

HANLEY, Frank

Causeries



**archives
municipales**

VOUS NOUS OBLIGERIEZ EN NOUS RETOURNANT

LE DOSSIER DANS LE PLUS BREF DÉLAI.

Student-voters.

I address you as student-voters today because most of you are 18, or soon will be, and with that age comes the privilege of casting a vote to select your government leaders.

A lot of brave men died to make it possible for the rest of us to cast our votes as free men and this right is not one to be taken lightly.

It was not given you 18-year-olders without misgivings on the part of certain responsible men. Many thought that at 18, a person is not sufficiently mature to be given the privilege of casting a ballot.

And judging by some of the would-be funnymen among you, I wonder if these men were not right after all.

Are you really mature enough to help choose a government? I know most of you are. But there are others down there who don't act mature enough to help choose a dog catcher.

A great man once said, "Youth is a wonderful thing. Too bad it's wasted on the young." I see many of the young he had in mind when he made that profound statement.

Think about it. Are you really mature enough to help select political leaders? Are you sure? Time was when you were referred to as "college men." Today you're known as "college boys" for obvious reasons.

Time was when college men were too concerned about getting an education to waste their time --- placards outside the American Consulate.

sheet 2

And they didn't consider themselves sufficiently versed in world affairs to tell the president of the United States to get his troops out of Viet Nam. What are some of you trying to do? Change the world before you know what it's all about?

What business is it of yours what the United States army does or doesn't do? Is everything running so smoothly in your own province and in your own country that you can go butting your nose into the business of our American neighbors?

If our American neighbors came up here and told us to choose this politician or that politician or told us how we should handle our Indian and Eskimo problem, you young people would probably be the first to shout "Yankee Go Home" wouldn't you? So then what right have ~~us~~ you to meddle in U.S. affairs? And who is going to listen to you anyway?

Isn't there any Quebec or Canadian issue that interests you? If not then, in my opinion anyway, you have not earned the vote that was given you.

If you used the enthusiasm and energy you waste on picketing and heckling politicians in an effort to clear the troubled picture here in the Quebec of today. Then the taxpayers would believe you are sufficiently mature to be given a ballot.

Or maybe you don't think there is a problem in Quebec today. This wouldn't surprise me one bit. Some of you seem so busy interfering in the affairs of other nations that you haven't the time to shave.

--more--

The taxpayers pick up a great part of the expense of your education. Are you giving them value for their money?

Don't you think the time has come for you to take a serious look at yourselves? This is your half of the 20th century and what your country's future will be depends almost entirely on you.

Some of you will go into public life, some into business or the professions and arts. There may even be a few of you who become professional comedians but you can't prove that by the brand of humour you've been hearing so far here today.

Your vote takes you out of adolescence -- or, at least, it should. You have been given a duty to perform and how you perform it depends entirely upon yourself.

If you have been waiting for an opportunity to prove that you are mature, here is that opportunity. Choosing people to run your country for you is a deadly serious business as you can tell by the headlines these past few months.

There is a new breed of politician today. He is younger and he is better educated. He's better educated because a great many people made sacrifices in order that he could be better educated.

Ottawa and Quebec needs this new breed of politician -- maybe you will be one of them. Your behaviour today is all important to your future. Make the most of it. Prove you are mature enough to vote and to take your place in the community -- this community.

New York 1960

Frank Hanley was invited by intimate friends of Senator John Kennedy to express his opinion concerning the interest of Canadians in the forthcoming elections for the presidential seat.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN

You have heard many Americans discuss the issue — and the candidates in this election.

Tonight, we are fortunate in having with us an impartial observer from across the border — a Canadian who had made his mark in the political life of our good neighbor to the north.

Frank Hanley is no ordinary Canadian. He is a man of the people, who reached great heights in political activity.

He is an elected representative both in the City of Montreal and the Legislative Assembly of Quebec.

He has been a City Councillor for more than 20 years and has held the second highest municipal post in Canada, that of Vice-Chairman of Montreal's policy-making-executive Committee.

He is also a member of Parliament, a post he had held for some 12 years.

His voice defending the interests of the working class, has been heard across Canada. Tonight, across the border, he speaks to you.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, MR. FRANK HANLEY.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen:

You may find it strange, that I, a Canadian, am here speaking on behalf of Senator John Kennedy.

Let me say that not only I, but every Canadian is as vitally interested in this American election, as are the Americans, themselves.

Nov. 1960

A few days ago, we held municipal elections in Montreal. Five men were seeking the Mayoralty. A record 236 - the 66 City Council seats at stake.

It was an election with many issues, and yet, more people were talking about the Kennedy-Nixon contest than our own elections!

I am an elected representative both in the provincial and municipal fields, and while I am perhaps disappointed that there is not greater interest in our affairs than now exists, I am not surprised that the people of Canada are closely following this presidential election south of the border.

I, one canadian believe John Kennedy is the man for president, and I am convinced that the great majority of my fellow-canadians would agree with my choice.

Its no secret to you that Canada's economic life is closely allied with that of the United States. My own Province of Quebec has undergone vast changes in recent times, because of American investments.

It has proven profit, both to Americans and to Canadians.

We believe that more could have been accomplished along these lines, and that more should have been accomplished.

We believe that John Kennedy is the man to bring Canada and the United States closer together.

We believe that John Kennedy is the man to lead the United States to unprecedented prosperity and that Canada as the United States' good neighbor will benefit accordingly.

Ladies and gentlemen, Canada will be watching closely, as you cast your ballots.

We hope you don't make a mistake. Canada would like to see the United States, regain its stature, in the world.

We are not impressed by kitchen debates

PS- The President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon and Governor Rockefeller were addressing a group at the Herald Square on behalf of Mr. Nixon, and at the same time, Frank Hanley was addressing a group at the Broadway Headquarters of Senator John Kennedy, corner of Broadway and 43rd Street.

ADDRESS BY FRANK HANLEY (IND. MONTREAL-ST ANN'S)

in the Quebec Legislative Assembly

re: RENT CONTROLS

In an address to this House last Friday, the Honorable Secretary of the Province outlined the disastrous consequences that would lie ahead were the province to lift existing rent controls.

I congratulate the Secretary for the position he has taken in endorsing an extension of the present controls.

Coming from a riding which, unfortunately, has more than its share of slums, I am closely acquainted with the housing problem in Montreal. I am therefore certain that the Secretary's statement that more than 116,000 persons now live in slums in Montreal is no exaggeration.

Only days ago, the grievous slum problem in St. Ann's came sharply to the forefront. I refer to the recent sub-zero cold wave which hit many of my people a terrible blow.

Picture antiquated flats where the plumbing is so old that pipes froze, leaving tenants completely without water facilities.

Picture flats with huge cracks in the walls and only a tiny wood stove to heat the premises.

Picture flats where electrical wiring is so inadequate - particularly in cold waves that life-consuming fire is an ever-present threat.

Picture thousands of flats in this era of great scientific and technological progress, without even a bath tub.

The portrait I paint is not of some unknown little community in the wastes of a far-off, underdeveloped country. It is here at home, in Quebec Province, in the very heart of Montreal, Canada's greatest city.

I say to the Honorable Secretary of this province, who also has jurisdiction over tourism: What a sad state of affairs it is that American visitors see the slums of St. Ann's before they see anything else of Montreal, after crossing the bridge! How incredible that

Fev 1962

the first glimpse of Montreal should be a view of rotten flats and odorous abattoirs!

Knowing the Secretary's sincere desire to serve, I feel certain he will want to look into the problem.

I further suggest to the honorable leader of this government that he appoint a provincial commission to examine the slum situation. With the very health of slum residents, undermined by the unsanitary housing which is an ugly scar on the face of this province, I am convinced that it is within the jurisdiction of the Quebec Health Department to examine this problem.

It is obviously not a matter of choice that decent people, thousands of them senior citizens, are condemned to live in flats that are not fit for swine.

Where else can a pensioned couple, with a total income of \$110, a month, go, if not to slums? They must live in slums and they thank God that rent controls limit their rent to \$40. a month, when it should be no more than \$10.

But surely that is not a credit to this province, nor to this nation that Providence has blessed.

Surely we can do better than leave them in misery until death comes to free them from economic bondage.

Mr. Speaker, I have used strong terms and those who know St. Ann's can appreciate that I speak as honestly and sincerely as the Honorable Secretary of the Province did last Friday.

What can you tell people, living in this nation of plenty, in this province of untold wealth, when they come crying to you that their children have been viciously attacked by rats thriving in their vermin-infested slum-homes?

The Government of this province is making a decisive effort to make education available to every one. It is worthy of thanks for this effort. But let us be frank with ourselves: What encouragement is there for a child to remain home at night to study when his home is a foul, sub-human mass of decay?

Is it any wonder that he prefers to spend his evenings in a clean, modern recreational centre, a place where cold gives no worry?

I cannot speak highly enough of the associations and the individuals who maintain and run these centres. It is thanks to them that St. Ann's has no major juvenile delinquency problem. Without them, and with the slums that spawn juvenile crime, God alone knows the frightening situation that might face us.

It is a matter of public record that the present civic administration of Montreal favors slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects in St. Ann's. It has given the green light towards such works. But the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is apparently standing still.

I ask that a provincial commission take an immediate hand in the matter, not only in St. Ann's but wherever slums exist in Quebec. I do not want a commission that will merely make a study of documents: I want a commission that will visit the various ridings concerned with this problem and discuss the matter with the Member for that area.

With federal-municipal housing projects, rent controls would become less a necessity. In fact, many a rent would be reduced, instead of increased. In the case of a pensioned couple, for instance, their rent would become \$22. instead of the \$40 I mentioned earlier since the rent they would have to pay is based on a percentage of their income.

I further recommend that the province introduce tough legislation to prosecute slum lords. The Government shoudl have no pity on these parasites who take advantage of people living on welfare, simply because these people have not the financial resources to fight them legally. Like blood-suckers, they drain the last drop of hope from the veins of the poor. They mortgage misery.

There is another matter I would raise in connection with the question of slums. With more and more houses in St. Ann's being declared uninhabitable, two Catholic churches in the riding are faced with extinction. Unless something is done quickly to bring new residents into the parishes, they will surely have to disappear. This would be most regrettable and I feel certain the government would want to avoid such an occurance.

Address by Frank Hanley, MPP,

to the

Roxboro Chamber of Commerce "Junior Section"

Thursday, Feb. 22, 1962

Mr. I received your kind invitation some time ago to address you tonight, my position on the cold war now engaged in by Montreal and the suburban municipalities was already known. I take it, therefore, ~~that~~ as a great personal compliment as well as a reflection of your anxiety to know both sides of the issue, that I have been asked here. Groups such as your own are rendering a great service to the community by pausing to study the implications of the situation now facing us all. The fact that you, as businessmen in one of the "enemy" territories, are prepared to hear me out is clear evidence of your desire to seek the common good.

Mr. Chairman, I need not, I am sure, go into all the background of the differences now separating the City of Montreal and its adjoining municipalities. It is abundantly clear, I think, that something is definitely wrong--and the suburbs themselves admit this.

Occasional incidents--such as the notorious water ~~short~~ shortages which have occurred in this area--provide further proof, ~~in~~ if any were needed, that the ~~one~~ individual suburbs are not equipped to provide the services which are so essential to an area's development.

I do not ~~mean~~ suggest any criticism of individual ~~within~~ suburban elected representatives; rather, I am simply acknowledging a fact and that is ~~that~~ the time-proven adage that in unity there is ~~more~~ strength.

At no time in Canada's history possibly has there ever ~~been~~ before been such a need for working together in Greater Montreal. Faced with a grave unemployment ~~situation~~ situation, with ever-growing demands for more and better public services, it would be nothing short of scandalous were we ~~to~~ each to go our own way, regardless of the dire consequences to our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I am among those who have unequivocally advocated the ~~an~~ one-city approach. I believe, without shadow of a doubt, that all municipalities on the island should band together for our mutual betterment. I believe that putting off this decision--and it must surely come--is only folly.

Each municipality--with reason--is anxious to have its own representatives; the men, or women, who have ~~are~~ defended their interests in their respective city ~~council~~ councils. Under the proposal I have put forward, this could continue to be so. I have suggested that a ~~new~~ new council representative of all our municipalities ~~is~~ could be elected on the basis of assessment. In other words, using arbitrary figures, a town with a municipal roll of \$1,000,000 would have one councillor, and a town with a \$2,000,000 valuation roll would have two councillors.

I have heard no objection to this proposal. On the contrary, a ~~large~~ large number of ratemayers--both in the City of Montreal proper as well as in the suburbs--have said they would be prepared to accept such a system, since it would ensure democratic representation.

In the last few weeks, other proposals have been put forward.

One such proposal came from Carl Goldenberg in address to the Canadian Club of Montreal. Mr. Goldenberg is an eminent lawyer whose services have proven extremely valuable not only to his own Province of Quebec, but to many other provinces as well. He has served in different capacities in a number of Royal Commissions and Commissions and each time, he made a sizeable contribution.

I say these things to establish the esteem and respect I hold for Mr. Goldenberg both as a lawyer and as an economist. He has certainly proven himself in both of these capacities.

But where I take issue with Mr. Goldenberg is when his opinion, valued as it may be, is represented as that of a "municipal expert." I know of nothing in Mr. Goldenberg's background which makes him a "municipal expert", as some newspapers have chosen to call him.

And what has Mr. Goldenberg suggested after all? He has said that Greater Montreal should perpetuate the existing Montreal Metropolitan Corporation--but giving it wider powers. He does not suggest any specific powers, mind you.

I think everyone will agree that the present Montreal Metropolitan Corporation has "wider powers" than its forerunner, the Montreal Metropolitan Corporation. In a partial way at least, this is what Mr. Goldenberg is suggesting.

But has the Metropolitan Corporation proven any more effective than the Metropolitan Commission? The answer must be a firm no. The situation today could not provide a clearer answer.

I therefore, as one who has had a score of years of experience in provincial and municipal affairs, am forced to rule out Mr. Goldenberg's theory as well-meaning, but fallacious.

What fascinates me is the way a point Mr. Goldenberg made was rather buried in his address. Sort of en passant, he mentioned his belief that some municipalities should be annexed to Montreal. I wonder how many of you are aware that Mr. Goldenberg made this recommendation? Certainly so little was made of it that I would not be surprised to hear the great majority of you say that Mr. Goldenberg had said no such thing.

I urge you to investigate what I say. Mr. Goldenberg did advocate such annexations. And that he did so, to me, is an indication that he is not fully convinced of his Metropolitan Government theory but that, in fact, he too leans towards the one-city approach which I support.

Another proposal put forward in the last few weeks is that of the City of St. Laurent, one of your sister municipalities.

St. Laurent, after a year's study, came up with a 63-page report which urged, among other things, that Montreal be cut up into pieces and distributed to the outlying municipalities.

I realize this philosophy sounds incredible so let me quote directly from the report:

"There is no intend to reduce Montreal to the status of a second rank city. As a socio-economic agglomeration, and as a metropolitan area, it would be as prosperous and as dynamic as at present. It would continue to grow. Territorial reform would apply only to those areas that are within the administrative jurisdiction of the city itself.

"Thus, Notre Dame de Grace, Mount Royal, Ahuntsic, Rosemount and Maisonneuve would be detached from Montreal and added to the new suburban municipalities. This would contribute to the creation of something somewhat analogous to a system of boroughs or wards."

End of the quotation from the St. Laurent report, which was made public on Feb. 9.

My reaction to this recommendation is that as an April Fool's joke, it was issued seven weeks too soon. How the leaders of a municipality as important as St. Laurent can make such a suggestion is beyond me. Is it any wonder that we, of the City of Montreal, feel it is no longer possible to sit down and talk with some of the suburban officials when such incredible proposals are put before us? Is it any wonder that we feel some of the suburban administrators show nothing but bad faith?

Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic. Without Montreal, St. Laurent would never have been born. ~~Montreal~~ under those circumstances.

Yet now, St. Laurent, the son, is asking Montreal, its father and mother, to dismember its arms and legs so that it--the child--can learn to walk faster.

Most of you, I'm sure, are fathers. All of you, I'm equally sure, love your children.

But would you cut off your legs and arms for your child for no good reason? For your child to ask you to do this would be unheard of; it would be tantamount to the supreme insult. Surely, no serious-minded person would expect such a thing from a parent.

And never forget, gentlemen, that Montreal is a parent, a parent willing to help, but refusing to suicide.

Mr. Chairman, Greater Montreal is an economic region which is indivisible. It is not by grafting flesh from the parent to the child that disease will be halted.

The disease itself must be removed; one simply cannot dig one's head into the sand and hope that the problem will go away.

It will not go away until a physician has removed the disease with a scalpel.

In this case, the physician is the Government of the Province of Quebec and its scalpel is the law.

It must move quickly, courageously, to protect the life of Canada's great metropolis.

I urge it to carry out an operation that will unite the various municipalities making up our area.

Makeshift provisions have failed and failed dismally. The time has come for bold action--action that only the Government of the Province can take.

For let us not forget: Municipalities are but the creatures of the province. The province is the doctor that says how long we can live--or how soon we must die.

Montreal is too great a city to be slowed down. None of you, I'm sure, would want it to take a secondary place in Canada.

Some of you may favor retaining your municipality as an autonomous region; yet all of you, on your travels, always say proudly "I'm from Montreal" when asked where you live.

It is because we are all proud of Montreal that we should put petty, selfish differences aside and become one city, a province within a province.

.....

I especially appreciate this opportunity to get in an advance plug for the Irish two days ahead of the greatest day on the calendar. I would have thought that some dancing collections could have set the stage for St. Patrick's Day far better than I, but then, there's no accounting for tastes.

Seriously though, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply honored by the invitation to be with you today. I'm sure there's many an Irishman who is green with envy.

When I received your kind invitation to address you, it was suggested to me and not too subtly - that my talk should have something to do with the Irish. I'm sure you're not expecting a serious speech - I have been known to give them, occasionally, you know, - so don't expect any Churchillian phrases. In fact, if no one believes a single thing I say, it will be all the better. That's exactly how I want it - this one time.

Having said this, let me now tell you what I intend to speak about.

You have read, I'm sure, about the campaign for separatism now being conducted in certain quarters in this province. Well, the point I want to make today is: If the French can have an independent state within what is now Canada, why shouldn't the Irish be allowed to have an independent state within what is now Quebec?

Frankly, I can't think of any good reason why the Irish should have a free state in this province but that shouldn't stop us: The French separatists don't have a good reason, either.

Marcel Chaput is already threatening to form his own political party under which, he would, of course, become Prime Minister.

Well, what's good for Chaput is good for Hanley. Obviously, I can't get to be Prime Minister of Quebec, under the present setup, anymore than Chaput can, but, with an independent Irish state in Quebec, ah, that is different! After all, what Irishman is more entitled to the job of Prime Minister in a new state than I? I have more than a score of years of experience in provincial and municipal politics; no other living Irishman in Quebec can claim such a career. So, that problem is settled. I will be Prime Minister.

March 1962

Prime Minister Frank Hanley. I like the sound of that!

Of course, if we are to have our own state, we must also have a capital for this state. Well, there's one made to order. Have you heard of Kilkenny, Quebec, that green little spot near Lake Lachigan? That will be the seat of our Parliament.

The movement clearly will have to have a name. Well, Chaput has gone to a lot of trouble publicizing the letters RIN-- Rassemblement pour l'Indépendance Nationale-- so we'll just steal those letters, and say that RIN stands for Republican Irish Nihilists.

There's also the question of language. A sovereign state must have a language of its own, I've thought of that problem and I have the answer.

The Irish of North America were never accused of being overly friendly with the English language. And, they don't do so well with the French language either. When it comes to Gaelic, they've really had it.

Since they can't speak any one of these languages well, and since we, as an independent country, must necessarily have our own tongue, I propose a combination of all three, a sort of poor man's Esperanto.

We'll call the new language Engfrengael-Eng, for English, Fren for French, and Gael for Gaelic. Engfrengael will be a corruption of all three. No one will understand us but this will be another thing we will have in common with the French separatists.

And while it may be all right for Canada not to have its own flag, the Republican Irish Nihilists will adopt one immediately.

You may be surprised to hear that the background will be green. But there will be shamrocks. We do not want to place ourselves in the position where we will be accused of being a colonialist pawn.

No, our flag will be green and on it will be my picture. Surely one one could object to such an aesthetic design. With our own political movement, our own capital, our own language and our own flag, we shall be prepared to secede. Overnight, the new state will be declared: Its name will be "The Republic of Hanley". After all, I started the whole idea, didn't I?

We will, of course, need an Army. That shouldn't present a great challenge. We've got some Irishmen in key posts in the Montreal Police Force. Well simply nationalize these fellows, à la Lévesque, and make them create an Army.

At the start, "The Republic of Hanley" may be faced with some economic problems. But they shouldn't last. I've already begun negotiations with the European Common Market and the chances are excellent that we will be accepted into the family, especially if our whiskey is as good as I think it will be.

I would think that the Republic of Hanley would prove a great tourist centre and this will contribute significantly to our economy. I have faith in our touristic future because we are prepared to outwit Quebec.

Quebec has been indicating that it favors a provincial lottery. Well, that may be all right, as far as it goes, but the Republican Irish Nihilists intend to go farther. Our state will have gambling casinos a-plenty and, with the proverbial luck of the Irish as well as crooked dealers, we should make a fortune.

We have other plans too, to keep the tourists happy but I don't think I should go into them here.

And so, gentlemen, you now know our plans. We are very grateful to Mr. Chaput for having inspired this idiotic idea. Without him, the Republic of Hanley could never have been foreseen. And, yet, we're already outwitting him at his own game.

You probably read the other day where Mr. Chaput's playmates applied for a permit from the Quebec Provincial Police to carry firearms. You probably also noticed the Provincial Police vetoed the idea.

The Republican Irish Nihilists have outsmarted the Provincial Police. We Irish are used to shillelaghs and the Criminal Code does not list shillelaghs as offensive weapons. And so, we're already set to defend ourselves while Mr. Chaput is still groping for loopholes in the law.

You may think that Mr. Chaput is closer to his objective than we are but this

isn't the case.

Mr. Chaput holds his meetings in public. We keep ours secret. We don't need publicity.

He has to go and canvass for funds. We don't because we've arranged to get a kickback on every pot of shamrocks sold this coming Saturday.
So, remember, Whenever you see someone wearing shamrocks, keep in mind that that man is a secret operative of the Republican Irish Nihilists, just waiting to take up his shillelagh the day I declare the new Republic of Hanley.

Councillor
Hanley

"ME, TOO".

Address by Councillor Frank Hanley
Member of the Provincial Parliament
for Montreal-St. Ann's
before the
Westward Rotary Club,
Thursday, March 15, 1962

for release 2.30 p.m. Thursday, March 15th.

I especially appreciate this opportunity to get in an advance plug for the Irish two days ahead of the greatest day on the calendar. I would have thought that some dancing colleens could have set the stage for St. Patrick's Day far better than I, but then, there's no accounting for tastes.

Seriously though, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply honored by the invitation to be with you today. I'm sure there's many an Irishman who is green with envy.

When I received your kind invitation to address you, it was suggested to me and not too subtly - that my talk should have something to do with the Irish. I'm sure you're not expecting a serious speech - I have been known to give them, occasionally, you know, - so don't expect any Churchillian phrases. In fact, if no one believes a single thing I say, it will be all the better. That's exactly how I want it - this one time.

Having said this, let me now tell you what I intend to speak about.

You have read, I'm sure, about the campaign for separatism now being conducted in certain quarters in this province. Well, the point I want to make today is: If the French can have an independent state within what is now Canada, why shouldn't the Irish be allowed to have an independent state within what is now Quebec?

Frankly, I can't think of any good reason why the Irish should have a free state in this province but that shouldn't stop us: The French separatists don't have a good reason, either.

Marcel Chaput is already threatening to form his own political party under which, he would, of course, become Prime Minister.

Well, what's good for Chaput is good for Hanley. Obviously, I can't get to be Prime Minister of Quebec, under the present setup, anymore than Chaput can, but, with an independent Irish state in Quebec, ah, that is different! After all, what Irishman is more entitled to the job of Prime Minister in a new state than I? I have more than a score of years of experience in provincial and municipal politics; no other living Irishman in Quebec can claim such a career. So, that problem is settled. I will be Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Frank Hanley. I like the sound of that!

Of course, if we are to have our own state, we must also have a capital for this state. Well, there's one made to order. Have you heard of Kilkenny, Quebec, that green little spot near Lake Lachigan? That will be the seat of our Parliament.

The movement clearly will have to have a name. Well, Chaput has gone to a lot of trouble publicizing the letters RIN— Rassemblement pour l'Indépendance Nationale— so we'll just steal those letters, and say that RIN stands for Republican Irish Nihilists.

There's also the question of language. A sovereign state must have a language of its own, I've thought of that problem and I have the answer.

The Irish of North America were never accused of being overly friendly with the English language. And, they don't do so well with the French language either. When it comes to Gaelic, they've really had it.

Since they can't speak any one of these languages well, and since we, as an independent country, must necessarily have our own tongue, I propose a combination of all three, a sort of poor man's Esperanto.

We'll call the new language Engfrengael-Eng, for English, Fren for French, and Gael for Gaelic. Engfrengael will be a corruption of all three. No one will understand us but this will be another thing we will have in common with the French separatists.

And while it may be all right for Canada not to have its own flag, the Republican Irish Nihilists will adopt one immediately.

You may be surprised to hear that the background will be green. But there will be shamrocks. We do not want to place ourselves in the position where we will be accused of being a colonialist pawn.

No, our flag will be green and on it will be my picture. Surely one could object to such an aesthetic design. With our own political movement, our own capital, our own language and our own flag, we shall be prepared to secede. Overnight, the new state will be declared: Its name will be "The Republic of Hanley". After all, I started the whole idea, didn't I?

We will, of course, need an Army. That shouldn't present a great challenge. We've got some Irishmen in key posts in the Montreal Police Force. Well simply nationalize these fellows, à la Lévesque, and make them create an Army.

At the start, "The Republic of Hanley" may be faced with some economic problems. But they shouldn't last. I've already begun negotiations with the European Common Market and the chances are excellent that we will be accepted into the family, especially if our whiskey is as good as I think it will be.

I would think that the Republic of Hanley would prove a great tourist centre and this will contribute significantly to our economy. I have faith in our touristic future because we are prepared to outwit Quebec.

Quebec has been indicating that it favors a provincial lottery. Well, that may be all right, as far as it goes, but the Republican Irish Nihilists intend to go farther. Our state will have gambling casinos a-plenty and, with the proverbial luck of the Irish as well as crooked dealers, we should make a fortune.

We have other plans too, to keep the tourists happy but I don't think I should go into them here.

And so, gentlemen, you now know our plans. We are very grateful to Mr. Chaput for having inspired this idiotic idea. Without him, the Republic of Hanley could never have been foreseen. And, yet, we're already outwitting him at his own game.

You probably read the other day where Mr. Chaput's playmates applied for a permit from the Quebec Provincial Police to carry firearms. You probably also noticed the Provincial Police vetoed the idea.

The Republican Irish Nihilists have outsmarted the Provincial Police. We Irish are used to shillelaghs and the Criminal Code does not list shillelaghs as offensive weapons. And so, we're already set to defend ourselves while Mr. Chaput is still groping for loopholes in the law.

You may think that Mr. Chaput is closer to his objective than we are but this

isn't the case.

Mr. Chaput holds his meetings in public. We keep ours secret. We don't need publicity.

He has to go and canvass for funds. We don't because we've arranged to get a kickback on every pot of shamrocks sold this coming Saturday.

So, remember, Whenever you see someone wearing shamrocks, keep in mind that that man is a secret operative of the Republican Irish Nihilists, just waiting to take up his shillelagh the day I declare the new Republic of Hanley.



STATE OF NEW YORK
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER
GOVERNOR

ALBANY

August 29, 1962

Dear Mr. Hanley:

Would you be my guest at luncheon on Wednesday, September twenty-sixth at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel in Montreal? I would be deeply appreciative if you can come.

Keith S. McHugh, our State Commissioner of Commerce, and I, intend to announce at the luncheon the opening of our New York State Commerce Department branch office in the Place Ville Marie, Montreal.

We hope this new office can serve you and be mutually advantageous to all our Canadian neighbors and to the people of our State.

A reception will be held at 12 noon, followed by luncheon which should conclude by 2 p.m.

Both Commissioner McHugh and I look forward to meeting with you.

Please let me know if you will be able to attend.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive ink that reads "Nelson A. Rockefeller".

Mr. Frank Hanley, M. P.
Councillor
City of Montreal

NOTICE OF DINNER MEETING

Date: Monday, March 25th, 1963

Time: 6:15 p.m. (Dinner at 6:30 p.m.)

Place: Parish Hall - 12275 Somerset Road

Cost: \$1.50 per person

Guest speaker: Mr. FRANK HANLEY

Mr. Hanley is one of the few men who has never lost an election in nearly a quarter of a century of public life in municipal and Provincial arenas. Regarded as the "strongman of Pointe St. Charles" he is one of Quebec's most controversial political figures. He was, for several years, vice-chairman of the city's powerful executive committee and has been a city councillor since 1940. He was first elected to the Quebec legislature as Independent member for St. Anne's riding in 1948 and has been elected ever since.

Topic: "ME TOO"

Mr. Bill Bantey of the Montreal Gazette will act as moderator.

If you cannot attend this meeting, please advise one of the following members of the Association by Thursday, March 21st. Gavin Lancaster at FE-4-4975, Bob Brownstein at MU-1-5270 or Denn Taylor at RI-7-5949.

Sincerely

J. V. Fanning
Geo. V. Fanning
Program Chairman.

"A NEW ITEM OF IMPORTANCE TO MEMBERS"

N ADDRESS BEFORE THE LAKESHORE KIWANIS CLUB - by COUNCILLOR FRANK HANLEY

To be released September 24, at 9.00 p.m.

I am delighted by this opportunity to address you at such an exciting political moment. Your invitation to me is deeply appreciated, not only because of the honor you do me but especially because it provides clear evidence of your interest in public affairs.

And surely, this is highly commendable in an organization such as yours, dedicated as it is to another form of public service.

The Civic Election of Oct. 28, the snap provincial election of Nov. 14, and the possibility of another federal election this year make it obvious that within a period of months, we shall be setting a great pattern for the future.

In effect, the elections which are to come may well prove the most significant of Canada's recent political history.

Nationally, we are in the midst of an era of austerity, an era whose outcome is closely linked with the possible membership of Great Britain in the European Common Market.

Provincially, we face demands for the nationalization of private power companies and a whole new pattern of French-Canadian thought.

Municipally, we must take a position on the future not only of Montréal itself, but on the standards that will guide the entire future development of the economic area of Greater Montréal.

These are the big questions, the big issues that the electors will have to resolve. But underlying these are other matters which also will have to be dealt with quickly. I am thinking for instance, of the question of free medical care. My personal view is that such a plan must come, not on a general basis perhaps, but certainly for the

Sept. 62

needy, the underprivileged, who today are crushed by mounting medical bills.

There are other questions, such as slum-clearance and low-cost housing, which in the development of new national and provincial policies, regrettably have been lost sight of, too frequently.

That the need exists for such things as low-cost housing and free medical care for the needy is beyond question. And these people have not the means to lobby, to pressure, for their rights.

Too often, in the large, over-all picture, they become the forgotten people, a people without voice.

In the years I have served St. Ann's, provincially and municipally, I have made it my task to speak for them. I say, with all modesty, that I have achieved some measure of success on their behalf.

But organizations like yours must join in this campaign to help those who need it most, not only in terms of financial help, important as that is, but also in promoting and defending their cause.

Mr. Chairman, you and your members can well be proud of the community in which you live. It has comfort and it has charm. Come to St. Ann's and you will see why it would be a dereliction of duty were I not to champion the cause of my people.

Consider how you would feel if you meagre personal possessions were being seized because you were unable to meet a doctor's bill.

I assure you, this is not a hypothetical situation. You have only to examine the newspapers' bailiff sales to confirm what I have just said to you.

Is it surprising then that over the years, I have always advocated the establishment of a provincial lottery? There is no reason in the world- other than the Criminal

Code- why such a lottery should not be instituted in order to find the revenue that would make it possible to care for our needy, in terms of health and other essential needs.

Let us not fool ourselves. People are buying sweepstakes tickets, anyway, no matter what the law says, and this money, instead of being used for the benefit of Canadians, is helping others.

Obviously, I have nothing against the Irish, nor their hospitals. But I care even more for Canadians as a whole, and particularly for the people of my riding.

The Government of Canada can no longer afford to delay amendment to the Criminal Code to make such a lottery possible. Undoubtedly, it will have to face some criticism but the fact remains that the great majority of Canadians, and major business bodies today support the idea of a lottery.

I cannot urge you too strongly to take a more active part in the political affairs of your community, your province and your country.

Far too often, politics are something considered only in electoral periods. But now, more than ever, this nation, and particularly our own province are seething with political thought and political activity.

New ideas, new concepts are being born every day. Some obviously are excellent, Others, to my mind, are fraught with potential danger.

Each of us, ordinary citizen and politician alike, owe it to ourselves and to our country to study these problems closely.

It is easy to criticize politicians; God knows they deserve it, at times.

But how much more effective government would be if the people truly spoke their minds after having considered every aspect of a new policy or potential policy.

The time to act, to make your views known, is while legislation is taking shape, not

after it has been adopted.

I know I have spoken in generalities and certainly, some of the views I have expressed have been expounded before.

The fact remains that most people lose sight of these concepts, trite as they may appear to be.

At this vital turning-point in our political life, these truths must be repeated and repeated.

You, as intelligent businessmen vitally concerned with the future, must meet the challenge, alongside those men who have offered their services to the administration of public affairs.

It has often been suggested and sometimes, none too subtly, that public life has made me a wealthy man.

Outside my riding, this illusion has been spawned by innuendo and deceit by my political adversaries.

Within my own constituency, the truth about my alleged richness is well-known. The time has come now for me to set the record straight for the public in general.

My wealth is such that I have been forced to sell my home at great loss to make good a debt of \$13,000 with the Income Tax Department. In business, because my time has been taken up exclusively looking after my constituents, I have lost virtually everything.

Today, I am receiving a cheque for \$21,000 for my 13 years house at 500 Dublin St., from Jean Rabouin. Of this amount, \$13,000 as I have said, will go to the Income Tax Department; the balance will go to the Sun Life Assurance Company to meet part of the \$11,000 mortgage still owing on the house, a mortgage I took a few years ago to pay \$12,000 to the Income Tax Department. For a number of years, I have also been paying \$100 a month to the Income Tax authorities.

I am being taxed for financial help I gave my constituents from 1950 to 1960, people who were unable to meet their rents, their fuel and grocery bills, and so on.

I have no quarrel with the tax assessors. They have been firm but fair with me. However, I do question the decision of the Income Tax Department to tax me for donations. Like every other taxpayer, however, I submit to the Law, unfair as it may appear to me. Some people will ask: Where did you get the money you gave away?

The answer is simple. It came from my indemnities as a Member of the Provincial Parliament, as a member of the City Council and, for a time, as Vice-Chairman of the City's Executive Committee. In addition, there was, in the beginning, substantial income from my garage business.

There were years when the garage grossed \$300,000 By the 50's however, things had changed a great deal. It had given credit totalling \$50,000 to a number of constituents. Unable or unwilling to pay, I would have had to take them to court. I decided, instead, to tear up the books. That, and the fact that I was unable to spend any time at the garage, cost me the bulk of the business.

18-6-1963

In 1952, I lost the garage business. To-day, only the service station belongs to my family. My son, Colin, though he works a 15 hour day, six-days-a-week, is only able to earn barely enough in the station for a salary.

It is strange the way life is. Twenty-five years ago, Jean Rabouin was a scrap dealer and he was one of the people to whom I used to give credit. To-day, in acquiring my house, Mr. Rabouin brings to life a rags-to-richess story. In my own case, the reverse is true. It is a case of richness to rags.

I do not intend to leave my constituents. Though I must surrender my home, whose door has always been opened to them, I will stay with my people by finding another house in the district.

I have already cut my standard of living sharply. I must reduce it even more if I am to be able to continue helping my people.

As strange as it may seem, I cannot really afford to continue in public life. There are so many demands from organizations and individuals within the district that a Member of the Provincial Parliament requires an indemnity of at least \$20,000 a year. In addition to these requests for help, there is also the need to maintain two residences for a good part of the year; one in Montréal year-round, and one in Québec for a major portion of the year.

My case is not unique. I have known a number of men who have lost their businesses, who have gone bankrupt, because of their public life.

The future will decide my own fate.

While baring my financial situation to-day, there are a few other points I would like to clear up:

A number of people, both within and outside my constituency, have asked me why I supported the Social Credit in the last Federal Election campaign.

Unfortunately, my lips are sealed by a gentlemen's agreement. Let me say this, however: There are a number of men in the business and political worlds who know the answer. They are the people who can answer the question, the people who can free me of my pledge of silence. Were they honest and honorable, they would explain why I supported the Social Credit. Anyone who knows Frank Hanley realizes that I would not endorse such a movement, unless I were asked to

do so for a specific purpose in the general interest.

I can say no more to answer the question. The few words I have said, however, should give some indication that my backing of the Social Credit was inspired by others, and achieved the goal for which it had been inspired. Let the "partners" to the agreement tell the rest of the story.

The other point I want to make is this: In recent months, I have had numerous complaints from my constituents regarding the issuance of many liquor permits within the district. This is a situation beyond my control. Members of the Provincial Parliament have been specifically asked not to interfere in the issuance of permits. I have not. My constituents will recall that when I did have a say in liquor permits in St. Ann's riding, there was not the situation there is to-day. To-day, the Quebec Liquor Board is the sole master. As always, my interest focusses on providing more and better open-air recreational centres for my people. They will be pleased to learn, I am sure, that \$43,000 is to be spent at my request, for handball courts in Leber park.

Il a été souvent signalé, et quelquefois sans trop de subtilité que la vie publique avait fait de moi, un homme riche.

A l'extérieur de ma circonscription, cette illusion a été répandue par nuances et tromperies par mes adversaires politiques.

A l'intérieur de mon propre comté, la vérité au sujet de mes richesses présumées, est bien connue. L'heure est venue pour moi de présenter au public en général les faits tels qu'ils existent.

Ma richesse est telle que j'ai été obligé de vendre ma maison à grande perte pour faire honneur à une dette de \$13,000 envers le service de l'Impôt sur le Revenu. En affaires, parce que j'ai donné tout mon temps exclusivement au bien-être de mes électeurs, j'ai perdu presque tout.

Aujourd'hui, je reçois de monsieur Jean Rabouin, un chèque de \$21,000 pour une maison que j'ai possédée depuis 13 ans, à 500 Dublin.

De ce montant, \$13,000 comme je l'ai déjà dit, s'acheminera vers le service de l'Impôt sur le Revenu; le solde ira à la compagnie d'assurances Sun Life pour payer une partie de l'hypothèque de \$11,000 encore dû sur la maison; un hypothèque que j'ai dû prendre il y a quelques années pour payer \$12,000 au service de l'Impôt sur le Revenu. De plus, depuis plusieurs années, j'ai également payé \$100. par mois aux autorités de l'Impôt sur le Revenu. Je suis taxé sur l'aide financière que j'ai apportée à mes électeurs de 1950 à 1960, des personnes qui ne pouvaient payer leur loyer, leur combustible, leur compte d'épicerie, etc. Je ne critique pas les évaluateurs de taxes. Ils ont été fermes mais justes à mon endroit. Je conteste toutefois la décision du service de l'Impôt sur le Revenu de taxer mes dons. Toutefois, comme tout contribuable, je me soumets à la loi, toute injuste qu'elle puisse me sembler.

Certains se demanderont: Où avez-vous trouvé l'argent que vous avez donné? La réponse est simple. Il provient de mes indemnités comme Membre de la Législature provinciale, comme Membre du Conseil municipal, et pour une certaine période, comme président intérimaire du Comité exécutif de la Cité. De plus, mon garage me rapportait au début un revenu substantiel; il y eut des années où le garage rapportait un montant brut de \$300,000

Dans les années 50', toutefois, les choses changèrent considérablement. J'avais accordé du crédit se totalisant à \$50,000 à un grand nombre de mes électeurs. J'aurais pu les trainer devant les tribunaux même s'ils étaient incapables ou impuissants à payer. J'ai décidé à la place de déchirer les livres. Ceci, en plus du fait que je ne pouvais consacrer aucun temps au garage, m'a coûté la majeure partie des affaires.

En 1952, j'ai perdu le garage; aujourd'hui, seul, le poste d'essence appartient à ma famille. Mon fils Colin bien qu'il travaille 15 heures par jour, et six jours par semaine ne peut que gagner à peine assez dans le poste d'essence pour se payer un salaire.

La vie est étrange. Il y a 25 ans, Jean Rabouin était un marchand de bric-à-brac et était un de ceux à qui j'ai accordé du crédit. Aujourd'hui, en devenant possesseur de ma maison, monsieur Rabouin représente l'histoire de l'homme au début, humble qui s'est acquis la richesse. Dans mon propre cas, l'inverse est vrai. C'est le cas de commencer par la richesse et retourner à la pauvreté.

Je n'ai pas l'intention d'abandonner mes électeurs, bien que je doive abandonner ma maison, dont la porte leur a toujours été ouverte, je resterai parmi eux en trouvant une autre maison dans le district. J'ai déjà réduit mon mode de vie considérablement. Je dois le réduire davantage pour qu'il me soit possible de continuer à les aider.

Aussi étrange que cela puisse paraître, je ne puis vraiment me permettre de poursuivre ma carrière politique. Il existe tellement de demandes de la part d'organisations, et d'individus dans le district, où'un membre de la Législature provinciale aurait besoin d'une indemnité d'au moins \$20,000 par année.

En plus de ces demandes d'assistance, il existe également le besoin de maintenir deux résidences pour une bonne partie de l'année. Une à Montréal durant toute l'année et une à Québec pour une grande partie de l'année.

Mon cas n'est pas unique. Je connais un grand nombre de personnes qui ont perdu leur commerce, qui ont fait banqueroute, à cause de leur vie publique. L'avenir décidera de mon propre sort.

Alors je mets à nu, ma position financière aujourd'hui, il existe quelques autres points que je voudrais mettre à jour. Un grand nombre de personnes dans, et à l'extérieur de mon comté

m'ont demandé pourquoi j'ai appuyé le Crédit Social lors de la dernière campagne fédérale. Malheureusement, mes lèvres sont scellées par une entente de gentils-hommes. Permettez-moi toutefois de vous dire ceci: il y a un grand nombre de personnes du monde des affaires et de la politique qui connaissent la réponse. Ce sont eux qui peuvent apporter la réponse à la question, eux qui peuvent me libérer de ma promesse de silence. S'ils étaient honnêtes et honorables, ils expliqueraient pourquoi j'ai appuyé le Credit Social. Quiconque connaît Frank Hanley comprendra que je n'aurais pas endossé un tel mouvement, à moins qu'on me l'ait demandé pour une fin spécifique d'intérêt général. Je ne puis dire plus pour répondre à la question. Les quelques mots que j'ai dit toutefois devraient indiquer que mon appui du Crédit Social fut inspiré par d'autres et a atteint l'objectif pour lequel il avait été inspiré. Que les "partenaires" de l'entente relatent le reste de l'histoire.

L'autre point que je veux mettre en évidence est celui ci: au cours des récents mois, j'ai reçu de nombreuses plaintes de la part de mes électeurs, concernant l'émission de plusieurs permis de liqueur dans le district.

Je n'ai aucun contrôle sur cet état de chose. Les membres de la Législature provinciale ont été spécifiquement requis de ne pas se mêler de l'émission des permis. C'est ce que j'ai fait. Mes électeurs se souviendront que lorsque j'avais mon mot à dire dans l'octroi des permis de liqueur dans le comté de Ste-Anne, la situation n'était pas ce qu'elle est aujourd'hui. Aujourd'hui, la Régie des Alcools est le seul maître.

Comme toujours, mon intérêt vise à l'établissement d'un plus grand nombre de meilleurs centres récréatifs à ciel ouvert, pour mes gens. Ils seront heureux d'apprendre, j'en suis sûr, qu'une somme de \$43,000 doit être dépensée, à ma demande, pour courts de balle à la paume, au parc Leber.

REMARQUES SUR LE BILL 60

Jan.

MONSIEUR HANLEY: Monsieur l'orateur, j'aimerais exprimer très brièvement mon opinion . /64 ce soir. Ce parlement sait que nous avons eu les années '20 endiablées, les '30 déprimantes, les '40 pleines de fougue, les '50 faiblissantes et nous connaissons maintenant les '60 éducatives. Monsieur l'orateur, je crois que l'homme qui est appelé Monsieur 60 verra son nom s'inscrire dans l'histoire comme l'homme le plus remarquable du 20ième siècle. La marque de respect que j'offre au Ministre de la Jeunesse lui est due parce qu'il est un des rares hommes dans la vie publique qui a combattu pour ses convictions tout au cours de la période orageuse qui s'est amorcée lorsque le Bill 60 a été mentionné pour la première fois dans ce Parlement. Ce soir, comme l'arc-en-ciel suit l'orage, le Ministre de la Jeunesse devient une étoile brillante dans la Province de Québec pour son courage en face d'une aussi formidable opposition.

Monsieur l'orateur, il aurait été regrettable pour la population de la Province si le Ministre de la Jeunesse avait faibli devant l'Opposition. Nous n'aurions pas aujourd'hui un Ministre de l'Education et nous avons besoin d'un tel Ministre. Nous en avons présentement un et c'est le tribu que je dois offrir au Ministre de la Jeunesse. Il a établi un précédent. Je doute que plusieurs hommes dans la vie publique de la Province de Québec auraient fait face à cette tempête de protestations et voyagé à travers toute la province pour expliquer le Bill que nous étudions ce soir. Il a maintenu une attitude ferme et par son courage a éclairé ceux qui s'opposaient à ce Bill. Il a éduqué les éducateurs eux-mêmes qui s'opposaient au Bill 60 et nous devrions avoir plus de personnes dans la vie publique à tous les échelons de gouvernement ayant le courage de leur convictions, qu'ils peuvent rendre service à la population.

Monsieur l'orateur, il y a eu une forte opposition contre le Bill 60 de la part de quelques institutions et organisations catholiques anglophones. Elle était tellement bien organisée que quelques unes de nos églises catholiques anglaises ont demandé à leurs paroissiens d'exiger que leurs représentants catholiques anglophones au sein du Parlement de Québec votent contre le Bill 60. J'ai porté cette question à l'attention du bureau du Ministre et j'ai personnellement rencontré les personnalités religieuses qui n'étaient que des victimes innocentes. Elles avaient reçu de fausses interprétations au sujet de la protection dont joueraient les catholiques anglophones de cette province si le Bill était adopté. Et lorsque que je leur

Janvier 1964

ai [] évoqué quelques unes des explications que le Ministre donnait à travers la Province, les membres vraiment sérieux de nos institutions catholiques anglophones ont changé d'idée et sont maintenant favorables au Bill 60. J'aimerais déclarer monsieur le président, que certaines personnes qui s'opposaient à l'idée d'un Ministère de l'Education, les bureaucrates, ceux qui se désirent importants et veulent imposer leur conception de l'éducation, n'ont même pas le courtoisie de discuter le bill proposé avec leurs représentants anglophones du Parlement. Ils se rendirent directement au Premier Ministre et au bureau du Ministre pour exposer leurs griefs. Certaines personnes avaient préché qu'un Ministre de l'Education pourrait être un dictateur et que les catholiques anglophones pouvaient souffrir préjudice à cause de ce Bill. Je dis ceci: mon expérience personnelle après avoir vécu toute ma vie dans cette Province est que les catholiques anglophones et les minorités généralement ont été très bien traités; nous ne devrions pas être troublés sans raison lorsqu'un homme élu doit diriger la destinée de l'éducation dans notre Province, parce que si ce serviteur élu par les contribuables ne remplit pas ses devoirs, s'il n'est pas compétent, le peuple peut par un vote démocratique le chasser de son poste. Je crois que le temps est venu pour les hommes publics à tous les niveaux de gouvernement de faire face aux problèmes, mais y faire face honnêtement et présenter les faits devant leurs électeurs. Lorsque vous entendez quelques uns de nos éducateurs donner des instructions aux brigadiers qui protègent nos enfants aux traverses scolaires, vous penseriez que les enfants francophones ne devraient pas être protégés aux traverses scolaires. Je suis sûr qu'aucun parent francophone désirerait laisser les enfants non francophones sans protection. Monsieur l'orateur, nous avons un Ministre de l'Education, un serviteur public, à qui nous pouvons faire part de nos griefs. J'ai reçu des plaintes concernant des accidents et demandé à la police de faire enquête. J'ai transmis le rapport de la police à la commission scolaire de Montréal relativement à quelques éducateurs qui avaient donné des directives, qui, de fait, exposaient les enfants, sauf, ceux de langue française, aux accidents. Ceci s'est produit dans les années '60 et je suis heureux monsieur l'orateur qu'un membre de notre Service de la Police, un canadien-français ait porté le fait à l'attention des autorités scolaires. Depuis 45 ans, nous avons préconisé l'unité, l'amitié, la coexistence dans cette Province, particulièrement dans

le [redacted]teur sud-ouest de Montréal, dans Ste-Anne, Ste-Cunégonde, Ville Emard, Côte St-Paul. Nous ne voulons pas rétrograder de 45 ans alors que les écoliers se battaient entre-eux. Je crois que nous avons aujourd'hui dans la Province de Québec un gouvernement qui sera ferme dans ses attitudes et verra à ce que nous ayons un Canada uni, que le haut et le bas Canada soit uni et coexiste, et que nos enfants grandiront non avec la méchanceté et l'animosité au cœur mais grandiront sans égard à la couleur de leur peau qu'ils soient noirs ou blancs, chrétiens ou juifs, c'est-à-dire, une population unie.

Je suis heureux de dire ce soir, monsieur l'orateur, que nous sommes dans la bonne voie et que nous allons progresser et non retourner aux jours de violence sur les questions de race, religion ou couleur. Monsieur l'orateur, je ne veux pas en dire davantage afin que ce Bill soit adopté immédiatement , mais de nouveau je me permets de parler au nom des anglophones de la majorité des catholiques de langue anglaise des institutions religieuses et des parents. Leur confiance est acquise au jeune avocat constitutionnel qui est Ministre de la Jeunesse, et ils sont confiants que les catholiques d'expression anglaise seront protégés en ce qui a trait à l'éducation, en dépit du mouvement peu nombreux, faible, mais qui jouit d'une grande publicité et qui s'oppose encore au principe d'un Ministre de l'Education. La majorité du clergé et de la laïcité sérieuse catholique anglaise sont en faveur.

Jaw/64

MR. ~~HANLEY~~: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I would like to express my opinion this evening. This Parliament knows we have had the roaring twenties, the depressing thirties, the Fighting Forties the Weakening Fifties and now we have the Educational Sixties. Mr. Speaker I think the man who is named Monsieur 60 or Mr. Sixty will go down in history as the outstanding Canadian man of the twentieth century. The tribute and respect I offer to the Minister of Youth is due him because he is one of the very few men in public life who fought for his convictions throughout the gathering storm which began when Bill 60 was first mentioned in this Parliament. Tonight as the rainbow follows the storm, the Minister of Youth becomes a shining star in the Province of Québec for his courage in facing such tremendous opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been regrettable for the people of this province, had the Minister of Youth weakened against the opposition. We would not have a Minister of Education today and we need a Minister of Education. We will have one and that is the tribute I must offer to the Minister of Youth. He has set a precedent. I doubt whether many men in public life in the Province of Québec would have faced the storm of protests, they travel throughout every section of the Province to explain the bill we are studying tonight. He has stood firm and with his courage he has enlightened the people who were opposing this bill. He has educated the educators who were against Bill 60 and that is something we should have more of, from men in public life at all levels of government with the courage of their convictions they can render a service to the population.

Mr. Speaker, there was a strong opposition against Bill 60 by some English Catholic Institutions and organizations within the Province. It was organized so strongly that within some of our English Catholic churches they asked English Catholics to demand that their English Catholic members in the Quebec Parliament vote against Bill 60. I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister's office and I personally interviewed the religious who were innocent victims. They had received false impressions about the protection that English Catholics would have in this Province if this bill were adopted. And when I brought to them some of the explanations that the Minister was delivering throughout the Province, the serious-minded members of our

English-Catholic Institutions changed their minds and today they are in favour of Bill 60. And I would like to state Mr. President, that some of the people who were against the idea of a Minister of Education, the bureaucrats, the ones who want to be important and dictate education, did not have the courtesy to discuss with their English speaking members of Parliament the proposed bill. They went directly to the Prime Minister and the Minister's office with their grievances. Some people have been preaching that a Minister of Education could be a dictator and that the English Catholics could be in jeopardy because of this bill. I say this: My experience after having lived all my life in this Province is that English Catholics and minorities generally have always been very well treated.; we should never be concerned when an elected man is going to direct the destiny of education within our Province, because if that public-elected servant does not fulfil his duties, if he has not got the qualities, then the people have the opportunity by a democratic vote to relieve him of his duties. I think it is time that public men at all levels of government face the issues, but face them honestly and bring the facts before their constituents. When you hear some of our educators giving instructions to the brigadiers who are protecting our children at school crossings, you would think non-french speaking children should not be protected at school crossings. I am sure no French-speaking parent would want to leave non French speaking children without protection. Mr. Speaker, now we have a Minister of Education a public servant to whom we can bring our grievance. I have had complaints about accidents and have had the police investigate them. I have sent the police report to the School Commission of Montréal about some of the educators who gave instruction which, in every effect allowed every other child, except those who are french-speaking, to be open to accident. That happened in the sixties. And, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that a member of our Police Department a french canadian brought the fact to the attention of school authorities. For 45 years we have been promoting unity, friendship, coexistence within this Province, particularly in the south-west area of Montréal, in St. Ann's, St. Cergonde, Ville Emard, Cote St. Paul. We don't want to go back 45 years when school children fought each other. I believe we have a government today in the Province of Québec that is going to stand firm and see to it that we have a united Canada that both, upper and lower Canada will be united and we will coexist, and that our children will grow up, not with viciousness and animosity in their hearts but they will grow up regardless of whether their colour is black or white, whether they

are Christian or Jew, as a united people.

Tonight I am pleased to say Mr. Speaker, that we are on the right track and that we are going to go ahead and not go back to the days of violence, because of race, religion nor colour.

Mr. Speaker, I will say no more so this bill can be adopted immediately, but once again I take the liberty to speak for the English, the majority of English-Catholic, religious institutions and parents. They are confident in the young constitutional lawyer who is the Minister of Youth, and they are confident that English Catholics will be protected in regard to education, regardless of the small, weak, but well-publicized movement which is still opposing the principle of a Minister of Education. The majority of serious-minded English Catholic clergymen and laymen are in favour.

FROM THE PARLIAMENT IN QUEBEC RE BILL 60

MR. HANLEY: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I would like to give my opinion why I will support the Government in forcing school commissions to adopt budgets that will meet the needs of education to-day.

I will admit the errors that I made as administrator, twenty-years ago, by not enforcing compulsory education and that the scholars of twenty-years ago are unemployed today because they do not have eleventh grade education, I feel that I am justified in correcting the errors that I have been responsible for, for twenty years and I am not going to make the same mistake today.

Mr. President, I have read with great interest over the years that School Commissions provided a budget that was not sufficient to carry them through the fiscal school period, and they approached the Governments to take care of their deficits. I admit again that I was wrong as a member of Parliament to accept the demands of School Commissions during the last fifteen years because they lacked the courage to provide the necessary funds within their own constituencies.

Mr. President, ninety percent of my work within my office is employment and welfare. And the problem of employment to-day, I admit, is because our people lack eleventh grade education. And I feel that the Government is justified in insisting that school commissions provide a budget., that is required to carry out education and that school commissions, if they lack the courage to go before the taxpayers and present the facts today that were not presented twenty years ago, then the school commissions should not be representing the public or the taxpayers.

Mr. President, in conclusion the problem is the poor working man or the masses will be faced with this burden of increased taxation. If we tax industry one hundred percent for education, naturally the cost of living will go up and again our working class and our masses will have to take care of the requirements concerning the cost of living. If we tax, as we do, our proprietors on education, the tax is always passed on to the tenant and again the masses or the working man is faced with the problem of education so I think it is time, Mr. President that we stood up and we faced the issues and that from now on in twenty years from now, our scholars of today will be qualified for employment and they will not be unemployed and I think that we will be rendering him a very honest service.

JANVIER 1964

Therefore, I have never shirked in my duties of increased taxes, I was evicted from the City Council of Montreal by three policemen because I objected to cutting the budget by \$4,000,000 and nine months later the Administration had to appeal to the Provincial Government for special legislation to transfer funds to carry them through the fiscal years because they were fooling the public, I was against the Administration decreasing the right of taxation during one of the terms because you can never decrease taxes today in my opinion it is physically and practically impossible. Therefore, I think the legislators and the government of today should be congratulated because they have courage in facing this issue and forcing the School Commissions to bring before the taxpayers of their constituencies the facts, therefore, I shall vote for the government legislations against the amendment.

JANVIER 1964

Monsieur l'orateur, Très brièvement, j'aimerais donner la raison pour laquelle j'appuie le gouvernement qui oblige les commissions scolaires à adopter des budgets dont notre éducation a besoin. J'admettrai les erreurs que j'ai commises, il y a 20 ans alors que j'étais l'un des administrateurs, quand je n'ai pas appuyé l'éducation obligatoire. Maintenant, les étudiants d'il y a 20 ans sont sans emploi parce qu'ils n'ont pas leur certificat de 11ème année, et j'estime que j'ai raison de corriger les erreurs que j'ai faites dans le passé, mais que je ne recommencerai pas aujourd'hui.

Monsieur le président, j'ai lu avec intérêt que les commissions scolaires avaient un budget qui n'était pas suffisant pour leur année, et qu'elles ont approché les autorités gouvernementales afin qu'elles comblient leur déficit. J'admets encore que j'étais dans l'erreur comme député, d'accepter les demandes des commissions scolaires durant les 15 dernières années passées, parce qu'elles ont manqué de courage pour se procurer les moyens nécessaires dans leur propre rayon d'action.

Monsieur le président, 90% de mon travail de bureau représente des demandes d'emploi et de service de bien-être social . Et le problème de chômage aujourd'hui, je l'admets, réside dans le fait que les gens ne se sont pas rendus jusqu'à la 11ème année. Pour être journalier conducteur de camions, etc, il faut passer des examens et avoir une 11ème année. Et j'estime que le gouvernement est justifié d'insister pour que les commissions scolaires aient le budget requis pour les besoins de l'éducation, et qu'elles présentent les faits aujourd'hui, faits, qu'elles n'ont pas eu le courage de présenter il y a 20 ans. Si elles ne peuvent faire cela, alors les commissaires ne devraient pas représenter le public ni les payeurs de taxes.

Monsieur le président, le problème réside dans le fait que l'homme de la rue et les autres se verront infliger le fardeau de l'augmentation de taxes. Si nous taxons les industries à 100% pour l'éducation, naturellement le coût de la vie augmentera et les gens de classe moyenne en souffriront. Si nous taxons les propriétaires comme nous le faisons présentement, ces taxes retomberont sur les locataires et là encore, les gens de classe ouvrière feront face au problème de l'éducation. Alors je pense, monsieur le président, qu'il est temps de regarder les choses en face, alors que dans 20 ans, nos étudiants auront l'instruction voulue pour se procurer l'emploi de leur choix, ce sera leur rendre un grand service

JANVIER 1964

Je n'ai jamais négligé mes devoirs quand il s'agissait d'augmenter les taxes. A Montréal, on m'a évincé de la Salle du Conseil avec l'aide de trois policiers, parce que je m'objectais à la réduction du budget de 4 millions, et 9 mois après cet incident, l'Administration devait faire appel au gouvernement provincial afin de transférer des fonds qui leur permettraient de terminer l'année fiscale, car elle avait trompé le public. Durant un terme, j'ai été contre l'Administration parce qu'elle s'octroyait le droit de réduire les taxes, ce qui, à mon opinion est pratiquement impossible.

Alors je pense que le présent gouvernement devrait être félicité pour son courage en faisant face à ce problème et en forçant les commissions scolaires à porter les faits à l'attention des payeurs de taxes, donc je vote en faveur du gouvernement, contre l'amendement.

JANVIER 1964

1-A

Québec, le 31 décembre 1965.

Sénateur Robert Kennedy,
Edifice Législatif,
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

Cher Sénateur,

Le contenu de cette lettre sera d'un grand intérêt pour le Sénateur Mackell et pour vous-même ainsi que pour les industriels de l'état de New-York.

En résumé, le gouvernement du Québec est très inquiet au sujet de la politique de réserrement du crédit du Président Johnson et discute de la possibilité d'appliquer des mesures restrictives aux filiales américaines installées dans la province. Tout spécialement aux firmes qui ont des intérêts dans nos ressources naturelles et dans l'industrie des pâtes et papiers.

Etant l'unique membre indépendant de la Législature Québécoise, j'ai, en plusieurs occasions, parlé en faveur des investissements américains au Québec. J'ai souvent fait remarquer que sans les milliards de dollars américains engagés dans la découverte et la transformation de nos ressources naturelles, Québec, sans aucun doute, resterait une province agricole inefficace au lieu de l'usine génératrice de la nation comme on se plaît souvent à la décrire.

Il est fort possible que, à cause de la décision du Président, le gouvernement du Québec songe à nationaliser l'industrie minière et forestière. Je considère qu'il est de mon devoir de vous rendre conscient de cette possibilité due au fait de ma grande amitié pour les Etats-Unis et aussi parce que, comme membre de la Législature, je dois me soucier de l'économie de notre province à cause des restrictions imposées par les Etats-Unis.

1-

Par conséquent, je vous suggère de discuter avec le Sénateur Kennedy de la possibilité et de l'opportunité d'aborder cette question délicate qui crée une situation fort tendue: d'étudier des moyens susceptibles d'amener le Président à reconsidérer sa position en ce qui a trait à la politique de resserrement du crédit telle qu'elle est appliquée au Canada en général et tout particulièrement à la Province de Québec.

Amitiés sincères,

FH/lr

FRANK HANLEY, M.P.P.
Comté Montréal-Ste-Anne.

Janvier 11, 1966.

Frank Hanley, m.p.p.
Bureau des Conseillers,
Ville de Montréal,
Hôtel de Ville,
Montréal, Canada.

Cher Frank,

Je suis peiné de ne pas avoir vu passer quelque temps avec toi aujourd'hui et ceci à cause de certains problèmes de réorganisation du Sénat. Samedi, le 8 janvier, j'ai lu un reportage au sujet du problème sur lequel tu as attiré mon attention et ainsi je suis donc bien renseigné.

2-

Je suis bien au courant du problème que tu me soumets mais je me demande si je suis en position d'être un porte-parole sur le sujet car mon champ d'activité se limite au niveau de l'Etat. Cependant, je crois que le Sénateur Kennedy serait l'homme tout indiqué et j'espère le rencontrer bientôt.

J'anticipe le plaisir de te voir personnellement très bientôt.

Amitiés sincères,

THOMAS MACKELL



ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE

PROVINCE DE QUEBEC

Discours du Conseiller Frank Hanley, M.A.L.,
à l'Assemblée Législative,
le 25 janvier 1966.

Monsieur l'Orateur,

A l'ouverture de la présente session comme à l'ouverture de toutes les sessions précédentes de l'Assemblée Législative, je prévois que, bon nombre de députés, comme moi, feront un examen de conscience au moment de s'attaquer à la tâche d'améliorer les conditions de vie dans notre Province.

Comme l'a souligné le Premier Ministre dans son discours du Trône, de nombreuses lois sont nécessaires. Personne ici ne peut s'imaginer que la présente session sera facile. Nous avons beaucoup à faire pour transformer la Province comme nous le souhaitons.

Puisque nous ne disposons que de peu de temps, Monsieur l'Orateur, je ne m'attarderai pas ici à des questions qui me semblent pourtant méritées d'être étudiées par l'Assemblée.

Par exemple, je ne compte pas traiter des réformes dont le besoin se fait fortement sentir, telle que la transformation radicale de nos lois archaïques



ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE

PROVINCE DE QUEBEC

- 2 -

de divorce, lois qui obligent des milliers de couples à entretenir des liaisons, à vivre en marge de la société.

Nos lois archaïques de divorce, Monsieur l'Orateur, qui assombrissent l'avenir d'innombrables enfants du Québec, en plus de les stigmatiser d'ilégitimité.

Pour ma part, je ne comprends vraiment pas comment un enfant, quel qu'il soit, puisse être "illégitime" mais c'est pourtant là le stigmate que ces innocents doivent porter.

Je n'ai pas non plus l'intention de m'attarder sur le fait assez évident que nous importons de la main-d'œuvre spécialisée, tandis que nous refusons à nos propres ouvriers l'occasion de se spécialiser et de commander un meilleur salaire. Quantités de mesures pourraient retenir notre attention, mais je me limiterai à deux questions fondamentales:

La première, de première importance, est celle de légaliser les loteries. C'est un besoin vital pour notre Province. Nous pourrions lever des fonds sans recourir à la taxation directe, méthode souvent dou-



ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE

PROVINCE DE QUEBEC

- 3 -

loureuse. Bref, ce serait une façon d'obtenir les fonds dont l'Etat a besoin, sans entamer encore davantage le salaire des travailleurs.

Comme tout Irlandais, j'ai une tendresse particulière pour l'Irlande. Nous honorons notre pays d'origine tous les 17 mars, que nous nous appelions O'Flaherty, Archambault, Schwartz ou Martinelli. On m'a fustigé de m'être exprimé sur cette question, Monsieur l'Orateur, on m'a insulté et même diffamé dans les journaux et à la radio. Mais je reste ferme; la charité bien ordonnée commence chez soi, et chez moi, Monsieur l'Orateur, c'est le quartier Sainte-Anne dans la Ville de Montréal, Province de Québec. Je suis heureux et satisfait qu'il en soit ainsi.

De plus, je trouve ridicule de saigner notre économie de millions de dollars pour soutenir les hôpitaux d'Irlande, ou de tout autre pays quel qu'il soit.

A mon avis, il est injuste qu'un citoyen du Québec envoie de l'argent dans un pays étranger, que ce soit pour réaliser un rêve, par un billet de loterie, ou pour planter un arbre alors que des gens sont dans le besoin ici dans notre Province.



ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE

PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC

- 4 -

Si ces propos vous semblent familiers, Messieurs, c'est que je les répète à chaque session depuis le jour où en 1948, j'ai prononcé mon premier discours en cette Assemblée et préconisé la légalisation des loteries. Je crois fermement que la Province de Québec devrait organiser sa propre loterie, une loterie où courraient lors d'une course spéciale tenue soit à Blue Bonnets ou soit au Parc Richelieu à Montréal, des chevaux pur sang élevés au Canada. Cette course devrait rivaliser en prestige avec celle du Queen's Plate de Toronto. Course qui s'accompagnerait de tout l'éclat et de tout le déploiement qui s'attachent à de tels évènements. Et les profits, Monsieur l'Orateur, resteraient ici, dans la Province de Québec.

Une telle loterie soulagerait nos agents de la corvée embarrassante des arrestations destinées à faire respecter une loi interdisant ce qui est devenu un véritable passe-temps national. Cette situation est franchement ridicule. D'une part, les journaux publient la photo des gagnants des loteries, accompagnée de longs articles nous expliquant comment ils proposent de dépenser cette fortune qui leur échoit soudainement. D'autre part, ce-



ASSEMBLÉE LEGISLATIVE

PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC

- 5 -

lui qui a vendu le billet chanceux se fait arrêter et traduire en cour. Je crois que tous les honorables députés en cette salle conviendront du caractère lamentable de cet état de choses.

Combien d'entre vous ici consentiriez à jurer que vous n'avez jamais acheté un billet de tirage ou de loterie? Très peu, je suppose. Examinez votre conscience, Messieurs, et vous conviendrez, comme le disait Barry Goldwater dans sa campagne, "qu'au fond de votre coeur, vous savez qu'il a raison."

Il n'y a pas que la légalisation des loteries à accomplir dans notre Province de Québec. Il existe un autre problème peut-être plus important et qui exige une solution.

Il faut que la population de langue anglaise de notre Province se joigne à celle de langue française pour combattre les injustices qui se produisent à l'intérieur de nos frontières.

Il ne faut plus que des familles n'aient pour subsister que le salaire de \$32.00 par semaine du père. Il faut que les enfants des taudis cessent de considérer un sandwich à la moutarde ou une tartine de mélasse comme un mets fin, un vrai régal. Il faut mettre un frein à la ten-



ASSEMBLÉE LEGISLATIVE
PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC

- 6 -

dance qu'a notre société de placer les masses au service des intellectuels. Je veux dire qu'il faut mettre un terme aux projets chimériques des intellectuels. Ce sont ceux qui agissent, non pas ceux qui rêvent, qui apporteront l'abondance à notre société. Il faut revenir à ceux qui croient nécessaire d'établir notre économie sur des réalités concrètes. Les besoins des classes inférieures et moyennes doivent recevoir priorité absolue dans notre pensée et dans nos projets.

La loi du salaire minimum de cette Province doit être révisée et appliquée dans toute sa force et l'entreprise privée, sous toutes ses formes, doit être prête à prouver qu'elle se conforme à cette loi, tant en théorie qu'en pratique. Si nous sommes engagés dans une guerre contre la pauvreté, nous allons essayer de trouver où se trouve notre ennemi.

Laissons les entreprises privées produirent les noms de leurs employés gagnant moins de \$60.00 pour la semaine de 40 heures, et avec ces informations, armons-nous.. Nous aurons une meilleure idée de ce que nous sommes. Dans la lutte que nous effectuons contre la pauvreté, les entreprises privées devront s'unir à nous, en faisant leur demande au Gouvernement afin d'augmenter les salaires minimum à travers la Province de Québec.



ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE
PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC

- 7 -

Sans se préoccuper du niveau économique des différentes régions, en faisant cela, ils aideront à désigner les régions qui sont dans la pauvreté à longueur d'année. Nous devons aussi demander à l'entreprise privée d'expliquer pourquoi elle hésite à participer de bon coeur aux plans de construction de logis à loyers modiques préconisés par le gouvernement et à l'amélioration des conditions d'habitation des gens à faibles revenus.

Monsieur l'Orateur, il me semble que tous, nous devrions prendre conscience du fait que lentement mais combien sûrement, nous nous acheminons vers la socialisation. C'est une marée que nous ne pouvons pas retenir. Il n'y a pas de roi Canut parmi nous aujourd'hui bien qu'il semble que certains dans la Province de Québec se soient donnés la tâche futile de s'opposer au progrès.

Bref, Monsieur l'Orateur, voilà les deux points fondamentaux. En ces jours de tension entre nos deux races fondatrices, bien que je n'aime pas tellement ce mot, lorsque je songe aux Indiens du Québec et aux Esquimaux en ces jours de tension, nous devons nous unir pour combattre les injustices dans la Province que nous partageons. Il faut faire cesser ces rivalités entre nous.

Qui s'inquiète, en cette année 1966, de savoir quels ancê-



ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE

PROVINCE DE QUEBEC

- 8 -

tres ont été les plus heureux ou les plus valeureux à la guerre deux siècles déjà. Nombreux sont ceux, à l'extérieur de cette Province, qui se réjouissent de nos dissensions.

"Diviser pour Conquérir" est un axiome aussi vieux que le monde.

Ne laissons pas semblable malheur se produire chez-nous.

Allocution de
M. le Conseiller Frank Hanley, M.P.P.,
à l'Université Sir George Williams
18 février 1966.

3-

Pour être communiqué
à 1 heure p.m. le 18 février.

Les Français prennent la relève
et vous feriez mieux de vous en convaincre.

En effet, chers étudiants, les Français prennent la relève et vous feriez mieux de le croire. Ceci est un fait. Ceci nous ramène à la Bataille des Plaines d'Abraham mais cette fois la bataille s'acheminera vers un dénouement beaucoup plus logique.

De plus en plus des noms canadiens-français apparaissent au tableau des bureaux de direction, de plus en plus des Canadiens français deviennent présidents de corporations et la tendance est là pour qui veut bien s'en rendre compte et n'est pas complètement aveugle.

Je vous prédis que d'ici le très court laps de temps d'environ cinq ans, le Canadien français aura assumé le contrôle de cette province ainsi que de son économie.

Est-ce que quelqu'un se demande comment? Il y a plusieurs manières de procéder; une de ces manières pourrait être pour un gouvernement, disons un gouvernement municipal, de socialiser tout le territoire commercial et industriel situé dans ses limites.

C'est assez simple n'est-ce pas? L'entreprise privée se trouverait tout à coup entre les mains d'un nouveau propriétaire.

Ceci serait tout un choc pour ceux qui tournent en rond et qui font des affaires n'est-ce pas? Alors, ils m'écouteraienr peut-être lorsque je leur dis qu'il est grand temps qu'ils se joignent à nous tous dans cette guerre que nous menons contre la pauvreté.

En passant, chers étudiants, quand nous faisons la guerre il est normal que nous sachions d'abord qui est l'ennemi. Je n'hésite pas à vous dire que l'ennemi, dans la guerre que nous menons contre la pauvreté, c'est l'employeur qui inscrit moins de \$60.00 sur le chèque de paye d'un employé non spécialisé pour une semaine de 40 heures d'ouvrage.

Voilà l'ennemi et vous feriez bien de croire cela aussi. Moi pour un, ainsi que plusieurs d'entre vous jeunes gens, nous menons cette guerre sur un champ de bataille urbain. Je parle pour les citadins vivant dans des taudis. Les fermiers semblent se tirer assez bien d'affaire par le temps qui court, du moins Québec et Ottawa ont uni leurs efforts pour leur octroyer \$23,000,000. en subsides pour compenser les pertes subies par la pluie et la gelée.

Je suis très heureux qu'ils aient eu cette aide car, croyez-moi, ils en avaient grandement besoin. Mais d'un autre côté, je crois qu'il serait approprié si la triste situation du citadin était aussi considérée.

Que dire des pauvres diables de citadins qui sont mis dans le chemin à cause d'un incendie ou qui sont purement et simplement évincés de leur logis? Que dire du petit marchand dont le maigre stock de marchandises est ruiné par une inondation?

C'est ici que l'entreprise privée a une merveilleuse occasion de combler la lacune. Une occasion unique de descendre de leurs tours d'ivoire pour se placer au niveau des masses.

Pourquoi les Chambres de commerce et d'autres corps intermédiaires n'ont-ils pas mis sur pied un fonds de secours pour les pauvres familles économiquement faibles? Pourquoi, après une décennie de prospérité, n'ont-ils pas établi un "Fonds de Secours Urbain" pour venir en aide à ceux qui n'ont pas eu leur part de cette prospérité?

Qu'attendent-ils? Un soulèvement des jeunes économiquement faibles?

Oh! je sais, ils vont essayer de m'invectiver, de me ridiculiser, et surtout ils vont essayer de me faire essuyer la défaite à nouveau.

Eh bien! Je les mets au défi d'essayer de me faire essuyer la défaite. J'ai été amené à faire de la politique par les Canadiens français au début des années 30. Les Canadiens français et quelques membres de minorités m'ont gardé dans la politique depuis lors. Certains membres du corps professoral français ont manifesté une certaine inquiétude au sujet des généreuses contributions du Premier Ministre Lesage pour l'avancement pédagogique des minorités.

6-

Ils m'ont gardé dans la politique parce que je me suis battu pour défendre leurs droits 7 jours par semaine à Québec, à l'Hôtel de Ville et dans les rues de Montréal.

J'ai la ferme intention de continuer à me battre pour défendre les droits de mes électeurs même si ceux qui contrôlent la vaste industrie se sentent mal à l'aise.

Il est temps que ces capitalistes entrent dans les coeurs des gagne-petit - j'ai été dans leurs coeurs pendant 30 ans et je sais qu'il y a place pour eux là aussi - s'ils se méritent une place -

Mais ils ne s'y mériteront jamais une place à moins qu'ils n'aient eux-mêmes, dans leurs propres coeurs, un sentiment de sollicitude pour le pauvre gueux des taudis.

Il est temps pour l'entreprise privée de se joindre au gouvernement dans le champ d'activité du bien-être social.

Il est temps pour ces gens d'investir dans le peuple. S'ils le faisaient ils y trouveraient des profits beaucoup plus élevés.

Alors, pour la 26ème année, je fais un pressant appel au riche industriel ... démolissez nos taudis et construisez des logements à prix modique ou rapportant des dividendes restreints.

La minute fatidique approche pour eux. Elle approche rapidement, messieurs, parce que vous les jeunes de 18 ans possédez maintenant le droit de vote. Je suis l'un de ceux qui s'est battu longtemps et durement pour vous obtenir ce droit de suffrage et j'espère que vous vous en servirez sagement.

7-

J'espère que vous l'utiliserez pour stimuler la réforme sociale et vous unir à moi dans ma campagne pour aider l'étudiant économiquement faible à parfaire son cours universitaire et aussi pour empêcher ceux qui seraient tenter de lâcher. Que pensez-vous de ce slogan: "Aidez à éliminer le lâcheur"?

J'espère que plusieurs parmi vous ici aujourd'hui vont poursuivre des études de post-gradués et devenir professeurs - car nous aurons besoin de nombreux professeurs en raison du fait qu'un plus grand nombre de jeunes gens sont en mesure de fréquenter l'université.

J'espère que vous allez utiliser votre bulletin de vote pour venir en aide à ceux qui seraient en mesure de forcer l'industrie privée à payer au travailleur non spécialisé au moins un salaire de \$60.00, pour une semaine de 40 heures d'ouvrage afin que son fils n'ait pas à quitter l'école pour aller travailler afin d'amener de la nourriture sur la table familiale.

J'espère que vous utiliserez votre bulletin de vote d'une manière plus sage que ceux qui n'ont pas voulu se joindre à "U G E Q". Ceci ne s'applique pas autant ici au Sir George Williams que là-bas au McGill.

Pourquoi eux là-bas ne sont-ils pas capables de voir ce qui est écrit sur le mur bien que ce soit là en toute évidence, bien colorié et éclairé au néon.

Par leur vote ils se sont eux-mêmes séparés du principal courant de la vie étudiante dans la Province de Québec, parce que s'ils ne s'unissent pas au Canadien français dans la vie étudiante au Québec ils vont vite s'apercevoir qu'il n'y a pas de place du tout pour eux dans la vie étudiante du Québec.

Messieurs, ce sont les règles du jeu. C'est aussi simple que cela - Il y en a encore plusieurs qui ne sentent pas ce cent de renouveau qui balaie la province. Cela s'applique aussi pour le campus de McGill.

Ce sont des autruches cherchant assez de sable pour y enfouir leurs têtes.

A ce stade-ci, j'aimerais déclarer que la promesse du Ministre de l'Education, l'Honorable Paul Gérin-Lajoie, à l'effet que la Province de Québec aura des écoles neutres, marque un grand pas dans la voie du progrès.

Je n'ai jamais pu réellement comprendre pourquoi nos enfants étaient séparés à cause de la religion de leurs parents. J'ai toujours pensé que ceci n'était pas bien. Je crois encore que c'est une fausse notion et je crois de plus que c'est une des raisons fondamentales pour l'intolérance qui se manifeste si souvent ici dans notre province.

Les enfants sont des enfants et n'ont pas, de leur nature, cette idée d'intolérance en eux. L'intériorité est une chose que l'on apprend et, à mon sens, le moyen le plus sûr de l'inculquer aux enfants est de les séparer quand ils sont jeunes et surtout à l'âge où ils sont très impressionnables.

9-

C'est pourquoi je tiens à féliciter le Ministre pour cette sage décision et j'espère que dans un avenir rapproché, il pourra mettre sa politique en oeuvre.

A propos, ce n'était pas mon intention de porter la parole ici aujourd'hui. Je pensais que j'aurais à discuter avec les dirigeants de l'université de l'opportunité de construire encore une autre partie de l'université Sir George Williams ici dans la partie haute de la ville.

Je suis contre ce projet. Je ne vois pas pourquoi vous devriez avoir un autre campus en béton quand il vous en fait un de verdure. Je crois que ce dont vous avez besoin c'est d'un champ de football, un losange de baseball, de l'air frais et de beaucoup d'espace pour prendre vos ébats.

La haute direction pensait autrement et nous étions pour discuter de ceci aujourd'hui. Cependant, ils ont changé d'idée pour une raison ou pour une autre.

Je n'ai plus rien à ajouter sur ce sujet.

COUNCILLOR FRANK HANLEY, M.L.A.

TO:

The OUTREMONT CURLING CLUB

MARCH 16th, 1968

"WE THE IRISH"

GENTLEMEN:

FIRST LET ME EXPRESS MY PLEASURE TO FIND MYSELF IN OUTREMONT,
IT IS A PART OF CANADA, I PRESUME?

NOT TO MENTION ALSO BEING HERE ON SUCH AN AUSPICIOUS OCCASION
AS THE VERY EVE OF ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

AND THIS BEING TRUE, IT IS MOST APPROPRIATE THAT I SPEAK OF
WE, THE IRISH AND OF THE ILLUSTRIOS HIBERNIAN NAMES THAT ARE ENGRAVED
ON THE ANNALS OF MONTREAL'S HISTORY.

NAMES SUCH AS THAT OF THE BELOVED ALDERMAN THOMAS O'CONNEL,
AND SURE ALDERMAN TOM'S SON DAN, DARCY AND GRAND SON TOM, ARE PRESENT
HERE TO-DAY.

TOM O'CONNEL ESTABLISHED A RECORD FOR ST. ANN'S BY REPRESENTING
IT AT CITY COUNCIL FROM 1906 TO 1938---A RECORD THAT WILL BE VERY HARD
TO BEAT.

HOWEVER THERE'S A FLAG ON THE PLAY, AS THEY SAY IN THAT GAME
OUR ALOUETTES HAVE DIFFICULTY LEARNING; IN THE DAYS OF ALDERMAN TOM,
ST. ANN'S WAS A SMALL, BUT VERY IMPORTANT, RIDING.

TODAY, IT STRETCHES FROM BERRI STREET TO ROSE DE LIMA, SHERBROOKE ST. TO THE WATERFRONT, AND THE VOTING POPULATION IS PREDOMINATELY FRENCH-SPEAKING WHICH SUITS ME FINE, BECAUSE THE IRISH DON'T VOTE FOR ME ANYWAY.

SINCE ALDERMAN TOM'S DAY, THE AMOUNT OF VOTES IN ST. ANN'S HAS RISEN FROM 2000 TO 35,000, AND THAT SHOULD GIVE YOU A FAIR IDEA OF HOW THE IMPORTANCE OF THE WARD GREW WHILE ITS RACIAL INFLUENCE CHANGED. SUCH IS THE STATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF HANLEY.

I THOUGHT I'D GET A PLUG IN FOR MYSELF SOMEWHERE, AS MY FRIENDS ARE THROWING A SURPRISE BANQUET FOR ME ON APRIL 27th, AND I WANTED TO GIVE THEM SOMETHING TO PUT IN THE PROGRAM, BY THE WAY, THE PARTY IS TO CELEBRATE MY TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY IN PROVINCIAL POLITICS.

OH YES, I AM A VETERAN OF BOTH CITY HALL AND QUEBEC LEGISLATURE WARS, AND, WOULD YOU BELIEVE THE FUTURE MAYOR OF MONTREAL?

KEEP LAUGHING, GENTLEMEN, I'LL TELL YOU WHEN TO STOP.

IT HAS BEEN 56 YEARS SINCE MONTREAL HAS HAD AN IRISH MAYOR; TAKE A GOOD LOOK, GENTLEMEN, HERE IS THE NEXT ONE.

YOU MAY RESUME LAUGHING.

OKAY? NOW I'LL LET YOU IN ON A LITTLE THING CALLED "THE IRISH JOKE". MY FRENCH-SPEAKING CONCITOYENS ARE URGING ME TO RUN FOR THE MAYOR'S OFFICE, AND I, AS THEIR SERVANT, HAVE LITTLE CHOICE BUT TO CARRY OUT THEIR INSTRUCTIONS.

ALL OF WHICH BRINGS US BACK TO 1887, WHEN JERRY MC SHANE, A ST. ANN'S ANNOUNCED HE WAS RUNNING FOR THE QUEBEC LEGISLATURE. THE DERISION CAME FAST AND FURIOUS AND THE LAUGHTER COULD BE HEARD IN "TERRERONNE" COUNTY.

"YOU, AN IRISHMAN," THEY LAUGHED, "YOU AND YOUR FEATHERED HAT AND BIG DRINKS OF SITTING IN A PREDOMINATELY FRENCH-SPEAKING PARLIAMENT? HOW FUNNY!" AND HERE IS WHERE THE IRISH JOKE COMES IN; MC SHANE NOT ONLY WAS ELECTED, HE HELD TWO PORTFOLIOS; THOSE OF AGRICULTURE AND PUBLIC WORKS.

THEY STOPPED LAUGHING OF COURSE, BUT STARTED AGAIN WHEN MC SHANE STEPPED DOWN FROM PROVINCIAL POLITICS TO ANNOUNCE HE WAS RUNNING FOR MAYOR OF MONTREAL.

ALL WAS HILARITY IN THE STREETS OF THE POINT & FAUVEREAU HILARITY, THAT IS, UNTIL HE BECAME HIS WORSHIP THE HONORABLE MC SHANE, MAYOR. AND, AS AN ENCORE MC SHANE BECAME HARBOUR MASTER WELL

THAT, MY FRIENDS, IS THE IRISH JOKE AND, AS HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF, I PLAN TO PLAY THE IRISH JOKE ON YOU. COULDN'T HAVE PICKED A BETTER DAY TO WARN YOU, EITHER THIS BEING THE END OF ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

THINK IT'S INCREDIBLE, DO YOU? WELL, GENTLEMEN, NOTHING IS IMPOSSIBLE TO US, THE IRISH.

DO YOU THINK THE SCOTS INVENTED CURLING? THEY DID NOTHING OF THE KIND. THE IRISH DID.

IT HAPPENED DURING A HUNNYSKOK IN DUBLIN WHEN THE BATTLE RS
WERE TOO TIRED TO LIFT STONES AND THROW THEM, SO THEY SLID THEM ALONG
THE GROUND AT EACH OTHER.

THAT'S HOW THE IRISH INVENTED CURLING

ALTHOUGH THEY LAID A FALSE CLAIM TO THE GAME, I HOLD THE SCOTS
IN DEEP AFFECTION. THEY'RE THE ONES WITH THE BRAINS TO MAKE MONEY, THE
ONES WITH THE TALENT FOR FINANCIAL SUCCESS.

THINK OF THE NAMES OF THE BUSINESS LEADERS OF TODAY: THE HOWARD
WEBSTERS, THE DONALD GORDONS, THE MACGREGORS, THE UDOS, THE SINCLAIRS;
THE CRUMPS AND THE MACLELLANS; SCOTSMEN ALL, ALTHOUGH YOU DON'T GET TO
SEE THEM IN KILTS EXCEPT AT ST. ANDREW'S BALL.

"SCOTLAND FOREVER" IS THEIR BATTLECRY EVEN AS "THERE'LL ALWAYS
BE AN ENGLAND" IS THAT OF THE BRITISH.

AND WHILE I AM OF THAT RACE WHICH HAS FOUGHT THE BRITISH FOR
GENERATIONS, I MUST CONFESS THAT IT IS WITH SADNESS THAT I SEE THE
BRITISH EMPIRE, THE EMPIRE THAT HELPED KEEP THE WORLD FREE IN TWO MAJOR
WARS, FADE INTO A MINOR ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS.

LET'S HOPE IT IS JUST A CASE OF THE BRITISH LION AND BULLDOG,
BUISSED AND BATTERED FROM THE LENGTHY STRUGGLE, ARE JUST LYING DOWN TO
REST BEFORE RISING TO FIGHT AGAIN.

BUT ON THIS EVE OF ST. PATRICKS, OUR MOTHER COUNTRY AND THE MEN
WE SENT TO MONTREAL TO STRAIGHTEN THINGS OUT, MUST BE FOREMOST IN OUR
THOUGHTS.

AND STRAIGHTEN THINGS OUT WE, THE IRISH, MUST CERTAINLY DO.
THERE ARE, HOWEVER, A FEW THINGS LEFT TO STRAIGHTEN OUT, AND WHEN I
AM MAYOR OF MONTREAL, WITH THE HELP OF DRAPEAU'S CIVIC PARTY, I INTEND
TO DO JUST THAT. OH YES, BUT I DO.

OF COURSE, I WILL INHERIT ON BEHALF OF MONTREALERS, \$9,000,000,000
IN CITY DEBTS---KNOWING THE FEELING OF MONTREALERS REGARDING INCHES/SEED
TAXES---I HAVE THE ANSWER.

AT THE START, MONTREALERS MAY BE FACED WITH SOME ECONOMIC PROBLEMS,
BUT THEY SHOULDN'T LAST. I'VE ALREADY BEGUN NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN
COMMON MARKET, AND THE CHANCES ARE EXCELLENT THAT WE WILL BE ACCEPTED INTO
THE FAMILY, ESPECIALLY IF OUR IRISH WHISKEY IS AS GOOD AS I THINK IT WILL

I WOULD THINK THAT THE CITY OF MONTREAL WOULD PROVE A GREAT TOURIST
DRAW AND THIS WILL CONTRIBUTE SIGNIFICANTLY TO OUR ECONOMY. I HAVE FAITH
IN OUR FORTHCOMING FUTURE BECAUSE WE ARE PREPARED TO OUTFIT QUEBEC

QUEBEC HAS BEEN INDICATING THAT IT FAVORS A PROVINCIAL LOTTERY
WHICH THAT MAY BE ALRIGHT, AS FAR AS IT GOES, BUT MONTREALERS INTEND TO GO
FURTHER. OUR CITY WILL HAVE GAMBLING CASINOS A-PLenty AND, WITH THE PRO-
TEC AT THE JACK OF THE IRISH AS WELL AS CROOKED DEALERS, WE SHOULD HAVE A
PROBLEMA.

ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY BEING SET UP FOR US IS THIS RADIO-QUEBEC. I
WILL GO EASY ON MY PARLIAMENTARY COLLEAGUES AND ASK ONLY THAT IT BE CALLED
"RADIO-FREE-QUEBEC" FOR OPENERS.

THEY WILL SOONLY REALIZE, OF COURSE, WHAT A MISTAKE THEY HAVE MADE. THE OBVIOUS STEP -- WHICH I WILL TAKE --- WILL BE TO BRING THIS OUTFIT WHERE THE STRENGTH IS: ST. ANN.

SO: "RADIO-ST. ANN." IF THEY WANT TO BE PRECISE.

THEN, THE STROKE OF REALITY. "REFH"... "RADIO-FREE-HANLEY" THE VOICE OF ST. ANN, DUBBED AND ALL "REALLY FREE PEOPLE."

WE HAVE OTHER PLANS TOO TO KEEP THE TOURISTS HAPPY, BUT I DON'T THINK I SHOULD GO INTO THEM HERE.

WHEN I AM MAYOR, I WILL HIRE MORE IRISH COPS. IT TAKES AN IRISH COP TO DISPENSE INSTANT JUSTICE.

WHY, BACK THERE IN JIMMY MCSHANE'S DAY, A RAMBUNCTIOUS DRUNK GOT A BLOODY NOSE INSTEAD OF A POLICE RECORD. THOSE WHO MANAGED TO GET THEMSELVES FLOPPED FOUND THEMSELVES SLUGGING IT OUT TOE-TO-TOE WITH A SON OF OLD IRIN IN PRIME.

AND WHEN THE BATTLE WAS OVER THE DRUNK WAS PUT TO SLEEP IN THE TANK UNTIL HE SOBERED UP AND THEN WAS SENT HOME TO FACE ANOTHER BATTLE WITH HIS WIFE. DA FINI LA!

TODAY, LET A GUY GET STONED AND HE'S MORE THAN LIKELY TO WAKE UP IN JAIL JUST IN TIME TO FACE A DOZEN CHARGES. WHAT KIND OF JUSTICE IS THAT? THE SELLING OF LIQUOR IS A MULTI-MILLION DOLLAR BUSINESS FOR THE GOVERNMENT AND IS THIS THE WAY TO TREAT CUSTOMERS?

I INTEND TO FIX THAT, BUT WHAT CAN I GIVE THE IRISH OF MONTREAL WHEN I'M MAYOR? MOST OF THEM LIVE TOO FAR FROM HANLEY COUNTY TO DO ME ANY GOOD EVEN IF THEY WANTED TO, AND THAT, IN ITSELF, IS A MATTER OF DEBAT-

- 7 -

PERHAPS THEY WOULD BE HAPPY WITH BILINGUAL --- GAELIC AND ENGLISH
LICENSE PLATES.

WE ALREADY HAVE A SHAMROCK ON THE CITY OF MONTREAL'S OFFICIAL FLAG.
HOW DOES A SHAMROCK ON THE QUEBEC FLAG GRAB YOU? OR SHILLELAHS INSTEAD OF
BUTTONS FOR MONTREAL CONSTABLES?

HOW ABOUT REPLACING THE COCKTAIL HOUR WITH THE IRISH COFFEE HOUR?
AND THIS REMINDS ME OF A GREAT INJUSTICE TO THE IRISH OF MONTREAL, AN
INJUSTICE THAT WAS ONLY RIGHTED WITH THE COMING OF CHARLIE BROWN'S DOWNTOWN
PUB AND RESTAURANT IN PLACE BONAVENTURE.

UNTIL ITS ARRIVAL THE IRISH COFFEE SERVED IN MONTREAL WAS ONLY FIT
TO BE SERVED IN ENGLAND, BUT DID WE HAVE TO IMPORT AN IRISHMAN FROM NEW YORK
TO TELL US THAT THE CREAM MUST BE POURED OVER THE BACK OF A SPOON BEFORE
AN IRISH COFFEE WAS FIT FOR AN IRISHMAN TO DRINK?

TERrible THing, BUT ALL IS NOT LOST.

NOW THAT WE HAVE AN IRISHMAN, ONE DANNY BOY BY NAME, AS PREMIER,
IT IS ONLY FITTING AND PROPER THAT WE HAVE AN IRISH MAYOR OF MONTREAL, AND
BEGORRAH, AM I AVAILABLE?

SO IN CLOSING GENTLEMEN, MAY I SAY THAT SO FAR TODAY, THERE HAS BEEN
MORE TALKING THAN FIGHTING AND WHAT KIND OF A WAY TO CELEBRATE ST. PATRICK'S
IS THAT?

"I HOPE YOUR DAY WILL BE A HAPPY ONE.
MEANWHILE, ERIN GO BRAGH AND THANK YOU."

NOT TO BE RELEASED BEFORE THURSDAY

- SEPTEMBER THE 12th. 11 A.M.

TRUDEAU AND JOHNSON ASKED TO MAKE A PERSONAL APPEAL FOR UNITY TO THE FRENCH-CANADIANS
FRANK HANLEY'S INVITATION

The greatest honour I know for a country leader is to feel that he is doing a personal contribution toward the full growth of the nation. And the greatest feeling of happiness I know, for a country leader, is the certitude that he is spreading gladness and heart's content around him. For I think that the true nobility, for a public man, must be calculated from his acceptance to open the dialogue with those who elected him. If we still cherish so much public men as both Kennedys, Ghandi or Martin Luther King, it is indeed because they were so close to the small craftsman, the shop workman, or the unemployed. It must not be a question of language, of origins or creed. It must be a human interest, a duty affair.

Some thirty years ago, I was elected by French-canadians people who were my true friends. They still are. These people were not always living with the high society. Nevertheless, I always had the feeling that noble hearts are not shaped with money or high class standards of living. Indeed, since thirty years, I discovered that noble hearts are made of friendship and mutual understanding.

Today, Mr. Prime Minister of Canada and Prime Minister of Québec, I invite you to share the wonderful experience I had with the French-canadians. I invite you to go directly without intermediates, to them. Ask them to help you build a prosperous country. Ask them personally to help you spread harmony, unity and happiness from coast to coast. And don't put any conditions. Just ask them, a friendly way. By means of your tremendous personal prestige as Canada and Québec leaders, you may succeed where so many failed. French-canadians are found of friendship. They shall not refuse your's.

Would you believe that they love this country as much, maybe more than you do? They know that they will benefit from a rich, prosperous and prestigious country. The only thing they ask for is mutual understanding. You as their leaders, must explain a lot of things to them. But please, do not use intermediates this time. Have a personal appeal to understanding. Go where they are; in the street, on the docks, at the office, in the workshop. Ask them a very simple question:

- Are you ready to help me, personally, to build a prosperous nation where friendship and prosperity will ride altogether? -

I know the answer they will give you.

But, please, go get that answer yourself.

Frank Hanley M.P.P.
St. Ann's Montreal