

Criminal Code

country. As such, it is probably the best compromise to suit the opinions of the majority of our people.

The measure of gun law control provided in this bill will be useful and is long overdue. Most people in this country are urban dwellers who use guns mostly in the hunting season. My own area of Northern Ontario is a favourite place for moose hunting, and thousands of inexperienced people flock to the bush annually. Many of them engage in careless, foolish practices such as taking sound shots. A hunter shoots into the bush because he hears a sound which he thinks is game. Often the sound turns out to be another hunter. It is hard to believe that such things happen, but the fact is that many people are carried out of the bush each year, killed or permanently maimed. The bill before us will further control the use of firearms in such a way as to discourage the careless handling of weapons.

The provisions relating to compulsory breathalyzer tests for drivers suspected of consuming alcohol beyond the level of .08 per cent are very serious. Persons thus convicted will carry a criminal record for life with all its attendant difficulties. Were it not for the amazing results which have been achieved in Britain following the introduction of compulsory breathalyzer tests, I doubt that this action would be justified. But here are the results in Great Britain, and I read from an Associated Press report from London dated December 2, 1967:

Night-time road accidents in London dropped by a dramatic 42 per cent in the first month after Britain's new drink-drive law was introduced, Scotland Yard said today.

The first official figures to be released since the tests began October 9 also showed a slump in accidents in other British towns and cities.

Scotland Yard said that 54 people were killed in road accidents in London during October—28 fewer than in October last year.

There was a 42 per cent drop in fatal and injury accidents in London between 10 p.m. and 1 a.m., when the total fell by 324.

Accidents involving serious injury totalled 835—102 fewer than last October—and the number of people slightly hurt dropped to 4,221 from 4,668.

As the tests covered only three weeks of October, the figures for a full month may show an even more dramatic reduction.

"There have been notably fewer vehicles on the roads at night," a police spokesman said.

"The reduction in accidents appears to be due to the breathalyzer," said Stephen Swingler, minister of state at the transport ministry.

"It seems clear that the new drink and drive law is having some effect," Swingler added.

Under the new law, police are empowered to direct motorists to take a test involving a breath-testing device.

So the results in Britain indicate that we can save lives on our highways, and by this yardstick compulsory breathalyzer tests are justified.

The changes in this bill relating to cruelty to animals are significant. One of the most important is the provision which will prevent persons convicted of cruelty to animals from keeping domestic animals for as long as two years from the time of conviction. This restriction may be applied by a court order. I know of instances in the past where persons raising dogs for medical research continued to follow this practice in spite of two convictions for cruelty; they continued to raise dogs for sale to medical research laboratories by disposing of them through other dog raisers. The medical schools and research laboratories are unaware of the origin of these animals. The new provisions of the bill will give a magistrate or judge power to make an order completely prohibiting these individuals from keeping animals for a period of up to two years.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I am not going to attempt to cover the many other provisions of this bill at this time. I believe that the bill reflects a balanced approach to the reform of criminal law in Canada, and for this reason I support Bill C-150.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, let me say at once so there may be no mistake that, for reasons I will deal with later, I propose to support the bill on second reading, and to some extent I do so for the reasons advanced by the leader of our party a short time ago.

The main thrust of my remarks has to do with what I consider to be the very improper position taken by the government regarding the method that has been adopted by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his colleagues in order to bring this matter into the house and secure the views of members, representing the people of Canada, at the different stages of the debate. I think that the attitude of the government has been arrogant, authoritarian, undemocratic and downright immoral.

Any talk of parliamentary reform, of participatory democracy, of giving a new prestige and value to the work of members of parliament seems to me to be glib and unrealistic in the light of the brutal and ruthless dragooning by the government of its supporters on certain of the issues involved in