

I am not recommending it at this session, but if in the course of time it is found that we have to do something, from what consideration I have been able to give the matter this is the most practical amendment I can suggest if an amendment is to be made to stiffen the section. The proposed amendment has much to commend itself, but it also has much against it. I should like those who are interested in the subject to give it some consideration between this and the next session. I may say that we have had strong representations to the effect that we ought to go quite far in amending the section. I have not gone very far, as will be seen when the section is reached; what I have done is to try to offset the decision of the courts with regard to one particular phase of the matter which will be explained when the section is reached.

Mr. GREEN: Is that section 3?

Mr. ILSLEY: Section 10.

Mr. MacNICOL: Would the minister elaborate on the Bracebridge case, the particularly revolting case which was referred to by the hon. member for Spadina?

Mr. ILSLEY: I think the general rule is that an inquiry may be held in camera. It is the duty of the presiding officer—I think a coroner would have the same right, although I am not sure—whether a judge or other officer, to do what is right in that regard. I am not familiar with the case mentioned by the hon. member for Spadina, but I do know that judges often hear cases in camera if there is sufficient reason for doing so.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—Imprisonment to be served consecutively.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, if this is the best bill the government can bring down on this 104th day of the session regarding law reform, then we might just as well realize that there is no law reform proposed in the said bill. The bill is a disappointment to me. You cannot discuss the principle of the bill because there is a different principle in each clause. Each clause deals with a different subject matter. I am disappointed if this is the best law reform that Canada can get after being twenty-five years behind the times.

One section deals with accidents, but it offers no effective means of preventing accidents. The bill does not deal with some of the most important problems we have. We have had no opportunity of discussing the bill

on second reading, and for that reason I do not think the minister will object if I make a few remarks in connection with the bill.

This bill is a disappointment to the chief constables' association, to the bar associations of the country, to the magistrates, to the judges and to the police officials who are enforcing the law. It would be better if the Attorney General of Canada would enforce his own statutes, and not leave their enforcement to the attorneys general of the provinces. As I see it, these amendments will not prevent any further accidents. You are going to have a lot of trouble. When you go over the bill you find that it absolutely forgets some of the main principles involved in law reform, or road accidents that cause death from the motor car, the abuse of which is one of Canada's greatest scandals.

We should have a complete revision of our criminal code every ten years, but I do not think there has been one since it was first passed. Is this the best law reform that the members of the two old parties and the other parties to my left can bring about? This bill of reform is not in accordance with the principles of real law reform which they have in England. There is nothing in this bill to prevent imprisonment for debt. Our gaols are filled with people, some of them soldiers, who cannot afford to pay their fines. Nothing is done about that in this bill. The summary offenders act was adopted in the mother country twenty-five years ago. Before the war, half of the prisons in England were closed as a result of time given to pay fines under the summary offenders act there.

Our newspapers are filled with details of accidents every day, but so far as these measures are concerned, we might as well meet in secret for all the public know of what is said here. It will be noticed that the bill contains some mention of the payment of fines, but that will have very little effect. The only thing to do is to adopt the same principles of law which have been in effect in England for twenty-five years. This minor change in the principle will not keep people out of gaol who have not the money with which to pay their fines. Some of our gaols are filled with these people, notwithstanding what has been said.

In these days the motor car is the cause of many deaths. Thousands of people are injured on our highways and the amendments proposed will have very little effect. I can find very little cure in these amendments for the problem of the hit-and-run driver, one of the most beastly types of murderer you can find. This is the man who runs away and leaves a child on the pavement. This is the