

*Criminal Code*

materially change what is now already generally accepted by society's consensus concerning the practical approach to this problem.

With regard to the sections devoted to the problems of guns, I would say that the new provisions are designed for large cities and are not as applicable to our rural areas. It will be difficult for organizations such as junior rifle clubs to carry on their activities because, for instance, section 87 states that no one shall give ammunition to those under 17. Presumably, therefore the use of ammunition by a junior rifle club would be prohibited. It would have been wise for the department to have worked out a more suitable statute in collaboration with the National Fish and Game Federation.

According to section 94, casual sportsmen who are involved in a day's shooting can be made liable for what seems to be a very minor offence. I would like to point out also that in the case of reporting lost weapons, a weapon may be stolen for some time before the loss is noticed by the owner. I think that this section may be impractical.

I would like to make a suggestion to the minister, which I think he might agree is constructive, that a ballisticgram be made of every new firearm at the manufacturer's level with a record of its serial number. This in turn would be correlated with the serial and permit numbers of the registrant and would make it considerably easier to correlate bullets and firearms from the central registry.

I will conclude my statement with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay the bill, and my remarks will be brief. Nevertheless, it is my responsibility and my duty to the people I represent to put my views on the record as well as to take cognizance of the thoughts and ideas of the many people who have written me in respect of Bill C-150.

This bill contains much that is meritorious. In fact it contains one item in which I have a special interest. I introduced it to the House of Commons by way of a question to the Minister of Justice of that day. On January 27, 1966, I put the following question to the minister:

Would the government give consideration to amending the Criminal Code so that breathalyzer tests can be made mandatory?

I pressed the government on three other occasions in 1966 to take the necessary action to bring in this legislation. The urgent need to curb drunken driving was brought home to me forcibly at that time when a whole family

of five in my riding was wiped out in one accident involving a drunken driver proceeding on the wrong side of the highway. Since that time hundreds of other people have died unnecessarily at the hands of drunken drivers because this government continued to ignore the urgency of the matter, even though the Highway Safety Council provided them with figures which indicated the costly hazard of drunken drivers.

The highway casualty lists for the first half of 1968 are available and, as usual, are appalling. In six months there were 2,143 fatalities resulting from Canadian motor vehicle accidents, 83 more than for the same period of 1967. In addition to the dead, there was a multitude of injured. The number of Canadians who survived accidents but suffered harm to some degree totalled 75,713. If there were an epidemic that took 2,143 Canadian lives in six months, the country would be in a state of wild alarm. However, the 5,522 deaths due to motor vehicle accidents in 1967 were accepted with calm resignation, and a higher total for 1968 will neither cause panic nor surprise the survivors.

I know there is some resentment across the country against the breathalyzer method but apparently there is no other way of dealing with drunken drivers. I have here an editorial taken from the *Free Press Weekly* of January 4, 1969, entitled "Conclusive Proof" which reads:

Britain's breathalyzer legislation is now one year old. The results: 40,000 fewer casualties and about \$35 million less damage. A total of 1,152 fewer people were killed in Britain and 11,177 fewer people were seriously injured than in the previous year, despite increased vehicle registration, and despite higher alcohol sales.

The proof is now conclusive. The breathalyzer legislation works without being a killjoy. It has merely taught Britons that one does not drink and drive. In percentage figures the breathalyzer is held responsible for a 10 per cent drop in road casualties. If the same criterion were applied to Canada we could have saved something like 400 road deaths and 10,000 injuries.

British transport minister R. W. Marsh has said that unless there is a further drop in the casualty figures the present legislation will be made stiffer and enforced with even more vigour. This proves another point, so violently disputed by modern penologists: That deterrence is effective. In Britain, the worst time on the road was after the pubs had closed at 10 p.m. Now the casualty rate during this period has dropped by the startling figure of 33 per cent. Clearly people are deterrent from excessive drinking and then driving home by the prospect of meeting a policeman with his breathalyzer, and facing then, not only severe penalties but automatic suspension of the driver's licence.