything more than just having somebody available in the office to translate, or are you concerned, as has been raised by others, that it may well be that it's required that anybody who's providing a service, right up to a Deputy Minister, might have to speak French in order to provide that service? Is that your . . .

MR. D. PFRIMMER: We are afraid that the position will call for that, which it may never be used, but because we haven't got the French we cannot fill that position and that's what worries us and a lot of our children.

MR. G. FILMON: Have you heard the Minister, on behalf of the government, ever deny or clarify that for you?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Seeing no further questions, Mr. Pfrimmer, I would like to thank you for appearing here tonight.

MR. D. PFRIMMER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm advised by the Clerk that I missed a previous out-of-town person, Mr. Dennis Epps. Is Mr. Epps present? Mr. Oatway. Is Mr. Oatway present? Mr. Albert St. Hilaire? Mr. Terry Veenendaal? Mr. Doug Sisson?

That concludes my list of out-of-town members present tonight.

Mr. Mackling.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I know there are a lot of folks here and I don't know, there may be some of them that want to make presentations that are not going to be inconvenienced to come tomorrow. If they can come tomorrow, fine; if there are any of them that feel that they are unable to come tomorrow, they're on the list, even though they're from Winnipeg, I think we should be prepared to hear them. Maybe there'd be one or two or three of them that would be inconvenienced if we don't hear them tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable with the committee? Mr. Anstett.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to go too late, but if there are people who can't come back tomorrow that would like to be heard tonight, I would be prepared to sit a little later to hear anyone who can't come back tomorrow or would be inconvenienced in coming back tomorrow. I think that's an excellent suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone present who would wish to give their presentation tonight?

MR. D. PFRIMMER: I see one of my constituents there, that's why I was concerned.

Friday, 27 January, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: There seems to be no one present willing to give their presentation tonight. What is the will of the committee?

HON. A. MACKLING: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.