

[Chairman: Mr. Stewart]

[7:33 p.m.]

[Dr. Garrison was sworn in]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee will come to order.

Item 1 on the agenda is the Approval of Agenda. May we have a motion in that regard? Mr. Schumacher. All those in favour, say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Item 3: the Approval of Minutes of May 25, 1987, meeting. May I have a motion approving the minutes as distributed? Mr. Musgreave. All those in favour, say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

One of the items mentioned in the minutes was the adoption of exhibit 8, and that has now been distributed to all members. They are the provisions of the Alberta Act. Exhibit 9, I believe, we are still anticipating receiving from Dean Christian -- Mr. Wright, I believe. So that will become exhibit 9 when we do receive it. I believe they were excerpts from the Supreme Court of Canada reference.

MR. WRIGHT: Right. No, number 8 should have been the North-West Territories Act.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That's what it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; the North-West Territories Act, yes.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That's what we've got. Number 9 is the reference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, quite right.

MR. WRIGHT: Could we have number 8? I didn't receive a copy.

MR. SCHUMACHER: It's this one, Mr. Wright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 on the agenda is consideration of evidence, and tonight we have with us Dr. Gary Garrison, Editor of *Alberta Hansard*, who has been approved by the committee to be a witness, to bring us certain evidence that pertains to the area in which he has expertise. I thank you, Dr. Garrison, for coming.

May I just say by way of introduction that before we administer the oath to you, the committee has received a reference from the Assembly in the form of a motion of the Assembly to deal with certain questions of privilege. I'm not sure whether you're familiar with the terms of reference and have seen that motion, but obviously any evidence that is given is given in the context of the terms of reference of the committee.

So with that I will ask the counsel to administer the oath. I believe you're also familiar, Dr. Garrison, with the procedure tonight as to the fact that you will be giving your evidence, and then I will ask counsel to direct certain questions your way. Then you will be at the mercy of our committee, and they will put what questions they wish to you at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

DR. GARRISON: Mr. Chairman, when you referred to my expertise -- because it's actually quite limited, but I'm glad the committee did make a distinction between myself and the other expert witnesses.

I have just a number of points I'd like to put before the committee. The first one is probably the one I'm the most expert at, and that is the current practice at *Hansard* regarding the use of French in the House and, by the way as well, the use of other languages in the Chamber. Our practice has been, ever since *Hansard* began, as far as I'm aware, to publish in the language spoken in the House. That means that what we do is if a member speaks in French, we publish the remarks in French. If, as happened today, a member speaks in Cantonese or some other language, we ask the member for the text of his remarks. If the alphabet of the language used is not our own, we will publish the transliteration of it.

In practice the primary distinction between our handling of French and our handling of other languages is that we don't request from the member a text of his remarks if he speaks in French. We have had a practice of having people on staff who are sufficiently competent in French to transcribe, edit, and proofread, and that modest expertise has been complemented by personnel in the Clerk's office, namely Louise Empson, at least in recent years.

From that starting point, I wanted to put that in the context of the other Canadian provinces and briefly to outline what is done in other places in Canada. As soon as I knew I might be called before the committee to give some evidence, I did a little bit of research, and I phoned my counterparts in the other provincial Legislatures. That's where this information is coming from. Although this information is secondhand -- it's not really my own knowledge -- it's the result of some research. And I'll just go through one by one in the order I have them here.

In Saskatchewan they don't publish anything except English, no matter what language a member speaks in. They simply have an editorial comment that says the member spoke in French or Italian or whatever it might be.

In New Brunswick they have the only fully bilingual *Hansard* of any of the provinces. Both French and English are recognized as official languages in the Chamber. The *Hansard* publishes all the speeches in the language in which they are spoken, in the first instance. Then within the year following the sitting all the debates are translated into the other official language, and then that's published.

In British Columbia the editor there told me that French is very rarely used and that his staff have minimal capacity to handle French. As we've done on occasion, they use other people in the Legislative Assembly to support their own resources. But they also print in the language spoken, whether it's English, French, Japanese, or whatever.

In Ontario they also print in the language spoken, the same as we do. They have been using an outside agency to assist them in transcribing and editing any French remarks, but just this year, because of some new developments in Ontario, they're getting some in-house French expertise, and they're going to do it themselves. As some of you probably know, simultaneous interpretation was introduced in the Ontario House within the last year. Of course, there is simultaneous translation in New Brunswick as well. I was told that since 1959 in Ontario,

French has been accepted as a language that can be used in the Chamber.

In Manitoba I'm sure you're all aware, as a result of a Supreme Court decision recently, that French is an official language. I found out an interesting thing, however, from the editor of the *Manitoba Hansard*, and that is that the *Manitoba Hansard* is not an official document and therefore does not have to be translated as all the statutes of Manitoba have to be. I was told that if the *Manitoba Hansard* were an official document, as ours is recognized officially in Standing Orders, then they would have to publish in both English and French.

In Nova Scotia they also publish in the language spoken, and they have a practice of publishing translations as well if it's provided by the member. Except for Newfoundland, so far as I'm aware, none of the other *Hansards* publish translations except the ones that are bilingual. I guess that just means New Brunswick.

In Quebec they publish the debates in the language spoken only, and there's no translation provided nor is there any simultaneous interpretation in the House.

In Newfoundland, apparently the rule is that since the late 1960s, MLAs have been allowed to speak either English or French at any time during the proceedings of the House, but in actual fact French is very seldom spoken. When French is spoken -- and it normally is just when guests are being introduced -- the editor himself translates the remarks into English and publishes the translation.

The third and final point that I wanted to put before the committee has to do with the practical ramifications that I see as possibilities if there were a significant increase in the use of French in this Chamber. First of all, if there were no translations or simultaneous interpretation services provided but we simply had to cope with a larger quantity of French, it would be somewhat awkward to do using the present word processing system we have, and there would be an additional cost of around \$70,000 just for equipment. We would also have to ensure that we had some bilingual staff. We do have some now. As a matter of fact, when we hired sessional staff this past winter, that was a consideration in the hiring process, although it wasn't a requirement. As a result, we have one transcriber who is fully bilingual and we have two who -- well, as they put it, they have a smattering of French and they could rough it if they had to.

If we were to go the way of Ontario and provide simultaneous interpretation services, there are a number of factors that would be involved. I should mention that I spoke with the people at Queen's Park who are involved in the installation and the operation there. I spoke to Jean-Pierre Dulude, who is the expert in the Department of the Secretary of State in Ottawa, on the provision of simultaneous interpretation services throughout the country. Yesterday, as a matter of fact, Madeleine Lalande, the director of the Secretary of State's translation bureau was here in town for personal reasons. I met with her and had a long chat with her and actually took her on a tour of the Chamber, just to get some idea from her as to what it would involve if this House were to decide to provide simultaneous interpretation, both English to French and French to English.

One of the first things she noted to me as soon as she came into this Chamber was that it was rather small. Maybe she's used to the House of Commons. When she looked to see where we could possibly put a booth for simultaneous interpretation, she said that there were really only two possibilities. One would be in the Speaker's gallery over at this end, and the other one may not even be a possibility, because it would involve install-

ing a booth in one or the other of the parts of the north wall of the Chamber. These booths have to be, by specification, about seven and a half feet square and seven and a half feet high. The cost of such a booth is about \$80,000 I was told, not including any modifications to the existing building.

As well, there's a question of the availability of staff and the cost of staff for such a service. Madeleine Lalande said that if we considered going the route of Manitoba in providing interpretation services on notice -- and I guess this is one thing I forgot to mention when I went through the provinces. In Manitoba members are allowed to speak French in the House, but they have to give at least one hour's notice so that interpreters, who are on call, can be called in and provide the service. But the interesting thing is that to provide this service, you have to have at least one person who will do French to English, another person who will do English to French, and . . . Well, let me backtrack a bit. In order to provide a full interpretation service, you have to have a minimum of two going English to French and two going French to English. Given the scarcity of interpreters in this part of the country, it was suggested that if we were to go this route, we would need to hire two full-time people at a cost of about \$35,000 a year each, and we would need to supplement that with two freelancers. The interesting thing is that the cost of the freelancers, just being paid on a daily rate, comes to about \$29,000 a year apiece.

Another point she mentioned was that it is virtually essential in providing any simultaneous interpretation for the interpreters to be able to have a clear view of the faces of the people who are speaking. In practice that means that, as in Ontario, they would not only need to have a booth but they would have to have a TV monitor, which would mean there would have to be television coverage of the proceedings. I don't know if that's really an ironclad requirement or not to have television, because I'm not at this point aware of whether Manitoba has television coverage or not in the Chamber, at least gavel-to-gavel coverage.

The last point in my third point is the production of a fully bilingual *Hansard*, which is what they do in New Brunswick. Using the cost of the translation services used by the *New Brunswick Hansard* and estimating the printing costs of such a publication, I estimate that it would cost about half a million dollars a year to publish a bilingual *Hansard*. That's half a million dollars in addition to what we're spending now on our present *Hansard*. The current *Hansard* budget is \$650,000.

In addition to that, in order to be able to use our text finishing equipment so we won't have to pay for outside typesetting, we would need to have a word processing system on the French side that would be compatible with our word processing system, and the cost of that is estimated at an additional \$110,000. Now that's . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Is that annually or capital?

DR. GARRISON: That's the capital; that's the start-up cost.

That's basically all the information I had to present in my presentation. If anybody has any questions on anything I've said, Mr. Chairman, or if I have left anything out or, I guess, if I've even said too much, maybe someone will tell me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. Garrison. I'll ask counsel to direct questions to you.

MR. RITTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Garrison, I'm just going to go over some of the points which I think you've

dealt with, but I would just like to confirm a few things.

Presently the practice of *Hansard* is to publish in the language spoken. Does that include all languages even above French; for example, Russian, Chinese? I think you mentioned it did.

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's right. We've had a number of occasions since I've been around here where members have made brief introductions, partly in Ukrainian, for example.

MR. RITTER: If a member does speak in another language, I take it you do not require a translation from him if he speaks in French but any other language you do require a translation?

DR. GARRISON: No, we don't require a translation. What we ask for is the text of the comments made in the language in which they were made.

MR. RITTER: Oh, I see. So there is no reference to what was actually said in the translation in English as far as *Hansard* is concerned when it involves another language. Is that correct?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. RITTER: What time delays and difficulties do you encounter traditionally when you do have an address in this House in a language other than English?

DR. GARRISON: Well, last year, as you know, when Mr. Piquette gave his first speech -- it was an address during the throne speech debate, I believe -- he spoke in French for five to 10 minutes, I think it was. That slowed us down a bit because, as you can appreciate, in order to get the turnaround that we have, we have to schedule certain bits of the proceedings to be assigned to certain transcribers. If that rotation needs to be disrupted, it throws everybody off a little bit. It is necessarily slower, I think, transcribing in a language you're not use to. Even if you are bilingual, it takes a bit longer.

If that speech were to be given today or a speech of similar length in French, there would be an additional difficulty that we didn't have last year, and that is that our time lines are much shorter. As you know, starting this session we have been producing *Hansard* for the next day. When that speech was given in French last year, we had the opportunity to take a little bit more time to transcribe it, to look over it a few times, and to get what we thought was a fairly clean copy to Louise Empson for her to proofread and mark all the accents in and that sort of thing.

MR. RITTER: Now, I take it you do rely on Louise Empson for anything at least that is spoken in the French language. Is she a member of the staff of *Hansard*, or do you also rely on other people within your own staff?

DR. GARRISON: We rely primarily on our own people. At the outset when we get a tape of a speech that is in French or partly in French, I would have my own staff transcribe it. They would produce a rough copy, and we would have another person on staff, who knew some French at least, look over it and check it to see that it looked reasonably accurate. Then at that time we would send it on to Louise for a final look.

MR. RITTER: And I take it . . . I'm sorry.

DR. GARRISON: I didn't answer the first part of your question. I thought that was a bit rhetorical, asking me who Louise Empson was, because I believe she sits in -- maybe not that chair but in Ann's chair at the Table.

MR. RITTER: Yes, this was just for the benefit of the members, Dr. Garrison. I think most of them do know who Louise is, but I did want you to confirm whether or not she was a member of your staff when she did work for *Hansard* or whether in fact it was just on a friendly basis that you used her as an assistant in French language issues. Do you use her on a friendly basis, or in fact is this something that's a formal arrangement with your department?

DR. GARRISON: Well, it's actually both. We're on friendly terms, and it is a formal arrangement. As a matter of fact, before the sitting last year, I wrote a memo to the Clerk asking if he would mind if we did refer items such as this to Louise for final proofreading. So that arrangement was in place then, and it still continues.

MR. RITTER: I see; thank you. How many people on your staff understand French well enough to cope with it on a more regular basis?

DR. GARRISON: I would say there is really just one who is fully competent in French. There are two others, as I mentioned, who could muddle through it but not very efficiently.

MR. RITTER: I see. As your facilities exist today and as they are now, do you feel that you have enough facilities to handle French, let's say, if it was spoken weekly?

DR. GARRISON: I think so. It would depend on how long the speeches were in French. If somebody just wanted to speak for a couple of minutes in French a couple of times a week, that probably wouldn't even slow us up very much. It would be a bit of a hassle, I guess, to have to disrupt our schedule repeatedly and to keep bringing things over here to Louise to have her read them. But if it were just that much French, then it probably wouldn't bother us a great deal.

MR. RITTER: Would question period pose any more problems to you than any other time in the Chamber if French were spoken?

DR. GARRISON: The only real difficulty, I guess, that would be there for question period that wouldn't be there at other times is that there is always a demand from the media and from members and their staff for the Blues for question period. There's more of a demand for question period than for the other parts of the proceedings. If we had to transcribe questions and/or answers in French, those Blues would be delayed. I'm assuming, though, now that I think of it, that it may not be a very realistic estimate to say that somebody would speak for two minutes in French in question period. Knowing the way question period operates, if there is a question in French, an answer in French, and then several supplementaries also in French as well as supplementary answers, that would probably take a good deal longer than two minutes.

MR. RITTER: I see. Right now what we are talking about, I take it, is transcribing the French into print. This isn't including

interpretation. I take it that you're not including in that estimate of time any time required to provide a translation of what was said into English?

DR. GARRISON: No, we're not.

MR. RITTER: So if a member were to consult the Blues or *Hansard* presently as you imagine it, he would be reading the actual text in French and would have to seek out a translation of what was actually said independently of *Hansard*. Is that correct?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. RITTER: Dr. Garrison, to your knowledge do any other Legislative Assemblies in Canada have any official policy or regular policy of allowing languages other than French or English?

DR. GARRISON: An official policy?

MR. RITTER: Well, do they have any recognition, as I say, encompassed in the Standing Orders or entrenched through practice for so long that would allow, for example, German, Italian, Cree, or other languages to be spoken in the Assembly?

DR. GARRISON: Not that I am aware of, and my distinct impression from talking to the other *Hansard* editors was that when these other languages were spoken, they were allowed as a matter of courtesy. In any case, when these other languages were used, it was primarily for a special event or for the benefit of guests who were from another place or were studying another language.

MR. RITTER: To the best of your knowledge do you have any knowledge of Legislatures that require a translation to be given by the member? You mentioned something about Manitoba, but I think that was only in reference to French. Is there any Legislature that will accept other languages spoken, provided the member give the translation to the *Hansard* people?

DR. GARRISON: Well, I know -- and I didn't mention this in my survey of the provinces -- in the Northwest Territories, I believe, there are something like six or eight languages that are permitted in the Chamber.

MR. RITTER: Does *Hansard* there, do you know, give a translation into English of what was said in another language?

DR. GARRISON: I'm not really sure.

MR. RITTER: Okay. You mentioned New Brunswick, that they publish in the two languages and have a fully bilingual system there. Do they ever handle, to your knowledge, languages other than French or English?

DR. GARRISON: Not that I am aware of, no.

MR. RITTER: And in Ontario, how often would French arise in practical terms in their Legislature?

DR. GARRISON: I'm just checking my notes here. Up until simultaneous interpretation was introduced into the House in

this last year, less than 1 percent of the speeches in the Ontario House were delivered in French. That's my information from the Ontario editor. Since then, he said it was still less than 5 percent. It had increased a bit, but he wasn't able to be any more exact than that.

MR. RITTER: How complete are Ontario's facilities with regard to translation and interpretation? Are they completely bilingual? Do they provide members with a full translation service and a bilingual *Hansard*?

DR. GARRISON: No, they don't. The *Hansard* is, as I said, in the language spoken only. I should make a distinction between a couple of terms that you just mentioned. "Interpretation" refers to the process of an interpreter orally changing one language to another simultaneously or shortly after the words are spoken. "Translation" is the word that's used to describe what's done with the written language. I must admit that I was unaware of that very fine distinction myself until yesterday when Madeleine Lalonde was here from Ottawa, and she made that very clear.

MR. RITTER: I see. How often does the Quebec Assembly have opportunity to translate, I think is the term we're dealing with, into English?

DR. GARRISON: How often do they have the opportunity or how often do they . . .

MR. RITTER: How often do they have to deal with speeches delivered in their National Assembly in English?

DR. GARRISON: My information is that about 1 percent or less of the speeches in the House in Quebec are in English.

MR. RITTER: Could you summarize for the members then, Dr. Garrison, basically all the Legislatures you're aware of in this country that provide not only translation services but interpreted into the other official language in their official House documents like *Hansard*? If I'm not mistaken, we know that the federal Parliament in Ottawa does that. Is that correct?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's right.

MR. RITTER: Are there any provincial Legislatures that have the same practice?

DR. GARRISON: New Brunswick provides simultaneous interpretation as well as translations of the debates in *Hansard*. As far as I'm aware, no other province does. As a matter of fact, my information from talking to these other editors is that none of them do, except that Manitoba provides simultaneous interpretation on an on-call basis. They don't provide any translations, though, in *Hansard*. Ontario provides the interpretation but not the translation. I'm afraid I don't really have any solid information on the Territories.

MR. RITTER: So I take it we've got basically three situations in this country. We've got those provinces who publish *Hansard* in the language that was spoken, be it French or English without any . . . I don't know what the word is I'm looking for now, you've got me so confused in interpretation or translation into the other language.

DR. GARRISON: Translation is the written word.

MR. RITTER: I'm still not sure whether we're translating into another language or not. Now I'm thinking in other terms. However, we've got the *Hansard* that translates everything into one language or the other. We have the *Hansard* that basically publishes everything in the language as it was spoken. Is that correct?

DR. GARRISON: Well, that's not quite the complete picture. As I mentioned, in Newfoundland they don't publish the French comments in French; they publish the translation. But that's the only province that does that.

MR. RITTER: I see. And the practice here in Alberta presently is that we don't provide any translation into English. If a member speaks in French, it is published in French.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. RITTER: Okay. I think I'm getting myself wrapped around here in circles, Mr. Chairman. This is all very confusing, so I'm going to switch to just another area.

I would like to ask you, Dr. Garrison, something along the line of costs. Now, if we had a simultaneous interpretation service in this Assembly, could you give the committee members some idea of what would be required in both equipment and the costs of that equipment, as well as staff?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, I can, Mr. Chairman. This again is a rough preliminary estimate. If we wanted a firmer price, we'd obviously have to have an expert come in and assess the situation. The capital cost of the system for interpretation would be approximately \$80,000, not including modifications to the Chamber. As I mentioned, the booth itself is supposed to be seven and a half feet square. To fit a booth of that size up in the Speaker's gallery would obviously require the floor of the Speaker's gallery to be enlarged. I'm told that in existing buildings such as this there is some leeway allowed for in the specifications, but about five feet is the minimum that an interpreter could work in. But even five feet, I expect, would require that the Speaker's gallery would have to be widened a bit to fit a booth up there.

In addition to that, I think I mentioned the cost of interpreters. I've discussed this with Mme Lalande and with Heide Seeholzer who, some of you may know, is the manager of translation services at FIGA. They recommended that if we were to provide this service, we would have to pay about \$35,000 apiece for two full-time people -- one English to French, one French to English -- and then two freelancers at a cost of \$325 a day, plus expenses. I found out an interesting fact here, and that is that there aren't even any freelance interpreters in Edmonton. If ever there is a conference in Edmonton that requires simultaneous interpretation, interpreters have to be flown in from either Calgary or, I believe, Victoria. And the cost is an additional \$100 per day because they have to come from out of town. So that the total cost of that for two freelancers and two full-time interpreters is about \$150,000 a year just for salaries and expenses.

MR. RITTER: I see. Thank you, Dr. Garrison. So I take it that if we're flying them in from Calgary and Victoria, one hour isn't enough notice, then, as far as your staff would be concerned?

DR. GARRISON: Well, it would remain to be seen whether these people would be on my staff or not, on *Hansard* staff. But I expect for the purpose of the House, unless somebody is working up a new system of transportation that I don't know about, one hour would certainly not be enough. As a matter of fact, I was told by Mme Lalande that the main reason we would have to have some full-time people is the nature of freelance interpretation, that these people are flying all over the place all the time. If we had notice today that somebody was going to speak in French in the House tomorrow and we needed interpreters for them, we might find that the interpreters we would be relying on, who normally resided in Calgary or Victoria, might be on a job in Winnipeg or Ontario somewhere and they simply might not be available.

MR. RITTER: I see. Thank you, Dr. Garrison. As far as simultaneous interpretation goes then, I think we've established a few difficulties there. But if I could propose a practical situation to you, perhaps you could give the committee members your assessment of how it might work. If a member wanted to speak in French or Chinese or German or any language of his choice in the Assembly in the future and provided that he gave you a translation in advance of that address in English, would you in fact find any difficulty with that? If he gave you two hours' advance notice and the text of his speech or the English translation thereof which he wanted to bring in the Chamber, would that provide any problem at least as far as *Hansard* was concerned? And if so, would it require any extra cost or equipment changes or anything like that that you can foresee?

DR. GARRISON: Actually, as I mentioned, we wouldn't publish a translation unless we changed our policy. But if a member wanted to give a speech in Japanese or Ukrainian or Polish or something like that, we wouldn't really need any notice at all. All we'd need from the member is a copy of the text, and we could just type it in and check it character for character against the text. So we wouldn't need any notice at all for *Hansard*.

MR. RITTER: I see. Now, you say unless there's a change in our policy. What, as far as you're concerned, would the policy change have to be? Would it have to be a change to our Standing Orders or something to allow you in fact to just publish the text in English? Like the translation where -- an example would be: the hon. member spoke French and then what follows is a translation in English. Would that require a change to our Standing Orders?

DR. GARRISON: No, it wouldn't. It's not in Standing Orders anywhere. It's simply a practice that's developed over the years, and it's internal policy.

MR. RITTER: So as far as you're concerned, if this Assembly decided that was to be the policy and from now on they would open up the possibility of a member speaking in any language of his choice provided he gave *Hansard* and, I assume, various officials in the Assembly the translation, you would see no problem or extra expense involved with that, would you?

DR. GARRISON: Well, there would be a little bit of a problem. Because if this were very extensive -- as I mentioned, we would have to check it character by character, and that would take a lot more time than simply reading or typing English. So if it were extensive, delays would be caused. But if these statements were

just a couple of paragraphs or something, it wouldn't slow us down significantly, I would think.

MR. RITTER: I'm going to be very unfair to you, Dr. Garrison, because I'm going to suggest that if this committee should decide to recommend to the Assembly that it allow, for example, French or any other language for that matter to be introduced into the Assembly, how would you like to see that implemented as far as your office is concerned, with the most efficient expenditure of money and staff resources and that type of thing? What form would you like to see it take?

DR. GARRISON: Well, if it involved continuing our present practice of simply publishing in the language spoken and not publishing translations, then all we'd really need is some assurance that we could get readily from the members, on request or even without request I suppose, a copy of the text.

MR. RITTER: And if the members decided that for the sake of consulting the Blues or things like this -- you know, if they do have trouble understanding French or whatever language was spoken, and they decided they wanted a translation in *Hansard* or whatever records there were of this debate -- would the same go for turning into you a copy of the translation of that particular text that was delivered in the House? Would that still be fairly easy to deal with?

DR. GARRISON: Well, if the Assembly decided that it would accept a translation provided by the member as a bona fide official translation, then that wouldn't pose any problem at all.

MR. RITTER: I see. I have one last question for you, Dr. Garrison. Then, Mr. Chairman, I'll turn over questions to members of the committee.

You mentioned that there are time delays as far as putting French text into *Hansard* in other provinces. Could you tell me typically -- for example, in the Manitoba case -- how frequent it is that the time delays are met and how long they usually take on a regular basis?

DR. GARRISON: I didn't really go into that kind of detail with the editor of the *Manitoba Hansard*, so I'm afraid I can't say.

MR. RITTER: That's fair enough, Dr. Garrison. I would turn it over to you, Mr. Chairman, for members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. Garrison. Mr. Hyland, I believe, is on my list.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My first question, Dr. Garrison, is: when you estimated the cost of the interpretation and those it would take to do it -- you gave us a figure of a total cost of \$150,000 or something like that -- how many days were you estimating session to last when you arrived at those figures?

DR. GARRISON: I thought it would be simplest if I went by the number of days we estimated for this year's *Hansard* budget, which is 80 sitting days -- excuse me; 90 sitting days. It used to be 80, and we just increased it this year to 90.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you. So anything over and above 90 of course would be added cost onto that.

What problems do you see, in your opinion as Editor of *Hansard*, with accepting translations from people? How do we know -- and I guess this would follow in any language -- what was said in the House is the same as what the translation says? How do we know he said the same as what he or she proposed they said? We all once in a while have trouble with our English and get a decimal point in the wrong place and then have a terrible time trying to get *Hansard* to get the numbers right again. I've been caught in situations where they wouldn't change it because they said "No, that's not what you said." If we had to go that way, wouldn't that create a problem that would be tough to get around, especially when you're publishing next day *Hansard*? Where are you going to find somebody in the middle of the night to check it?

DR. GARRISON: I don't believe we could. As a matter of fact, I'm not sure which *Hansard* it is -- I think it's Manitoba -- as I mentioned, and as everybody knows I'm sure, Manitoba is officially bilingual. They publish translations of all the speeches that are given in French in the House. They publish translations, but they don't come out until two days later.

When you mentioned the question of the accuracy of the translations and can we trust them to be accurate, it is true that unless we had some third-party expert to check it and verify it, there is no way we could tell that the translation the member provided was an accurate and exact translation of what he actually said in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions, Mr. Hyland? Mr. Wright, followed by Mr. Russell.

MR. WRIGHT: You say that in Newfoundland speeches in French are recorded in English.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. WRIGHT: Is the editor's name Haultain by any chance?

DR. GARRISON: Harold Stamp.

MR. WRIGHT: A little joke there.

In explaining the cost of recording speeches in French -- that's to say, following your current practice -- you mentioned the figure of \$70,000 for new word processing equipment.

DR. GARRISON: You want to me to elaborate on that a little bit?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, please.

DR. GARRISON: Okay. I should explain a little bit how our process works, and of course any of you are welcome to come up and have a look at it. It's a new piece of equipment we got just before session this year, which enables us to produce camera ready copy in-house and not have to pay for phototypesetting to a private firm. It's a pretty slick operation, except that when we have a number of French accents -- and I say "French accents" because that's usually what we get in words like vis-à-vis and déjà vu -- in order to print those accurately with the proper accents, we can't reproduce that on our existing word processing terminals. We communicate the text without the accents to the typesetting device, and we have to basically hand-set every one of those French accents. So if we had French text

of any significant length, there would be a very significant delay in production.

The best way to get around that, I would think -- you know, unless we wanted to have an additional staff person or a lot of staff time spent doing this manually, and even so it would delay production and we'd miss our deadlines -- we could get different word processing terminals at the front end with French keyboards, international keyboards, with the accents right on them so that at the transcribing stage all these accents could be input, and when the text was communicated to the typesetting device, all the accents would automatically be in there.

MR. WRIGHT: So this would not be additional equipment. You would replace your existing equipment.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. WRIGHT: With a more sophisticated version.

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. WRIGHT: Would there be incidental advantages, by the way, having nothing to do with French?

DR. GARRISON: Incidental advantages to having this other equipment?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I mean, since you got your last lot of equipment, have there been other improvements in the equipment that you would get as a bonus?

DR. GARRISON: Well, as far as the text processing, I don't think so, but if we were to go this other route, we very well could produce our own *Hansard* index in-house using one of these terminals. It would be basically a PC terminal.

MR. WRIGHT: PC.

DR. GARRISON: Personal computer. Sorry about that. And here I am in your seat too.

MR. WRIGHT: That was only, though, if there was a significant increase in the use of French, you noted. If it was a once-a-month phenomenon for whatever reason and lasted maybe five or at the most 10 minutes, you could get by on the existing setup, I suppose.

DR. GARRISON: I think we probably could. There would be some delay. But since we've had this new equipment, we really haven't had to deal with more than just a smattering of French, so it's really hard to tell how much hand-setting would be required for five or 10 minutes worth of French.

MR. WRIGHT: And the alternative of going the Newfoundland route, so to speak, and relying on the translation supplied would require no extra equipment at all or even entail any delay.

DR. GARRISON: Yes, that's right. But maybe I should correct one thing. I hope I didn't leave the wrong impression. In Newfoundland the members don't supply the translation; the editor does it himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we'll move on, Mr. Wright. Mr.

Russell, followed by Mr. Gogo.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm trying to get a good handle on what's happening here so that all the members are able to understand each other during the proceedings of the House. You mentioned, Doctor, that you can recall instances of members giving speeches or introduction of guests in another language. Can you recall another language being used during the spontaneous question period?

DR. GARRISON: No.

MR. RUSSELL: I'd like to pursue the matter of members handing you prepared translations for speeches they give in another language in the House, and put that together with a Speaker or other members who don't understand what's being said, together with the fact that we have live television in this Chamber. Is it possible that if a person wanted to, they could literally say anything which could be broadcast far and wide and we would have no idea whether it was in order or courteous or whatever?

DR. GARRISON: Yes, I guess unless you knew something of the language, a member could say almost anything.

MR. RUSSELL: I'd go back to the purpose of *Hansard*. Why have Houses got *Hansards*?

DR. GARRISON: Well, it's probably more appropriate that parliamentarians themselves should answer that rather than me, but I'll take a crack at it since you asked me. I've often been asked this -- not just because I'm the Editor of *Hansard* but because I have a PhD in English -- and my answer has been that the essence of a parliament is that it's a speaking place. And that's what the word means: a place where speaking is done. The essence of what happens in the House is the speeches that are made, and *Hansard* is the full record of all the words that are used in the House.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Dr. Garrison, I'm somewhat confused. I wonder if you could answer this question. If you were to maintain the schedule of the publication of *Hansard* and if that were to have to include, without notice, translation to only another one language -- and that is the official language of Canada besides English, and that's French -- could you summarize, in terms of the cost side, two factors: the capital cost necessary, which you've spoken of at length here, and the operating cost, if you could combine that. Or rather than put you on the spot, if I were to suggest to you that it would cost in the neighbourhood of \$1 million and operating of a quarter million dollars annually, would that be within the ballpark based on your research to date?

DR. GARRISON: If you're talking about a fully bilingual *Hansard*, translating all English speeches into French and all French speeches into English, I estimate that it would be about half a million dollars a year. Plus I would estimate an additional \$110,000 or so in start-up costs. That's not counting what it would cost to install new equipment, for example, in an existing building, or the cost to the government of a certain amount of



space that would be required and all the wiring, heating, office furnishings, and that sort of thing.

I hope that answered your question.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Mr. Gogo? Is there any other member with any questions for Dr. Garrison? Mr. Schumacher.

MR. SCHUMACHER: I wonder if I could ask whether in the survey of the different Legislatures you received any information as to their budgets for bilingual services, whether it's translation or interpretation?

DR. GARRISON: Yes I did, and the figure I just gave in response to Mr. Gogo was based partly on our present *Alberta Hansard* printing budget and partly on the . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: I meant to say -- for example, the Legislature in Ontario; what do they spend for their bilingual services? The same for Manitoba and New Brunswick.

DR. GARRISON: I'll see if I can find it here in my notes. Now, you're talking about interpretation services or translation services or both?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, it doesn't matter. You can itemize them. I want to end up with a total though.

DR. GARRISON: Okay. In New Brunswick the annual budget of the debates translations service for '87-88 is approximately \$350,000; that's for translation. The simultaneous interpretation service is run by a department of the government and provides these services to all branches of the government as well as the Legislative Assembly, and that budget is \$660,000 a year.

Now, you asked about Ontario. The cost of the simultaneous interpretation in Ontario for the current year is \$350,600. As yet they don't have translation services in Ontario, at least not for *Hansard*.

MR. SCHUMACHER: And Manitoba?

DR. GARRISON: I'm afraid I don't have a figure for Manitoba. Sorry about that.

MR. SCHUMACHER: And of course the figures you've given us -- that's mainly salaries. That doesn't include the capital cost of any equipment or the cost . . .

DR. GARRISON: That's right. That's the operating.

MR. WRIGHT: Your figure for Ontario for the interpretation cost was the whole government's budget, I take it, for all the services?

DR. GARRISON: No. That is only for the Legislative Assembly.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

DR. GARRISON: But I should mention as well, that in addition to providing simultaneous interpretation in the Chamber, they

have a committee room which is also equipped for simultaneous interpretation.

MR. SIGURDSON: And of course Newfoundland -- the translation from French speeches into the English record, there is no additional cost?

DR. GARRISON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? Well, if not I would like to thank you again, Dr. Garrison, on behalf of all of the members of the committee for being with us tonight and providing the evidence and information that you've gathered. I think it's very helpful.

I think it's the hope of all of the members that we could have an early evening. However, we have one other item here: other business. Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the minutes we adopted a few minutes ago on schedule of committee meetings, I'm afraid I didn't read that very accurately. If I would be permitted to comment on -- it's under schedule of committee meetings, top of the page and the second sentence, "Further meetings would be held on Tuesday mornings from 8 to 10 a.m., and Wednesday evenings." My recollection was, Mr. Chairman, that we were addressing one Tuesday morning, which I thought was next Tuesday morning. Am I incorrect?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the words "as necessary" should also be read in the context. I think what we were doing was trying to establish what times might be available in the tight schedule that all of us have to have meetings of this committee. It was suggested that Wednesday evenings, obviously being a night off from the normal sittings was available as required, and that Tuesday mornings was suggested. Now you may be right there, and I'd ask for the clarification of the others, but Tuesday morning certainly was suggested as a possibility from, say, 8 till 10 for some of them, not on a regular basis but perhaps as required.

MR. GOGO: So in what way, Mr. Chairman, would that take precedence over the Wednesday evening, for example?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm at the . . .

MR. GOGO: Well, I meant clarification, Mr. Chairman. I understood it would be dealing with a Tuesday morning as opposed to all Tuesday mornings, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly won't have any meeting at any time unless, obviously, there's work to be done. The times will not dictate the work of the committee. It will be the other way around. Mr. Hyland.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, dealing with next Tuesday. As I remember, the suggested possible scheduling for witnesses Monday night when we had the meeting, there was nobody in place on Tuesday morning. Unless some changes have taken place, I would suggest it was the next two Wednesdays where people were available. I think we should deal with those people when they are available, and unless we can slot one of them into a Tuesday, we'll have to do the Tuesdays one at a time. But I would suggest at least next Tuesday morning there would be no need for a meeting of the committee unless some other wit-



nesses come forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, did you have your hand up?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I think the record is correct. This is what we did agree, Mr. Chairman. But of course we had only on Friday expected witnesses on this Wednesday and next Wednesday, and then whatever day June 10 is. Is that a Wednesday too?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes it is.

MR. WRIGHT: But it does mean that you can arrange meetings on Tuesday morning if there are witnesses to be heard, without coming back to the committee I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's the way it's left, that the 24-hour calling of the meeting is still left to the Chair.

MR. WRIGHT: But dealing with next Tuesday then, did you have anyone in mind Mr. Chairman, or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No I don't, at this point in time.

MR. WRIGHT: How about Dr. Green?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have further questions for Dr. Green?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it was my understanding, though, when he was here the other night, that he indicated he was going to be going away, and that's one of the reasons why he was on Monday.

MR. WRIGHT: He said he couldn't be here tonight, but he didn't say anything about next week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we can certainly check into that. That's a possibility. Mr. Oldring.

MR. OLDRING: I thought we had concluded with both of

those witnesses last Wednesday night, and I felt that the reason for extending the hours the way we did was so that we could conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, quite frankly, that was my understanding too. We'd indicated that we'd go until a quarter to 11 as sort of a compromise, I think, as I put it at that time. At that point in time, all the questions seemed to be finished, and the meeting came to an end.

MR. WRIGHT: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I made it quite clear that I had a number of questions still to be asked. I'm sure it's on the record there.

MR. FOX: I think the record will also show that it was a suggestion of Mr. Oldring's that we might finish dealing with Dean Christian, then get on to dealing with Professor Green, and if there was a need to ask, ask him back at a future date. There were also some statements made that we could call either witness back -- indeed, any witness -- if it was the committee's wish to do so. And I know that we certainly had a lot more questions of Professor Green.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we'll certainly check the records on that and we'll certainly . . .

MR. WRIGHT: It's page 55, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. We'll have a look at that then. Are there any other matters to be brought forward? If not, may I have a motion for adjournment? Mr. Gogo?

MR. GOGO: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour, say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary? Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 8:45 p.m.]