

In a very interesting article by Doctor Maurice Ollivier which has just appeared in the last number of the *Canadian Bar Review*, and in which the law clerk of the House of Commons makes a study of the different statute revisions both in the United Kingdom and in Canada throughout the years, I noticed a section in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, Act, to the effect that the printed roll of the French version:

—should be deemed to be the authentic original French version of the said statutes, and as such shall have the force of law as if herein enacted.

The article refers to the discussion which took place at that time, and quotes Mr. Aylesworth, then minister of justice, as having stated in the house that:

The French text of our statutes is of absolutely equal potency with the English.

This section dealing with the French version does not appear in the governing act of the revised statutes of 1927, nor does it appear in the present bill. I wonder if the minister would not consider the insertion of a similar clause as section 13 of the present bill; or if not, would he consider making a declaration to the house that, although this section will not appear in the act, the situation as far as the authenticity of the French version is concerned remains unchanged.

Dealing with the next revision of the statutes as contemplated in the present bill, Doctor Ollivier makes what I believe to be some valuable suggestions which I should like briefly to bring to the attention of the house and of the minister.

The first suggestion is that a departmental subcommittee of the Department of Justice might prepare a codification and extensive revision of the criminal code, to be passed at the next session of parliament, to improve the act from the points of view of drafting, arrangement of parts and sections, and simplification of procedure.

His second suggestion has to do with the consolidation and revision of taxation measures along the line already started with the revision of the act respecting income taxes. In other words, there should be a revision of the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Customs Tariff. Doctor Ollivier states that if these statutes, and some others which he names, could be adopted by the house purely as consolidations, without changes, and by consent without discussion, much of the work of the commissioners would be eliminated, and consequently the cost of the general revision would be greatly reduced.

The article goes on to suggest that it would expedite matters if an act were passed or the

rules of the house amended to provide that when a revised act is introduced it shall receive first, second and third readings without any discussion if the minister introducing it states that the bill is simply a consolidation without any new matter or essential change. It could further be provided that, if the minister so desires, the bill may be referred to a committee, there to be further revised, studied and examined.

These are all valuable suggestions which certainly deserve to be considered. I have no doubt, however, that the minister has read this memorandum by our law clerk and has had these very points under advisement and consideration.

Mr. CHURCH: The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, Mr. Chairman, is one of those mentioned for promotion in case there is any change in the Department of Justice.

This bill is one of the most important which the present Minister of Justice has introduced into this house. Some years ago I proposed that the statutes of Canada should, like the Bank Act, be revised every ten years. This revision is going to take a long time. The last revision was in 1927. Every year amendments to statutes are made; and a very large amount of legislation has been put on the statute book since 1927. I believe the time has come for revision.

The present Minister of Justice will be very much missed. I am sorry to see him go, because he is a conscientious and hard-working public officer and has proved himself a most trustworthy attorney general. But if a change is to be made in the Department of Justice I believe that the province of Ontario should have this important portfolio. Sir Wilfrid Laurier appointed as minister of justice one of his colleagues, Mr. Mills, who represented a part of the country from which you yourself come, Mr. Chairman, western Ontario.

I want to compliment you, sir, on the work you have done as chairman during a large part of the discussion of these bills. I believe that in the estimates provision of \$2,000 a year should be made for our chairman for the work he did last year and this year. Having said that I may say that the time has come when that portfolio should be given to the old province of Ontario.

I should like to hear something from the minister about this resolution. Is it proposed, as in the case of the revision of the Ontario statutes, to have a commission of judges conduct this revision—because it will take a long time to go over all the law? We have to consider also the rules and regulations which