

During the course of debate in the other House it became clear that there was a certain concern about the name "Canadian National Environment Week". The general feeling, expressed by Senator Martin, was that the name was too cumbersome and thus would not lend itself to efforts to have it well remembered in the minds of citizens across this country. The suggested change was the deletion of the word "National" throughout the bill with the result that the week would be known simply as Canadian Environment Week. The bill was referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science for consideration of such an amendment. In committee it was unanimously agreed that such a change was desirable and thus the bill was reported, as amended, by deleting the word "National", and given third reading in the other chamber last Wednesday.

I feel that the change of title to "Canadian Environment Week" makes Bill C-25 a better and potentially more effective piece of legislation. I therefore ask the concurrence of the House in this amendment.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): It occurs to me that a word of comment about the various metamorphoses through which this bill has passed might be appropriate at this point.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, it was originally introduced by the hon. member under the name of Canadian National Pollution Awareness Week. I believe it does say something for the value of careful consideration in committee that the House of Commons committee made one proposal for a change of name; several were actually considered. Then again, the committee complied with the suggestion which it received that the timing of this particular week be changed to allow of its observance in the fall rather than in the spring. Now, Their Honours have made a proposal, through their amendment, which I would agree improves the bill, by making the title less cumbersome. I am sure we would all concur in this amendment and express a hope that this particular week, which will become the second week to be officially observed by Act of Parliament, will be used by citizens of coming generations to improve the environment. I am happy to support the proposal by an hon. member who comes from another constituency in the Province of British Columbia that this amendment be concurred in.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

* * *

● (5:10 p.m.)

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING IMPAIRED DRIVERS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford) moved that Bill C-33, to amend the Criminal Code (control of motor vehicle), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker—

Criminal Code

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member's bill seeks to amend the Criminal Code by adding a new section 223A. The explanatory note refers to sections 222 and 223. The bill gives the wording of sections 222 and 223 of the Criminal Code that existed before the amendments that were adopted by the House in 1969, I believe, in the Criminal Law Amendment Act which we referred to as the omnibus bill.

I submit that, as presented, the bill could not be referred to the justice committee without amendment because it refers to sections of the Code that are no longer in existence. Sections 222 to 224 were amended by the omnibus bill. I raise this point because I expect many hon. members will be interested in the bill. Although debate will go until six o'clock and the bill will not be referred, I would point out that in its present form the bill is irregular and would have to be amended.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): I suggest to hon. members that we proceed with the debate on the basis that the sections of the Criminal Code referred to are the amended sections, unless the hon. member for Oxford has some other suggestion.

Mr. Nesbitt: I thank my hon. friend for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I think there is a patent error here that has escaped the law officers of the House. However, it is the substance of the bill that is of importance and perhaps the clause of the bill could be amended accordingly. As I say, the hon. member is quite correct; there is a patent error here which may be due to a misprint or an oversight.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Then, we will proceed on that understanding.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, the substance of the matter is clearly explained in the explanatory note to the bill. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Criminal Code so as not to penalize drivers of cars who, realizing that they are intoxicated or that their ability to drive is impaired, are wise enough to stop their car immediately and refrain from continuing their journey for as long as their state lasts. In other words, the purpose of the bill is to get drunken and impaired drivers off the road and to encourage them to stay off it.

I think most people in this country, even the government, would agree that this is desirable. Only last year, I think it was, the government brought in some good legislation in this regard when amending the Code by providing a breathalyzer test for drivers who were considered to be intoxicated or impaired. This legislation has had a good effect and proved to be a deterrent to driving while intoxicated.

This bill is carrying that step a little further in that it seeks to keep off the road drunken drivers, who as everybody knows are a menace not only to themselves but to other drivers on the road. As Your Honour knows, under the present law a person who, realizing he is intoxicated, drives his car on to a side road off the main highway, takes the keys out of the ignition and places them in his pocket, and perhaps even sits in the rear seat of the car,