

Mr. STEWART: I am informed by the legal gentlemen in charge of this matter that approval of the plans has been granted by the government of Canada.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Stormont): Does the hon. gentleman know the date when that approval was given?

Mr. STEWART: No.

Mr. HOWE: I should like to ask one question. Is there any change in the terms under which the deposit is made by the bridge company with the Canadian government?

Mr. STEWART: No, the deposit is still required.

Mr. HOWE: Is there any change in the terms?

Mr. STEWART: Yes, there is some change in the terms.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

CRIMINAL CODE

PENALTIES FOR INFRACTIONS OF MOTOR VEHICLE REGULATIONS

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved the second reading of Bill No. 57, to amend the criminal code.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I arranged with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) last Friday that this bill should be gone on with to-night. To me it is one of the most important bills with which we have to deal. When you think that between now and next Christmas over three thousand more people in the city from which I come, more than ten times as many as would be required to fill up all these seats, will have suffered injury in automobile accidents and about 50 more killed, I am sure you will agree that this is a bill which should be considered. I should have preferred to introduce this subject by means of a separate resolution, as I did last session. At the beginning of this session in the house here I suggested that a committee of both houses of parliament should deal with this problem, but I was unable to get the matter before the house in any way other than this. This matter is far more important than any resolution in the budget, since it concerns the life and death of the people on our highways. In every constituency of Canada people are being slaughtered in this way; men, women and innocent children are being injured and killed, and the House of Commons does nothing about it. They can talk about Mr. Sage; they can waste time deciding who should be

[Mr. Chevrier.]

the ten men to constitute the House of Commons Follies for 1936, but they cannot give consideration to this bill which deals with such an important matter.

According to the rules of the house, on the motion for second reading I cannot take up the bill clause by clause, but I can discuss only the principle of the bill and the necessity for it. Is the present law adequate to protect the public at level crossings and on highways? That is the principle of the bill. If the bill reaches committee I will explain every clause contained in it or later seek to add it all to any government bill. The first section refers to level crossings, and I should like to remind the house that only a few weeks ago five people were killed on a level crossing at Delhi, and not so very long ago four people were killed at Whitby while returning from a hockey match. I seek to have the law of Quebec in regard to motor vehicles being compelled to come to a full stop at level crossings made to apply all over Canada.

I wish at this time to deal only with the principle of the bill, because if the house agrees to the principle we may do what should have been done long ago. Canada is lagging far behind the times in connection with this work. We are the only country in which something has not been done to protect the public. Long ago we should have had a committee of both houses of parliament studying this problem. Why, Mr. Speaker, you might be knocked down on the street to-morrow and be unable to preside over the sittings of this house again. There are 245 members of this House of Commons. In 1934 the number of those killed in automobile accidents in Canada would be sufficient to fill all the seats of this chamber four or five times over, and that is the result of the failure of parliament to deal with this question.

This matter was discussed by the house for a whole day last year, and everyone agreed from all sections of the house that something should be done. That debate will be found in Hansard for February 13 of last year, at page 786. This bill is not a criticism of the motorists, ninety-five per cent of whom are usually careful. I own a car, though I do not drive; I should like to live a while longer, and that is why I do not drive. Ninety-five per cent of the people who drive automobiles try to obey the law, but facts are facts and we must face them. These death cars are on every highway, and with the exception of a few newspapers no one does anything about it. In my opinion transportation in Canada should be a means to an end and not, as is becoming fashionable in this country,