

Criminal Code

our duty as good citizens. The best treatment people can get is close scrutiny by the police, a sympathetic hearing, and a firm and fair warning. Then, when citizens flout the law, they should receive proper and severe treatment at the hands of a magistrate who has heard the case carefully and reached a decision on the facts, fortified by an act which has some teeth in it.

In a case where a man insists on driving when drunk, under the new section in the amended Criminal Code a magistrate will have some authority to see that he does not drive in such a condition again. If there should be future offences, the magistrate can make sure that it becomes increasingly difficult for him to operate a motor vehicle in Canada. I commend this provision. A great deal depends, I repeat, on the attitude of law enforcement authorities and of the policeman on the beat. It depends on the co-operation of the civil authorities generally, of mayors, police departments and of the officials directly concerned at both federal and provincial levels. Any commotion at the expense of the public will backfire. Where the police are fair, the public know it; where the police are held in little esteem by the public it will probably be found that the blame does not lie on one side alone. I know that in the area in which I served the co-operation of the public was always good. The police took a fair attitude and people responded to that kind of treatment. One can expect respect for law and order when it starts with the law enforcement officers and the law enforcement bodies themselves.

I suggest we renew our efforts. To review the Criminal Code is not enough. We still need a program of education. Programs such as the Youth and Police programs which were set up in Saskatchewan back in the middle 'forties cost the people of Canada very few dollars in terms of what they got back. I would remind hon. members of such things as this: a certain town in New Brunswick had at one time the highest juvenile delinquency rate in Canada. A young policeman started a boxing club there. The club produced some fine young amateur sportsmen but, and this is more important, juvenile delinquency in that district sank to an all-time low. In fact, instead of a special session of the juvenile court meeting in that town every week, the court found little work to do and was eventually closed. Thanks to a little leadership by some law enforcement officers, this club became a centre in which growing young men took an

interest in manly sports; the policemen became the best friends these boys ever had. Programs of this type are money in the bank in terms of citizenship in Canada and wherever they have been dropped they should be reinstated.

To turn to another subject, I say we should have held a conference with all the provinces long ago in an attempt to secure uniformity in our traffic laws. I was a traffic policeman for some 15 years, yet it confuses me when I drive across Canada and am expected to conform to at least 15 different traffic codes—each of the provinces has its own, as do most of the larger cities. In Ontario the motorist can turn right at a red light; indeed, he can be fined if he occupies the righthand lane and fails to turn right on a red light. In Quebec, if you turn right at a red light, you are committing an offence. This is confusing enough to a Canadian, but what must it be like to a motorist from another country who finds that the rules in Moncton are different from the rules in Toronto and different again from the rules which apply in Winnipeg or Regina? This is a disgrace to our country. A country with a small population like our own could well agree to standardize traffic laws. I suggest to the minister, when he has pushed this omnibus bill through, that he would make himself very popular if he gathered together the attorneys general of the provinces of Canada and settled the question of uniformity of traffic laws once and for all. I think that is a good place to leave it, Mr. Speaker.

● (9:20 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we have now before us an amendment tending to defer consideration of this bill for six months.

I feel pretty sure that, after having perused all the information which all hon. members have received, after having read also the briefs submitted to the standing committee on justice and legal affairs and after hon. members have heard this arguments brought forward in the house, this amendment would be welcome so as to give the hon. members an opportunity to meditate, since before such an important vote, it is normal that all members could listen to the people who have not been made aware of the importance of this bill.

We have read briefs, but it would be good for all members to have an opportunity to hear the people's views and to ponder. That is