



BACKGROUND PAPER

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES AND PARLIAMENT

Publication No. 2015-131-E

10 December 2015

Revised 19 May 2020

Chloé Forget
Marie-Ève Hudon
Élise Hurtubise-Loranger
Legal and Social Affairs Division

Revised by Marie-Ève Hudon

Parliamentary Information and Research Service

Library of Parliament *Background Papers* provide in-depth studies of policy issues. They feature historical background, current information and references, and many anticipate the emergence of the issues they examine. They are prepared by the Parliamentary Information and Research Service, which carries out research for and provides information and analysis to parliamentarians and Senate and House of Commons committees and parliamentary associations in an objective, impartial manner.

This publication was prepared as part of the Library of Parliament's research publications program, which includes a set of publications, introduced in March 2020, addressing the COVID-19 pandemic. Please note that, because of the pandemic, all Library of Parliament publications will be released as time and resources permit.

© Library of Parliament, Ottawa, Canada, 2020

Official Languages and Parliament
(Background Paper)

Publication No. 2015-131-E

Ce document est également publié en français.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
1	INTRODUCTION1
2	CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS1
2.1	<i>Constitution Act, 1867</i>1
2.1.1	The Right to Use English or French in Debates.....2
2.1.2	Records and Journals of the Houses of Parliament3
2.1.3	Printing and Publishing of Acts4
2.2	The <i>Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms</i>5
2.3	The <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>6
3	STATUTORY PROVISIONS: THE <i>OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT</i>7
3.1	Debates and Proceedings of Parliament8
3.1.1	Use of English and French8
3.1.2	Broadcasting Debates8
3.1.3	Translation in the Parliamentary Context.....10
3.2	Legislative and Other Instruments10
3.3	Historical Debates.....11
3.4	Public Services and Communications11
3.5	Modernization of the <i>Official Languages Act</i>12
4	PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE12
4.1	Official Languages12
4.2	Other Languages13
5	NEW TECHNOLOGIES15
5.1	Social Media15
5.2	E-consultations15
5.3	Parliament’s Virtual Sitings and Committee Meetings15
6	OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT16
7	CONCLUSION.....18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the Canadian parliamentary context, English and French enjoy equality of status and use. In fact, there are a number of constitutional and legislative provisions governing the use of both official languages in Parliament. These provisions, which have evolved over the course of history, now apply to both the legislative process and parliamentary procedure and reflect the fundamental nature of the language rights granted to members of Parliament and senators, as well as the people they serve.

The *Constitution Act, 1867* introduced the first official languages guarantees and obligations for parliamentary institutions. Practices promoting legislative bilingualism have been developed over time, and parliamentary institutions have adapted accordingly, for example, by implementing simultaneous interpretation and the co-drafting of federal legislation. Certain practices were codified when the federal government adopted its very first *Official Languages Act* in 1969.

Recognizing that bilingualism is an important feature of parliamentary democracy in Canada, the 1982 *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* codified language rights for parliamentary proceedings and documents. Canadian courts then clarified the scope of these rights and ordered Parliament to continue adapting its practices. In 1988, the language requirements regarding debates, proceedings, the legislative process and various parliamentary documents were set out in a new version of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA).

Parliamentary procedure has undergone several changes to provide a framework for the use of not only the official languages, but other ones too. In recent years, the Senate and the House of Commons have taken measures governing the use of Indigenous languages.

In addition, more resources were allocated for parliamentary translation and simultaneous interpretation to meet parliamentarians' significant official language requirements. As well, bilingualism was added as a condition for the appointment of officers of Parliament.

Recent official languages challenges stemming from the use of new technologies have appeared and, once again, required the Canadian Parliament to adapt its practices. For example, virtual Senate and House of Commons sittings and their respective committee meetings resulting from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic have brought about their own set of challenges regarding Parliament's and parliamentarians' compliance with language requirements.

By promoting official language best practices, Parliament serves as a model of an institution that is accessible to both of Canada's official language communities. This model could be called upon to continue evolving in connection with debates on the OLA, which the federal government has pledged to modernize over the course of the 43rd Parliament.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES AND PARLIAMENT

1 INTRODUCTION

In Canada, a number of constitutional and statutory provisions concern the use of official languages in the legislative realm, thus recognizing the right of both official language communities to participate equally in the parliamentary process. These provisions stem from the collective history of Canadians, and their presence in the Constitution of Canada confirms the fundamental nature of those rights.

This paper provides an overview of the various aspects of the issue of official languages in the context of the Canadian Parliament by examining:

- the guarantees and obligations arising from the Constitution, notably relevant provisions of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, the *Constitution Act, 1982* and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*;
- the statutory provisions contained in the *Official Languages Act*;
- some specific aspects of parliamentary procedure as they relate to official and other languages;
- some official languages issues stemming from the use of new technologies, including virtual meetings and sittings; and
- the linguistic obligations to which officers of Parliament are subject.

2 CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

2.1 CONSTITUTION ACT, 1867

In the negotiations preceding Confederation in 1867, one of the proposed approaches was “optional” bilingualism in the activities of the future Parliament of Canada. French-Canadian members vigorously opposed this option, and their protests culminated in the passage of a resolution providing for the “mandatory” use of English and French in certain specific areas of parliamentary activity.¹ That resolution became section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*,² which reads as follows:

Either the English or the French Language may be used by any Person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any Person or in any Pleading or Process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec.

The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages.

The purpose of section 133 is to grant “equal access for anglophones and francophones to the law in their language” and to guarantee “equal participation in the debates and proceedings of Parliament.”³

Interpretation of section 133 must take that purpose into account. Without granting English and French official status, section 133 nevertheless confirms the bilingual character of the Parliament of Canada, which Senator Gérald A. Beaudoin has called the “embryo of official bilingualism.”⁴

Section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* has been interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada on various

occasions, thus elucidating its scope. The following sections look at each of the components of section 133.

Section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*

This provision sets out three types of legislative guarantees:

- the right to use English and French in legislative debates;
- the use of English and French in the official records and journals of the houses of Parliament; and
- the use of English and French in printing and publishing Acts.

2.1.1 The Right to Use English or French in Debates

Section 133 expressly guarantees all parliamentarians the right to use English or French in parliamentary debates. As not all parliamentarians are bilingual, a system of simultaneous interpretation was introduced in the House of Commons in 1959 as a result of a motion by Prime Minister John Diefenbaker,⁵ thus enabling all members to express themselves in the official language of their choice and to be understood by all members of the House. Before that system was introduced, a parliamentarian speaking French was generally not understood by the anglophone majority, which had the effect of emptying the House of Commons of a large number of its members.⁶ In the Senate, simultaneous interpretation was introduced in 1961.⁷

When the interpretation system was established, a small group of seven interpreters assumed responsibility for interpreting all debates.⁸ Since then, the Translation Bureau’s Services to Parliament and Interpretation Sector has expanded to some 40 permanent interpreters and regularly calls on freelance interpreters.⁹

Because of a decision rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1986 (*MacDonald v. City of Montreal*), it is not currently clear whether the right to use English or French in parliamentary debates also includes the constitutional right to simultaneous interpretation.¹⁰ In an incidental statement in the decision, Justice Jean Beetz said that the right to use English or French in parliamentary debates did not include the right to simultaneous interpretation. It is useful to note that the *MacDonald* decision is part of a case law trend advocating the restrictive interpretation of language rights, a trend

overruled by the 1999 decision in *R. v. Beaulac*,¹¹ in which the Supreme Court of Canada redefined the rules for interpreting language rights. Section 133 and language rights in general must now be given a broad and liberal interpretation based on their objectives.

In addition, it is apparent from Prime Minister Diefenbaker's remarks when the motion on the simultaneous interpretation system was passed that the system's introduction was clearly viewed as the recognition of a constitutional right:

I also believe this motion will provide belated recognition of the fact that under our constitution this basic right has been secured and will be maintained as part of our constitutional freedom, and will be regarded as unchangeable and unchanging. This view, I believe, is of the essence in the maintenance of unity within our country. After all, our very confederation came about as a consequence of the partnership between those of French and English origin. Because of that fact, everything we can do to ensure the preservation of those basic constitutional rights and the equality of those rights of language should be attained and implemented.¹²

Given the importance of ensuring respect for every person's right to use the official language of his or her choice and to be understood within an appropriate period of time, this practice, whether or not it enjoys constitutional protection, is now essential to the proper operation of Parliament.

2.1.2 Records and Journals of the Houses of Parliament

Section 133 provides that "records and journals" must be prepared in both official languages. This bilingualism obligation presupposes the simultaneous use of English and French in the publication of those parliamentary documents: "Both languages, and not one or the other, must be used in the records and journals."¹³ It is not enough to produce certain passages in English and others in French or to summarize them in the other official language. Documents must be made available in full simultaneously in both official languages.

What documents are subject to this obligation? First, the "records" of the houses, which include their Acts and bills.¹⁴ Second, the "journals," which are the *Minutes of Proceedings* and *Journals* – the official minutes of the votes and proceedings of the houses.¹⁵ Before 1976, the journals were printed in separate English and French versions. Since the 2nd Session of the 30th Parliament, they have been published in a two-column bilingual format.¹⁶

2.1.3 Printing and Publishing of Acts

Section 133 expressly provides that the Acts of Canada shall be printed and published in English and French. This is called legislative bilingualism.¹⁷ Does that obligation apply from the moment a bill is introduced until it receives Royal Assent? In other words, must bilingualism apply to the entire legislative process or only at the printing and publication stage?

As the text of section 133 is not explicit on this point, we must turn to the interpretation made by the courts in order to determine the scope of the provision. In *Blaikie c. Québec (Procureur général)* (1978), Chief Justice Jules Deschênes of the Superior Court of Quebec, whose findings were confirmed by the Supreme Court in 1985,¹⁸ held that the obligation to print and publish Acts in English and French necessarily included the obligation to use English and French simultaneously throughout the legislative process:

Now if the reasoning appears naïve, it remains none the less unassailable: how to print and publish in the two languages a law which has not been adopted and does only officially exist in one of the languages?¹⁹

Thus, for the English and French versions to be equally authoritative, they must be passed and assented to in both languages. Simply printing and publishing them in both languages is not sufficient to respect either the letter or the spirit of section 133.²⁰ Since 1978, federal legislation has been co-drafted by pairs of law clerks, one anglophone and the other francophone, working together with the help of jurilinguists responsible for ensuring that the two versions match.²¹

Co-drafting

Federal legislative texts are prepared using a process called co-drafting. This means that the English and French versions of federal legislation are drafted simultaneously and neither is considered a translation of the other.

Section 133 concerns Acts, but it also covers delegated legislation. In its 1981 decision in *Attorney General of Quebec v. Blaikie et al.*, the Supreme Court of Canada held that the obligation of bilingualism applied to regulatory enactments issued by the government, by a minister or by a group of ministers.²² Regulations made by the executive branch are similar to government measures and are thus subject to the obligation of bilingualism provided for in section 133.²³

As for orders in council, the Supreme Court of Canada held in *Reference re Manitoba Language Rights* (1992) that the obligation of bilingualism also covers instruments of a “legislative nature.”²⁴ To determine whether an order in council is of a legislative nature, the Court held that the form, content and effect of the instrument in question must be considered. These criteria do not operate cumulatively.²⁵ As regards form,

the connection between the legislative instrument and the legislature must be examined. With respect to content, it must be determined whether the instrument embodies a rule of conduct. Lastly, as to effect, it must be determined whether the instrument has the force of law and whether it applies to an undetermined number of persons.

The Supreme Court of Canada also considered the issue of the application of the bilingualism rule in the case of documents incorporated by reference. For example, if a federal Act or regulation incorporates legislative standards from a provincial Act, must those legislative standards be available in both official languages? In the context of section 23 of the *Manitoba Act*, the Supreme Court of Canada established the test that must be applied:

Some documents are simply mentioned in legislative instruments; they need not be consulted before the operation of the instrument in question can be understood. Others are “incorporated by reference” in the sense that they *are an integral part of the primary instrument as if reproduced therein*. It is this latter type of incorporation that can be termed “true incorporation” and that potentially attracts translation obligations under s. 23.²⁶ [Authors’ emphasis]

Thus, instruments that are an integral part of the Act or regulations must be available in both official languages. In 2017 and 2018, the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations reiterated that documents incorporated by reference in federal regulations must be available in both official languages to be considered accessible in accordance with the *Statutory Instruments Act*.²⁷ In practice, there are exceptions. According to a federal government policy that came into effect in September 2018, federal departments may incorporate unilingual material by reference “when there is a legitimate reason to do so.”²⁸

2.2 THE CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

With regard to the provisions concerning Parliament, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the Charter),²⁹ which was adopted in 1982, essentially restates the same rights and obligations as section 133, but with a few additions and clarifications.

First of all, the first subsection of section 16 of the Charter enshrines in the Constitution the status of English and French as the official languages of Canada. Official language status had been granted to English and French in the *Official Languages Act* (1969),³⁰ but that principle was not constitutionally protected.

For the purposes of this paper, it is also important to mention sections 17 and 18 of the Charter, which concern, respectively, the language of the debates and proceedings of Parliament and the language of Acts and other parliamentary instruments. More specifically, section 17 provides that “[e]veryone has the right to use English or French

in any debates and other proceedings of Parliament.” This provision essentially confirms an established fact by reasserting the right to use the official language of one’s choice in debates in the houses of Parliament, a right already guaranteed by section 133 of the *Constitutional Act, 1867*.

Section 17 of the Charter nevertheless adds a new element, in that it extends that right to other parliamentary proceedings, such as those of committees of the Senate and the House of Commons. The right to use the official language of one’s choice before the Senate or House of Commons and committees of Parliament is thus a constitutional right.

Section 18 of the Charter provides that “[t]he statutes, records and journals of Parliament shall be printed and published in English and French and both language versions are equally authoritative.” These rights and obligations, already provided by section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, suggest that Acts are passed in both official languages.³¹ With its inclusion in the Charter, this principle, which had not been expressly stated in section 133, is now recognized in the Constitution of Canada.³² The courts strive to interpret bilingual legislation using the equal authenticity rule, which requires reading both language versions and considering them to equally have the force of law, with neither version taking precedence over the other.³³

Equal Authenticity Rule and Shared-Meaning Rule

The English and French versions of federal legislation both have the force of law and are equally authoritative, and neither version takes precedence over the other. The courts interpret legislation using the equal authenticity rule. In the event of a discrepancy, the courts must determine the meaning common to both versions.

2.3 THE CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982

The equal authenticity rule applies to bilingual laws and constitutional documents alike. When the Constitution was repatriated in 1982, provisions were added to Part VII of the *Constitution Act, 1982*³⁴ in order to

- recognize that the English and French versions of the Constitution are equally authoritative (section 57);
- require the Minister of Justice of Canada to prepare “as expeditiously as possible” an official French version of a certain number of statutes still in force, including the *Constitution Act, 1867* (section 55);³⁵ and
- recognize that the French version of these texts, once adopted, will be as equally authoritative as the English version (section 56).

An official French version of the constitutional documents included in the Schedule to the *Constitution Act, 1982* has yet to be adopted.³⁶ In 1990, the French Constitutional Drafting Committee presented a report to implement the provisions of section 55.³⁷ However, neither Parliament nor the provincial and territorial legislative assemblies have endorsed it. This issue was raised a number of times in recent years, including during the celebrations of the 150th anniversary of Canadian Confederation in 2017;³⁸ the debates on the modernization of the *Official Languages Act* in 2019;³⁹ and an application filed before the Superior Court of Quebec in 2019.⁴⁰

3 STATUTORY PROVISIONS: THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT

The constitutional guarantees constitute a minimum, which may be supplemented by federal and provincial statutes.⁴¹ In 1969, Parliament passed the first *Official Languages Act*, following the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The Act recognized, for the first time, the official language status of English and French in all matters pertaining to Parliament and the Government of Canada.

Following adoption of the Charter, the *Official Languages Act* was revised and modernized to take into account the new constitutional guarantees regarding language rights. A new *Official Languages Act*⁴² (OLA) was passed in 1988.

The first two parts of the OLA are particularly relevant to this paper. Part I involves the language of the debates and proceedings of Parliament; Part II addresses the language of legislative and other instruments of a parliamentary nature. Incidentally, it is also important to note that the provisions concerning the institutions of Parliament do not appear solely in the first two parts of the OLA. The Senate, the House of Commons, the Library of Parliament, the Office of the Senate Ethics Officer, the office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, the Parliamentary Protective Service and the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer are the “institutions” enumerated in section 3 of the OLA and, consequently, are subject to other parts of the Act involving, in particular, language of work and language of services offered to the public.

The courts have given quasi-constitutional status to the OLA. In *Lavigne v. Canada (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages)* (2002), the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed that the OLA is no ordinary statute:

The importance of these objectives and of the constitutional values embodied in the *Official Languages Act* gives the latter a special status in the Canadian legal framework. Its quasi-constitutional status has been recognized by the Canadian courts. ... The constitutional roots of that Act, and its crucial role in relation to bilingualism, justify that interpretation.⁴³

In 2014, in *Thibodeau v. Air Canada*, the Supreme Court of Canada reaffirmed the quasi-constitutional status of the OLA, repeating that “it belongs to that privileged category of legislation which reflects ‘certain basic goals of our society’ and must be so interpreted ‘as to advance the broad policy considerations underlying it.’”⁴⁴

The OLA contains provisions that derive from various constitutional provisions, but, with regard to parliamentary debates and legislative enactments, these provisions often go beyond the constitutional guarantees examined above.

3.1 DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS OF PARLIAMENT

3.1.1 Use of English and French

Part I of the OLA consists of a single section on the language of the debates and proceedings of Parliament. Its first subsection confirms that English and French are the official languages of Parliament, and that everyone has the right to use either of those languages in any debates and other proceedings of Parliament. This first subsection essentially restates the rights guaranteed by section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* and section 17 of the Charter. Subsection 2 goes beyond existing constitutional provisions by guaranteeing the right to simultaneous interpretation of the debates and other proceedings of Parliament.

While knowledge of both official languages is not required to serve as a parliamentarian, certain signs point to a change in this area and to renewed interest in bilingualism. In the Senate, the appointment process introduced in 2016 provides that fluency in both official languages is “considered an asset” in Senate appointments.⁴⁵ In the House of Commons, second-language courses are provided to parliamentarians, their spouses and House of Commons Administration staff. Each year over the course of the 42nd Parliament, between 111 and 138 members of Parliament (MPs) (out of 338) have benefitted from English or French training provided in Ottawa.⁴⁶ With each Parliament, interest in language training grows, particularly among ministers, parliamentary secretaries and members of shadow cabinets.⁴⁷

3.1.2 Broadcasting Debates

The broadcasting of the debates and proceedings of Parliament constitutes a service within the meaning of Part IV of the OLA.⁴⁸ Starting in 1977, the general public was able to follow the debates of the House of Commons on radio and television. From 1979 to 1991, debates were broadcast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) through two parliamentary channels, one English, and the other French.⁴⁹ The public was thus able to follow the debates in the official language of their choice.

In 1991, these parliamentary channels became a thing of the past as a result of budget cuts at the CBC. Since then, the Cable Public Affairs Channel (CPAC) has broadcast parliamentary debates and proceedings. The House transmits the English, French and original audio feeds to CPAC, which redistributes them to the cable companies.

The agreement between the House of Commons and CPAC provided that the latter would distribute all signals to the cable companies. However, the cable companies, which were not bound by that agreement with the House, could choose to broadcast only one of the three audio signals. As a result, in some regions of the country, parliamentary debates were broadcast in only one official language or from the floor, that is the original feed without interpretation.

That situation resulted in a complaint filed under the OLA to Dyane Adam, the commissioner of official languages at the time, and then an application for remedy before the Federal Court. In its 2002 decision in *Quigley v. Canada (House of Commons)*, the Court held that the House of Commons “must, if it uses another person or organization to deliver services that are required to be provided in both official languages, ensure that the person or organization providing such service does so in both official languages.”⁵⁰ The House must, therefore, ensure that CPAC and, ultimately the cable companies, broadcast the debates in both official languages.

Since that time, regulations of the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission have required the cable companies to broadcast the signals in both official languages to ensure that parliamentary debates and proceedings are accessible to the public in the official language of their choice.⁵¹ Broadcasting obligations extend to Senate and House of Commons committee proceedings, when the signal is provided to CPAC.⁵² Depending on the region, the signal is available either on a separate channel or through second audio program (SAP) technology.⁵³

In 2004, as a result of the work of the Special Committee on the Modernization and Improvement of the Procedures of the House of Commons, the ParlVU service⁵⁴ was made available to the public on the parliamentary website, providing online access to House and committee proceedings in English, French and the language spoken during the proceedings, known as “floor sound.”⁵⁵ The service is also available for Senate proceedings and its committees.⁵⁶

In 2016, as part of the work of the Special Senate Committee on Senate Modernization, a report was tabled requesting that:

- the Senate be equipped to broadcast or webcast its proceedings;
- the *Rules of the Senate* be amended accordingly; and
- negotiations with CPAC be conducted for this purpose.⁵⁷

The Senate proceedings have been broadcast on CPAC since March 2019.⁵⁸ However, the *Rules of the Senate* have not been updated to reflect this change.

3.1.3 Translation in the Parliamentary Context

In Budget 2017, the federal government made commitments with respect to official languages in the parliamentary context:

Canadians have a right to communicate with, and be served by, Parliament in their preferred official language, ensuring that all citizens are able to fully participate in the Parliamentary process. In order to improve Parliamentary translation services, Budget 2017 proposes to invest \$7.5 million per year ongoing, starting in 2017–18. This investment will ensure that Parliamentarians and Canadians continue to be served in the official language of their choice.⁵⁹

In winter 2017, a number of commitments were made by the Minister of Public Services and Procurement to improve the Translation Bureau's ability to serve Parliament and federal institutions in general.⁶⁰ One of the measures taken was the creation of a position of chief quality officer.

In March 2018, the Advisory Working Group on the Parliamentary Translation Services of the Senate Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration presented a report to the Senate that included recommendations to improve the translation and interpretation services offered to senators.⁶¹ The government presented its response seven months later, in which it described the measures taken by the Translation Bureau to improve the quality of services provided to the Senate.⁶²

3.2 LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER INSTRUMENTS

Part II of the OLA concerns legislative and other instruments of a parliamentary nature. Among other things, this part contains provisions relating to the archiving, printing and publication of the records and journals of Parliament (section 5), as well as a provision on the enactment, printing and publishing of the Acts of Parliament (section 6).

These provisions reproduce the constitutional obligations examined above, but, once again, the OLA adds greater clarity by expressly stating that the OLA applies to the legislation enactment process, which therefore must be carried out in both official languages.

The OLA also addresses the issue of delegated legislation and concerns all instruments published in the *Canada Gazette*, as well as instruments of a public and general nature (section 7(1)). The OLA thus goes beyond the tests established by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Blaikie* (1981) and *Reference re Manitoba Language*

Rights (1992) by requiring that everything published in the *Canada Gazette* appear in both official languages. Section 7(2) concerns instruments made under executive power. Such instruments must also be published in both official languages if they are of a public and general nature.

Section 13 restates a constitutional principle, and, by doing so, highlights an important principle of legislative interpretation: the English and French versions of legislative Acts covered by Part II are equally authoritative.

3.3 HISTORICAL DEBATES

The Library of Parliament's Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources online portal provides public access to the historical debates and journals of the Senate and the House of Commons, as well as their respective committees' evidence, in both official languages.⁶³

In 1871 and in 1880 respectively, the Senate and the House of Commons adopted official reporting of their debates, issuing them in bound, indexed volumes. These debates, which have been digitized, are available on the portal. Reconstituted debates – debates that were held prior to the adoption of official reporting – are also available on the portal, although they are unofficial versions. While some debates were initially published in only one official language, the portal offers translated versions.

3.4 PUBLIC SERVICES AND COMMUNICATIONS

Parliamentary institutions are also subject to the other provisions of the OLA. They have developed, however, official language policies and guidelines that are different from those used in the rest of the federal public service. Parliamentary institutions are required to deliver public services and communications in an individual's preferred official language and can be sanctioned by the courts should they fail to comply. In a fall 2019 decision, the Federal Court ruled that the Senate had failed to meet its language obligations in terms of signage and reiterated the important symbolic role played by parliamentary institutions with regard to respecting Canada's two official languages:

It bears reminding that the House of Commons and the Senate are not only subject to the OLA but also embody the constitutional and quasi-constitutional values recognized in the Charter and the OLA, including, of course, institutional bilingualism. ... The relics of the past that express the preponderance of the use of one official language to the detriment of the other in an institutionalized context have no place in the buildings of Parliament and the Government of Canada. This is the case of the unilingual drinking fountains in the Senate, which have become, over time and with the passing years, conspicuously obsolete objects, incompatible with the constitutional principle of the protection of minorities.⁶⁴

The Senate decided not to appeal this decision.

3.5 MODERNIZATION OF THE *OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT*

Multiple reports and briefs advocating for a modernization of the OLA were published in 2019, the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the first Act. Although there have been calls to amend parts I and II of the OLA, they have only represented a small part of the larger debate. Some of the propositions include:

- providing a framework for the translation of documents submitted to parliamentary committees;
- requiring the English and French versions of the records of parliamentary debates and proceedings to be published side by side;
- enshrining in the OLA the practice of co-drafting federal legislation; and
- specifying the rules governing the interpretation of bilingual legislation.⁶⁵

In her mandate letter, published on 13 December 2019, the Honourable Mélanie Joly, Minister of Economic Development and Official Languages, was given the mandate to modernize the OLA.⁶⁶

4 PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

4.1 OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Canada's linguistic duality is apparent not only in the Constitution and legislation, but also in the procedure and practice of the Senate and the House of Commons. For example, the first bilingual Speaker of the House of Commons, Joseph-Godéric Blanchet,⁶⁷ used to alternate between English and French versions of the prayer recited at the start of each sitting.⁶⁸

Standing Order 7(2) of the *Standing Orders of the House of Commons* provides that the member elected to serve as Deputy Speaker of the House shall be required “to possess the full and practical knowledge of the official language which is not that of the Speaker for the time being.”⁶⁹ For example, when Jeanne Sauvé, who was of Franco-Saskatchewanian origin, was Speaker of the House of Commons in the early 1980s, the Deputy Speaker was Lloyd Francis, an anglophone from the Ottawa region. However, this Standing Order has not been followed since the beginning of the 37th Parliament in January 2001. Wherever possible, bilingual candidates are to be sought for this position.⁷⁰

Two other provisions of the *Standing Orders of the House of Commons* contain procedural language requirements: Standing Order 32(4) stipulates that documents are to be distributed or tabled in the House in both official languages, while Standing Order 65 deals with the reading in English and French of motions submitted in writing and seconded.

Linguistic duality is also evident in the context of parliamentary committees. At the start of each parliamentary session, a number of committees pass motions requiring that the documents provided by a witness shall be distributed only once they are available in both official languages.⁷¹

This type of motion illustrates the potential conflict between the right of parliamentarians to receive documents in the official language of their choice and the right of witnesses to use English or French in their interactions with Parliament. Following a complaint filed with the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, an application for remedy was recently made to the Federal Court to contest the validity of this practice. The applicant, Howard P. Knopf, claimed that the practice was contrary to his right to use the official language of his choice before a parliamentary committee as provided for by section 4(1) of the OLA.

The Federal Court, Trial Division, held in 2006 that this practice does not infringe that right. In the Court's view, this right, as set out in section 4(1) of the OLA, allows all individuals to use their preferred official language in the debates and proceedings of Parliament, but does not include the right to distribute documents to the members of a committee. The decision to distribute documents falls under the absolute authority of parliamentary committees to manage their internal procedure and is protected by parliamentary privilege. The Court concluded that the language rights of the applicant were not infringed.⁷² The Federal Court of Appeal upheld in 2007 the conclusions of the Trial Division, then the Supreme Court of Canada denied in 2008 the application for leave to appeal, thereby putting an end to this case.⁷³

In practice, as was the case during the 42nd Parliament, a parliamentary committee may disregard its own rule after adopting a motion providing for the distribution of documents submitted to it in both official languages.⁷⁴

4.2 OTHER LANGUAGES

Languages other than English and French may be used in the debates of the House of Commons, but in moderation and preferably with advance notice.⁷⁵ For example, members have spoken in Inuktitut, Mohawk, Japanese, Greek, Latin, Gaelic, Punjabi and sign language.

In November 2018, the House of Commons adopted a report on the use of Indigenous languages in proceedings of the House of Commons and committees, which the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs had presented five months earlier.⁷⁶ Upon providing advance notice, it is now possible for MPs to obtain simultaneous interpretation services into French or English if they decide to speak an Indigenous language. In addition, their speeches are transcribed in the Indigenous language spoken in the House *Debates* or Committee *Evidence*, together with the French and English translations. In January 2019, Robert Falcon-Ouellette became the first MP to give a speech in Cree and have it interpreted simultaneously into English and French for his colleagues.⁷⁷

Similar permissions for the use of other languages have been given in the Senate, provided that English and French translations are provided in advance.⁷⁸ In April 2006, Senator Eymard Corbin introduced the following motion to recognize the right to use Indigenous languages to communicate in Senate proceedings:

That the Senate should recognize the inalienable right of the first residents of the land now known as Canada to use their ancestral language to communicate for any purpose; and

That, to facilitate the expression of this right, the Senate should immediately take the necessary administrative and technical measures so that senators wishing to use their ancestral language may do so.⁷⁹

The motion was debated in the Senate on a number of occasions and was referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament for more detailed consideration. The committee heard various witnesses and then completed a fact-finding trip to Nunavut to observe the measures the legislature has taken to provide simultaneous interpretation of its proceedings. The committee published a report in April 2008 that recommended:

- commencing a pilot project involving the use of Inuktitut in the Senate chamber in order to meet the needs of the two senators whose first language was Inuktitut;
- extending this pilot project to two Senate committees, the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, since they usually include a larger number of Aboriginal senators than do other committees; and
- reviewing the pilot project after a reasonable period (one Parliament, for instance) to find cost-effective ways to include the use of other Aboriginal languages in debates in the Senate Chamber.⁸⁰

The report of the Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament was adopted on division on 14 May 2008. A few debates took place in Inuktitut in the Senate between 2010 and 2014,⁸¹ as well as a small number of

speeches in this language in 2017 and 2019. Contrary to the Senate committee's recommendation, the use of this language has not been reviewed since 2008. That said, in March 2017, the Standing Senate Committee on Aboriginal Peoples published an Inuktitut translation of a report on housing in Inuit Nunangat, as well as the associated executive summary and recommendations.⁸²

5 NEW TECHNOLOGIES

5.1 SOCIAL MEDIA

The emergence of new technologies and new means of communication like social media raises questions about the use of official languages in Parliament. Parliamentarians are turning to social media more often, frequently using their personal accounts to communicate with the public and to promote their work. Some parliamentarians use only one official language, while others use two. In addition, the Senate and the House of Commons have institutional bilingual accounts on various platforms, including Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and YouTube.

In 2014–2015, the Commissioner of Official Languages conducted an investigation into the use of official languages on ministers' Twitter accounts. The Commissioner concluded that government officials who interact on social media must communicate with the public in both official languages.⁸³

5.2 E-CONSULTATIONS

Between 2015 and 2019, a number of Senate and House of Commons committees launched e-consultations as part of their proceedings. Currently, there are no strict procedural rules covering the use of such a tool by committees, particularly regarding the relevant linguistic obligations. Although questionnaires to date have been publicly posted online in both official languages, there are still questions surrounding the requirement to translate and publish data received in both official languages.

5.3 PARLIAMENT'S VIRTUAL SITTINGS AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

As a result of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, several parliamentary institutions around the world have had to modify their practices and procedures to carry out virtual meetings, including Canada's House of Commons and Senate, as well as their respective committees. The language requirements set out in the Constitution and the OLA continue to apply in spite of these changes.

This still-recent experiment with new technology brings with it a variety of challenges regarding compliance with official language requirements. The platform used must allow for remote simultaneous interpretation and broadcasting of debates in English, French or the floor language. In addition, parliamentarians are required to choose one language each time they speak and keep speaking that language for the duration of their intervention. Under normal circumstances, parliamentarians may often use one official language and then switch to the other, depending on the overall context, their audience, the witness or their level of comfort when voicing their ideas.

Poor audio and video quality due to inadequate equipment and poor Internet connections are creating additional difficulties for remote simultaneous interpretation, and parliamentarians' access to the same level of high-quality services in both official languages has been compromised as a result.⁸⁴ Interpreters are facing increased stress, cognitive load and risks of injury, and the pool of available interpreters is diminishing as a result.⁸⁵ Access to staff trained to offer high-quality translation and interpretation services is also being limited by other difficulties resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, such as increased family responsibilities for employees whose children are not attending school.⁸⁶

The House of Commons Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs is aware of the challenges arising from virtual sittings and meetings. In order to help MPs carry out their parliamentary duties during the COVID-19 pandemic, the committee carried out a study and presented its report on 15 May 2020.⁸⁷ After studying language issues in particular, the committee recommended:

- complying with the OLA during the COVID-19 pandemic;
- continuing to provide simultaneous interpretation in Indigenous languages during the pandemic;
- ensuring that MPs, witnesses and interpreters respect the minimum standards set by the Clerk of the House in consultation with the Translation Bureau, including the requirement to wear a headset and use a microphone;
- recognizing that the burden of simultaneous interpretation falls especially on francophone interpreters and taking measures to alleviate it; and
- taking measures to protect the health and physical well-being of Parliament's employees, among them, interpreters.

6 OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT

In May 2012, Member of Parliament Alexandrine Latendresse introduced a private member's bill, C-419, which led to the adoption of the *Language Skills Act (LSA)*, which received Royal Assent in June 2013.⁸⁸ The LSA requires that individuals appointed to certain key offices reporting to Parliament – namely officers of

Parliament (also called “agents of Parliament”) – must be able to readily speak and understand both official languages at the time of their appointment. Pursuant to section 2 of the LSA, this prerequisite applies to the following offices:

- Auditor General of Canada;
- Chief Electoral Officer of Canada;
- Commissioner of Official Languages of Canada;
- Privacy Commissioner of Canada;
- Information Commissioner of Canada;
- Senate Ethics Officer;
- Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner;
- Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada;
- Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada;
- President of the Public Service Commission of Canada; and
- Parliamentary Budget Officer.⁸⁹

This bill was debated in Parliament following the appointment of Michael Ferguson – a unilingual anglophone at the time of his appointment – as the Auditor General of Canada. According to Ms. Latendresse, any officer of Parliament must be able to “communicate in both official languages in order to be able to properly carry out his or her duties.”⁹⁰ Graham Fraser, commissioner of official languages at the time and himself an officer of Parliament when the bill was introduced, expressed his support before the Standing Senate Committee on Official Languages:

What is important to point out when it comes to agents of Parliament is that they have direct obligations toward parliamentarians. So it is very important for parliamentarians to be understood in the language of their choice.⁹¹

The idea of respect for the language rights of parliamentarians has gained ground elsewhere in Canada. In her 2014–2015 annual report, Katherine d’Entremont, the former commissioner of official languages for New Brunswick, said that her province’s legislative assembly should “take the Parliament of Canada’s lead, which adopted the *Language Skills Act* in June 2013.”⁹² In her report, she recommended that the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick enact legislation establishing that the ability to speak and understand both official languages be a requirement for the appointment of officers of the assembly.⁹³

In 2016, the federal government applied a new approach to all Governor in Council appointments, not for Officer of Parliament appointments alone. The new selection process, described by the government as “open, transparent, and merit-based,” is meant to reflect Canada’s linguistic diversity and requires candidates to provide information on their second official language proficiency.⁹⁴

7 CONCLUSION

A number of constitutional and statutory provisions relate to the use of the two official languages in Parliament. Those provisions, which are deeply rooted in the bilingual nature of Canada, concern a range of parliamentary activities, such as debates, proceedings, the legislative process and the publication of various parliamentary documents. These provisions grant rights to parliamentarians and the Canadian public, thus making Parliament an institution accessible to all members of both official language communities. As noted by Michel Doucet, a researcher who has studied the issue, participation in the parliamentary process is particularly essential to the vitality of an official language minority community:

The right to participate in the legislative process is one of the “minimum requirements for a language to be effective in the public as well as private realm.” It helps make it possible for a minority linguistic group to participate in public life in its language.⁹⁵

As a result of the vigilance of legislators, Canada has the tools and rights to ensure that both the English and the French official language communities are actively involved in the Parliament of Canada and, consequently, in Canadian society. In recent years, the Senate and the House of Commons have also opened the door to the recognition of other languages, by taking measures governing the use of Indigenous languages. Therefore, parliamentary procedure has undergone several changes to provide a framework for the use of not only the official languages, but other ones too.

NOTES

1. André Braën, “La rédaction bilingue des comptes rendus des comités de la Chambre des communes,” *Revue générale de droit*, Vol. 26, No. 4, Érudit, 1995, p. 536. [Available in French only]
2. [Constitution Act, 1867](#), 30 & 31 Victoria, c. 3 (U.K.).
3. Braën (1995), p. 537. [Translation] See also [Re Manitoba Language Rights](#), [1985] 1 SCR 721.
4. Gérald A. Beaudoin, *Essais sur la Constitution*, University of Ottawa Press, Ottawa, 1979, p. 237. [Translation]
5. House of Commons, *Journals*, 1st Session, 24th Parliament, 11 August 1958, p. 402, in Library of Parliament, [House of Commons Journals, 24th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 104](#), Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources (database).

6. Réjean M. Patry, *La législation linguistique fédérale*, Éditeur officiel du Québec, Québec, 1981, p. 41. [Available in French only]
7. Senate, *Debates*, 4th Session, 24th Parliament, 25 September 1961, p. 1155, in Library of Parliament, [Senate Debates, 24th Parliament, 4th Session: Vol. 1](#), Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources (database).
8. Address by the Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Reception on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the simultaneous interpretation service in the House of Commons, 16 March 1999. See also Jean Delisle, "[Fifty Years of Parliamentary Interpretation](#)," *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, Vol. 32, No. 2, Summer 2009, pp. 27–32.
9. Conference interpreters who have all the necessary parliamentary interpretation skills are also available to meet additional needs, if required. See Charelle Evelyn, "Senators complain of 'shameful' second-class translation services," *Hill Times*, 28 March 2018.

The number of parliamentary interpreters has increased in the two years following an additional \$7.5 million provided in Budget 2017 to "ensure that Parliamentarians and Canadians continue to be served in the official language of their choice." See Department of Finance Canada, [Building a Strong Middle Class](#), Budget 2017, 22 March 2017, p. 190.
10. [MacDonald v. City of Montreal](#), [1986] 1 SCR 460, paras. 60 and 67. See also Michel Doucet, "Le bilinguisme législatif," in *Les droits linguistiques au Canada*, ed. Michel Bastarache, 3rd ed., Les Éditions Yvon Blais, Cowansville, Québec, 2013, pp. 194–195. [Available in French only]
11. [R. v. Beaulac](#), [1999] 1 SCR 768.
12. House of Commons, *Debates*, 1st Session, 24th Parliament, 11 August 1958, p. 3332 (the Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker), in Library of Parliament, [House of Commons Debates, 24th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 3](#), Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources (database).
13. Doucet (2013), p. 199, citing *Blaikie c. P.G. Québec*, [1978] CS 37, pp. 44–45. [Translation]
14. Doucet (2013), p. 197, citing *Blaikie c. P.G. Québec*, p. 43.
15. Marc Bosc and André Gagnon, eds., "[Chapter 24: The Parliamentary Record](#)," *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 3rd ed., 2017.
16. Ibid.
17. Section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* also requires all legislation adopted by the National Assembly of Quebec to be printed and published in French and English. Although this Background Paper focuses on federal legislation, it is important to note that there is some dispute regarding the manner in which laws are currently adopted in Quebec. Generally, Quebec legislation is written and adopted in French, then translated into English and printed in both languages. The translation of legislation at the end of the process can create discrepancies between the two versions, as was the case with the *Civil Code of Quebec*. See Julien Vailles, "[Code civil : des erreurs depuis 20 ans!](#)," *Droit-inc*, 7 June 2016. [Available in French only] See also Karine McLaren, "[Bilinguisme législatif : l'importance des méthodes de production des textes législatifs](#)," *Ottawa Law Review*, Vol. 49, No. 1, 2018, pp. 180–181. [Available in French only]
18. *Blaikie c. P.G. Québec* (1978); and *Re Manitoba Language Rights* (1985).
19. *Blaikie c. P.G. Québec* (1978), p. 54.
20. Ibid., p. 56.
21. Karine McLaren, "[Bilinguisme législatif : regard sur l'interprétation et la rédaction des lois bilingues au Canada](#)," *Ottawa Law Review*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 2015, pp. 46–47. [Available in French only]
22. [Attorney General of Quebec v. Blaikie et al.](#), [1981] 1 SCR 312.
23. Ibid.
24. [Reference re Manitoba Language Rights](#), [1992] 1 SCR 212. The Supreme Court of Canada rendered this decision in the context of section 23 of the [Manitoba Act – Enactment No. 2](#) [*An Act to amend and continue the Act 32–33 Victoria, chapter 3; and to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba, 1870, 33 Vict., c. 3 (Can.)*], which includes obligations equivalent to those under section 133 of the Canadian Constitution for the purposes of the Province of Manitoba. Consequently, the Supreme Court of Canada judgments on section 23 of the *Manitoba Act* also apply in the case of section 133 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*.

25. *Reference re Manitoba Language Rights* (1992).
26. Ibid.
27. Parliament of Canada, Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations [REGS], [Second Report \(Report No. 90 – Accessibility of Documents Incorporated by Reference in Federal Regulations\)](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, pp. 3–4; REGS, [Fourth Report \(Report No. 92 – Accessibility of Documents Incorporated by Reference in Federal Regulations – Reply to the Government Response to Report No. 90\)](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, pp. 1–4; and [Statutory Instruments Act](#), R.S.C. 1985, c. S-22, s. 18.3(1).
28. Government of Canada, [Policy on Regulatory Development](#).
29. [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#), Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c. 11.
30. *Official Languages Act*, S.C. 1969, c. O-2, s. 2.
31. Michel Bastarache et al., *The Law of Bilingual Interpretation*, LexisNexis, Markham, Ontario, 2008, p. 24.
32. Ibid., p. 17.
33. McLaren (2015), pp. 29–32; and McLaren (2018), p. 171.
34. [Constitution Act, 1982](#), being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c. 11, Part VII.
35. The French version of the *Constitution Act, 1867* was translated by Eugène-Philippe Dorion and only exists for reference purposes. Since it was only adopted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom in English, it is not authoritative. See Government of Canada, « [Textes constitutionnels](#) », *site Web de la législation (Justice)*.
36. Twenty-two of these documents still do not have an official French version.
37. Department of Justice, [Final Report of the French Constitutional Drafting Committee responsible for providing the Minister of Justice of Canada with a draft official French version of certain constitution enactments](#).
38. Linda Cardinal and François Larocque, *La Constitution bilingue du Canada : un projet inachevé*, Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2017 [available in French only]; and Senate, "Court Challenges Program," [Debates](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 13 June 2017, 2210 (the Hon. Serge Joyal).
39. Senate, Standing Committee on Official Languages [OLLO], [Modernizing the Official Languages Act: The Views of the Justice Sector](#), Fourth interim report, 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, April 2019, pp. 6–7; and OLLO, [Modernizing the Official Languages Act: The Views of Federal Institutions and Recommendations](#), Final report, 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, June 2019, pp. 21 and 72.
40. Mathieu Galarneau, "[Pression pour que la Constitution soit complètement bilingue](#)," *Droit-inc*, 25 September 2019 [available in French only]; and "[Senator sues government to get official French version of constitution](#)," *CBC News*, 19 September 2019; and Superior Court of Quebec, Case no. 500-17-109358-195. [Available in French only]
41. *Reference re Manitoba Language Rights* (1992).
42. [Official Languages Act](#), R.S.C. 1985, c. 31 (4th Supp.).
43. [Lavigne v. Canada \(Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages\)](#), 2002 SCC 53, para. 23.
44. [Thibodeau v. Air Canada](#), 2014 SCC 67, para. 12.
45. Government of Canada, [Assessment criteria](#).
46. House of Commons, Standing Committee on Official Languages, [Evidence](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 21 March 2017, 1120 (Ms. Nina Maimone, Chief, Official Languages, Language Training and Assessment Centre, House of Commons); and Data provided by the Language Training and Assessment Centre, November 2019.

In addition to the language training offered in Ottawa, there are two additional types of training: training provided in constituencies, and full immersion, which is delivered outside the National Capital Region.
47. Ibid., 1130 (Mr. Pierre Parent, Chief Human Resources Officer, House of Commons).

48. This part of the *Official Languages Act* (OLA) concerns communications with and services to the public and includes the obligations to the public of the institutions to which the OLA applies. See [Quigley v. Canada \(House of Commons\)](#), 2002 FCT 645.
49. Parliament of Canada, Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages, [The Broadcasting and Availability of the Debates and Proceedings of Parliament in Both Official Languages](#), 1st Session, 37th Parliament, May 2001.
50. [Quigley v. Canada \(House of Commons\)](#) (2002), para. 55.
51. See Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission [CRTC], [Public Notice CRTC 2001-115](#), which resulted in an amendment to the *Broadcasting Distribution Regulations*.
52. CPAC, [Mission Statement](#).
53. CPAC, [Choose Your Viewing Language](#). See also Bosc and Gagnon (2017), “Chapter 24: The Parliamentary Record,” note 123.
54. ParlVU, [Welcome to ParlVU](#).
55. Bosc and Gagnon (2017), “Chapter 24: The Parliamentary Record.”
56. ParlVU, [Welcome to the Senate ParlVU](#).
57. Senate, Special Committee on Senate Modernization, [Eighth Report](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 18 October 2016.
58. Senate, Speaker of the Senate, “[Senate Chamber launches video broadcasting](#),” News release, 14 March 2019.
59. Department of Finance Canada (2017), p. 190.
60. Senate, Standing Committee on Official Languages, [Evidence](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 13 February 2017 (the Honourable Judy Foote, Minister of Public Services and Procurement Canada). See also House of Commons, Standing Committee on Official Languages, [Evidence](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 9 February 2017 (the Honourable Judy Foote, Minister of Public Services and Procurement).
61. Senate, Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration, [Twenty-seventh Report \(First Report of the Advisory Working Group on the Parliamentary Translation Services\)](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 15 March 2018.
62. Government of Canada, [Government Response to the 27th Report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration on Parliamentary Translation Services](#), 5 October 2018.
63. Library of Parliament, [Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources](#) (database).
64. [Thibodeau v. Canada \(Senate\)](#), 2019 FC 1474, paras. 49 and 52.
65. OLLO (April 2019), pp. 6–12 and pp. 25 and 27; and Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne du Canada [FCFA], [Time for Action: The FCFA Proposes a new Wording of the Official Languages Act](#), 5 March 2019, pp. 97–103.
66. Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, [Minister of Economic Development and Official Languages Mandate Letter](#), 13 December 2019.
67. Joseph-Godéric Blanchet was Speaker of the House of Commons during the 4th Parliament, from 1879 to 1882.
68. Bosc and Gagnon (2017), “[Chapter 10: The Daily Program](#).”
69. House of Commons, “[Chapter 1: Presiding Officers](#),” *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, Consolidated version as of 20 April 2020.
70. Bosc and Gagnon (2017), “[Chapter 7: The Speaker and Other Presiding Officers of the House](#).”
71. Bosc and Gagnon (2017), “[Chapter 20: Committees](#).”
72. [Knopf v. Canada \(House of Commons\)](#), 2006 FC 808.
73. [Knopf v. Canada \(House of Commons\)](#), 2007 FCA 308; application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court refused: see Judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada, “[Howard P. Knopf v. the House of Commons and Attorney General of Canada](#),” *Applications for Leave*, 20 March 2008, Case no. 32416.

74. Mark Power, Darius Bossé and Perri Ravon, "[Langues officielles : No, it's not 'okay'](#)," *La Presse+*, 11 March 2019. [Available in French only]
 75. Bosc and Gagnon (2017), "[Chapter 13: Rules of Order and Decorum](#)."
 76. House of Commons, Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs [PROC], [The Use of Indigenous Languages in Proceedings of the House of Commons and Committees](#), Sixty-sixth report, 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, June 2018.
 77. House of Commons, [Debates](#), 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, 28 January 2019, 1125 (Robert Falcon-Ouellette); and Robert Falcon-Ouellette, Member of Parliament, "[Honouring Indigenous Languages Within Parliament](#)," *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, Vol. 42, No. 2, Summer 2019.
- In 2018–2019, the Indigenous languages most requested among parliamentarians from the Translation Bureau were Quebec Cree, Plains Cree, Mohawk and Inuktitut. The services to Parliament were provided by freelance interpreters, as needed.
78. Senate, [Senate Procedure in Practice](#), June 2015, p. 84 (note 6).
 79. Senate, [Debates](#), 1st Session, 39th Parliament, 6 April 2006.
 80. Senate, Standing Committee on Rules, Procedures and the Rights of Parliament, [Fifth Report](#), 2nd Session, 39th Parliament, 9 April 2008.
 81. Senate (June 2015), p. 84 (note 5).
 82. Senate, Standing Committee on Aboriginal Peoples, "We Can Do Better: Housing in Inuit Nunangat," [Reports](#), Fifth report, 1st Session, 42nd Parliament, March 2017.
 83. Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, "[Statement from the Commissioner of Official Languages about ministers' Twitter use](#)," News release, 20 February 2015.
 84. Nicole Gagnon, "Don't sacrifice official languages during times of crisis," *Hill Times*, 29 April 2020; Samantha Wright Allen, "Interpreter injuries spike due to virtual Parliament, prompt calls for quality controls," *Hill Times*, 6 May 2020; and House of Commons, PROC, [Evidence](#), 1st Session, 43rd Parliament, 4 May 2020, 1410 (Greg Phillips, President, Canadian Association of Professional Employees [CAPE]).
 85. PROC (4 May 2020), 1405–1410 (Greg Phillips, President, CAPE); and PROC, [Evidence](#), 1st Session, 43rd Parliament, 29 April 2020, 1950 (Nathalie Laliberté, Vice-President, Services to Parliament and Interpretation, Translation Bureau, Department of Public Works and Government Services).
 86. PROC (4 May 2020), 1405–1410 (Greg Phillips, President, CAPE).
 87. PROC, [Parliamentary Duties and the COVID-19 Pandemic](#), Fifth report, 1st Session, 43rd Parliament, May 2020, p. 27.
 88. [Language Skills Act](#), S.C. 2013, c. 36.
 89. The Parliamentary Budget Officer was added to the list in 2017 following the adoption of the [Budget Implementation Act, 2017, No. 1](#), S.C. 2017, c. 20.
 90. House of Commons, [Debates](#), 1st Session, 41st Parliament, 1 May 2012, 1005 (Alexandrine Latendresse, Member of Parliament, Louis-Saint-Laurent).
 91. OLLO, [Evidence](#), 1st Session, 41st Parliament, 17 June 2013, 2132 (Graham Fraser, Commissioner of Official Languages, Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages).
 92. Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for New Brunswick, [2014–2015 Annual Report](#), June 2015, p. 24.
 93. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
 94. Government of Canada, [Governor in Council Appointments](#).
 95. Doucet (2013), pp. 190–191. [Translation]