



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights

JUST • NUMBER 014 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

—
Chair

Mr. Mike Wallace

Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

• (1145)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC)): Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for coming. This is the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, meeting number 14. It's supposed to start at 11 o'clock, and I do apologize to our witnesses for being delayed, but we had a vote in the House and we had to attend.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Monday, October 21, 2013 we're doing a statutory review of part XVII of the Criminal Code. We're doing two video conferences today, and I thank you for joining us, gentlemen. Just so you know, there will potentially be other votes that we may get called to, but my goal is to make sure that your testimony does get into the record.

From the Fédération des associations de juristes d'expression française de common law inc. we have Mr. Allan Damer; and from the same organization, Mr. Rénaud Rémillard from Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Gentlemen, the floor is yours. You have 10 minutes each and we'll start with you, Mr. Damer.

[Translation]

Mr. Allan Damer (President, Fédération des associations de juristes d'expression française de common law inc.): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank you for giving the Fédération des associations de juristes d'expression française de common law inc., or FAJEF, the opportunity to appear before this committee.

I will start by explaining a little bit about who we are and what our priorities are.

The FAJEF brings together seven associations of French-language jurists located in common law provinces outside of Quebec. They include Alberta, where I live, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Our colleagues in Nova Scotia have [technical difficulties].

We act as the national spokesperson and [technical difficulties]. We provide support services to our members, and bringing together French-language jurists in all common law provinces is an advantage in terms of understanding the concerns of the regions [technical difficulties] and the flourishing of francophone and Acadian communities in Canada.

I will now tell you about the structure of the FAJEF, which brings together seven jurists' associations. [technical difficulties] sends a representative to sit on our board of directors. We have meetings

around every two months and [technical difficulties] to collaborate on national initiatives.

In addition to my role as president, I sit on the board of directors as a member of the Federation of Francophone and Acadian Communities. The Forum of Leaders tasked with the Strategic Community Plan results from their commitment [technical difficulties] and three organizations come together...

The Chair: Excuse me, sir.

[English]

Can you hold on for a second? We're having trouble with the audio.

I'm going to put you on hold, Mr. Damer.

Mr. Rénaud Rémillard, we're going to go to you. We're going to see if we can fix the other issue from Edmonton. Sorry.

The floor is now yours, sir.

• (1150)

[Translation]

Mr. Rénaud Rémillard (Director General, Fédération des associations de juristes d'expression française de common law inc.): Hello. My name is Rénaud Rémillard, director general of the Fédération des associations de juristes d'expression française de common law inc. I am appearing today along with Mr. Damer, who explained a little bit about the mandate of the federation. I am appearing today as the director general of the federation.

We also have the Centre canadien de français juridique. I have noticed that in previous meetings, you have discussed the question of training participants in the justice system, be they crown prosecutors, probation officers or others. This is also the type of work that we do.

As I said, I am appearing along with Mr. Damer. I and Mr. Damer will be happy to answer your questions. We often receive feedback from our members and from French-speaking jurists concerning what is happening on the ground. So in that context we will be able to provide you with some comments concerning what is happening in certain provinces and we will be able to tell you what our members and what members of associations of jurists across Canada have said. That said, I will be happy to answer your questions.

[English]

The Chair: Is that good, committee members? Then we'll go to questions.

Our first questioner will be Madam Boivin.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP): Thank you.

Thank you both for participating in our meeting. It's too bad, Mr. Damer, because we would have liked to hear your full speech. We hope to make that up through our questions.

My questions are fairly practical. After all, that is the goal of this exercise by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. We really want to see how part XVII of the Criminal Code is applied on a daily basis to those who work in the field. This is especially important for accused persons who are protected by that section.

What have the members of your association said about this practice on a day-to-day basis? What is the day-to-day experience? I understand that there are preliminary inquiries and trials. Some people have suggested that perhaps these protections should be extended to bail hearings, to people released on bail.

I would like to hear both of you answer, if the technical problem with Mr. Damer is resolved. I would also like to get an idea of how the minority groups experience this in the provinces, all minorities, that is.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay now? Yes, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allan Damer: I will answer your question. One key problem that we experience on a daily basis is the active offer of service. That is in the current Criminal Code, section 530.

Many of our members who are practising lawyers say that the active offer of service is not regularly provided. This means that an accused person appearing for the first time before the court or before a justice of the peace may not be advised of the fact that he has the right to a trial and other proceedings in the official language of his choice. So that is a huge problem.

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Normally, how is this active offer provided?

Mr. Allan Damer: Let's say that the accused appears before a trial judge for the first appearance during his case. Under the Criminal Code, the judge must advise the accused of his right to choose the official language, French or English, in which he would like his trial to be held.

Generally, the judges base their decision on the person's name. So if the name of the person appearing appears to be francophone, for example Mr. Rémillard, the judge will advise the person of his right to be tried in the official language of his choice. If the person's name does not appear to be a francophone name, such as Mr. Damer, the judge may neglect to advise the accused person of his right.

We believe that the active offer of service must be done in every case. We cannot assume that because someone's name is Boivin they are necessarily francophone. Why would the judge not make an active offer of service to a Mr. Johnson, for example? Everyone should be able to exercise their rights.

• (1155)

Ms. Françoise Boivin: As far as bail hearings are concerned, do you believe it would be a good idea to extend the protection of

part XVII to that very important part of a criminal proceeding? In your opinion, would that be too complicated to apply?

Mr. Allan Damer: Applying that would certainly pose some practical problems.

In criminal law, if we want both official languages to one day have real equal status, we will have to continue working toward that goal on a practical level.

I am aware that there are many obstacles. For example, what happens when disclosure is not available in French and the accused is francophone?

Let's take the example of a particular case mentioned by some of our members in Nova Scotia. In the case of a conditional release for an accused person who is francophone, if disclosure is not available in French at the time of the person's appearance, that person can give up the right to French-language proceedings and agree to English-language proceedings, knowing full well that if he insisted on having French-language proceedings, the appearance would be postponed, and in the meantime, he would remain in detention. Such a situation is unacceptable in our opinion.

I don't know if my colleague Mr. Rémillard would like to add anything.

[*English*]

The Chair: That's Madame Boivin's time.

From the Conservative side, Monsieur Goguen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Goguen (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, CPC): I would like to thank the witnesses for appearing today.

I would like to speak briefly about trials with a judge and jury. I would like to know if it's difficult to find francophone or bilingual jury candidates for a trial involving a judge and jury.

Mr. Allan Damer: I will let Mr. Rémillard answer your question.

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: Thank you.

That question has already been raised in some provinces. I know that Manitoba and British Columbia have looked into making up these juries. Each province uses different means. Manitoba, for example, uses health insurance card numbers to make up a list. The issue is to ensure that the list is representative of the general population. I know that poses a problem in some provinces. We have, for example, approached francophone school boards or spokespersons from member associations to make lists.

The issue of the make-up of juries has been a problem, but it is different from one province to the next. It is another example of Canadian diversity. What does that do? It makes things difficult if we want the process throughout the country to be identical. We must have some ability to adjust and respect the necessary basic principles.

As I said, the issue of juries has been raised on several occasions, but I have not heard many of our members talk about that. They are more worried that judges in some regions or provinces are not ensuring that the accused is advised of his or her rights. There is more talk about that issue. In some cases, we have talked about the juries, but there is less talk about that than the fact that the judges give out little or no information.

● (1200)

Mr. Robert Goguen: Mr. Damer, do you have something to add?

Mr. Allan Damer: In practice, the problem is more or less the same, be it for anglophones or francophones. Recently in Edmonton, a judge asked sheriffs to go out into the street to find anglophone jury members. It can be a problem regardless of the language of the proceedings.

Mr. Robert Goguen: Is there a province that has a model for training bilingual or francophone juries that is better than the others? Is there one that could be considered the best model?

Mr. Allan Damer: I do not know.

Mr. Robert Goguen: This is clearly not a problem in New Brunswick, because many people are bilingual, especially in urban regions, a little like in Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. Allan Damer: Mr. Rémillard just mentioned some examples from British Columbia and Manitoba. I think that in Alberta, they tried to use the list of people whose children attend francophone schools. In fact, thousands of students are registered in francophone schools. We take for granted that their parents are francophones and that they could be part of these juries.

From time to time, people call me to ask me if they should participate in a jury. Because of their careers, they can decide to participate or not.

Mr. Robert Goguen: To constitute a bilingual or francophone jury, could the candidates come from outside the judicial district? Is that done in some provinces?

Mr. Allan Damer: I do not have information on that. Perhaps Mr. Rémillard can give you some.

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: Various methods have, in fact, been proposed and used. I am aware of a case in Nova Scotia, I believe, a few years ago. Because they had not targeted the francophone population, through a school board or another means, they had to ask approximately 900 people, or practically the entire population. They were able to come up with enough people to constitute the jury, but they did nonetheless contact some 900 people, if I remember correctly. So a problem remains. I was told, unofficially, that francophones had stated that they did not speak French, because they did not want to do jury duty.

So there are sometimes problems in that regard. However, many solutions have been proposed in various provinces, even if they have not all been implemented, since they did not necessarily need to form a jury. In some cases, it remained purely theoretical. Nevertheless, I think that is done. Practices vary from one province to another.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

[English]

Our next questioner is from the Liberal Party, Mr. Casey.

[Translation]

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Province of New Brunswick told us that it had problems finding enough interpreters. Does that problem exist elsewhere?

Mr. Allan Damer: I can answer that question. We can say that it is, in fact, a huge problem.

I do not know if Mr. Rémillard already mentioned this, but in 2010, the Fédération des associations de juristes d'expression française de common law inc. created the Centre canadien de français juridique to provide better training for support staff and provincial court judges. The centre includes a component for interpreters.

We find that in practice, the interpretation is not reliable. It is not because the interpreters are unable to speak French, but because they do not have specialized legal training in French.

If the nuances of the lawyers' arguments are not interpreted properly before a court of law, that can adversely affect my client's case. So I have to step in from time to time to correct the interpretation by the interpreter. I do not do it out of lack of respect for the interpreter, but instead to clearly explain the case to the judge. Since I am bilingual, from time to time, I can explain to the judge that my comments were not interpreted accurately. That even happens at the Alberta Court of Appeal.

I can give you an example of something that happened last spring, when we were appearing before the Alberta Court of Appeal. There were two interpreters on our team. In presenting our arguments, we referred to "l'onglet 2" of our brief. That translates into English as "tab 2". The interpreter understood "anglais 2" and translated it as "English 2". Those are the kinds of fundamental things that can adversely affect a case. In this case, since there were several lawyers, we were able to share the work and ensure that the judges hearing the case received accurate interpretation of all of the arguments presented.

Interpreter training could therefore be an important part of the Centre canadien de français juridique.

I think I will give the floor to Mr. Rémillard to allow him to add some comments of his own.

● (1205)

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: We hear that question often. Criminal lawyers have told us that there are problems with court interpreters in some provinces.

It varies from one province to another. In some cases, the employees or the court interpreters are well trained. They are provincial employees, be it at the Department of Justice or in another department. These employees have a rather high level of bilingualism in the legal field. In other provinces, however, that is not the case. They call upon interpreters who do not have training in the legal field to interpret testimony or things of that nature.

Problems with court interpreting have been raised primarily in the western provinces, namely in Saskatchewan and Alberta, but also in other provinces, though to a lesser extent.

Two years ago, when we consulted court interpreters across Canada, most of them told us that there was a need for training and that it was a general deficiency. That is what we heard in many regions.

There is also another problem with court interpreters. When they are not provincial employees, they are generally people who do conference interpreting, in the health and legal fields. To do court interpreting, they must take training on their own time. So it is more cost effective for them to stick to conference interpreting. In some cases, it's a personal matter, they will simply prefer to not do any court interpreting, either because it does not pay enough, because there is mandatory training, or because the risks are too high.

The problem is clearly a reality in some provinces.

Mr. Sean Casey: Are there sufficient resources at the federal or provincial levels to train these interpreters? What role do the governments play now? Is there an opportunity to improve their role in the training of interpreters?

Mr. Allan Damer: Mr. Rémillard can probably answer that.

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: Yes. I think that the jurilinguistic centre at the University of Moncton offers some training and that it is primarily provided in New Brunswick as well as in the eastern regions of the country. An interpretation master's program was set up at Glendon College, in Toronto. That master's level training deals with conference interpreting in the legal and medical fields.

In the case of that master's program, the legal resources are undoubtedly lacking. Since I am the part-time director of the Centre canadien de français juridique, I can address the issue. There are not many initiatives for court interpreting, and French legal terminology. I think there is a need to increase the number of initiatives in this area to better train interpreters and to provide a certain level of quality across the country.

That is a very good question. Some practitioners have raised concerns with regard to court interpreters, as I mentioned. It is not the case in all provinces, but it certainly is in many of them.

• (1210)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you for those questions and those answers.

Our next questioner is Mr. Dechert from the Conservative Party.

Mr. Bob Dechert (Mississauga—Erindale, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to each of our witnesses this morning for sharing their knowledge with us.

I'm from Ontario, and I want to ask you a question about the situation in Ontario. I believe you mentioned that FAJEF also covers the province of Ontario. You may be familiar with the fact that in 2010, the Ontario government established a committee, known as the French Language Services Bench and Bar Advisory Committee, to look at issues of access to justice in both languages. In June 2012 the committee submitted a report, and instituted the French language

services bench and bar steering committee in order to implement the recommendations in the report.

First of all, are either of you familiar with that committee and the report?

[Translation]

Mr. Allan Damer: Mr. Rémillard, do you want to comment on that?

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: Yes, we are familiar with that. The member of our federation who is part of the Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario participated significantly in this study, as did Mr. Paul LeVay as president of the same association. We are aware of what is happening in Ontario. We are also aware that it might be a good idea, in some cases, to use what is being done in Ontario outside of the province.

[English]

Mr. Bob Dechert: That was going to be my next question—if you thought it should be followed as a model in other provinces—and I think you just answered that question.

Just generally, are there other provinces that have taken a unique and more effective approach to access to judicial services in both official languages that you think could be emulated by others? You think the Ontario model is worth noting; are there any other models out there that we should also know about?

[Translation]

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: I know a model that is used here, in Manitoba. Because I come from this province, I am probably more familiar with what is being done here. In the provincial court, we have added a key aspect to the judge's checklist. From now on, at the first appearance, judges must advise the accused of his or her right to use French or English and to have a trial in one of the two languages. The adding of that aspect to the checklist guarantees that the judge will ensure that the accused is advised that he or she may use French or English. While it is something simple, this process integrates a mechanism that is uniformly applied.

I have been told that judges in the New Brunswick provincial court automatically apply that in some regions, but not in all regions. When there is a checklist that applies to the entire province, it is the judge's duty to advise the accused that they may use French or English.

[English]

Mr. Bob Dechert: Thank you for that. I appreciate it very much.

My next question is changing direction a little bit. It comes from the response from the Minister of Justice of Saskatchewan. I don't know if you've seen his response, but Saskatchewan did point out one issue they're having with respect to French bail hearings. I know that bail hearings are not specifically part of the provisions of the Criminal Code that we're examining in this study, but it did seem to me that it was a matter of concern if people can't get timely bail hearings in both official languages. Their specific comment was that they have difficulty finding enough bilingual prosecutors, judges, and court officials to conduct those bail hearings on a timely basis. Therefore, sometimes the bail hearings are delayed.

Can you comment on that in Saskatchewan? Have you seen that experience in any other province? Do you think that is something that the Criminal Code should also cover?

Mr. Rémillard, I guess, or either one.

• (1215)

[Translation]

Mr. Allan Damer: Obviously, I do not have the same experience in Saskatchewan, but according to some justice of the peace colleagues, Alberta sometimes uses video conferences, like the one we are doing now. That is perhaps a way of dealing with the shortage of staff, francophone or French-speaking justices of the peace or prosecutors. That tool could be easy to use, but it is still in development, as we saw this morning, when we had some technical problems from time to time.

Mr. Rémillard would perhaps like to add something.

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: Yes, we will have to work out the kinks in video conferencing.

Furthermore, many students in immersion go on to law school, namely out west. That's one example I can give you. As a result, the shortage of bilingual people will become less of a problem in the future.

The bilingualism of prosecutors and people working in legal aid is increasing, thanks to immersion. A growing number of anglophone members of law associations have French as a second language. It's certainly the case in the western provinces, as well as in Ontario and Nova Scotia.

I believe bilingual capacity is increasing. The shortage of bilingual people is likely to be less of a problem in the future, particularly thanks to the training offered across the country. That's one way of increasing the bilingual capacity of the system. There are a lot fewer constraints in that sense than there were 5, 10 or 15 years ago.

[English]

The Chair: Our next questioner is from the New Democratic Party, Madam Péclet.

[Translation]

Ms. Ève Péclet (La Pointe-de-l'Île, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I would like to thank the witnesses for their testimony.

My first question has to do with the role of the judge. Since Bill C-13 was adopted, the judge must inform the accused of his right to stand trial in the official language of his choice. However, the judge is under no obligation to inform the accused personally. He must simply ask if the accused was made aware of this right.

What can you tell us about this provision? In your respective provinces, has it caused any problems?

Mr. Allan Damer: Sometimes, judges refuse to inform accused persons of their right. I reviewed letters sent to the committee by the provinces and I noticed that Alberta's justice minister seemed unaware of article 530(3) of the Criminal Code, which asks the judge to make an active offer. That's part of the problem.

Colleagues from other regions in Canada seem to have the same issue. Certain judges are not informed or trained in that regard, and they do not recognize their obligation to inform the accused.

I will let Mr. Rémillard speak, as he may have something to add.

• (1220)

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: Indeed, the situation varies greatly from one region to the next, and even within provinces. People in certain regions tell us things are going well, that the accused are well aware of their rights. In other regions, this is much less the case. The situation greatly varies. It is not uniform across the country, and that's a problem.

Some efforts were undertaken to change codes of conduct in order to compel attorneys to inform their clients of their rights. For example, changes were made to the attorney code of conduct in New Brunswick and Ontario. Even though the judge must make sure that the accused are informed of their rights, it is just as important that attorneys inform their clients as to whether or not they have the necessary linguistic skills to represent them during the trial that might take place in French or in English. There has been some work done in that sense.

Ms. Ève Péclet: In its report, the Senate committee recommended that the law be changed in order to compel the judge himself to inform the accused of their rights. According to you, should this recommendation constitute an amendment to part XVII of the Criminal Code?

Mr. Allan Damer: I think it would be a good idea to make such an amendment to the law. At the same time, it is important to provide good training for judges, because if they are not made aware that they must inform the accused of their rights, the law will not be properly enforced.

Mr. Rémond Rémillard: I agree with my colleague. Because the judge is an authority figure, he has a certain credibility. If a judge tells the accused that he has the right to proceed in English or in French, I personally believe that that meets the active offer requirement. It's a bit like a school principal who tells a student that he has the right to do such or such a thing. It has real weight.

In my opinion, this meets the active offer requirement. When the offer comes from someone in a position of authority, it probably has more influence, which further favours the use of this right.

Ms. Ève Péclet: You are reading the provinces' answers, but do you have any mechanisms to hold discussions with the provinces about, for example, problems that arise from the implementation of part XVII or ways in which provinces could improve its implementation? Do you have discussion groups or contacts with the provinces that allow you to oversee this part of the Criminal Code's proper application and improvement?

Mr. Allan Damer: I believe that some provinces, including Nova Scotia, meet regularly with the Minister of Justice or one of the minister's representatives. I don't know what the other provinces do, but perhaps Rémond could provide you with more information about that.

Mr. Rénaud Rémillard: In some provinces, working groups or joint groups have links or discussions with the Minister of Justice. Discussions don't necessarily deal with implementing part XVII, strictly speaking, but issues of access to justice in which part XVII is raised in one way or another. These discussions are held in an official context and often follow various established mechanisms. On the other hand, information is also largely shared in a less official fashion. For example, practitioners can identify difficulties or improvements to be made.

Each province is unique when it comes to interacting with legal experts' associations in the province or with people who work in the field. The situation varies according to the province's reality.

•(1225)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you for those questions and answers.

Our final questioner today is Mr. Jacob.

A voice: [Inaudible—Editor]

The Chair: You weren't on the list, my friend. I'm sorry. I'll put you on the list after Mr. Jacob.

Mr. Jacob, the floor is yours. You have five minutes.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Jacob (Brome—Missisquoi, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to both witnesses for participating in today's meeting.

The Commissioner of Official Languages, Graham Fraser, recently completed a study on the bilingual capacity of the judiciary for superior courts. Essentially, he concluded that there were not enough bilingual judges appointed to superior courts. According to him, the main reason for this problem is the judges' appointment process, which "does not allow for a sufficient number of judges with the language skills needed to hear citizens in the minority official language."

Could you tell me how the provisions for the accused's language rights can be applied when the bilingual capacity of superior court judges is lacking?

My question is for both witnesses.

Mr. Allan Damer: Obviously, there is work to be done. In some regions of Canada, there are perhaps fewer judges appointed to superior courts who are bilingual or who have bilingual capacity.

The Centre canadien de français juridique intends to better train provincial court judges. That is one of the aspects of the problem which we are attempting to resolve. As we train these judges, a wider pool of possible appointments is created. As Mr. Rémillard mentioned earlier, many students, even anglophones, who start to receive their training in French are able to study the law, become lawyers, or even judges.

When it comes to resolving this problem immediately, our lawyer colleagues must have a bilingual capacity to be eligible for an appointment. The official languages commissioner indicated that in the appointment criteria [technical difficulties].

•(1230)

Mr. Rénaud Rémillard: [Technical difficulties] part XVII, the bilingual capacity of provincial courts is probably the most important element. This does not mean that the bilingual capacity of higher courts is not important, but training judges from the provincial courts is probably the most important aspect in terms of part XVII of the Criminal Code.

I would like to highlight how important training is. Bilingual capacity could in part be improved through training, in addition to having an increasingly larger pool of candidates to the legal profession, which can serve as a sort of incubator for the judiciary.

With regard to part XVII of the Criminal Code and the language rights it covers, I think training for provincial court judges is probably the most significant factor. However, training for superior court judges is also important. These judges also need to have bilingual capacity because they also have to hear cases.

Mr. Pierre Jacob: In what ways does the lack of bilingual superior court judges compromise the linguistic rights of accused persons?

My question is for both witnesses.

Mr. Allan Damer: The problem obviously stems from the fact that, practically speaking, the accused have to base their choice on whether to have their trial in English or in French on the capacity of the legal system before which they are to appear. If they choose to have their trial in French, their trial will have to be postponed, which is unacceptable to them. In order to go to trial earlier, the accused may have to choose to proceed in English rather than in French. The lack of bilingual judges could lead to this type of problem.

I do not know whether Mr. Rémillard will want to add anything to that.

Mr. Pierre Jacob: Could you give me more details about the kinds of delays accused persons face when they ask for a trial in French?

Mr. Allan Damer: Let us say that, in a given region, there are no francophone judges available. What can you do in that case? Some people will decide to proceed in English.

In my criminal law practice, I had an accused ask me whether the judge would treat him more harshly if he asked for his trial to be held in French. We obviously want to avoid this perception.

The issue of delays is extremely important, even in criminal cases. For accused persons in jail waiting for their trial, it is unpleasant to have to wait a number of months before their cases are heard.

There are other problematic situations. For example, I heard some of my colleagues from southern Manitoba say that some counsels knew that a certain francophone judge was stricter towards the accused. They would therefore specifically ask for the trial to be conducted in the other official language so as not to have their case heard by that judge.

To answer your question, I must say that there are many factors to consider. I do not know whether my colleague Mr. Rémillard will want to comment on this.

•(1235)

[*English*]

The Chair: No, we are done.

Thank you to our witnesses today. Your testimony has been excellent. I want to apologize for the technical difficulties we had here on the Hill today. It's an important review we are doing of part XVII of the Criminal Code. Your testimony has been very valuable to assist committee members, so thank you for that.

Before we adjourn, I want to let you know that if you have witnesses...The intention is to have another meeting on this issue when we get back from our break on the Tuesday. On Thursday of this week we have the estimates with the minister coming for the first hour and officials for the second hour. Make sure that the clerk gets any further witnesses.

We did ask, so you know, the Commissioner of Official Languages to come. He was unable to make it today. We are going to continue to pursue that individual, hopefully for that first week back. My thought is we'd have two panels, if we can, on the first Tuesday back; and then on Thursday, we may go in camera to talk about a report and give directions to the analysts, and then maybe a subcommittee on agenda to see what we're going to do for the next few weeks after that.

With that, are there any questions?

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Yes, please, I have a couple of questions.

[*Translation*]

On Thursday, we will begin our study of supplementary estimates (C). We have also received the main estimates. Could we plan to...

[*English*]

The Chair: No, different meeting.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin: I mean that we have to set a meeting date aside for that.

[*English*]

The Chair: You mean plan a meeting for the mains?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Yes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Yes, I thought you were going to ask me for the mains on Thursday. If you'd like to have a meeting on the mains, which we all should have, in my view, we can plan when that will be. We know approximately the date that we need to be done by.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Françoise Boivin: Excellent, thank you.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>