

I think it is important that the public perceive the legal profession as one with a social conscience. It is even more important that each of us in our own way contribute towards finding solutions for our environmental problems.

In conclusion then, the Young Lawyers Conference does ask for your support for the resolution currently on the floor.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on the resolution?

**MME S. BOURQUE (Montréal):** Monsieur le président, je crois que le grand intérêt de cette résolution-là va être d'éviter au Barreau canadien avec sa section sur le Droit de l'environnement de se faire dire qu'avant de chercher la paille dans l'oeil du voisin, elle devrait peut-être regarder la poutre qu'elle a dans le sien. La section de l'Environnement s'occupe des lois dans l'environnement, mais cette résolution aura l'avantage de sensibiliser tous les avocats à l'effort individuel qu'ils doivent faire concernant ces notions d'environnement qui nous concernent tous en tant que collectivité.

Alors je demande d'appuyer cette motion.

**PRÉSIDENT SUPPLÉANT:** Merci. Further debate on Resolution number 8?

**MR. G. REILLY (Vancouver):** Could I ask for clarification? Paragraph 2 of the resolution suggests that the Canadian Bar Association should direct the National Environmental Law Section, and if you drop to Sub-Section 1, to conduct research. I would not have thought that the Section was capable of conducting research, there is no funding provided. But it is proposed by the Section itself, perhaps they could clarify.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Eleanor or Sophie? Did you hear the question Eleanor?

**MS. E. OLSZEWSKI (Edmonton):** Actually, I am not certain what is being asked.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** The question that is being asked is whether in the second paragraph of the body of the resolution, you indeed intend that the National Environmental Law Section conduct research, I take it of a scientific sort. Scientific research.

**MS. E. OLSZEWSKI (Edmonton):** That is what is proposed. It is unfortunate actually, Franklin Gurtler(ph) from the Environmental Section was to be here this morning. He could likely better address some concerns, being a member of that particular Section. It is my understanding that they have put a proposal together with respect to preparing this handbook. It includes budgetary requirements, and their section is prepared to do the research and conduct whatever surveys are necessary in order to prepare that publication. Does that answer the question?

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Sir? Mr. Reilly?

**MR. G. REILLY (Vancouver):** I would be concerned that there would be a call for funding, and I would like to move that the resolution be amended by deleting the phrase "conduct research and" from paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (i), noting while I do so that there is provision for the collection of data gathering information. And if that is what is meant by research, it is amply covered by the other words.

MOVED BY G. REILLY  
SECONDED BY J. WADDELL  
CARRIED

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** There is a motion to amend the second paragraph of the body of the resolution. Is there a seconder for the motion to amend? Mr. John Waddell seconds that motion to amend.

There is an amending motion on the floor. Is there debate on the motion to amend? And the amendment, for members of Council, is on page 127 of the book. Delete the words from 2 sub (i), "conduct research and," and that sub-paragraph will begin "collect data in order to."

The French version of the resolution will begin with the word "recueillir". Il faudrait enlever les mots "mener une recherche et..."

Further debate on the motion to amend which is on the floor?

**MR. J.J. CAMP (Vice-President, Vancouver):** I spoke with Eleanor briefly. I am concerned about the funding aspect of this as well. We have just passed our budget, and our budget does not contain any reference to \$7,700 which is apparently the cost associated with this.

As I understand this amendment, it will either reduce or eliminate that cost, and while I am all in favour of environmentally friendly matters, I am also all in favour of insuring that our deficit does not grow larger. I will give this assurance, that if funding can be found for this without driving us into further deficit, I would support it. But for the moment, I do not support the resolution and I do support the amendment because it will reduce or eliminate the funding problem.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on the motion to amend?

All in favour of the motion to amend? Opposed? The motion to amend is passed. The resolution is now on the floor as amended. Is there debate on the resolution which is on the floor, Resolution number 8 as amended?

Question. All those in favour of Resolution 8? Opposed? Resolution 8 is passed.

Resolution number 9. Is there anyone here this morning to speak to that resolution?

**M. G. LÉVESQUE (Ottawa):** Monsieur le président, mon nom est Gérard Lévesque, appuyé par Simon Potter j'aimerais proposer la résolution numéro 9.

PROPOSÉE PAR G. LÉVESQUE  
APPUYÉE PAR S. POTTER  
ADOPTÉE

La Conférence des juristes d'expression française des territoires et des provinces de "common law" a pris l'habitude depuis quelques réunions de notre Conseil de présenter une résolution pour promouvoir un peu plus de tolérance linguistique au pays, et un peu plus d'accès à la justice pour la minorité francophone au pays. C'est ainsi, par exemple, qu'à Regina cette année, plus tôt à l'assemblée mi-hiver, nous avons accepté comme conseil une résolution dirigée à l'attention du procureur général de la Saskatchewan.

J'aimerais rappeler la résolution que nous avons votée à l'assemblée de la mi-hiver en 1990, qui demandait justement au gouvernements fédéral, provinciaux et territoriaux:

...to adopt legislative provisions securing for parties the right to proceed in both official languages when involved in litigation under federal legislation administered by provincial and territorial courts, particularly under the Divorce Act 1985 and the Bankruptcy Act.

This was passed at our Mid-Winter Meeting of 1990.

Unfortunately, there was not much action in this province in the follow-up of this recommendation. So as a conference of French-speaking lawyers, we

thought that it would be useful to bring forward a resolution pointing out a little bit of progress that could be done in this province. We had a lot of choices, we pinpointed only one example.

J'aimerais rappeler qu'avant la création de l'Alberta en 1905, comme nous l'a indiqué la Cour suprême du Canada dans la décision *Mercure* en 1988, il y avait sur ce territoire des droits linguistiques qui ont continué d'exister tout comme en Saskatchewan. La province ici a choisi de limiter ou d'enlever beaucoup de ces droits-là par une loi linguistique et les tribunaux ont indiqué, du moins un tribunal l'an passé a indiqué qu'il y avait nécessité de revenir sur le sujet.

Nous pensons qu'il est inacceptable, lorsqu'une province poursuit un individu, de l'empêcher d'utiliser un document rédigé dans l'une ou l'autre des deux langues officielles du Canada. C'est arrivé l'an passé ici en Alberta, à Calgary, and I was surprised to see in the *Calgary Herald* and in the *Edmonton papers*, headlines last October in the case of Lefebvre. So I wrote to Judge Power of the Queen's Bench of Alberta to receive a copy of his judgment. If the resolution is passed today, I will table a copy of this judgment with Terence Wade.

I will just quote you five lines:

It is my opinion that the Alberta legislature should amend the Language Act by inserting an additional clause giving the right to citizens of Alberta to plead their case and make written submissions in the French language, and to file documents in a Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta in the French language.

C'est le juge Power dans la cause la Reine contre Lefebvre.

Il est aussi inacceptable que lorsque deux partis francophones ou bilingues sont en litige devant un tribunal, qu'ils ne puissent pas utiliser un document qui est rédigé en français, qu'ils doivent le traduire à leurs frais pour que ce soit déposé seulement dans l'autre langue.

Nous avons dans la Charte des droits et libertés un droit constitutionnel à la mobilité. Beaucoup de conjoints au pays commencent à utiliser ce droit-là lorsqu'il y a des séparations, et nous avons souvent des causes qui impliquent des documents dans différentes langues.

Nous avons eu plus tôt cette année le rapport Edwards sur la pratique interprovinciale. La résolution vise à diminuer les obstacles à une pratique interprovinciale en favorisant l'utilisation des deux langues.

Nous avons eu dimanche le rapport sur la réforme des tribunaux. Et à la page 149 du rapport en anglais, il y a une recommandation à l'attention du Conseil, à l'attention de l'Association du Barreau pour travailler dans le sens d'assurer une meilleure justice dans les deux langues.

Depuis plus de 124 ans, le Québec fait ce que nous demandons par cette résolution-là en permettant l'utilisation de documents écrits dans l'une ou l'autre des deux langues officielles. Depuis plusieurs années, c'est possible au Nouveau-Brunswick et dans d'autres provinces telles que l'Ontario et le Manitoba. Ces changements ont été apportés graduellement sans qu'il y ait trop de problèmes, et nous avons, nous, des autres provinces de "common law" la possibilité d'offrir à nos collègues de l'Alberta notre expérience, notre expertise, pour qu'ils puissent trouver une solution albertaine de mettre en oeuvre cette proposition-là.

Nous avons eu au petit déjeuner cette semaine la commandite de l'Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Alberta avec notre conférence pour le petit déjeuner. Plusieurs d'entre vous ont sans doute rencontré Jean Moreau, le président de cette association-là, et les autres membres qui offrent leur collaboration pour la mise en oeuvre.

J'aimerais seulement noter en terminant que this recommendation is also in accordance with the acceptance by the Legislature of Alberta of what would have been the Constitutional Act 1987, in which this province was accepting constitutional binding to preserve the existence of its French-speaking population. Merci.

**PRÉSIDENT SUPPLÉANT:** Merci. Is there further debate on Resolution 9?

**M. K. ALEXANDER (Timmins):** C'est difficile de comprendre dans un pays comme celui-ci qu'on ait le droit de parler, mais qu'il soit défendu d'écrire dans une des langues officielles de ce pays.

As I have indicated, it is very difficult in this country to understand from time to time why one is permitted to speak but not to write in one of the official languages.

It is my respectful submission that a request from this body urging the government of this province to implement the right to write in one of our official languages, would be gradually and sensibly implemented, but that the initiative and the impetus to do so would be respectfully and I think forcefully received, if it were given by this body. And I urge the support of this resolution.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate?

**M. C. BLOOM (Montréal):** J'appuie également cette résolution, monsieur le président. C'est illogique il me semble de permettre les communications orales, comme le fait la loi, sans permettre les communications écrites. Ça c'est évident et ça va de soi.

But there is something else in this resolution that I think merits the support of this assembly. Here we have a chance to indicate in a tangible way our support for a principle which this Association has always stood for. We have been speaking throughout this annual meeting of Canadian unity. Here is one of the things that makes for Canadian unity; the possibility for all of us to use both languages, particularly in the courts. If we are not going to support this kind of a resolution, who will?

I would just make one suggestion, it is a small amendment that I am going to propose to the proposer of this resolution. It is in the whereas, which reads "Whereas French-speaking individuals should have the right".

It seems to me that all individuals, not only French-speaking individuals, should have the right to file documents in the official languages of their choice. So I am suggesting to them that they change the wording "French-speaking individuals" to "all persons" and likewise "attendu que le justiciable d'expression française" soit changé également pour "toute personne".

MOVED BY C. BLOOM  
SECONDED BY I. ALLEN  
CARRIED

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** There is a motion to amend, Mr. Bloom has moved it. Is there a seconder for the motion? Igor Allen, Toronto, seconds the motion to amend. There is on the floor now a motion to amend. Is there debate on the motion to amend, which just for clarification, would have the third whereas read, "Whereas all persons should have the right," "Attendu que toute personne devrait avoir..." Paule Gauthier?

**MME P. GAUTHIER (Trésorière, Québec):** Bien entendu, monsieur le président, j'ai l'intention d'appuyer la résolution. Je trouve que c'est une occasion extraordinaire pour l'Association de démontrer son appui à la Conférence des juristes d'expression française qui veut exprimer son opinion.

J'aimerais également attirer votre attention sur le deuxième attendu en français. Je pense qu'il est bien important d'ajouter "Attendu que la loi ne permet pas le dépôt de documents en français devant ses tribunaux".

**PRÉSIDENT SUPPLÉANT:** Merci. Is there further debate? I will take that Paule as being in there. Good point. Donc, en français, le deuxième attendu "que la loi ne permet pas le dépôt de documents écrits en français devant ses tribunaux".

Thank you. Further debate on the motion to amend the resolution? Mr. Reilly.

**MR. G. REILLY (Vancouver):** Mr. Chairman, I am troubled by this. Because if the motion to amend should pass, then the reference to Alberta should be deleted. I do not know the distinction between English-speaking or corporations or French-speaking people in any part of the country. And while I sympathize, I have not seen or heard anything than I could understand.

I regret my ability to speak and understand French does not allow me to understand what has been said today by some of the speakers, but I have not been able to understand why this motion is necessary to facilitate or to implement the administration of justice in Alberta or elsewhere.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Is there further debate on the motion to amend which is now on the floor?

All those in favour of the motion to amend? Opposed to the motion to amend? Alright.

Resolution 9 as amended is on the floor. Is there further debate on Resolution nine?

**MR. S. ROLINGER (Edmonton):** I am here in spirit, maybe not in body. I take this resolution as one being ill thought of, because I, as a practitioner in Alberta, am not familiar with any restriction upon me to not be able to file pleadings in this province in French. In fact, if one reads the Act, that is a part of your materials, there is no restriction.

Why Alberta is singled out? My mind made a mockery of, by saying that we do not do something when in fact I believe we can, is improper. I do not think that this thing should go ahead. I do not think we have the proper materials behind us in our Resolutions books to make this kind of a motion or to pass it.

If you read this, it only says that in fact legislation passed to this point in English is made valid, but it does not say further legislation passed has to be in English only firstly; it does not address the issue of pleadings, it does not restrict any pleadings not being able to be filed in French. I do not think we should go to our Attorney General of this province and ask him to do something we do not even know if it is right or wrong in the first place.

In other words, I do not think the proper materials are before us to pass on this properly; and if we pass this resolution and it is not right, we will have done more harm than good in the first place. So either this should be tabled until we know what is right or wrong, or it should be withdrawn.

Now, if someone can address the issue as to whether, in fact, we have the inability, we are not able to file pleadings in French, then I move that this motion be defeated. Do you know that?

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Further debate?

**MS. P. DAIGNAULT(ph):** As a former practitioner in Alberta, I can advise that pleadings would not be accepted by the clerk unless an accompanying introduction is filed at the same time.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate?

**M. S. POTTER (Montréal):** La question a déjà sa réponse, monsieur le président. La réponse vient de la Cour du banc de la Reine de l'Alberta. C'est dans le jugement qui a été cité par monsieur Lévesque il y a quelques moments, et c'est une réponse qui a été donnée le 9 octobre 1990. Ce jugement, écrit à ce moment-là et qui a reçu commentaire dans la presse albertaine, commence par le paragraphe suivant:

The question raised in these proceedings is: Has Yvon Lefebvre the right to file documents in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta in the French language to initiate a process?

Question un peu limpide, réponse limpide aussi. La réponse est celle qu'a lui maître Lévesque il y a quelques moments. C'est qu'il faut que le gouvernement amende, modifie sa législation pour permettre que des documents soient déposés en français. Le paragraphe précédent, celui qui a déjà été lu, se lit:

While a judicial declaration that the Crown has a constitutional duty to amend the regulation or that a certain statute will violate the constitutional until amended by the appropriate legislative body would not impose a legal obligation on anyone. The political pressure on the government in question to carry out the responsibility, as directed by the Court, should be sufficiently great to insure the amendment to the statute.

Il s'agit là, monsieur le président, d'une invitation qui vient de la Cour du banc de la Reine de l'Alberta à des gens comme nous, de créer cette pression politique pour mettre fin à une absurdité. Une absurdité, monsieur le président, qu'on puisse parler mais qu'on ne puisse pas écrire; que l'invitation de venir à une cour soit une invitation qui n'est qu'à moitié.

Est-ce qu'il s'agit là d'une ouverture à des gens de venir à la cour quand on leur dit de venir parler mais de ne pas écrire? Ou s'agit-il d'une insulte? C'est une absurdité à laquelle il faut mettre fin.

**PRÉSIDENT SUPPLÉANT:** Merci. Further debate on Resolution 9?

**MR. J.J. CAMP (Vice-President, Vancouver):** Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record that I support this resolution. I understand that you cannot file documents in French in civil actions in Alberta. I say that because I have spoken with several Alberta practitioners, and I say that because I understand that is what Mr. Justice Power said in his response. And that being so, that is not satisfactory.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on Resolution 9?

**MR. P. NEWCOMBE (Ottawa):** Mr. Chairman, just very briefly. We have heard that you cannot physically go in and file a pleading. So that really is the answer as to whether or not it can or cannot be done.

If people are concerned about the word the Act "does not allow," you could say "does not permit," but that is the same thing. There is no provision in the Act that says that you can put the document in, and we are told that is the way it is enforced. And to have the provision "oral communications" makes it so patently obvious, that I think that the omission, and it should be an omission rather than a deliberate act, should be corrected, i.e. that one should be permitted, in the same way any person may use English or French, it should just be in communications or pleadings or documents. Very simple.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on Resolution 9?

**MR. S. ROLINGHER** (Edmonton): I have heard some comments based on hearsay that we think we cannot file pleadings here in Alberta in French. We do not have any materials in this Resolutions book that supports that at this moment. I am not satisfied that what I have heard today says to me I am denied the ability to file my pleadings in French in this province.

If that is a fact, then the authority for that should be in our Resolutions book. We should have the ability to read it, have received it in time. I, in fact, did not even get my Resolutions book till I got here and have a chance to review that material.

Determine if it is right or wrong, and make the decision on the materials provided to us; not on hearsay, not what somebody says they believe to be the case and we do not know. And if we are wrong, we have made a grievous error. We are telling the Attorney General of a province to make a change, and we do not know for a fact if we are doing the right or wrong thing.

I now move that this matter be tabled to Whistler to make the motion a proper resolution with the proper supporting materials; and if in fact the motion is correct, I will be the first to stand up and vote for it. I am not satisfied that it is at this point, and I would like to have ... (inaudible)... so I can make a proper decision; and not, in fact, if we do the wrong thing, be a laughing stock in my own province. I therefore move that it be tabled. I am looking for some support.

MOVED BY S. ROLINGHER  
SECONDED BY A. CANTOR  
DEFEATED

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Rolingher is moving a motion to table to Whistler, seconded by a voice. Who was that? Allan Cantor seconds the motion to table. Is there debate on the tabling motion?

**MR. A. CANTOR** (Winnipeg): I would like to speak to the seconding of the motion to table. I was very curious, when this resolution was proposed and presented, that I did not hear anybody from Alberta speaking. After all, this does deal with Alberta. And while I appreciate the sentiment, I was curious to know how Alberta felt about it.

I would think that if this was passed and presented to the Attorney General here, would the first question not be for the Attorney General to ask: How does the Bar of Alberta feel about this? And it seems to me that unless this resolution can have the vocal support of the Bar of Alberta, I do not think the Attorney General here is going to pay very much attention.

So it seems to me that tabling it to get the right facts, to get a little support from the Alberta Bar, would be a very valuable thing.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on the tabling motion?

**MR. C. BLOOM** (Montreal): Yes, I would like to argue against the tabling of this motion. The reason that Saul Rolingher raised for tabling this is because he says it is not clear in his mind that documents cannot be presented and filed in the Alberta courts. It think the decision that was read by Gérard Lévesque of the Court of Appeal is clear that you cannot do it.

But if not, if you just look at the statute itself which reads, and I cannot see it reading any other way, "Any person may use English or French in oral communication." Now if it was not intended to restrict it to oral communication, it would have said "in communications" in the Court. But the very use of the word "oral" means that it is restricted to oral communications, and written communications cannot be exercised.

Now the argument that Allan Cantor just raised, I do not think it is a valid argument. He says that before we speak to this, before we pass this or even vote on it, we should enquire as to the Attorney General's views on this of Alberta.

I do not think we have to be concerned here as the Canadian Bar Association what the Attorney General thinks. We have to be concerned with what we think. If we think this is the proper thing to do, we should adopt this and then present it to the Attorney General of Alberta for his consideration. But we should not wait for him to present to us his views before we take a position. This would be new for our Association to wait for Attorney Generals to tell us what to do.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on the tabling motion?

**MR. G. MANNING** (Toronto): I do not know what more the proposer of the motion to table needs to be convinced that not to vote on the main motion and to pass it would be anything more than basic fairness, courtesy, and decency in this country.

We have heard an Alberta practitioner confirm to us that documents cannot be filed in French. We see the Languages Act, where it is quite obvious that you can plead in both languages, but you can only file in English by omission. We have heard our President J.J. Camp tell us that he is satisfied on speaking to many Alberta practitioners that pleadings in French do not happen and are not permitted. What any normal, rational lawyer needs beyond that, totally escapes my imagination.

In Ontario, Council unanimously passed and our Annual Meeting unanimously ratified a by-law, which says in words of one syllable that English and French are and shall continue to be the official languages of Canadian Bar Association Ontario. That speaks for itself. The main motion speaks for itself. It would be a significant disaster to this national association if we did not defeat the tabling motion and if we did not unanimously vote in favour of the main motion.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on the motion to table?

**M. S. POTTER** (Montréal): J'aimerais adresser seulement quelques paroles, monsieur le président, à la foule ici, en invitant chaque membre du Conseil à considérer une question bien simple. Quel est le message que nous donnerions au grand public canadien en acceptant la suggestion de remettre à six mois la considération de quelque chose d'aussi fondamental? Le message serait bien négatif.

Alors je vous demande de donner un message bien positif en rejetant la suggestion de différer la considération de cette résolution.

**PRÉSIDENT SUPPLÉANT:** Merci. Further debate on the motion to table?

**MS. C. JOHNSTONE** (Edmonton): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Alberta Branch, I want to make it clear, our position. Our position is one very much in favour of the resolution, at the risk of matrimonial disharmony. But I just want us to be aware of something that has happened here.

I have spent probably two hours on the phone with the Chair of the Conference that raised this resolution. The Alberta Branch was not advised, we were not consulted at all. It would have been of much assistance to us to work in harmony with our brother on this Conference, if we would have had some warnings that we could have been prepared, so that we would have read the legislation properly and have been able to deal with it.

So I want you to be clear that Alberta endorses this. We were just taken aback because there was no consultation, and I think for future reference, for us in terms of resolutions, that we should be able to do that. It impacts and we need, and I think you would want our support on this. That is the position of our Branch, and I am obviously speaking against the tabling.

**MR. I. ALLEN (Toronto):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that in the resolution, there is a misquoting or a misprinting of the excerpt from the Statute. It reads "any person may use English or French or oral communication" and in fact the Statute says "in oral communication" which will make a lot more sense. If that has not been picked up already, then I am sure you will want to pick it up.

Page 133, Resolution 9.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** "In" rather than "or."

**MR. I. ALLEN (Toronto):** Between "French" and "oral" it should say "in."

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. The main motion is on the floor in that form. Now, we have debate on the tabling motion?

**MR. J. WADDELL (Victoria):** A brief comment, perhaps slightly off the point. I certainly am against the tabling motion. But I do note and would ask our delegates and Council members from Quebec to remember that, were this a resolution dealing with language legislation in Quebec, we would be rather concerned that we would somehow be meddling in Quebec affairs. That has been the response taken in the past sometimes when that delicate question has been addressed in Quebec.

So let us not forget here in Calgary that we are meddling the same way and rightfully meddling. But let us at least apply it fairly when we deal with this question in the future.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Further debate on the motion to table?

**M. G. LÉVESQUE (Ottawa):** Monsieur le président, je suis contre la proposition de déposer la proposition. J'aimerais mentionner que souvent on a eu des propositions qui ont été adressées aux procureurs généraux des provinces et ça a été de toutes les provinces au niveau des droits linguistiques. Mais notre conférence veut profiter du fait que nous siégeons dans une province ou l'autre pour montrer un peu la direction vers une plus grande tolérance linguistique.

Il y a des membres, dans le débat ce matin, qui ont montré qu'ils voulaient plus d'informations sur des obstacles linguistiques. S'il n'y a pas eu plus de détails dans nos textes, c'est que nous avons présumé qu'au moins nos collègues de l'Alberta étaient au courant des lois de l'Alberta. Nous avons voulu ne pas tellement les humilier en leur citant des dispositions linguistiques qui nient complètement un minimum de respect à l'utilisation du français. Je vais vous citer seulement deux autres dispositions législatives des lois de l'Alberta que sans doute nos collègues devraient connaître.

Section 4 of the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgment RSA-1980, Chapter R 6.  
Section 14 of the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders RSA-1990, Chapter R 7.1.

I will not review the section. I will just tell you what is the effect of those sections. If I am coming in Alberta with a judgment or maintenance order rendered in French in Quebec, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Ontario, it would not be accepted. My client would have to pay for translation, and it is the translation that will have to be filed.

So those are extra sections for those who need example of the Alberta Statutes that create some problems. I have checked them yesterday in the library of the Court of the Queen's Bench to be sure of my research. They are still in existence, no amendments have been made.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Further debate on the tabling motion?

**MR. A. CANTOR (Winnipeg):** My concern about seconding the motion to table was that I did not where the Alberta Bar stood. Cecilia has clarified that, the Alberta Bar is in favour. And in those circumstances, Saul, I am sorry, it is too bad they do have better domestic communication, I want to withdraw my seconding of the motion to table.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** I am not going to permit you to do that, Mr. Cantor. I appreciate your thoughts. There is a tabling motion on the floor, seconded.

Question. All those in favour of the motion to table? All those opposed to the motion? The motion to table is defeated.

There is on the floor Resolution 9 with two typographical corrections and an amendment. Now, we are all clear on the picture, I trust?

All those in favour of Resolution 9 as amended? Opposed? The resolution is passed.

Now let us move to Resolution 10. Is there anyone here this morning to speak to Resolution 10?

**MR. S. PINX (Winnipeg):** On behalf of the National Criminal Justice Section, I am moving this resolution, and I am seconded in my motion by Mr. Terry La Liberté from Vancouver.

MOVED BY S. PINX  
SECONDED BY T. LA LIBERTÉ  
CARRIED

Last month, Canada and the United Nations signed a memorandum of understanding which provided that the new Vancouver International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy will in effect work in conjunction with the United Nations in formulating a policy on criminal matters, criminal reform, involving international cooperation, particularly dealing with criminal law reform in developing countries.

This resolution is in effect to state the CBA support for the collaborative international efforts for developing and reforming criminal law, together with the use of the International Centre in Vancouver to effect that purpose, and any and all other bodies in this country which can assist in promoting a much better understanding in other countries of the rule of law, human rights, and the independence of the judiciary and the bar.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you. Is there debate on Resolution 10? The question is called.

All those in favour of Resolution 10? Opposed? Resolution 10 is passed unanimously.

Let us turn now to the internal resolutions, and there is someone immediately at the phone. Mr. Usher?

**MR. R. USHER (Vancouver):** I am wondering if I could beg the indulgence of this conference. I need to leave for an airplane and I wonder if we could take a look at Resolution number A-30. I hope it will be uncontroversial and could be quickly dealt with, simply changing the name of the section to bring it in compliance with Ontario and other jurisdictions.

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON:** To establish a precedent in that regard, but we have heard Mr. Usher. What is the wish of the meeting to deal with his name change? Yes, alright.