

*Publication of Statutes Act*

must be read together and that the meaning in one case might be limited or extended by the corresponding words in the other version. In the province of Quebec the statutes are already printed in parallel columns, first in French and then in English. In 1937 the Quebec Superior Court in the case of *Robitaille v. Beaupré* upheld the proposition that where one version of a statute is susceptible to a meaning different from the other version, the version most consistent with the intention of the legislation should prevail.

I am suggesting it will be a great convenience to the bench, to members of the bar and to people generally to find both versions of a statute printed on the same page in the same volume, each casting light, meaning and interpretation one upon the other. I think I would be remiss if I failed to mention the feeling of the government and, I hope, of this house, that if we are to talk in terms of the equality of both official languages in Canada we should not limit ourselves to section 133 of the British North America Act. If we are to mean what we say, French speaking Canadians should be made to feel at home not only in Quebec but in other parts of the country, and have equal access to the law in their own language. The act of placing each version in parallel columns grants equality to the languages used. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said before the Senate committee last year when he was Minister of Justice, having two versions separate but equal, that is to say, in separate volumes, is not the same as having them equal and in the same volume. There should be equal access to each version in the same volume.

I was present during the last debate on this subject and listened with great interest to what was said by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner).

**Mr. Horner:** Do you want to hear it again?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** No, thank you. But the hon. member did express a point of view which deserves a hearing in this house and I do not contest his right to have made that speech one bit. Having heard that speech, as well as the speech made on that occasion by the former hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, Mr. Churchill, I realize that some concern is felt about the additional cost of the new volumes and the size it is anticipated they may reach. When we reach the committee stage, if the house allows us to proceed, I believe I should be able to demonstrate that the cost will not be appreciably

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

greater than the current cost of producing these volumes, that the price paid by purchasers will not be appreciably more, and that the size of the volumes will not be appreciably increased. In other words, we intend that the volumes should be of a convenient size to carry into a court. We do not contemplate a cumbersome type of binding or printing.

I do not intend to deal with the amendments made in the Senate unless this matter is brought up during the committee stage. I shall simply add a few remarks having to do with the publication of statutes generally and the possibility of accelerating the speed with which these statutes can be published and revised. I think this is related to the larger area of legal reform, of bringing the law up to date with technology and the introduction of a greater degree of computerization in connection with the publication of the statutes in permanent form. I would think that the availability of the statutes in the two languages would enhance this possibility. Since 1960 much has been said and written in this area and today studies on these lines rank as a highly specialized discipline called *jurimetrics*. I have had something to say about this outside the house but so far I have had no opportunity to mention it here.

I have only a few more things to say, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure the hon. member who is representing the minister of justice in the shadow cabinet, which is rather an illusory concept at best—

**Mr. Woolliams:** When they have a case won, good counsel do not talk too long.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Don't talk your client into gaol.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** If that is the understanding, I will sit down.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the minister sat down because I think there was an understanding—indeed, he knew there was an understanding—that we would try to get this bill through today. It is, after all, a procedural matter. I appreciate the minister's wish to explain the bill and the advantages attaching to it, but when he got into the political realm to try to wrap up a few votes I thought he lost his purpose. We on this side agree with what he proposes. Let us get on with the job and approve the bill without delay.

• (3:30 p.m.)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.