

when people used to think this way. It would seem that the lawmaker is now heading back in that direction.

The summary gives an insight into the legislative amendments contained in Bill C-72. However, this litany of excuses has no other purpose than to eventually refer the issue to the Supreme Court, for an opinion on the approach taken in the amendments made in Bill C-72.

The Minister of Justice is consistent as he again considers the option of a referral asking the Supreme Court to examine the amendments to the Criminal Code in Bill C-72, as soon as the legislation is passed by Parliament but before the legislation comes into force.

He would seek a non-binding advisory opinion from the Supreme Court, as if Parliament needed the seal of approval of the courts! And if the Supreme Court felt that the provisions were unconstitutional, we would have to go through the whole process again. We would be back to square one, and the time spent in the House and in committee would have been wasted.

If the Minister of Justice is so sure that his bill would pass the test of a constitutional challenge, why bother seeking the approval of the Supreme Court?

Immediate implementation of these amendments is both necessary and crucial. As long as we keep postponing the coming into force of this legislation, the number of these sad and sordid cases will continue to increase. Courts across the country are waiting for the Minister of Justice to act. This time they are seeking an opinion from the Supreme Court.

Aside from the preamble, the bill is very brief. Just one clause. Bill C-72 proposes to add a new section 33.1 to the Criminal Code, which consists of three subsections. The first one removes the defence of self-induced intoxication, the second subsection defines the standard of fault and the third specifies the type of offence to which the provision applies.

Section 33.1 of the bill will be added to the general part of the Criminal Code under the heading *Self-induced intoxication*. However, the section in question provides no definition of this term and does not list specific circumstances to which the section does not apply. It seems to me that the Minister of Justice, who wants to correct a judicial decision, is still leaving a lot of room for interpretation. The connection between the preamble and subsection three of the article seems somewhat ambiguous.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business. Before we do, however, I would ask the hon. member for Saint-Hubert if she could tell the House how long she will need to conclude her remarks. Perhaps we could then agree to delay Private Members' Business, or perhaps we should ask for unanimous consent.

### Routine Proceedings

Could the hon. member for Saint-Hubert help us out with this information?

**Mrs. Venne:** Mr. Speaker, I would need 8 or 9 minutes more.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Under the circumstances, I would ask, without wanting the hon. member for Saint-Hubert to be bound by her statement, if there is unanimous consent?

[English]

Would there be unanimous consent that I not see the clock so the hon. member for St. Hubert could conclude her remarks? Then at approximately 5.40 p.m. we would go into Private Members' Business. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Silye:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe the parliamentary secretary to the House leader has another issue he would like to bring forward. If he does I would like to have that heard now so that we could proceed. We would agree to the request.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** As we say repeatedly from the Chair, it is your House and I am only here to accede to your wishes.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### INDUSTRY—AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the comments of the Reform Party whip I would seek the consent of the House for a couple of motions. I move:

That 15 members and 7 staff of the Standing Committee on Industry be authorized to travel to Toronto, Ontario, during the adjournment of the House between August 1 and August 3, 1995, in order to conduct hearings on major banks and their activities.

I seek unanimous consent for that motion and then I will have another one.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)