

we should not rush it through in order that we could hear from the Canadian Medical Association, I believe, in committee. I think that is a good suggestion and perhaps a reason why we should put the Bill into committee.

During the last session I, along with other Members at that time, rushed a Bill through at the last moment. It concerned an amendment relating to Indian women. That Bill was rushed to the Senate. I suggest it was embarrassing for Parliament when one senator would not consent to the Bill and it died. Eventually that legislation will have to be passed but we were clearly not ready to put it through at that time. I suggest it is irresponsible for us as legislators to rush legislation through for a symbolic purpose or for political posturing. I believe if something is worth doing it is worth doing right.

Let me point out some of the provisions of this Bill which I would like the committee to consider. As I have said, there is obviously a public will that we become more strict with impaired and drunken drivers. We have sent that signal as a result of this Bill. However, I want to ask the Parliamentary Secretary whether tougher penalties will really solve the problem. During his speech the Minister of Justice said it would not. In fact, he said that these penalties would have a short-term effect because people thought they might not get caught. They knew the laws were tougher but that fear would wear off in the long run.

I had the benefit of looking at a study called "Deterring the Drinking Driver" conducted by H. Lawrence Ross of the State University of Buffalo. Let me refer to this study because it is similar to what the Minister of Justice was talking about. At page 111 it states:

However, deterrence-based policies are questionable in the long run. No such policies have been scientifically demonstrated to work over time under conditions achieved in any jurisdiction. This fact does not mean that such policies are hopeless but rather that success—if achievable—probably will involve something other than what has been done in the past. On the basis of the evidence, it will not suffice to import further elements of the Scandinavian approach into other jurisdictions in the expectation that Norway and Sweden have the answers. Moreover, the option of merely increasing penalties for drinking and driving has been strongly discredited by experience to date. The most hopeful opportunities for further deterrent accomplishments would seem to lie in increasing the actual probabilities of apprehension and conviction of drinking drivers.

The Minister of Justice acknowledged in his speech that increased penalties will not solve the problem in the long run. This Bill provides for increased penalties. The Minister said he would advocate a penalty of a jail sentence and gave the example of the bank president in Switzerland. We know that in Scandinavia and in Norway and Sweden there are tougher penalties for first offences. I suggest that we will return here in a couple of years to pass that type of law. We will probably favour a law that will place a drunk driver in jail. My point is that we know that it still will not solve the problem. While increased penalties may partly solve the problem, it does not answer the entire question.

The average Canadian is most familiar with our provincial courts or lower court system. If one studies a court docket, there are usually about two or three impaired driving cases each day on a judge's court docket. These cases take up much time in our courts. It is at this level that most Canadians

Criminal Law Amendments

usually become involved. I have found in my experience that many of those who were charged with impaired driving were repeat offenders.

This was also reflected in the Minister's statistics which he gave us today. I have found through my personal experience that many were repeat offenders and had a drinking problem. It is only occasionally that a person who drinks too much at a party gets caught and is charged with impaired driving. It is usually those who have a drinking problem who are caught and it is a symptom of deeper problems. It is often the case, when acting as a lawyer for someone who has been charged with impaired driving, that he has been stopped by the police before and let go because they were not quite sure of his condition. In British Columbia in the past there was a provision for roadside suspension of a licence. However, such people would finally be charged with impaired driving.

● (1240)

That is really an alcohol problem, a treatment problem. What we tried to do in the Alcohol and Drug Commission of B.C.—I am having a little trouble speaking; perhaps Members could go and converse in the lobby. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but it is a little distracting. We formed local committees made up of local citizens. In Nanaimo, British Columbia, volunteer groups had programs for impaired drivers after conviction. These drivers would meet with the local coroner, a local doctor, local policemen and nurses. It had a bit of shock value. Then they would meet with job providers and so on. These were not fancy professionals but local people. It did not cost very much because it was mostly volunteer work. We provided some of the films, the aids and things like that. It cost the Government very little. We started to get good results in that we were stopping repeaters. A ripple went out in the community that impaired driving was a community problem.

I want to say something to Canadians. I suppose one is not supposed to criticize one's electors but Canadians are hypocritical on this issue. We all want to stop impaired driving. We want to have tougher penalties; at least, we say we do. On the other hand we are not prepared to face the problem that we are a pretty alcohol-soaked society. I am not advocating prohibition or anything like that, but there will have to be some fundamental changes in attitude. It is coming. You notice it at a party. A couple goes to a party and one person does not drink so he or she can drive home. I am told this is much more prevalent in Scandinavia.

These are, however, the responsible people. The problem is some younger people who are less responsible and some people who have an alcohol problem. We also have a problem of people making judgments. You hear people say: "If you get in your car and drive you will get a penalty. You might go to jail or it might cost you a lot of money". We can all appreciate that now, but we may have a different attitude after six or seven drinks because then one is impaired. That person then has to judge whether to get into a car. As I say, Canadians are a bit hypocritical. We know that 2,500 people a year die as a