

Bill J3, an Act for the relief of Joseph Bergman.

Bill K3, an Act for the relief of Marie Martha Hermine Browne Peters.

Bill L3, an Act for the relief of Ethel Gerson Kalmanovitch.

Bill M3, an Act for the relief of Freda Sweet Simon.

Bill N3, an Act for the relief of Phyllis Mary Alice Verrinder Horrell.

Bill O3, an Act for the relief of James McKinna Wood.

MOTION FOR SECOND READING.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON moved the second reading of Bill P3, an Act for the relief of Leah May Jarvis Traver.

He said: Honourable senators, the reason I did not include this Bill in the motion I made a few moments ago was that I thought an honourable gentleman might want to say something about this case. I now move second reading.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: Honourable senators, the honourable gentleman from Sorel (Hon. Mr. David) desires to make some remarks concerning this Bill, and he asked me to request that the second reading be not proceeded with before our next sitting.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: That is agreeable. The motion for second reading stands.

CANADA EVIDENCE BILL SECOND READING

Hon. J. H. KING moved the second reading of Bill 66, an Act to amend the Canada Evidence Act.

He said: Honourable senators, this is an enactment to enable governments, banks, railway and express companies, telegraph and telephone companies and insurance companies to use as evidence photographic copies in lieu of original records. The idea is that much less space is required for storage of films than of the actual documents themselves. It is said that 2,600 sheets of letter size can be recorded on one photographic film of 200 feet, at a cost of about seven dollars a film. The process is so speedy that twenty-five sheets can be photographed on both sides in one minute. By the use of a projecting machine, which throws an enlarged picture upon a screen, the photographed record can be examined readily. When a particular document is required for evidence, an enlarged print may be easily obtained from the film.

This process, I understand, is in use in the United States, and five of our provinces have

passed legislation along the lines of the present Bill. If a government body, bank or company covered by the Bill wished to destroy old records which it is now obliged to keep, a microfilm would be made and an affidavit executed by the photographer and the person who destroyed the original record. If in future it became necessary to use any of these records in evidence, an enlargement of the film, submitted to the court with a copy of the affidavit, would be received as evidence of what the original record contained. I think that is all I need say. Some of our legal friends may care to discuss the matter.

Hon. L. COTE: Honourable senators, I have read the report of the discussion on this Bill in the other House. The Bill was promoted by the Minister of Justice, who, I should judge from the discussion, considered it very thoroughly and in his usual able way. That in itself is a recommendation in favour of the measure. I think nothing can be said against the principle of the Bill. The moment this measure became law it would be applicable to procedure in federal courts and with regard to matters governed by federal law; for instance, in cases under the Criminal Code. But I understand that provincial legislation would be required before the new rule of evidence would become effective in other places.

Hon. Mr. KING: Except in the provinces that have already adopted similar legislation.

Hon. Mr. COTE: Except in provinces where similar legislation has already been adopted. That is quite right. Personally I have no objection to the Bill. I certainly do not object to second reading. It has been suggested by some members on this side of the House that in order to understand better, not only the meaning, but also the scope of this proposed amendment to the Evidence Act, there should be a reference to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I wonder whether the honourable leader would consent to that procedure, as there is no urgency about the Bill.

Hon. Mr. KING: There is no urgency, and I cannot see any objection to a reference to the committee.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On motion of Hon. Mr. King, the Bill was referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.