

*Publication of Statutes Act*

by the Prime Minister who will be making a statement on the matter in due course.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell the house when he expects to appoint the members of the consumer council, the chairman of which was appointed as early as July 16?

**Mr. Basford:** Very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

**PUBLICATION OF STATUTES ACT**  
AMENDMENTS RESPECTING FORM OF  
PRINTING

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice)** moved the second reading of Bill No. S-2, to amend the Publication of Statutes Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, to begin with I should like to review for the house the history of this bill in the previous session of parliament. It was first introduced in the other place in 1967 during the course of the last parliament. It had been given second reading in the other chamber, considered there by the standing committee on banking and commerce, given third reading and passed, whereupon it reached this house in the spring of this year.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder whether copies of the bill could be distributed to our desks before we proceed with it. I know we have copies upstairs but we do not have them here.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I think it is being distributed now, Mr. Speaker; the bill is at the table.

I was saying that last spring, just before parliament dissolved, the bill was introduced into this chamber. It was given first reading but debate on second reading had not been concluded at the time the house was dissolved.

A week or so ago the bill was introduced once more in the other place; it was given second reading and sent to the standing committee on banking and commerce. Certain technical amendments were made to it in the other place and the bill was given third reading. The text that hon. members now have before them incorporates the amendments made to the original bill by the Senate. I might say that those amendments are accepted by the government and the bill is now before this house for second reading.

The purpose of the bill is to give the governor in council authority to publish the statutes in a certain form. At the present time, as

members know, under the existing Publication of Statutes Act, the statutes must be published in separate volumes, in English and in French. The purpose of this bill is to enable the government to publish the statutes in another form, having the English and French texts in adjacent columns on the same page, thereby putting both versions of the statutes in the same volume. By courtesy of the house leaders of all parties, Mr. Speaker, bills have until today been submitted to this chamber in that form. Therefore Bill S-2 itself, which we are now discussing, appears in a form similar to that which would be provided for under the regulations by the governor in council should the house adopt this bill.

● (3:20 p.m.)

The Revised Statutes of Canada to be published in the course of the coming year will be printed in the form recommended by the commission on the revision of statutes and it is the intention that the revised statutes be in both languages, printed on the same page in parallel columns, thereby including both languages in the same volume. Since the revised statutes will be in this form the government feels it would be appropriate to publish the annual statutes in the same form.

For the information of all members the Clerk has at his table specimen copies of the revised statutes as they will appear when published, and hon. members who wish to see them could perhaps call at the table, or possibly the pages can distribute copies to those who are interested.

The reason for the introduction of this bill is that while section 133 of the British North America Act provides that the laws of Canada shall be published in both languages it does not provide that they should be published side by side. As a matter of fact, they have been published until now in separate volumes, one in English and the other in French. The intention now is to publish the two versions in the same volume. I believe this will prove to be a convenience in a number of ways. I believe the legal profession itself will derive benefit from the change.

I should like to recall to hon. members of this house learned in the law that the rules adopted by the courts in the interpretation of statutes provide that a statute in one language, if of doubtful interpretation, may be compared with the same statute in the other official language. In 1935, in the case of *The King v. Dubois*, the Supreme Court of Canada held that the two versions of a statute