

during the election campaign, had a pretty clear idea of what it wanted to do with street prostitution. I have made public my own views and I would have been very happy to have seen street prostitution dealt with by removing the requirement for pressing and persistent behaviour and by introducing a provision to allow prosecution of both the prostitute and the prospective client. I wish more had been put on the table by the Government in this regard, indeed in general.

There is as well an urgent requirement for law reform dealing with the profits of crime. The former Bill contained a provision which helped the state confiscate the profits of crime. There are some provisions for this now in the present criminal law but their inadequacies are well known. There are huge fortunes being built in North America as a result of illegal activities and illegal funds being laundered. I can refer to statements made by the RCMP Commissioner recently about the limitations on police and court action under the present Criminal Code. I know that some of the provisions we had were controversial. Perhaps they might have been improved in committee through the appearance of civil liberty groups and the banks who were worried about the consequences of those measures. But instead of doing that and seeking a way of dealing with the profits of crime, the Government has taken a big step backward and is going to sit and wait until a perfect solution is devised. This will perhaps be done without the benefit of the public input that the former Government would have liked to see in the committee when the matter was considered there.

I would also like to have seen more for victims in this package because there was more proposed for victims in the other package. One of the most remarkable and troubling injustices of the present system is its failure adequately to recognize the needs of the victims of crime. The Government has done a little in this Bill but I think it is a discredit to the criminal justice system that victims suffer as much as they do from that system as well as suffering at the hands of the criminal who has caused them their loss or damage. To me it meant a lot to see more for victims and I am glad the Minister has said he is thinking about it and is going to bring forward more provisions in that area. But if he had put them in this Bill and sent it to the committee, I think there would have been a better process of law building and we would have achieved justice for victims more quickly than by seeing a lesser package than the one that was before the House at the time of the last election.

I would like now to turn to a couple of the substantive subjects affecting this Bill. I talked earlier about the timing of the drunk driving provisions. Concerning substance, I would like to say that there is no doubt that there is a great interest in having tougher treatment of drunk or impaired drivers. The inadequacy of the law and the failure of the courts to impose a certain minimum sentence is becoming a public scandal in many ways. I welcome the opportunity for Parliament to give some direction to the courts about how the Canadian people feel about drunk drivers, whether they actually injure anyone

Criminal Law Amendments

or damage property or not. This is an act of social irresponsibility and that should be underlined, and the Bill will do that.

If the Minister does not accept the opportunity to pass the Bill today and it goes on to committee, there may be some interesting questions which could be addressed in this area, although they are not questions which would have led us to want to see the Bill delayed.

● (1220)

I would just like to mention one that the Minister referred to in his remarks, and that is the problem of involving a doctor in taking a blood sample. There are a number of doctors' associations that are raising the issue of whether doctors should perform any services at all that do not contribute directly to improving the health of their patient. Of course, taking samples for the purpose of prosecution is in that category. If the Bill goes to committee, I want to be certain that we can get the CMA, or one of the other medical associations in the country, to appear to give us the good housekeeping seal of approval on that feature if we are going to make the opinion of the doctor as important as it seems we intend to from what the Minister said.

With regard to telewarrants, I think they really are urgent. There are still some writ of assistance cases before the courts. There are a few dozen cases that are at some stage or other of the criminal justice proceedings. The validity of the writ of assistance is a matter for the courts. The former Government ordered the RCMP to turn in all writs of assistance and none was being used, even the outstanding ones, at the time of the last election. The absence of the writ of assistance and the non-arrival of the telewarrant presents a serious problem for law enforcement because there is an important element of time in which a drug criminal can commit an offence and get away with it because the telewarrant and the writ of assistance are not available to permit the evidence that would be required for effective prosecution to be seized. We need telewarrants and I hope all Members of the House will recognize that, whatever the problems with them. I hope we will try to solve those problems to get an instrument which will permit a policy action on a timely basis to permit the drugs to be seized so that they will be available for trial.

I certainly do not hold it against telewarrants that they are new. As I mentioned yesterday at my press conference, I had the opportunity to visit the United States and to follow the process of a telewarrant in a police car to a house. There was no doubt that if the normal alternative procedure of looking for a justice of the peace or a judge, appearing before that individual, and swearing the affidavit is followed, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of drugs could easily be flushed down the toilet, burned, or contaminated very quickly and the police would just be wasting their time.

Therefore, we do need that, but I was concerned about the newness of the telewarrant and the Bill which was before the last Parliament reflected that concern by limiting the issuing of telewarrants to senior judicial officers, excluding justices of the peace. I notice in this Bill that a judge can designate