

[Chairman: Mr. Stewart]

[1:35 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee please come to order. Item 2 on the agenda is Approval of the Agenda, and I would ask for a motion in that regard, please. Moved by Mr. Wright that the agenda be approved as submitted. All in favour, say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Item 3 on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of June 10, 1987. May I have a motion with respect to the approval of those minutes?

MR. CAMPBELL: I so move.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary? Motion is carried.

Item 4 on the agenda is Consideration of Evidence of Mr. Leo Piquette, MLA. Mr. Piquette is with us at this time. I might say, Mr. Piquette, that with respect to the administration of oath, upon assuming your office as a member of this Assembly, you took an oath of office at that time. By virtue of that oath it is not the practice to administer a further oath to members at the time of giving of evidence before a committee, so I will merely ask you to confirm that you regard yourself bound by your oath of office in the evidence that you are to give to this committee today.

MR. PIQUETTE: I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Mr. Piquette, we will follow a procedure wherein we will give you an opportunity to make a brief statement to the members of the committee, and following that we will open it up to the members to ask any questions in connection with matters before the committee. So you may proceed at any time.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman and committee members, I would like to thank the committee for inviting me to be a witness to l'affaire Piquette. For me this is a very historical day in my life, and I think the decision and deliberation of this committee will also be a very historical decision as well.

For some time prior to my attempting to ask a question in French in the Oral Question Period on April 7, 1987, the Francophone community in Alberta had been concerned about the proposal for French language education to be contained in the new School Act. In fact, this serious concern had been present since the Constitution Act of 1982, and specifically section 23 of part 1 of that Act, which deals with French language education, came into force. L'association exécutive, or the French association executive, had met with me previously and asked me to question the Minister of Education.

Now, since 150,000 Albertans are bilingual, 82,000 whose first language is French, and since we have a French media in this province -- French newspaper, television, radio -- and occasionally they would like to have one of their elected MLAs speak to their audience in our second official language, I thought it would be appropriate on this day to use the occasion

to question the minister in both French and English. On April 6, the day before I attempted to ask my question, I notified Karen South and Louise Empson in the Clerk's office of my plans and asked them to pass on the word to the staff. This I did in compliance with the Speaker's previous request.

I notified the Minister of Education of my intention on the evening of April 6. She made no objection at that time, except to say that perhaps her French was maybe not up to par to answer all of my questions in French. I replied to her that she could answer me in her language of choice. I should note that the reason I decided to put the question on April 7 was that it had been previously arranged that prominent members of the société francophone de l'Alberta would be in the gallery on that day.

Having met every obligation of courtesy and order of which I could think, I was greatly surprised when, as I attempted to put my question, I was directed to do so in English and only English. Certainly, I did not believe I had done anything wrong; however, I was prepared, if shown to have been in error or at fault, to apologize. I remain prepared to apologize if I'm shown to have been in error or at fault. I remain convinced that I was not in error or at fault up to this present time.

There are many other subjects that I could deal with now; however, I'll submit to your questions and attempt to answer them to the best of my ability.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you very much, Mr. Piquette. I will commence my list of names of people who wish to direct questions. Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, does Parliamentary Counsel ask questions, or does he forgo that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should have asked you. Do you have any questions that you would like to direct?

MR. RITTER: Yes. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. No, I have no questions I'd be directing at any of the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Piquette, I can understand your motivation in putting the question if you had those people in the gallery and so on. I was not aware of that.

I wanted to ask you with regard to -- I think you said that on April 6 you discussed with the Minister of Education the fact that you wanted to put a question or questions to her. Could I just follow that up? Did you indicate to the Minister of Education that it would be dealing solely with the French language in Alberta schools?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. I met with Nancy Betkowski; it was just after the night sitting. I believe it was around 10:15 or 10:30 p.m., and I met her downstairs by the flower arrangement. I indicated to her that I would be attempting to question her about the education Act, relating to section 23.

I also reminded her that this was something we had actually both talked about at the congrès annuel of l'ACFA last October 23, 1986, where both she and I indicated that we would be raising this question in the House in the spring sitting of the Legis-

lature. So the Francophone community, about 800 gathered there that evening, were very much aware that this was something which would be happening in the next sitting of the House, that MLA Leo Piquette would be asking questions relating to section 23 in relation to the education Act to the Minister of Education. This I made very public to that gathering that evening, and the minister replied very affirmatively that she was looking forward to that occasion to present itself in the Legislature.

That gives you a bit of the background of how this transpired. It's not something that the minister was not aware of. In fact, she was aware of it way before the occasion presented itself.

MR. GOGO: But on the evening of April 6, I think you stated, you discussed down in the rotunda this question with the minister. Is that accurate?

MR. PIQUETTE: I believe it was the 6th. I know I did speak to her just previous; it could have been on the 5th, the day before, because there was a problem with one day there where we had our questions delayed because of the fact of just trying to get into the House here in terms of our question period. So I believe it was either the 5th or the 6th. But it was close to 24 hours before the happening did take place.

MR. GOGO: And Mrs. Betkowski was, you say, aware that you were going to put that question in French?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I'd be interested in discussions with Mr. Speaker Carter that were alleged to have occurred the previous year, but perhaps we can come back to that. Other members may wish to pursue this.

MR. WRIGHT: Following up on what you just said about the Minister of Education and the conversation you had with her at the meeting beforehand that you spoke of, of l'association, were you present when she mentioned anything about the language she would like to reply in?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I don't recall exactly what she said at that meeting. I was a little bit surprised by her statement at congress annuel, but I believe that she did reply saying, "I will try to answer Mr. Piquette in French if I am able to." I believe that was the gist of her reply in her text.

MR. WRIGHT: Have you questioned any former member of the House as to the use of French in it, and has he come up with something for you?

MR. PIQUETTE: I don't...

MR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry; I'll repeat that. Have you questioned any former member of this House on the use of French, and has he come up with anything for you?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. Actually, you know, it makes it quite a while that I've been aware of a lot of precedents relating to this House, that French has been used in the past. For example, I was a childhood friend of Mr. Mike Maccagno, and actually I was part of his campaign -- manager -- in the 1968 federal elec-

tion. As you recall, Mr. Maccagno was also the Liberal leader of the province of Alberta in the 1960s, and at that time he made me aware of a statement he had made to the House in French which was relating to the whole bilingual issue that was being discussed at that time. I have a copy of that text. He's actually consented that it be used as evidence here before the committee.

Other MLAs that I was made aware of in terms of conversation with other people were Mr. Romeo Lamothe from Bonnyville, Mr. Antonio [Aloisio], Athabasca, and even Mr. Drain in 1975. All had spoken in French in the House in the past. So I really did not see any problem with myself citing that right because I thought the precedent had already been established within the Chamber of the Alberta Legislature.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Piquette, did Mr. Maccagno provide you with an excerpt from his memoirs that he is preparing?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I have it here. I believe I can submit that to the committee.

MR. WRIGHT: Perhaps you would do that, and read it if you wish.

MR. PIQUETTE: The memoir indicates as well his interpretation of that occasion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're moving this to be an exhibit, Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, the excerpt from his memoirs, which is in English of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. That'll be exhibit 11, I believe, or 12. We'll wait till our clerk comes back to make sure of that.

MR. WRIGHT: That will be exhibit 12, I believe -- whatever it is, anyway. I think he's provided enough copies for the members of the committee.

My final question, Mr. Piquette: if you had been permitted to finish the question that started all of this off, what about a translation?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. As all MLAs that were there that day remember, I introduced the beginning in English and I started or attempted to start the French paraphrasing of what I had just said in English in French. If I would have been allowed to continue, all members would have been perfectly knowledgeable of what I was saying both in English and French. Now, it probably would not have been word for word, but paraphrasing was what I intended to do because of my awareness that a lot of members do not understand the French language.

MR. STEWART: I have Mr. Musgreave, Mr. Russell, Mr. Gogo, and then Mr. Horsman on my list. Mr. Musgreave.

MR. MUSGREAVE: My first question. You have mentioned as a matter of interest the number of people in Alberta that speak French or are Francophone. I just wondered: could you tell me how many people in Alberta use French as their first language or working language?

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay. There are two sets of statistics that I'm aware of. There is one that indicates approximately -- well,

at the last census -- 62,000; another one that comes out with 82,000. And we have of course quite a number of people who are also officially bilingual, knowing both French and English, maybe not as a mother tongue, but just simply add, for example, your 22,000 in the French immersion program as an indication of how we have a great interest in the second official language of Canada developing in this province. I'm fortunate to be a leader of that movement. As a school principal I was one of the first principals in Alberta to help develop a lot of these French immersion programs as well as the Ukrainian immersion program in the province of Alberta, because I feel it's very, very important that young people today know more than one language.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Next question, Mr. Chairman. When you met with the minister at the fountain, could you tell me if the meeting was prearranged, or was it just a chance encounter?

MR. PIQUETTE: With the minister it was a chance encounter, basically a reminder of a conversation we'd had previously so that she would not feel that I was surprising her in the House. But Mrs. Betkowski was very much aware that one day she would face, in terms of being in the House in the question period, French questions.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Did you advise her at the time that you were going to provide English translations immediately after asking the question in French?

MR. PIQUETTE: I'm not sure if I indicated that to her that evening. Basically, the intent of that meeting was just to politely inform her of my intention, and I don't recall -- I indicated I would be paraphrasing. But I know Mrs. Betkowski's knowledge of French is good enough to understand my question without translation. The paraphrasing which I was intending to do was basically for the benefit of all other members in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Russell.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Piquette has led into the matter that I wanted to question, and that is the participation of the other members of the Assembly during question period while these arrangements between himself and Mrs. Betkowski were occurring. Had you given any thought as to how the other hon. members of the Assembly were to participate while all this was going on?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I think I've already answered that question. I indicated that I would be paraphrasing my question.

MR. RUSSELL: So the House leaders of the various parties and all the other members were to rely solely on your paraphrasing with respect to supplementary questions and points of order, et cetera, that are so essential to the question period?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, yes. I mean a paraphrasing or translation from French into English or English into French. With my feeling that I do have a right to speak both official languages in this Chamber, with that kind of an attitude on my part, that I will be providing either a written or oral translation, I don't see that I'm making an inconvenience to any other members of the House.

MR. RUSSELL: And we were to rely solely on your skills as a translator for this so that we could participate?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I am fully bilingual, and I feel quite capable of doing that.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo, followed by Mr. Horsman, then Mr. Fischer.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Piquette, I'd wanted to ask you about the arrangement with Mr. Speaker Carter about the use of French. I've read various comments. I recall -- I think it was June of '86 -- when you made a major speech in the House. Would you share with the committee -- I assume this was a meeting between you and Speaker Carter. From your recollection prior to that, could you assist the committee with what went on with that discussion about you could speak in French but not ask questions in French or so on? Could you help the committee?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I'd love to, because I think there appears to be a different interpretation of what happened at that brief encounter. Again, it was not an official meeting that took place between Dr. Carter and myself. Before my maiden speech in French I had advised Mr. Speaker the day before that I would be doing that, to allow a bilingual staff to be present for that first speech. I very clearly stated that right in front of all the members here, and I have a copy of that. I'm not sure if it should be exhibited as evidence here. On June 20 I rose in the House and indicated the reason why I felt, as a Franco-Albertan, that I was -- you know, to make sure there was not a lack of precedent in the House or a lack of an individual member finally indicating . . . You know, even the Alberta Chamber, if you look at its historical laws, they do in fact indicate that the Alberta Chamber here is a bilingual Chamber according to section 110 of the Constitution Act.

Now, after I made that speech, I had a brief encounter with the Speaker. He indicated to me -- now I'm just basically trying to recollect what took place, in a kind of oral comment: "I would appreciate, Leo, if you advise my staff prior to the next time you're going to speak in French in the House, to make sure we have *Hansard* staff, et cetera, available for you." It was probably only about a 30-second kind of encounter, and I basically said, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will follow the same format as I have done for this occasion here." So I was a little bit surprised when I heard that the Speaker had a different interpretation relating to question period. Because from my recollection nothing was talked about in terms of the question period being treated differently than what transpired in the House. Again, I'm saying there are two interpretations here of what actually took place.

MR. GOGO: Well, perhaps you could refer to Mr. Speaker Carter, because Mr. Speaker is a member of this committee, and it might be . . . Are you saying then, Mr. Piquette, with the discussion with Mr. Speaker Carter, that at no time he said, "Please do not ask questions in French at question period?"

MR. PIQUETTE: I can honestly say that I do not recall him making that statement.

MR. GOGO: Then as far as you were concerned, you felt it was legitimate to put questions in French, particularly if a minister of the Crown had agreed to it. Is that it?

MR. PIQUETTE: Exactly. And since there was no objection to my first speech being in French and English, where I had cited the right -- and to me, speaking in the House means speaking, both questions and debate. I mean, I don't see a distinction between the two. I think other experts who have witnessed here have indicated the same thing. So I didn't see a distinction at all in my mind, and since there was none that I can recall being cited by the Speaker and I had complied by advising his staff prior to my question being raised here on April 7, I was following exactly to the verbal agreement that he and I had agreed to on June 20, 1986.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Horsman, followed by Mr. Fischer, Mr. Musgreave, Mr. Wright, and Mr. Fox.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Piquette, I want to follow up on this issue of your contact with the Speaker's staff relative to your intention to ask a question in French. Am I correct that you had said in your opening statement that you contacted Karen South and Louise Empson in the office of the Clerk to tell them that you were proposing to ask a question in French on the following day and that they were then to advise Mr. Speaker Carter of that intention and that that was your understanding as to the procedure that you had believed had been discussed with Dr. Carter in the previous year?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I considered both Karen and Louise part of his staff. So when I indicated to them that I was proposing -- I wasn't sure when I made that conversation exactly what day the actual question would be coming up, because, again, in question period as an opposition MLA you don't always get your chance to ask your questions on the day that you propose to ask them. So I made them aware of this. There was no feedback to me that there was any problem, so I assumed either the message had been carried through or simply that there was no problem. So that's basically what transpired there.

MR. HORSMAN: And this conversation took place with both Karen South and Louise Empson in attendance in the Clerk's office?

MR. PIQUETTE: I believe they both were. I know very definitely that I spoke to Louise Empson. I believe Karen was sitting up from there. Whether she overheard the conversation -- but both were in my presence when I made the statement. Now, I basically just made them aware. I didn't ask for any permission or whatever. I simply said that I'll be -- and I recall I said to advise *Hansard* to have someone who is bilingual. And of course I know Louise Empson quite well; she's fully bilingual and understands very much what was proceeding.

MR. HORSMAN: I just wanted to make absolutely certain of that. You did it verbally and without any indication in writing or by way of letter to Dr. Carter, the Speaker, or directly to him before the question was put.

MR. PIQUETTE: No, I did not. Because again, you see, there was no request by the Speaker for anything written, and I had been made aware of no written instruction from the Speaker af-

ter the conversation I had with Dr. Carter about the proceedings in the future. So since the advice by Dr. Carter was verbal, I simply did the verbal notification to his staff and to the minister, as I thought was appropriate to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fischer, followed by Mr. Musgreave.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. My question has been mostly covered. But you mentioned that you didn't feel you had done anything wrong when you began speaking in French. You do say that you had discussed this before with the Speaker, and you understood that you could speak French in question period.

MR. PIQUETTE: Correct. But to advise his staff of when I would be doing so. From what I understood, it was basically a formality to make sure there was somebody who was bilingual in the House. Now, whether he meant the legal counsel or whether he meant *Hansard*, I'm not quite sure because, like I said, the conversation between Dr. Carter and me was very brief on June 20, 1986, and was part of a congratulation on his part as well.

MR. FISCHER: But anyway, after you were finished and the Speaker ruled you out of order, you continued to speak at that time. Do you not believe that the rules of the House should be followed and that the Speaker is our referee here?

MR. PIQUETTE: Oh, very much so. I do respect the traditions of this House. I was a little bit shocked -- or perhaps surprised would be a better word -- when he indicated that. I thought he was misinterpreting what I was going to be doing next; I thought perhaps he thought I would be totally going on in French. So what I was trying to do when I got up the second time was to show that I was going to go on to the next part in French and then English, and I did comply when he said no on the second or third occasion -- I forget; I don't have the record in front of me. I did translate everything back into English only. But I did indicate that at the end of the question period I would be standing on a point of order, which I believe is very respectful, very polite in the way that I handled myself that particular day. Even though I was very much taken aback at what happened, I felt that my actions were very sensible and rational.

MR. FISCHER: Okay.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Piquette, do you not find it strange that your interpretation of a conversation with Dr. Carter outside of the Assembly and your interpretation of a conversation with Mrs. Betkowski outside of the Assembly -- that neither one of them agree with your opinion of what took place?

MR. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe there is any evidence to the contrary.

MR. PIQUETTE: I'm answering as an hon. member, sir, and I'm telling the truth as I see the truth to be in what transpired. I have no fear of standing on my record as an honourable MLA.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, the next question I have: Mr. Piquette, could you please explain in full detail how you feel that you have a constitutional right to speak in French in the Legislature regardless of the rules of the Assembly?

MR. PIQUETTE: What rules of the Assembly are you speaking about? Could you clarify that?

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'd like you to answer the question, Mr. Piquette.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I can only answer the question if you're citing that there is a rule that says I cannot speak French in the Legislature, and there is no such rule on the book. Looking at the historical aspect, as the experts Dr. Dawson, Mr. Forsey, Mr. Christian, and Dr. Munro have indicated, there is a very valid point to be made: that section 110 of the North-West Territories Act has been carried forth into the Alberta Act. I'm simply, in my mind, following what I feel is a constitutional right. But I don't think that's the question now. You can go on about rights all you want, about what happened 100 years ago; I'm interested about what we should . . .

MR. MUSGREAVE: Point of order. I think that when we're asking questions of the witness, I would prefer that he just answer and not get into debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Mr. Piquette.

MR. PIQUETTE: Did I answer your question?

MR. MUSGREAVE: The question: in one of your opening remarks, Mr. Piquette, you mention that you had a constitutional right, and what I'm asking you is: please explain to me how you feel you have one. Because as you've said, we've had witnesses here, but the witnesses have not been unanimous; they've not agreed with each other.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I feel that four out of five experts is a pretty good indication of what I feel is a . . . Again, until it's interpreted by the Supreme Court or whatever, we can never be sure of the final decision, but based on my investigation -- for example, I can pull out an article, an essay, that I did back in my university days in 1967, which I then wrote in the *Lac La Biche Post* in 1968, looking back at the whole history of the province of Alberta and Canada as part of one of my courses. So in my investigation of the Francophone rights in Alberta I came to the conclusion -- again, I am saying that I'm citing that right. That constitutional right doesn't mean that I am the judge above all others. I'm just saying that's my conclusion. My conclusion is that I do have the constitutional right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, followed by Mr. Fox.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. The members now have distributed to them, Mr. Piquette, the statement from Mr. Maccagno's memoirs. Do you have a copy of it there?

MR. PIQUETTE: Actually, I believe I gave all of them away here.

MR. WRIGHT: All right. If one could be handed back to you.

MR. PIQUETTE: The French part -- I believe I gave a copy. Yes, I have his memoir.

MR. WRIGHT: [Inaudible] read it for the record now.

MR. PIQUETTE: Now, you were talking about what he said in French or what he put in his memoir?

MR. WRIGHT: No, no. [Inaudible] the extract from the memoirs.

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay, the extract from the memoir. Mr. Maccagno said:

As I started speaking in French, a government backbencher fell backward in his haste to voice his objection.

"Mr. Speaker," he cried, "have the honourable Member from Lac La Biche speak white."

If looks would kill, Mr. Manning could have been charged with murder.

The Speaker, Art Dixon, advised the objecting member that he was sure I would give an English translation and indicated that I [could] continue.

So basically the memoir from Mr. Maccagno was an interpretation of what happened to him back in the 1960s, and this was to do with the issue of bilingualism in Canada and the Constitution.

MR. WRIGHT: And you mentioned, Mr. Piquette, that you have a copy of the -- I guess it's an extract from *Hansard* of June 20 last year.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I do.

MR. WRIGHT: I would like to ask that that be filed as the next exhibit please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm just looking at the piece of paper, Mr. Wright, which purports to be, I gather, a statement by Mr. Maccagno . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . which has not got a signature on it, no indication that it's his, no declaration by way of the usual form.

MR. PIQUETTE: But I have a covering letter. I believe I've got the covering letter which indicates Mike Maccagno. But use it as you wish. Basically he . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a witness I see no indication on here that this can in any way be authenticated.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, that's true. The witness gave the circumstances, I believe, but perhaps you would care to repeat the circumstances under which you say that that's an extract from his memoirs.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. Mr. Maccagno sent me a letter, the copy of this, through the mail, and also a copy of a newspaper article which indicated other MLAs in the past who have spoken French in the Legislature of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With due respect, I see no difference in this from the point that Mr. Musgreave was raising when you rose on a point of order where he was indicating -- putting words forward that were from some other person that's not present.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, we have neither statements from the ministers nor Dr. Carter, Mr. Chairman. There's all the world of difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have anything that's really authenticated from Mr. Maccagno?

MR. WRIGHT: Give the man a chance to put the circumstances on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But hearsay, Mr. Wright. That's what I'm saying; he's putting forth hearsay.

MR. WRIGHT: So what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that was the point that you were making over here, as I understood it.

MR. WRIGHT: Did you have a hearsay? Because we have no statements from those two ministers -- at least the minister and the Speaker -- at all, either in written form or in any tangible form. There was a reference to an existing statement -- which doesn't exist -- before us. That's all I'm saying. Here is a statement that the witness says he received from Mr. Maccagno. Now if he wants to call Mr. Maccagno here, that's fine. But we can accept it for what it's worth.

MR. PIQUETTE: If you wish notify Mr. Maccagno, I am quite sure he would be willing to [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: All I am saying is that it's without verification at the present time, and until such time as it is verified to the satisfaction of the committee, I don't feel obliged to make it an exhibit at this point in time.

MR. WRIGHT: Perhaps Mr. Piquette can verify it now, as I've been asking for the last two minutes. Will you please describe for the benefit of the Chairman and the rest of the committee who need to be further satisfied the circumstances under which you came into possession of what we thought was going to be exhibit 12, and how you say it's part of his draft memoirs?

MR. PIQUETTE: I don't get your question.

MR. WRIGHT: Will you please describe to the committee how it is that exhibit 12, the statement in English that you say is from Mr. Maccagno, comes before us and came into your possession, and how you say it's part of his draft memoirs?

MR. PIQUETTE: He mailed it to me with that statement attached to a record of *Hansard* indicating: Leo, you may use this in your deliberation about the French question in the Legislature. His son sent me a second copy as well. So I received two copies of that transcript and that interpretation or memoir of the event.

MR. WRIGHT: And is he writing memoirs?

MR. PIQUETTE: That I haven't questioned. This was made available to me by Mr. Mike Maccagno. Where it comes from in terms of whether it's all part of a memoir -- I wouldn't want to answer that.

MR. WRIGHT: The June 20 statement, Mr. Chairman, is that an exhibit? That's a extract from *Hansard*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon. June 20, do you have it there? Copies for . . .

MR. PIQUETTE: I have a portion of it. I thought it was already perhaps part of the evidence given to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can certainly produce it. It's an excerpt from *Hansard* of June 20, 1986, as I understand it.

MR. PIQUETTE: Of the English section here. The other page I don't have is the French part of it. I thought I'd bring it today in case I was asked to comment about that. Do you want me to submit this as evidence?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will accept that, and then we will distribute it to all members.

Mr. Fox, followed by Mr. Horsman.

MR. FOX: Okay. Mr. Piquette, I'd like to ask a question that I hope will clear up what may be a misunderstanding here.

Now, Mr. Gogo asked you a series of questions relating to a conversation you had with the Minister of Education down here a day or two prior to your rising in the Assembly on April 7, and as well about a conversation that you and the hon. minister had at a function sometime last fall. He then asked a series of questions about a conversation you had with Speaker Carter after your maiden speech in this Assembly last year, regarding the use of French in the Assembly in the future.

As I understood it from your answers to the first series of questions, you indicated that you'd made it clear to the hon. minister that you would be asking questions about French language education, so she was aware of that. But am I correct in saying that you did not indicate that she had given her permission or had agreed to being asked questions in French? Indeed, you didn't even seek her permission; you were merely telling her. Is that right?

MR. PIQUETTE: I was basically notifying her of the event, of the proposed questions in French relating to the School Act, but I do recall quite vividly I did indicate it would be partially in French.

MR. FOX: Yeah. But you didn't say that she had agreed to that or given her permission.

MR. PIQUETTE: I did not say that at all. You know, what I read in my statement -- she did not say, "Yes, go ahead, Leo," or whatever. That wasn't part of the conversation. Basically, I indicated I would be asking her questions in French about the School Act and as previously discussed. She indicated, "Well, maybe my French is not up to par, but . . ." -- you know.

MR. FOX: Okay. I did want to get your clarification on that, because I believe Mr. Gogo, perhaps inadvertently in asking you a question about your conversation with Speaker Carter, used the word "agreed." But you never indicated that the minister had agreed, so I'd just . . .

MR. PIQUETTE: I was not seeking agreement; I was basically notifying.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Piquette, the circumstances surrounding the incident on April 7 have been of some considerable dispute relative to whether or not there had been a conversation between you and the Speaker in which the Speaker had understood that it was permissible to use French in the Assembly for debates but not within question period. A series of objections was just raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona indicating that there was no evidence before this committee that there was a dispute on that subject with respect to either the Speaker or the Minister of Education, but I'm sure you will recall that when you asked your question on April 7, the Speaker himself at that time -- as a matter of record in *Hansard* -- indicated that he didn't agree with your interpretation of the conversation he held with you the preceding year. Is that not correct?

MR. PIQUETTE: I can perhaps find -- I'm not sure if I've brought that along -- exactly what transpired there. I guess, you know, generally that's what I said. Do you have a copy of the response? Did I indicate that I did not agree with the Speaker's ruling? Is this what you're saying? Could you perhaps rephrase your question again?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I think it was quite clear. If I could do so without losing my supplementary, with the agreement of the committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: There was no question that there was a public disagreement by the Speaker on April 7 with your interpretation of the conversation you had had the preceding year. Is that correct?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. As I read this, you know, the Speaker indicated:

The Chair rises with great hesitation, but the hon. member and the Chair had discussion last June with respect to the use of the French language in the Assembly. Permission was indeed granted for that to take place within debates, but at that time there was mutual consent that it would not occur during question period. En anglais, s'il vous plaît.

I replied:

Mr. Speaker, when I rose in the House last year, I claimed the right to be able to speak in French in this House, and I don't think that right has been abolished by your statement.

Now, what I meant by "your statement" was the fact that I did not recall -- I was very surprised when I heard the Speaker indicating to me that there was prior agreement not to ask questions in French in the House. That was not my interpretation of the conversation I had with the Speaker. So that's how I reacted, based on the fact that I did not anticipate this whatsoever.

MR. HORSMAN: You indicated in your earlier remarks as well that you didn't know what day your question would be able to get on, and therefore you weren't sure as to what day it may have been that you had conversation with the staff of the Clerk's office as to the fact that you were proposing to proceed further with French in the Assembly, and yet on April 7 the Leader of the Opposition had designated his second question to you. So how can you allege now to this committee that you were not

aware of the fact that you would be in fact entitled to get on with your question on that particular day? And why did you not then notify the Speaker directly of the fact that you would be asking a question that day when you knew, obviously, that you would be able to ask the question and be on, because your leader was prepared to designate that question to you?

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay. To give you a bit of background on this, I was up in the back waiting to ask the question I believe on two occasions in the week before. At the caucus meeting of April 7 at 1 o'clock it was decided, because we were having difficulty trying to get in our important questions in the House, that Mr. Martin would designate his second question to me to ensure that I was able to get in on that particular day. And it so happened that I did not know that I would even be able to ask that question that day, even though it was designated number two, because Mrs. Betkowski was not in the House when the House convened at 2:30. She actually came in just prior to my getting up and asking the question in French. I actually had an agreement that that question would probably be turned over to somebody else because of the fact that the minister would perhaps not be in that particular day.

So more or less the reason why the question was designated to me was the fact we did have some people here in the gallery and we were trying to ensure, on that particular day at least, we would have a chance of getting that question to the minister, if she was available.

MR. HORSMAN: So what you're really telling us, Mr. Piquette, is that you and your caucus had agreed that because of the attendance of certain people in the gallery you were interested in asking your question and doing so in French, and that that was the whole purpose and intent of your position to exert, as you indicated, your right to this being a bilingual Legislature under section 110 of the North-West Territories Act.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, as you heard in my statement, I think, I am a very proud Franco-Albertan. Through my research I felt I did have the right to use French on occasion -- on special occasions -- and as you recall, since the year I was elected, I've used this very much on very specific occasions: in my maiden speech and now for the first time in the question period on April 7. So I can perhaps even give you a copy as evidence, the kinds of questions which have been proposed to me by the French association. They were very much in terms of section 23. Now, since the media was also aware that particular day that those questions about the School Act were going to be asked on section 23 -- again, like I indicated in my opening statement, we do have a sizable Francophone minority in Alberta, we have a media which is French in Alberta, and I felt as an MLA that I was not overstepping anybody's bounds by using the second official language in the Alberta Chamber here to address that population, that segment of my constituency. So like any good politician I think I was doing what I thought was right for the occasion.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I apologize for being a few minutes late, because I did miss a part of Mr. Piquette's initial comments. But in listening to subsequent questioning, I have to admit to being somewhat puzzled and a little confused about some of the things that I'm hearing. There is a great deal of discussion forth and back and response by Mr. Piquette which is all interpretation of conversations and so on, and

it doesn't appear that in a number of cases there is paper that speaks to notice and this type of thing that apparently had been discussed earlier on.

But first let me raise the memoirs part. I'm wanting very much to understand what is germane to our discussion here and what is not. I'm not sure that I've seen yet any information that deals with another language being used in question period in this Legislature, and I'm not sure that anything like that has been yet introduced, because I guess these purported comments here have come from somebody's memoirs; as this was introduced, that related to Mr. Maccagno. I believe I understood Mr. Piquette to say he was introducing it because it was a part of Mr. Maccagno's memoirs, and yet in subsequent questioning by Mr. Wright, Mr. Piquette said no, he couldn't say that that was a part of Mr. Maccagno's . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Draft memoirs.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes -- that he could substantiate that. And so I'm somewhat confused there. We seem to be walking in a gray area in recall, and that is -- I will look at Hansard, I suppose, after the printing to try to sort out those comments, because my notes say one thing and then his subsequent comments say something else.

I would like, first of all, an answer to the question as to whether any of the evidence introduced speaks to another language being used in question period.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I believe the evidence we also have on record here, which I think has been submitted, is that in 1975 Mr. Charlie Drain did ask a question in French in the Legislature here, and it was not ruled out of order by the Speaker at that time. So that's -- has that been submitted as evidence?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Osterman, that particular reference was made an exhibit for the members of the committee and distributed to the committee: the 1975 excerpt from *Hansard*.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exhibit 11.

MRS. OSTERMAN: The other question that I had has to do with Mr. Piquette's understanding of what his rights were and the type of advice that he received from Speaker Carter. As I understood, Mr. Piquette had a visit with Speaker Carter a year before, or whenever, and was advised that if he were going to be using French, it would be advisable to alert the Speaker ahead of time so that whatever arrangements were necessary would be made. Is that correct?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, he did make it a condition of speaking, and basically out of politeness. But the interpretation I had, to notify his staff to have available the appropriate people -- that was the understanding I had from the conversation with Dr. Carter, the Speaker, relating to that. And this is why I did those things: basically, as a matter of politeness, to make sure. And not just simply politeness; in terms of simply having available staff who are able to interpret my French, I guess.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask Mr. Piquette how there could be people made available and in the House in this regard if no date was given about when Mr. Piquette might

do this.

MR. PIQUETTE: What do you mean?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, I understand, Mr. Piquette, through the Chairman, that you advised staff of Speaker Carter's that you were going to ask questions, and I further understood you to say that you gave no date. I don't understand how there could be people available, if you thought you were fulfilling a condition.

MR. PIQUETTE: I recall the conversation. I said I might be able to get in today or tomorrow, and that was the gist. What I basically tried to do with that was to make sure that if there was any problem, that since Dr. Carter's staff was advised of it, then somebody would be getting back to me, either prior to the question period or whatever. That did not take place, so I assumed there was no problem. You can see -- I mean, my conduct was basically with the assumption that there was really no big deal about all this. Okay? In my mind there was just really no big deal about what I was doing. You have to understand a bit of my background to understand, and also my knowledge of having made a study of this even prior to my election, that I did not see that in 1986 or 1987 in the Alberta Legislature we would be saying "English only."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Osterman, you have one further supplementary, based on the fact that I think your first question really related to ascertaining whether or not something was an exhibit or not an exhibit. So I'll permit one more supplementary.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you. Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess I concern myself with any of us as individual members of this House taking it upon ourselves, as a result of our own studies, what the rules of the House may or may not be and the maybe casual information or conversation that passes to allow certain things, very important things, to happen in the Legislature; i.e., the speaking of another language, when there is nothing officially available to other members. I understand Mr. Piquette believes himself to be bilingual in that regard, and I wouldn't question it, but I do wonder out loud why we have official translators to speak to language, that obviously require a great of education, and that without the benefit of that no member can be precise in terms of questioning or raising points of order.

And I do concern myself with Mr. Piquette's interpretations' being based to a major degree, in terms of the participation that day, on conversations that were held here and there, and wonder if it's not appropriate to clarify those conversations for all of us, because I, too, have hearsay. I, too, have hearsay from asking questions of other people who have been involved with this, having their interpretation, and not at all agreeing with what I'm hearing here today. And that's very troublesome. I think it is unfair to those who are not here, and it is unfair to Mr. Piquette as well, because I am questioning his interpretation.

I believe that since other names have been introduced, they ought to be called to answer questions, and I think very quickly. We have staff, the staff that he has mentioned here today, hopefully available. I think a couple of questions simply put to them can clear this up as to whether we are dealing with a series of misunderstandings, misinterpretations, that really, in a very casual sense, are impacting on a very formal Legislative Assembly where we all come in a formal sense, elected by people fully

expecting us to be able to participate, particularly in the question period, and yet there are so many things that seem to hinge on these casual conversations. I'm very troubled by that. I think it's something that we should address, because a member here is stating that he believes his right under a certain section 110 is thus and so, and yet evidence has been introduced that -- notwithstanding that I read Senator Forsey's comments that the Alberta Legislature could make the rules with respect to language as they saw fit. So it's really interesting that we have these various opinions, and including in a witness that has been introduced, as I understand it, supposedly upholding the right of individuals to speak another language, and in question period.

So, Mr. Chairman, basically I am interested in seeing other witnesses today.

MR. PIQUETTE: Can I make a reply to a few of your concerns? Because I do think you missed part of my statement. I indicated that in the question period I was going to be paraphrasing French into English, and English into French. So I was not -- this is why, again, if I had been allowed to continue, every member of the House would have understood what I had asked in French, because it would have been translated into English. So that my intent on April 7. I didn't have a chance to be able to show to the House what transpired on that particular day.

So I think your concern about my creating rules in the House, trying to set a precedent . . . I think maybe what is a bit unfortunate here -- and I feel to some extent if perhaps on June 20 the Speaker and I had sat down and clearly stated some rules in a meeting and in terms of a written type of instruction to me, if that had transpired, then perhaps there would be less hearsay and less interpretation of what actually took place. Because here we're trying to relate back to a verbal conversation that we had over a year ago, a conversation which is on witness, simply two hon. members speaking after I made my speech on June 20, 1986. So my interpretation of what was said, in my mind -- and I can swear on a pack of bibles here -- did not indicate to me that I did not have the right to ask questions in the question period. So I can only report to the committee what I interpreted from that conversation I had with the Speaker.

Now, if the Speaker had another interpretation or another maybe un verbalized observation, then so be it. But the fact of the matter is that I did not feel that I was breaking any House rule here or even setting a new precedent in the House by my action of April 7. I've tried since that time to abide as a gentleman of what the committee here will decide. I feel the larger question though is this: are we going to be nit-picking about all these verbal kinds of things or are we going to be addressing the real issue here, when the real issue . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Piquette. I think you're just addressing the question. Mrs. Osterman, do I gather then you are making a motion?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, yes, I would put that in the form of a motion. There have been raised here four individuals whom Mr. Piquette is speaking to with respect to his belief that he had covered all the bases in alerting the Assembly that he would be speaking French and whatever needed to occur to make that duly proper would occur as a result of all these little side conversations that he has his interpretation of. I believe that since he put some weight on those conversations, in fact those individuals ought also to be called so that we have a clear

understanding of what took place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And what individuals . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: The Minister of Education, Speaker Carter. Is it possible to call him, or is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm advised by counsel that certainly by tradition, at least, the Speaker is not a compellable witness, but . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: Then leaving that aside, if it's a matter of choice or not choice, leaving Speaker Carter aside, then the other two staff people whose names have been raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Karen South and Louise Empson.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we'd deal with those three. Counsel has just indicated to me that it may very well be that if the Speaker consents to appear, then that is another matter. But perhaps we could deal -- in your motion you have three persons designated. The motion is that the Minister of Education, Miss Karen South, and Ms Louise Empson would be called as witnesses before this committee. Is there any discussion on that motion?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, Mr. Chairman, are we not going to complete the examination of this witness before we move into what action we take after that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly are. It was just that a motion, I gathered, was coming forward, and it's my understanding that when a motion comes forward, it can be dealt with insofar as the motion is concerned. We will dispose of the motion, and then we will return to Mr. Piquette.

MR. M. MOORE: So you're going to come back to examination of the witness after the motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Immediately.

Is there any other discussion on the motion? All those in favour of the motion, say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary? I declare the motion carried. Okay, I have on my . . . Mr. Wright, on this point?

MR. WRIGHT: No, I just [inaudible]

MR. CHAIRMAN: No? Very good. I have on my list here, just for the record, Mr. Anderson, followed by Mr. Bogle, Mr. Fox, Mr. Musgreave, Mr. Horsman, and Mr. Wright. Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Piquette, with respect to your statement to Mr. Musgreave that you believed it a constitutional right to speak in both languages, I was assuming that you were referring to the fact that there was not that resolution proclaimed, or at least there's a belief that that resolution was not proclaimed. Is that

the basis on which you state . . .

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, according to my research, that constitutional right exists today except, as Mr. Forsey indicated, I believe the House can decide on its own resolution at any time it wishes to do so. This is why I'm pleased to be here today, because I think we need the goodwill of all members of this House, because I don't feel it's a partisan issue here. We're talking about the two official languages of Canada; are we going to respect them -- yes or no?

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. Apart from that other question on which I agree with the witness, that we have the right to determine that ourselves within the Legislature, would the witness then agree that if -- and admittedly at this point there's evidence to the contrary as well as for it -- it were proven that the motion that was before this Legislature and passed was indeed proclaimed, would the member then feel that he did not have that right, at least until the Legislature deals with the question?

MR. PIQUETTE: No, I think since we're talking about 1892, what has transpired since in Canada, for example, the Constitution Act of 1982, the Meech Lake accord -- maybe I'm not speaking here about a right, but there's no doubt there is a realization that we are living in a bilingual country and that there is, I guess on behalf of every Legislature, a duty to honour that commitment right across Canada to make sure that the two official languages are at home in every Legislative Chamber across Canada; that it should be an example to show to all Canadians that we all stand together on the issue and that bilingualism has -- as a multicultural minister, you're very much aware -- enhanced the whole aspect of multiculturalism.

And to me, I'm talking here as a Canadian, not just simply as an MLA. I'm speaking to you as a Canadian that feels that what we have decided as a nation has not taken away from anyone but has given more to every culture, to every group. We are trying to respect that there is more than a unilingual, unicultural approach to our country, that there is a bilingual, multicultural aspect to our country. And I'm very proud to be one of those bilingual Canadians living here in Alberta that feels that as a provincial Legislature we should be making that positive assertion, especially to our young people.

For the Alberta Legislature in a resolution to say "English only" I think would set back the commitment of thousands of parents who have seen that it is to the benefit of their children to become bilingual in this country because there's a social, economic, and cultural benefit to it all.

I'm urging the members of this committee to set aside perhaps partisan politics, and let's look at this as a reality: what can we do now? I brought the issue forward, but the intent of the issue is not to divide and create hatemongering or whatever. It's actually to look at building this country as it should be built, built on tolerance and understanding and goodwill from all members of our society. Because it's so easy to be working on fear and misunderstanding of how some people would like to see our country.

So I have taken perhaps a lot of criticism in the last few months, but I feel very proud that I think what has issued out of this is a great debate about a commitment. Where do we stand? Are we going to be afraid to move ahead? Are we going to move backwards because of maybe a misunderstanding about the issues that I'm presenting to the committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Piquette, I hesitate to interrupt you, but I'm sure all of us share the ideals to which you speak. The point is that of course your question did not come forward on the basis of a positive motion with respect to bilingualism or anything of that nature. It came forward as a question of privilege, and the terms of reference of this particular committee must deal with questions of privilege because that is what you raised. You raised a question of privilege. So I would ask Mr. Anderson to carry on with his questioning.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I certainly share the witness's belief in multiculturalism and the nature of the country, by and large, and the need for us to try and work together on issues such as this. I think he may have misunderstood my question, which wasn't with respect to whether or not he believed that at this point in time we should make a decision that this be bilingual or multilingual in the Legislature, but whether or not a right has previously existed which he was exhibiting when he made the statement.

I was a bit confused by the answer, which seemed to contradict the first statement, which was that he based the belief that the right existed on the fact that the province was originally bilingual and that the motion passed had not been proclaimed. If that is the belief on the right to previously speak that, without any prejudice to the discussion of what should be in the future, then the question was: did he in fact breach the privilege of the House, or did he in fact -- albeit inadvertently, if the House had decided it was unilingual in the past -- move against that when he made his statement? I'm trying to get an understanding of whether he believes that would be the case.

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay. First of all, yes, I do believe I have the right. I mean, until other evidence is presented, I believe I have the right, and I think that is fairly clear, as presented by four out of five expert witnesses. You asked me the hypothetical question: what if? Okay, I tried to answer in the second part, that if that "what if" was true, would I believe that I still would have the constitutional right? And I basically said that I believed that due to the fact that we have moved forward in terms of our constitutional development since 1905, there is perhaps a duty of this House to recognize the two official languages in Canada. Does that answer your question?

MR. ANDERSON: If I might, Mr. Chairman, in part is the member then saying that he wouldn't have a right if it were proven that the House had determined itself to be unilingual previously? He feels that the House should determine that it's bilingual or multilingual: would that be . . .

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: . . . a correct interpretation of what . . .? [Inaudible] would believe that that should be the direction we go?

MR. BOGLE: To Mr. Piquette: in the opening comments made, Mr. Piquette, you indicated that you had been working closely with the French-Canadian Association of Alberta on matters pertaining to education, in particular as they related to the Charter. I think you also indicated that you had hoped to ask your questions at a time when members of the association would be present. Were executive members of the French-Canadian Association of Alberta in our Assembly for question period on Tuesday, April 7, 1987?

MR. PIQUETTE: That I don't recall. On that particular day I believe some of them were. I'd have to go back -- I don't think I even introduced any of them. I believe they were supposed to be present, but I think that with all that happened that particular day, my memory might be a little bit off right now about whether they were indeed in fact here.

MR. BOGLE: Well, the reason I ask, if I can, just for clarification, is that there is no reference in the introductions to any members of the association being introduced, and I wanted to determine if in fact that was Mr. Piquette's understanding of the situation.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I believe they were planning to be here, but whether they were actually in fact in the audience -- I don't recall that precisely, to answer that question to you. I believe they were, but . . .

MR. BOGLE: Could the member refresh my memory then, going back to the opening comments he made, on why he wanted to tie the series of questions to the Minister of Education to a time when members of the association would be present?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, because we had had a series of meetings relating to bringing this in focus, and they were trying to be present when those questions were going to be presented in the House so that they would be indeed there to witness the answer from the minister.

MR. BOGLE: But, Mr. Chairman, my very question is: why would you, Mr. Piquette, proceed with the questions if indeed you wanted members -- and I can certainly understand why you would want them to be in the gallery if you'd worked closely with the association, and it's a very prestigious Alberta association. You would want them to be present to hear you asking the questions and, more importantly, to hear the answers to be given by the Minister of Education. Why would you proceed on that particular day if you did not know whether or not members of the French-Canadian Association of Alberta were indeed in the gallery?

MR. PIQUETTE: Like I said, I do believe they were there, but I'm just trying to recall here which gentlemen they were. Now, I'm wondering why you continue with that line of questioning, because I'm trying to say here that I believe they were here, but I can't a hundred percent confirm that. And I indicated previously in my testimony that even though it was designated number two in the question period, there was still a chance that I would not be asking the question, because there was a question mark about whether the minister was going to be in the House. In fact, she was late coming in that particular day and just managed to make it before I stood up. So like in the question period, sometimes your best plan can go astray.

MR. BOGLE: Were there any other distinguished visitors in the Speaker's gallery that day?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, only after the fact I realized the Premier from Ontario was in the audience, but I only was made aware of that the day after, because as soon as the question period was over, I left almost immediately. There was just a brief interview in the hallway, and then I left because I had a funeral to attend in Plamondon, and I had to pick up my brother on the

way out of the city. So when I left, I didn't even know anything was going to come out of this whole question. I was driving down to Plamondon at about 4 o'clock, 4:30, in the afternoon; every five minutes it was on the radio station, so that's when I was made aware of some of the other incidentals, or accidentals, that happened that particular day.

MR. FOX: I just wanted to establish very clearly here the sequence of events in your mind, Mr. Piquette. Is it true to say that as far as you're concerned, there was no question about your right to use the French language in this Assembly, either in question period or in general proceedings?

MR. PIQUETTE: No question at all. I did not distinguish the two whatsoever, and this is why, if I had been under the belief that the Speaker had indicated not to use French in the question period, I would have probably had a meeting subsequent to that statement to make sure that I understood why or why not. And since I did not think there was any question about that, that it was something we should distinguish, that never raised my mind. I think even to members of my own caucus -- I don't think anyone predicted what happened that day. It was not even a part of our discussion in caucus that this could have happened. I simply assumed when I asked the question that it would have been accepted; that's all. So I don't think on my part here there's any trying to judge my motive for this. What I'm saying to you is exactly that I thought I had the right to speak French in the Legislature, both in debate and in the question period, with prior notification to . . .

MR. FOX: So then any conversations you had pursuant to that with members of the Clerk's office or the Minister of Education weren't to seek permission or to re-establish your right, which you say clearly exists. It was merely a matter of courtesy; it was notification.

MR. PIQUETTE: It was basically a matter of courtesy and notification.

MR. FOX: You had not been told or notified or required by Speaker Carter in any previous conversation that you had to do that a certain way? What I'm getting at: were you told by Speaker Carter in a casual conversation or in written form that before you could use French in the Assembly again, you would have to provide certain people notice in certain ways?

MR. PIQUETTE: Like I said, there was a very -- the conversation that I had with Dr. Carter was nothing in terms of a specific directive that I had to follow. I think maybe, in after respect, I should have insisted on . . .

MR. MUSGREAVE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I raised this same issue earlier today, and it was ruled out of order because the persons that these statements were being made were not here. I suggest that we're getting into the same line of questioning again.

MR. FOX: With respect, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member could please see the difference. We're dealing with this hon. member's memory of a conversation that occurred. The Member for Calgary McKnight made reference to his understanding of a conversation that he has not shared with any of us. There's such an obvious difference here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue, Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX: Thank you. Now, Mr. Horsman, in a question asked to you earlier, used the word "assertion" as if to imply that you were doing this to assert your right to speak French in the Assembly. But it's my understanding from your answer to me a moment ago that in your mind this right clearly existed; therefore, there was no need to assert it.

MR. PIQUETTE: Not any more, because I thought I had made that fairly clear in my first speech from the Throne which, just to make sure, was on record. But since nothing transpired after June 20, like you're saying, I assumed that I just simply had it. I just did not have to make any more assertions; it was simply there as a matter of fact. So it did not cross my mind that we would, you know . . . Like I said, I think what transpired on April 7 was quite a surprise to me, because I wasn't aware of what the Speaker was indicating, why I could not proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Musgreave, followed by Mr. Horsman.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Piquette, I just want to clarify something. I gather that whether or not we agree that section 110 was proclaimed or had to be proclaimed or it did not have to be proclaimed, as one of the expert witnesses said, you feel that you have the right to speak French in this Assembly at any time because of section 23 of the Canadian Constitution and the changes in the country since 1892. Is that what you're saying?

MR. PIQUETTE: I didn't say that. We're talking about a hypothetical question here, because I do feel that section 110 still governs the procedures of this House. What you're asking me here again is a hypothetical question: whether I have the constitutional right. If it were judged not to be in force today, section 110 of the North-West Territories Act, I said that I feel it would be incumbent on this House as a duty, since the progression of our country since 1867 and 1905 -- with recent accords, for example -- incumbent, I believe, on this Legislature to positively assert in a resolution that the two official languages be recognized in its Chamber.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Could it not be assumed that perhaps the recent ruling of the Speaker was more a strict adherence to the precedent custom of this Assembly, and that perhaps some of these other exhibits that you raised were that the Speaker of the day decided to just overlook it but it was a breach of privilege at the time?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I do believe the Speaker thought he was following established House procedures. I don't dispute that at all. I mean, that's his interpretation of the event. But for myself raising a privilege matter, I had to indicate to this House and to the Speaker that I, in my best judgment, felt with due respect, without prejudice, that we had historically here, under section 110, the right to speak French in the Alberta Legislature.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Assuming that we had this historical right, you would agree, perhaps, that it had not been used very often?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I think in the evidence that I've tried to give here -- you know, it's too bad we don't have a *Hansard*

prior to 1971, because I am sure, speaking with a number of MLAs, many of which used to be in my area -- for example Athabasca, Lac La Biche, Bonnyville -- their families and friends and themselves indicate that it was not an unheard of practice in the 1940s and '50s and even prior to that for French to be heard in the Alberta Legislature. So again, that to a large extent also influenced my understanding of the procedures of this House, which had permitted in the past French to be used in the Alberta Legislature. And at no time has anyone, prior to April 7, tried to distinguish question period from debate, and that's where the issue is at right now.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. If you were so sure of your rights, why did you bother doing the research?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I guess it was incidental to the fact that when I was doing a paper study on bilingualism and biculturalism back in the mid '60s -- I'm not sure if I have a copy of this, but I think it's been put in as evidence -- the whole commission was interested about what happened here in the western provinces. And this is where I came to my understanding that really probably a lot of other members in the past have spoken French because of a historical understanding of that section 110. It came to me as a reinforcement when I read that commission's report on bilingualism and biculturalism, that there was a very -- you know, it was just simply not a privilege as a member to occasionally speak French in the Legislature but a constitutional guarantee to section 110 of the North-West Territories Act. So that's where I basically came to that conclusion.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Piquette, you've made it very clear that you believe that this should be an officially bilingual Legislature in Canada, and whether or not section 110 is in place, you've made it clear that you feel the spirit and intent of the Constitution is such that no matter what legalities might exist, it is your fully held belief that this should be a bilingual Legislative Assembly. Is that the official position of the Official Opposition?

MR. PIQUETTE: I'm not saying it's an official position of the Official Opposition; that's my personal belief. Again, I have to define that a little bit more closely than saying that I believe in an officially bilingual House. I think it has to be with a certain condition, that there be some translation provided to all members. I think there are good examples -- even in Newfoundland, for example, in Manitoba, in other provinces, in Quebec, in the Quebec Legislature -- that this already exists and there is no great inconvenience to the members of their Legislatures and those provinces. So what I'm saying here is that in the spirit of our country, our bilingual country, we set forth in our Legislature here a resolution which clears up this whole matter once and for all and that we leave the door open to other members of this House in the future who are going to be bilingual and who will want to exercise those rights in the future.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Piquette, on April 10, 1987, in a discussion with the Speaker after a number of points had been made and so on, you said, "I have been asked by my caucus to say with respect that the position I have outlined is also theirs." Were you, in doing so, stating the official position of the New Democratic caucus on the subject of bilingualism in the Legislative Assembly when you made that statement?

MR. PIQUETTE: I believe your statement is taken out of context, so I'm not quite sure what it relates to. I think it was to do with the apology that I was attempting to make, as directed by the Speaker, on behalf of releasing the publication outside the House. It was nothing to do with bilingualism here that you're quoting from. But I am quite pleased to say, though, that the New Democrats is a party that believes in respect of the two official languages in Canada.

MR. HORSMAN: Should any other language be permitted to be used in the Assembly, than English and French, on a regular basis in both debates and question period?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. One of the reasons why I feel that both should be allowed is because of the fact that we have a media here and a population and a group of students who are . . .

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, that was not the question.

MR. FOX: I think it was misunderstood.

MR. HORSMAN: Should any language other than French or English be allowed to be used in either question period, debates, or otherwise in the Legislative Assembly?

MR. PIQUETTE: That is for the House to decide. I'm answering here this particular question about French in the Legislature as the second official language, but the House has a perfect authority to do that to any language. I think in the past we've respected that when Ukrainian members have made introductions in Ukrainian, et cetera, and I do not see for the life of me why some arrangement cannot be made where other languages can be allowed, you know, using proper procedures. But I do think it's good that as Canadians living in a multicultural setting, we respect the languages of other people and the cultures of other people. I guess that by being bilingual and having taken a couple of other languages, I see no problem with languages. To me it's a unifying force as opposed to being a divisive force, as some people try to make people believe.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I've made a tremendous number of notes. Would the committee entertain a 10-minute break before proceeding? That is a suggestion. I don't know how the committee feels.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your motion therefore is to adjourn for a period of 10 minutes.

MR. GOGO: Well, yes, I would, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I'll accept a motion to adjourn for 10 minutes. Any discussion on the motion? Pardon me, no discussion on the motion. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Contrary, if any? Okay, we'll adjourn until 20 after 3.

[The committee adjourned from 3:08 p.m. till 3:20 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee please come to order. I have on my list Mr. Wright, followed by Mr. Oldring, Mr.

Moore, Mr. Bogle, Mrs. Osterman, and Mr. Fox.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Piquette, Mr. Horsman and Mrs. Osterman questioned you about the notification to the Clerk of the Assembly and so on. The day you asked the question was April 7, which was a Tuesday, so the day before would be the 6th. As a result of your questions and answers then, has that refreshed your memory at all as to when it was: the Monday or the Tuesday or any other time that you notified the Clerk?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I have a bit of difficulty trying to nail down exactly what day I notified the Clerk, because I recall that the week before I was supposed to be asking a question and I believe at that first time notified the Clerk. Now, on the 6th or the 7th -- I'm not sure whether it was on the 7th after I was notified just prior to question period, as I was passing. Some of these details escape my memory, but I do recall notifying the Clerk's office. That was again basically, I believe, making sure that we had someone here who was bilingual, and I already knew that we had. So, again, one of the concerns that the Speaker had was to have appropriate staff in the House. Of course, I'm very knowledgeable that Louise is very knowledgeable in the French language. So that relieved my concern of making sure that we had someone capable of interpreting or translating.

MR. WRIGHT: On the second occasion, whenever it was, did you mention *Hansard* specifically?

MR. PIQUETTE: I believe I did leave the message to carry that to *Hansard*. Again, I'm trying to recollect; it's already over three months ago.

MR. WRIGHT: Right. You did mention that you did mention *Hansard*. Was that on the first or the second occasion?

MR. PIQUETTE: I believe it was on the first occasion.

MR. WRIGHT: I see. Okay. Mr. Chairman, the other question I have of this witness at this point is -- Mr. Anderson asked you about the Haultain motion without refreshing your memory. Perhaps he thought you had in your mind exactly what it was. It does pertain only to the records of the Assembly. To what extent then does that affect the right to speak French in the Assembly, in your mind?

MR. PIQUETTE: That's why I think the question of Mr. Anderson was very hypothetical, because I think even though it was proclaimed or not proclaimed, it really doesn't affect the debate in the House. It deals with the records only, that they be in English only, if that section were proclaimed, but that's under debate right now. I don't think it's really germane to the whole question here because it's only related to the recording and not to the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Oldring, followed by Mr. Moore.

MR. OLDRING: Pass, Mr. Chairman.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Piquette, you mentioned in your opening comments today that it had been your intention, after having asked the question in French, to -- I believe you used the words "paraphrase it in English"; in other words, translate it. I wanted

to ask whether or not you would regard it as important in the question period that if a member uses other than English or French, a translation be provided by the member?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I feel that in this question, yes, because of the fact that you have to have maybe numbers warranting a real official translation service or a simultaneous type of translation service. I feel that I do not want to be looking at creating extra cost to a Legislature. All I want to have is the respect of my right as a Franco-Albertan to on occasion address the House in French when it pertains to important matters to the French population here in Alberta or it could be in Canada.

But what I would like to propose is that either the translation be an oral translation or paraphrasing or a written translation being provided to all members so that no one is unduly inconvenienced and also so that they are able to ask supplementary questions, at least that they know what the main questions are all about. Then any member who does not understand or speak French can still add on a supplementary question. So I feel that I've been very, very respectful in my submission to the committee here. Really all that I'm calling on is that I'd like to see the House make an affirmative decision officially, on the record, so there's no more misunderstanding on anybody's part that the two official languages can be recognized.

MR. M. MOORE: The second question, to follow up that one, is: would you regard it also as being important that a member who intends to ask a question in a language other than English or French advise the Speaker in advance of his intention to do so?

MR. PIQUETTE: If it's a language other than French, I think there should be perhaps even a more clear kind of notification, because I think we're dealing here with something which is supplementary to two official languages.

MR. M. MOORE: Just with regard to a member asking a question in French, do you believe that the Speaker should be aware of that in advance?

MR. PIQUETTE: I think in terms of not seeking a permission but simply out of politeness, to make him aware of the fact that you would be proceeding.

MR. M. MOORE: Those are all the questions I had, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Mrs. Osterman, followed by Mr. Fox.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, through to Mr. Piquette. To some degree to follow up on Mr. Moore's questioning, I guess I'm interested in this term "paraphrasing." Without an official translation and my albeit limited knowledge of two other languages, I think one could honestly say that there is enough misunderstanding when we are all speaking the same language, leave alone when other languages are introduced, and this is not to diminish at all the importance of the use of other languages. I think that I want to emphasize here, from my perspective, the importance of the precision with which we speak and the understanding of whatever language is utilized, because after all we are only here as representatives not of ourselves but of our constituents, who through us are participants in this Legislature.

Therefore, if we do not understand the words that are being spoken, we cannot either question or challenge on behalf of our constituents. So in that regard . . .

MR. PIQUETTE: What is your question?

MRS. OSTERMAN: My question is: what language, if there are two -- and there would be. If we're only paraphrasing, if there are two different interpretations, would it be the French or the English that would be . . . For instance, if we just speak of the two official languages now, which one would be paramount, and how would we explain to the public that in fact the other language that was used was not precise in terms of an official interpretation? Which one would be official?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I don't think we should be at all trying to answer that question the way you're proposing. Languages across the world are different, and we tend to be able to still communicate across the world. So why are we trying to say that in this Chamber we have to put one paramount to the other in terms of a translation?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that wasn't my question. What I was saying was that without an official translation, people who are trained for many years in translating precisely, there will in fact categorically be a difference when one paraphrases into another language.

MR. PIQUETTE: Oh, there's no doubt.

MRS. OSTERMAN: The member has said that in fact he would paraphrase; somebody could paraphrase. My question is: what language then? Is it the first language and not the second paraphrasing that would be official?

MR. PIQUETTE: I'm not sure how to answer that question really. I guess what you have to rely upon is the member who is doing the question both in English and French. You assume that he's an honourable member and that he's not going to try to deceive the House by giving an incomplete translation. Now, if there's a question that the House wants to answer, that they want to have a precise translation, then I guess we could perhaps be looking at making sure in our *Hansard* that we have a staff who is bilingual, capable of doing that job. So I guess it could work both ways. But I do think we tend to look at ourselves as honourable members, that we will respect each other's ability to communicate.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that we all respect one another's ability to communicate, but when we speak in the Legislature and we have very precise rules to govern our conduct and the types of questions and so on that we can ask, I believe that all hon. members would concur that precise language is in fact very important. Because, in fact, this committee is sitting looking back retrospectively at language that was used 100 years ago. Mr. Chairman, I would say in that regard that then it is very important that precise language should be used, and I'm very surprised that the hon. member believes this Assembly is so casual as to be able to accept paraphrasing. However, if he is saying that in light of the questions I have asked with respect to what would be official then it is important to have precise language in both languages that are utilized and that there should be *Hansard* staff and so on to make sure that

that precision is there as well as translation for the members so that they may participate on behalf of their constituents, then I accept that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Fox, followed by Mr. Gogo.

MR. FOX: I just wanted to get back briefly to the actual day the question was put, Mr. Piquette. Now, you indicated that you had been earlier that day informed of your designation in question period as the number two questioner from the Official Opposition but that at the beginning of question period you weren't sure that you would be so designated because the hon. Minister of Education wasn't in the Assembly at that time. Now, what would happen if she hadn't arrived in the Assembly prior to the designation of that second question? Would you have been designated and asked the question to the Acting Minister of Education?

MR. PIQUETTE: No, the intent was -- because Mrs. Betkowski is bilingual, I did not wish to pursue the question with anyone else because of the fact that there was no prior notification with that other member. So I had indicated to Mr. Martin that if Mrs. Betkowski was not there, he would simply skip me and move on to the next one in the question period. So, again, I felt it very important to notify the minister prior to the question being asked.

MR. FOX: So you felt it was important that the minister to whom you were putting the question understood what you were saying?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, had at least a fair knowledge of French and also had prior notification of the fact so that it would not come as a complete shock or surprise.

MR. FOX: So again the asking of this important question on French language education en français was not to assert what you think is a right. It was an appropriate action considering the subject matter and the person to whom the question was being asked. Is that . . .

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. No question about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Piquette, Mr. Moore asked you a moment ago about advance notice to the Speaker when a member was putting a question in a language other than English, and I think you tended to separate the official languages from other languages. I guess I'd like to ask your view, Mr. Piquette. You are, I think, fairly well aware of the rules. We have a 45-minute question period. Hon. members obviously have important questions related to their constituency. You're also familiar with the fact that under *Beauchesne* 357, for question period the Speaker must rule whether a question is in order or not before allowing the question. I'm just kind of curious. I guess if you feel that if you wish to put a question in French and not advise the Speaker, then there is no question in your view that the Speaker must be fluently bilingual, I would assume. Is that a given by you?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I believe Dr. Carter is bilingual from what he's indicated to me in the past. So I assume that . . . I

believe he's already also made that statement publicly as well. But I don't think that should be a condition -- that the Speaker be bilingual -- to ask a question in French. I don't think that should be at all the question here. If in the future we so desire or would find it convenient, then by all means. But I think here we're talking about what I felt is a right. A right takes precedence over interpretation of perhaps House rules, because out of these statutes come basically our procedures in the House. I feel that since there was no statute or procedures in the past which denied myself as a member to address the House in both official languages, then I could simply continue doing that as a fact until the House otherwise decided or complied.

MR. GOGO: Well, a supplementary. You're well aware, Mr. Piquette, that the Speaker must determine whether a question is in order before it's allowed.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes.

MR. GOGO: I guess my confusion is that you tend to separate now into several languages. Then surely the Speaker, in order to allow that question, must be able to understand that question. So it would go without saying then that the Speaker would have to be bilingual if in fact we followed through on your response to Mr. Moore that the Speaker wouldn't have to have advance notice of a question being asked in French. Is that correct?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I already stated before that my intention on that particular day was to give the House both the French and the English text of the question. So again, if the Speaker would have waited a little bit longer, he would have been totally aware. Even if he had been unilingual, he would have been totally aware of what the questions were pertaining to.

MR. GOGO: But I'm not dealing with April 7. I was just dealing with Mr. Moore's question to you and your response that, as I gather -- and perhaps I didn't gather correctly -- you felt quite satisfied that if members wanted to put questions in other than the official languages of Canada, they should give notice to the Speaker, but if they wanted to put a question in French, that was not necessary. Was that correct?

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay. The reason I say that is because we do have two official languages. Let's first of all make sure we decide on those two before we start making rules about others. So I'm saying that the way we treat French and English in Canada is different from how we treat the other languages, but it does not preclude from the fact that we can allow other languages to be used in the Chamber.

Perhaps it might be a good idea for that determination to be made or to leave it as an open question and simply accept what comes and not be insulted or surprised that other languages are used in the House. But I believe we're talking here about two different issues. One is the two official languages of Canada, and then we have supplementary languages. I think they might have to conform to different sets of rules.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Piquette, in reply to Mr. Moore you said that the number of Francophones at the present state of development did not warrant expense on the translation side of it, but you said that out of courtesy, translation should be provided for questions or matters spoken in French. Who provides a transla-

tion then?

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, the member would provide the translation himself or herself, although I've been made aware that in other Houses it's possible, if you want to have translation to all members, that it can be cheaply done by having a contract on a part-time basis, but then it would lead to a lot more prenotification if you had that kind of service available to the House. But that is another option.

I'm saying that the option I would like to see at this time -- not without prejudice to what may transpire in the future, because I can guarantee you and all members in this House, look in this House 20 years from now and you'll probably find the majority will be bilingual. So what I'm only doing here is letting a little bit of sunshine into the Alberta Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, any supplementaries?

MR. WRIGHT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker and then Mr. Gibeault.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Piquette in terms of the question that was raised in the House, the motivation behind the question at that time. Was it your intent to challenge the question as to whether French could be used in question period, or was it the intent of the question at that point to get information with regards to the French language education?

MR. PIQUETTE: The whole purpose for the questions was to ask the minister questions relating to the School Act, section 23. That was the only intent, the only motive behind that series of questions. What transpired after was totally accidental. Of course as a member I reacted, I feel, very coolly. I don't think I lost my temper. I think I kept the honour of this Chamber. I felt that I did not want to create an emotional issue, but there was a principle I had to stand for after I was challenged.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In the designing of the question and the preparation of the question, you're saying clearly there were no discussions leading up to the fact that this should be an issue confronted in the Legislature of Alberta?

MR. PIQUETTE: No, I thought I had made that statement fairly clear in my maiden speech. I had had letters of congratulation from all members, from all parties of this House after I made my maiden speech in both French and English. This I assumed was the end of the question of French in the Alberta Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Did you feel, following that question period and the subsequent questions in the Legislature where we were going to move to committee and, as well, there were certain comments made on the floor of the Legislature, that your comments to the press clarified that matter, that the question you wanted to raise was gaining information further with regards to French education, not necessarily this question of whether we should have both French and English in this Legislature?

MR. PIQUETTE: What transpired after the question period was totally unrelated to the questions I raised in the House. I mean, if you recall what happened there, when I was interviewed by the news media, I don't think I was asked more than once or

twice about what was the purpose of my question. The whole incident got blown to the aspect of "What are you going to do now about speaking French in the Legislature?" But that was not the intent at all of why I had posed the question. The question was relating to the School Act, of making sure that Francophones' rights are respected there according to the Charter [of Rights] and Freedoms, section 23, which is very much a current issue today in Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other member wishing to direct any questions to Mr. Piquette?

If not, Mr. Piquette, I'd like to thank you on behalf of all the members for appearing here today and giving your evidence.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you very much for your time and attention. I mean no malice, and I hope that the deliberation of this committee will be very astute.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee, may we now move to item 5 on the agenda, Consideration of the Evidence of Ms Pam Barrett, MLA?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms Barrett, upon assuming your office as a member of this Assembly, you took an oath of office. By virtue of that oath, it is not the practice to administer a further oath to members at the time of giving evidence before a committee. I will merely ask you to confirm with regard to your oath that you regard yourself as bound by that oath with respect to the evidence you give to the committee today.

MS BARRETT: I do so consider.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Has committee counsel any questions for the witness?

MR. RITTER: No, I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

MS BARRETT: That's fine, Mr. Chairman. I'll distribute a copy of something in a moment. I would like to observe that this has been, I believe, a most regrettable incident that has taken on proportions that certainly could not have been anticipated. One of the reasons I believe this has happened is that I don't believe it occurred to any member of the Assembly that we could be facing a potential problem here. As is well known, Mr. Chairman, House leaders of political parties represented in this Assembly with the Speaker had, by common or negotiating process, agreed to a number of rules that would be observed in this Assembly without changing the Standing Orders. That was done after the 1986 election. There have been negotiations since, but none that have changed the observations made by the Speaker at the commencement of the first sitting of this Legislature last June 1986.

If we had anticipated -- if any member had anticipated -- that we were looking at a potential problem, I believe the House leaders would have gotten together to hammer out a recommendation to the Speaker which, unless it was changing the Stand-

ing Orders, would thereafter have been enunciated in the Assembly by the Speaker, given that that was the precedent we had established and which had worked. Now, since April 7, since it's become clear that the Assembly would like to differentiate between what is acceptable in debates compared to what is acceptable in question period with respect to the use of languages other than English, the Official Opposition caucus has had time to deliberate on the matter and has now a proposal concerning the use of French in the Assembly, which I would like to read. It's not very long; it's one page. I will have it distributed as I read it, if that's acceptable to the committee.

MR. FOX: Would it be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to move that that be accepted as item of evidence 13?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the only problem the Chair has is that of course the purpose for your being here today is to provide evidence for consideration of the committee. The committee itself obviously will be coming forward with recommendations based on the conclusions they reach with respect to that evidence.

MS BARRETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's certainly fair enough, and I was not aware that my hon. colleague would request that this be entertained as evidence. It is, I submit, though a policy recommendation that 16 members of this Assembly have discussed at length and unanimously support so that we can at least make our input into the recommendation process which will commence after all evidence is considered. If the committee prefers that I don't read it, that's fine, but I do believe that all members should have it, and I want to be on record indicating that this is a position that has been unanimously adopted by the Official Opposition caucus.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order on the question of whether the evidence is in order or not. I do remind members that number (4) in the motion that was referred to us is:

any other question that the committee deems is related to the matters of privilege arising under questions 1 and 2 . . .

I submit respectfully that the regime for the future, if we want to hammer one out, is a question that does arise, and this is in order as a matter of evidence. But whether it would be good to read this or not is another question of course.

MS BARRETT: [Inaudible] all about it. It would probably take me as long to read it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, with respect, I think in the interests of time, perhaps we could take it as read by all the members. It's been distributed to all, and I'm sure it'll be taken into account in the deliberations of the committee. So you may continue if you wish with any further statement, Ms Barrett.

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any questions from counsel?

MR. RITTER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'll take questions then from members. Mr. Russell.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm following up on questions relating to the Official Opposition caucus strategy of the day of April 7, as alluded to by Mr. Piquette when he was here. I guess the first question as House leader is: what was the strategy involved in asking questions about the School Act specifically in French rather than English if it was information about the School Act that you were seeking?

MS BARRETT: It was Leo's request to make his question in French as well as English to emphasize the concern of the Franco-Alberta community with respect to implementation of the provisions of section 23 of the Charter of Rights in the upcoming School Act.

MR. RUSSELL: Is it the official position of the opposition caucus or the opposition party that this Assembly should be bilingual?

MS BARRETT: That French be permitted?

MR. RUSSELL: Permitted but used -- a bilingual Assembly.

MS BARRETT: It is the official position of the Official Opposition that the use of French is a right, and it ought to be permitted in the Assembly. But we have a particular provision, and that is that it be used on occasion; that is, not a regular feature of dialogue within the Chamber.

MR. RUSSELL: It's true, as has been brought out by other evidence, that there are many precedents for the use of many other languages in the House. Certainly during my time in here that's happened without any problem. The problem of course has occurred in the question period because of the instant participation of the Speaker and everyone. Is it the objective of the opposition to have a bilingual question period?

MS BARRETT: It is the request of the opposition that French be permitted in the question period. That's why I wanted to read the statement I've handed out, because I believe it makes it very clear that we believe the onus for providing the translation should be upon the member using French and that should be immediate; that is, either orally immediately [after] the French language part of the question is concluded or in writing. I think that's very pivotal to our position, such that no special services would then be required, but this provision then would permit all members to exercise that which we believe is a constitutional right.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Just as a follow-up, because I think I asked a similar question of Mr. Piquette: where there is by way of official translators a difference pointed out in the true translations, which language would then hold the official view as given in the House?

MS BARRETT: Well, that's a very difficult question. I believe that if there were such an instance -- and that would imply having independent translators -- of a disagreement between the interpretation of the English and the French, then a process something like the translator going to the individual and questioning which was the intent might be appropriate. I couldn't make any recommendations about outcome or any other process in that regard, although I know what you're getting at.

MRS. OSTERMAN: In terms of evolving an official position, you had not foreseen the problem of there being, as Mr. Piquette put it, a paraphrasing and a translation that wasn't done by a recognized translator and verified before presentation? You hadn't perceived or thought ahead to answering that question?

MS BARRETT: Yes, certainly we had, but you see, it's not our position that independent translators ought to be present and performing that work. In the instances where French is spoken, it is our position that the onus of accuracy falls upon the member speaking the other language -- the French language in this instance -- and that responsibility can surely be upheld at least in essence by virtue of the fact that the person is also speaking in another language. If the person is competent in English and in French, then it's pretty clear the person is competent to reflect accurately what that person said in one or the other language.

MRS. OSTERMAN: I guess, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure then why we have the incredible cost of translation across the country by official translators if this is not a problem. But I've been given to understand that it is indeed a problem, and it then raises another matter, particularly in question period where we are representing our constituents in terms of questions and answers, and it is important on the spot. Because we're supposed to be dealing with subjects of importance of the day, to be able to reflect accurately on the questions that are raised, and to answer the question in one language or the other and be reflecting on a possible inaccuracy I guess I perceive as a problem. Therefore, to deal with it in a casual sense -- as the hon. member had said previously, we could paraphrase -- I think the Assembly, in terms of the important business being processed here, would need more than a paraphrasing to speak to the accuracy of it.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I'd like to respond to the concern. It is clear that where French and English are used in the House of Commons in almost equal amounts, translation becomes very important. In an Assembly which is predominantly English-speaking but in which the right of the French language is recognized, it is pretty clear that it would be used only on occasion. This process has been worked out in Manitoba quite successfully and in other provinces as well. Where the presence of the French language is not so great that it's going to take up an awful lot of the time or wouldn't constitute an awful lot of the dialogue within the Chamber, they've come to an agreement which they believe is satisfactory and which appears to work just fine, and that is that the onus of translation responsibility is upon the member. And it works. It's a natural, balanced way of looking at this question when one contrasts rights with numbers and the occasions in Assemblies which are predominantly of one language or another.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, do I have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have you down as completing your supplementaries, Mrs. Osterman. I'll be glad to put your name down here later.

Mr. Hyland, followed by Mr. Gogo.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My first question was related to onus of the translation. I think that's been covered by Mrs. Osterman. The second one is one of mechanics. Ms Barrett, I wonder if you could comment on: if we use a second language in question period and the question is put -- in this

instance, let's use French -- in French, the translation is provided to the minister, the minister reads the translation if they're not able to reply, they reply in either French or English, and if they reply in French, then there's no translation for them to be given to other members of the House. Once we get past the first question, how do we handle it?

Secondly, while all this is going on, that's going to be equivalent . . . Instead of one question and two or three supplementaries, it's going to be like asking seven questions or at least taking the time for seven questions. What do we do with it in our timing? How does that affect our timing, and how do we handle it?

MS BARRETT: Well, the hon. member is possibly not aware that I have worked hard for the last year to try to get other changes to the question period agreed to by the Government House Leader, which in my belief would look after some time considerations.

In any event, in terms of the mechanistic control, it's pretty clear in the proposal I've distributed that any member speaking French would also convey the substance of her or his presentation in English in the Assembly in oral or written form. Now, if you want to fine-tune that as a committee, that's certainly up to you. That's my recommendation. So if the respondent chose to respond in French, for instance, then it would be the responsibility of that respondent to provide the translation or paraphrasing of that response in English. It seems pretty clear to me.

MR. HYLAND: My second question is again: were you involved in delivering Mr. Piquette's letter to the Speaker? I guess I should have asked him that same question too, but I never thought of it.

MS BARRETT: Oh, that's okay because I can answer it. Leo signed the letter and then he had to leave. I took responsibility of delivering it. I made three phone calls that morning to the Speaker's office to let them know I would be delivering it. I couldn't get through to Speaker Carter and, on the third phone call, left the message that he may want to know that I would be up at, I believe, quarter to twelve -- no, it was twenty to twelve that day -- with the letter and that some media people would be with me. So I gave just by courtesy, over a period of a couple of hours, a lot of notice that that would be occurring.

MR. HYLAND: And was Speaker Carter in his office when you arrived at whatever time?

MS BARRETT: No. He had been in his office prior to my arrival but was unable to take my phone calls, as was his executive assistant unable to take my phone calls. So on the third phone call, which would have been at about quarter past eleven, I gave the contents of my message to the secretary in that office, and by the time I arrived it was my understanding, although I couldn't confirm it -- I couldn't see into his office -- I was told that the Speaker was not there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gogo, followed by Mr. Wright, Mr. M. Moore, and then Mrs. Osterman.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms Barrett, as the Official Opposition House Leader, I think you have a great vested interest in how this House functions in terms of legisla-

tion for Albertans. I think it's item 3 in the terms of reference -- that is, languages other than English that may be used and so on -- and I just draw your attention to the handout you gave, the fourth asterisk, whichever one that is, regarding oral questions. I've got to come back to *Beauchesne* and the rules of the House.

*Beauchesne* and Standing Orders really are enacted to enabling, I think, a very smooth functioning of the Assembly. And in order to comply with what you have suggested here, there is no question that the Speaker of the Assembly must be bilingual, that under our Standing Orders any member of the House that would find himself or herself in that Chair, if one reads Standing Order 12 in our Standing Orders, in the absence of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, and the Deputy Chairman of Committees, et cetera, et cetera -- I guess I have difficulty in understanding how you think that would function, being such a student of *Beauchesne* that you are, under section 357, where the Speaker must determine in the interests of all members of the House what is and what is not in order in the form of an oral question. As the hon. member knows, there are four pages there that deal exclusively with the nature of a question. I guess my first question would be: do you think this is possible in the Alberta Legislature today?

MS BARRETT: But of course it's possible, whether or not the Speaker is bilingual. I'd like to point out first of all that citation 357 in *Beauchesne* does not refer to Oral Question Period; it refers to Written Questions. But in the second instance, I think it makes no sense to imply that you need to have a bilingual Speaker in order to determine whether or not the question shall be ruled in order under the circumstances of provision of translation -- that is, the same translation from which all members would benefit.

MR. GOGO: But that's not referred to in the fourth asterisk there:

... in the case of oral questions, the member to whom the questions are put in French will be so notified, and sent or told the English of it.

I don't see how that relates to the Chair at all. You can't have a functioning House without the Chair being aware, obviously to rule on the question.

The second question would be then with that in mind -- and I guess Mr. Hyland is the one who put the question; that is, the length of the question period for hon. members wanting to put questions. I guess looking at the extreme, if you get five members who want to put their questions both ways and the time factor involved, do you think that would detract at all from the question period?

MS BARRETT: To respond to the first part of the question, I'd refer Mr. Gogo to the section on that handout which would be indicated by the third asterisk in which it's pretty clear that the member speaking French will also convey the substance of her or his presentation in English, in the Assembly.

All members would benefit from that and the Speaker is a member, so I think that answers that concern.

In terms of the question period time consideration, I don't believe it would be a problem under most circumstances, because I don't believe that under most circumstances French would be used in the question period. But in the second instance, I would say that I have made, I believe, about 13 recommendations in writing to the Government House Leader

and to the House leaders of the other political parties represented in this Assembly recommending ways by which more questions could be put in the Assembly and by which the processes could be expedited, to no avail. So if there is a concern about holding up question period by having to stop for a minute to do an immediate translation, then I wish that concern was also held in such a great order as to review other recommendations that could be in front of this Assembly with respect to speeding up the processes within question period.

MR. GOGO: My third question. This hon. member is not aware of your 13 proposals, because this hon. member is not a leader of any party. The proposal you've handed out, Ms Barrett, deals with the French language, one of the official languages of Canada. I can't recall whether you responded earlier to the question of language other than English in the House. Do you feel that languages other than English could be used both in debate and in question period? Not French; languages other than English.

MS BARRETT: I can't tell you that I've got a position on that issue. My concern has been with the French language issue, because Canada is a bilingual country in which we have two official languages. So my attention has been riveted, shall we say, to that question and not to questions of other languages, although I have personally, as witnessing the use of other languages in the Assembly prior to my election, certainly never felt any personal compunction to object to those uses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, followed by Mr. Moore.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Ms Barrett, have you ever had arrangements with House officials respecting rules of language?

MS BARRETT: No. I believe that's the basic problem here. I find it difficult to fault one MLA who was told that it's fine to speak in the Assembly in French on one occasion but not on another when there appears to have been somehow in the interceding period a distinction between the type of occasion, about which I certainly had not been informed.

It is my view and it is my experience that rules which will not be set down in the Standing Orders by way of a motion dealt with by this Assembly are worked out between House leaders and the Speaker. That process was a reasonably successful process last summer. It involved a couple of meetings during which Speaker Carter was present, I believe, nearly all the time, and it worked out quite well. That, it seems to me, means that if we didn't have such an arrangement, then no rule against the use of French could reasonably be interpreted to have existed.

I believe no decision, privately or otherwise, could reasonably be made without involving what is a really common parliamentary practice, and that is getting the House leaders together and working out a recommendation which thereafter either is reflected in a change to the Standing Orders or is made in a statement by the Speaker to the Assembly.

MR. WRIGHT: Following up on Mrs. Osterman's questions to you concerning translation and drawing on your experience of how things work in other Assemblies and perhaps in general with translation, is the existence of an official translation a guarantee that there will be no argument as to which translation, the original or the translation, embodies the true intent of the speaker?

MS BARRETT: Yes, I was trying to make that point clear in my response to Mrs. Osterman's question when she asked: what do you do if your translator says that what you said in one language doesn't exactly equal what you said in another language?

Obviously, in the world of linguistics that will always be true because there are words in every language that cannot be accurately translated into another language. I think the point is profoundly clear and that the difficulty will exist to the same extent whether or not an outside translator is assigned the job of doing the translation. Therefore, there is no reason to assume -- unless we assume dishonesty on behalf of the individual who is obviously competent in two languages or wouldn't be using an alternative language -- that the translation would not be accurate in essence or intent.

MR. WRIGHT: Since you were asked the question by Mrs. Osterman then, perhaps I can ask you: is there any difference do you suppose if in one place it appears to say something in one language and in another place something else in another language? Is there any difference between that and the case in which a member has made remarks which are inconsistent with each other, maybe in the course of the same speech?

MS BARRETT: Not at all. In fact, if you hadn't said that, I was going to just make a comment about that, because I can think of instances in which that has occurred. No difference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Moore, followed by Mrs. Osterman.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions to ask, and they are similar in nature to the two that I asked Mr. Piquette.

The first one deals with translation. I want members to be aware that when I say "translation," I'm talking about a member translating for his or herself, not an official translation.

By way of background in that regard, I've been involved as a member of this Legislature for some 15 years and have had literally thousands of translations from French to English and English to French in my own constituency that are unofficial, and I don't ever on one occasion recall having had a problem with the translation, which speaks pretty well for itself. The laws of the country, on the other hand, obviously do need official translations, as do some other decisions.

The first question relates to the question period and whether or not as House Leader of the Official Opposition you believe it's necessary for a member who's using a language other than English -- in this case French -- to translate that question into English.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. M. MOORE: Second question then, similar to the one I asked Mr. Piquette: do you believe it is also appropriate that notice be given to the Speaker of the member's intention to ask a question in French?

MS BARRETT: I do. I don't think it should be perceived as a statutory requirement, but yes, I do. Because I think it is only by virtue of common courtesy and not all the rules of orders that govern this Chamber that all parties manage somehow or another to get along. That must necessarily include the Speaker, as it does the Table officers, quite frankly. So yes, I do, with conviction.

MR. M. MOORE: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Mrs. Osterman.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just follow up my last series of questions, because I was interested in where a more casual translation or paraphrasing would be replaced by something official in terms of instant translation and so on.

Both Mr. Piquette and Ms Barrett referred to "where numbers warrant," and I wondered: in the opinion of Ms Barrett, what numbers would warrant that changeover from something relatively casual in paraphrasing to something that is perceived to be more official and why numbers make a difference there? In other words, if paraphrasing and provision by members themselves in providing interpretation are okay in terms of the numbers of people we have today in the province and the ethnic mix, what makes it different, and what will the numbers be to make it different in the future?

MS BARRETT: Well, of course, that question can't be accurately answered without some kind of crystal ball by which I could see 50 years down the road in this Assembly, and I'm afraid I don't possess that device. I think it's much more of an issue with respect to official translation and simultaneous translation when both official languages are used an awful lot in an Assembly, such as in the Assembly of Quebec or the Canadian Parliament. It seems to me that's the sort of thing legislators would have to look at as time went on and as any changes to the proceedings -- and particularly the quantitative proceedings -- with respect to use of French in the Assembly occurred.

It's not something that I could anticipate. If French came to be spoken 20, 30, or 40 percent of the time in this Assembly in years down the road, then this Assembly might want to look at that sort of official translation. But as far as I can see, that isn't likely in the near future.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't speaking about a year in the future. I was speaking to the amount of usage the member saw as being a reasonable one to then contemplate simultaneous translation and so on. The hon. member is saying it could be 20 percent or whatever.

MS BARRETT: Well, I would respond by saying that I would take my cue certainly from other Legislatures which have found that the use of French or English, in whichever instance, became so great that translation services were necessary. I would take my cue from that.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyland, followed by Mr. Horsman.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had said when I asked my first series of questions that one was related to translation. It begs me to ask another one after Mr. Wright's questions on would there be any guarantee that translators who are certified would be totally accurate any more than anybody else. I suppose I'd like your comment on -- you know, I have a lot of trouble with the English language, even though it's the only one I know. Is there any guarantee that because you and I speak English we'll always both understand each other?

MS BARRETT: That's absolutely correct. The debate of semantics has occupied some of my time when I was at universities, and I can assure you that there is substance to that debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyland, further supplementary?

MR. HYLAND: No.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I wasn't able to hear all of the comments relating to this written document now before us. I will review *Hansard* carefully, but it appears from perusing this that what the hon. member is suggesting is that section 110 of the North-West Territories Act is severable -- that is, into the four parts -- and that we ought to in fact make that clear, and in particular make it clear that English is the language of the Assembly with respect to records and publications, including statutes of the Assembly. In other words, put into effect what the Haultain resolution proposed earlier, but that we allow the use of the French language with respect to debates and oral matters that come before the Assembly under certain conditions. Is that the correct way of putting it?

MS BARRETT: Well, I'm not going to comment on section 110 or the Haultain motion. I'm not a historian, and I'm not competent to comment on that. The intent of the proposal in front of you, however, is to indicate that the official recording of the use of French be limited only to *Hansard*, which is of course the translation verbatim of that which goes on in the Chamber and no further; in other words, that it would not appear in, for example, Votes and Proceedings nor would it appear in any statutes.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the hon. member may want to decline to comment on the matter, but it would appear to be clear from a reading of the second paragraph -- which I must admit at this stage I don't quite understand, particularly with respect to the reference to "as numbers warrant" being included in this particular section -- that the Legislature should move to quiet "doubts as to the legal status of all laws in Alberta enacted since September 1, 1905." I would take that to mean that some action would have to be taken to prevent the situation which arose in Manitoba where all statutes would have to be translated and so on since 1905 in order to legalize them and that that is to make it clear that their enactment in English is in fact legal. Is that correct?

MS BARRETT: Full requirement for them to be effective, absolutely.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would want to just conclude my supplementary questions by asking for an explanation from the hon. member, if she can give it now or perhaps in consideration later by some discussions or by correspondence, as to what in fact is meant by the inclusion of the term "as numbers warrant" in paragraph two. It doesn't seem to bear any relationship, quite frankly, to anything relating to either section 110 of the North-West Territories Act matter or to anything else we've been dealing with, except that it is the term that appears in the Constitution of Canada today with respect to education of citizens in the official languages where numbers warrant. I don't understand, quite frankly, why it appears in a recommendation of this kind.

MS BARRETT: I think I can give you a brief explanation. That is that it is our belief that official translations from third parties and publication of anything in the French language outside of the *Hansard* is unnecessary, given that there are not a lot of MLAs in this Assembly who are bilingual and given that the other official language -- that is, French -- is not used in any kind of dominant fashion in the Assembly.

Therefore, it would be redundant, or to put a real blunt edge on it, ridiculous to engage in simultaneous translation, even contracted translation. It would be ridiculous to publish Votes and Proceedings or other official publications of the House in both languages. That would be a reflection of the linguistic makeup of this Assembly, and that's why that reference is in there. But I understand that the member asking the question is a lawyer, and I know that "where numbers warrant" has become a real issue for lawyers from coast to coast and will continue for a long time. I'm sure that's why the federal politicians used it in the first place.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, just a comment. That's a matter for legislators as well as lawyers.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions for Ms Barrett? If not, I would like to thank Ms Barrett for appearing before the committee today and would thank you on behalf of all the members.

Moving on to item 6 on the agenda. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Did we mark this paper as an exhibit for ease of reference? If we didn't, may I propose that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed, that this paper become exhibit?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. WRIGHT: It should be 14 according to my list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. There was a motion today with respect to the evidence of other witnesses. Those witnesses have been approved. The Chair would suggest that when we reconvene tomorrow at 9:30, perhaps it would be appropriate to move to those witnesses, to the extent that they are available. Obviously, we've had no opportunity to ascertain that as yet. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then after that we will proceed with the agenda as previously distributed. Is there any item of other business? Mr. Gogo.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the calling of the witnesses tomorrow, as you stated it's been somewhat sudden -- their being requested. Could the clerk of this committee endeavour to get the transcript of today's testimony with reference to those people to those people prior to tomorrow? I think that would be a gracious move on behalf of this committee, so that those witnesses may have an opportunity to understand what went on today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll endeavour to do that. Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX: Is it the intention of the Chair to call any witness from the *Edmonton Journal* in regards to the matters before the committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not call the witnesses.

MR. FOX: Is the Chair aware of any request from any member of the committee to see someone from the *Edmonton Journal* be

called as a witness?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as I know, there's been no motion made at any committee meeting with respect to the calling of any other witnesses other than those that have come forward to date.

MR. RUSSELL: Is a motion to adjourn in order?

[The committee adjourned at 4:28 p.m.]