

Mr. HACKETT: Mr. Power was in the Department of Justice, was he not?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not know whether he was or not.

Mr. HACKETT: It seems to me that he was.

Mr. ILSLEY: I mentioned Henry Robertson, K.C. Then there was Edward R. Cameron, K.C.; Thomas L. Metcalfe, barrister, and Henry Philippe Sirois, notary public.

Mr. HACKETT: Mr. Cameron was in the courts.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. HACKETT: He was registrar of the supreme court.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. So there was only one judge on that commission. In 1927 the commissioners were—

Mr. HACKETT: Sir Charles Fitzpatrick—

Mr. FLEMING: I read the names.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, they were placed before the committee by the hon. member for Eglinton. Apparently there were no judges at all on that commission, although I understood one county court judge was engaged in the revision in 1927.

I am interested in some of the observations that have been made this afternoon. I certainly was not aware that it was part of the scheme for the revision of the statutes to have the statutes debated section by section when they went through the house. That was contrary to my impression of what is done or what can practically be done. That seemed to be the view that the hon. member for Eglinton had as to the duties of members of parliament. I do not think that they have ever assumed that responsibility. I think that they take adequate means to see that the statutes on the books are truly reproduced, and that is all. I do not think they go over them critically at all, section by section. But I will look into the suggestion. I think the hon. member for Eglinton is all wrong about the operation if he thinks that this is a reconsideration, and that the revision of the statutes involves reconsideration by parliament of all the statutes of Canada. I do not think it ordinarily does.

Mr. HACKETT: I was under the impression that a report was made dealing with all the statutes that had been considered, giving the reason for the elimination of some that were not included, and for the abbreviation of others. I am not certain about that, though.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will make inquiries about it. This is the very purpose of discussion on the resolution; we can get our views straightened out on these matters. Then I can come back, either on the second reading of the bill or when we are in committee, and answer these questions.

The hon. member for Eglinton seemed to think that Doctor Ollivier's suggestion that there be some consolidation by parliament before the work is undertaken by the commissioners is not a good one. I simply took it that Doctor Ollivier was suggesting that that would be a more convenient way to effect consolidation; that the officials—and I suppose largely finance officials—were in a position to consolidate these taxation statutes, and that they should do it; that the consolidation should go through without discussion provided there was an assurance that there was no change in the existing law, and that the commissioners would be saved that much time and the government would be saved that much money. It does not strike me as an important saving, I must say; nevertheless I do not think there is anything particularly dangerous about it.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: What does the minister mean by "revision"? It is a word that requires interpretation. What had the minister in mind? Was it merely a consolidation, bringing up to date the various amendments and setting them under their respective sections?

Mr. ILSLEY: I will tell the committee what I mean by revision, and what I mean by consolidation, but whether my definitions are in accordance with the dictionary definitions or the ordinary acceptance, I do not know. By revision I mean re-enactment after consideration, with some changes. By consolidation I mean re-enactment, in perhaps slightly different form, but without any change in meaning. The duty of the commissioners, if I am correctly informed, has been to effect a consolidation without change of meaning. They straighten out language, rearrange sections, and remove anomalies. They strike out sections which were put in for the purpose of fixing the date of the coming into force of the act. They may remove preambles. They may make all sorts of verbal changes. But if they are consolidating the statutes they are not making any change in the effect or meaning of the statutes. That is a consolidation, and I think that is a duty of the commissioners. Revision, in the sense in which I use the word, is a different matter.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is a parliamentary responsibility.