

obsolete and not now applicable. It cannot be done too soon, for if we wait until the war is over it will be too late.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I really should rise to a point of order. I want to suggest that the doubt which Your Honour expressed a few moments ago was fully justified. The discussion which may take place on the second reading of a bill is clearly defined by our rules, which say that on second reading only the general principle of the bill shall be discussed. If I remember aright, there are more than eleven hundred sections in the criminal code. The rules do not say that on a bill like this we can discuss the general principle of the criminal code; we can discuss only the principle of the bill itself, which contains only four sections. It says nothing whatever about the other matters that have been alluded to this afternoon. If we are to be at liberty, on a trivial bill of this nature, to discuss at any length any or all of the eleven hundred sections of the criminal code, it is no wonder the Prime Minister spoke of the possibility of our being here until Christmas. It has been the custom since I have been in this house to discuss nothing but the general principle of the bill before the house on the motion for second reading, not the general principle of some other bill. I have known of a man who wanted to introduce an amendment to an act which had been thrown open, as they say; so he stuck around until they came to section 600, let us say, in order to move his amendment to that section. I have never heard, however, that it would be in order to have an open debate upon every section of the bill. We could not have a better illustration than the bill now before us; the act being amended contains so many sections, with very great implications. We shall be here for much more than a week or two if each of us airs his views and perhaps justifiable grievances in regard to every remote section of the code. I suggest that we adhere to the rules and discuss only the general principle of the bill under consideration.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I desire to make a few brief observations in respect of this bill, and I hope I will not displease the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) if I discuss the principles of the criminal code incidentally, in a most general way, while generally speaking confining myself to the principles of the bill.

There is a great deal in what the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) has said with respect to the criminal code and its administration generally. I am not going into any of the particular topics to which he

adverted, except to say that I support his contentions in every regard, with one exception. I think the criminal code should be overhauled. If my memory serves me aright it was in 1892 that the criminal law of Canada was codified. I had the honour to sit as a student under a very able man who did a great deal of work on the codification of the criminal law of Canada, the late Doctor Weldon, who lectured to us on crimes in the law school. His experience was of great benefit to us as students at law. The only point upon which I differ with the hon. member for Lake Centre is with respect to his suggestion that these unfortunate convicted men or women should be transferred immediately to the penitentiary.

Mr. NEILL: I repeat my point of order, which has not yet been decided. If it is to be generally understood that we can discuss every section of the criminal code under this bill, let us go to it. It will take a long time, and will be a precedent in the discussion of other bills. I just want the matter cleared up. If that is the ruling of the Chair and the judgment of this house, go to it; but don't kick later on when we come within sight of Christmas.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand that the hon. gentleman was raising a point of order. When the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) was speaking I asked him to state in what way his remarks were relevant to this bill, and the hon. member said he was dealing with the sections of the bill and giving some instances in support of his argument. It may be that in giving those illustrations he was somewhat irrelevant as far as this bill is concerned, yet generally speaking he was confining himself to the sections of the code now being amended. I would ask all other hon. members to confine themselves to these amendments and their implications, supporting their remarks by whatever arguments they consider proper but keeping always within the amendments themselves. I rather think the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) was proposing to deal with the matter in the same manner; at least I hope that was so, and that I will not have to call him to order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I hope there will be no occasion for Your Honour to call me to order. The weather to-day is too hot for me at least to engage in any great controversy. I just want to finish the statement I was making, and then I shall deal entirely with the principle of this bill. That is to say, I do not find myself in accord with the suggestion of the hon. member for Lake