

Member. I was present at the meeting of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs where the Minister admitted that some \$700,000 was being cut from the public legal education program which had been planned. Perhaps the Hon. Member could consult with his Minister.

Once the Hon. Member confirms that the \$700,000 has been cut, I would ask him if he would petition his Minister and urge the Minister to reinstate that sum of money and specifically direct that \$700,000 to a program of education for the public with respect to the very serious nature of drinking and driving.

Mr. Speyer: Mr. Speaker, first, I will not give such an undertaking. Second, I say to the Hon. Member that the \$700,000 was never in train. It has never been a matter for which moneys had been committed. Third, the \$700,000 refers to the totality of all matters involving legal education, not just impaired driving, but everything. The fact is that there are certain constraints on the Government. Every Hon. Member in this House hears of good programs which may very well have to be sacrificed because we just do not have the money. So I cannot give the Hon. Member the undertaking he is looking for.

● (1550)

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the Parliamentary Secretary. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) as well as the Parliamentary Secretary referred to the importance of that part of the Bill dealing with drinking and driving. I think all Members of this House share in that concern and are anxious to get these changes into committee to hear various representations as soon as possible. My question is this. If the Government was really concerned about this provision, recognizing that this time of year is a little different as there is much more tendency to party and, as the police would indicate, more people are on the highway who have been drinking, why did it not separate this section from the Bill? The Bill is very complex and includes a variety of critical areas. The Minister said during his presentation that he would like to see this Bill passed today or tomorrow. Well, rather than introduce it the day before the House is going to recess for the Christmas break, why did he not introduce it two or three weeks ago so this could have been accomplished?

Mr. Speyer: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the opposition Parties did not co-operate on the passage of this Bill—which, in my respectful submission, is not contentious. If the Hon. Member can point out any particular part of the Bill with which he is in substantial disagreement, I would be very surprised. Would he vote against those matters concerning computer crime, streamlining of the courts or telewarrants? I have heard absolutely no arguments from any Party against these provisions.

Mr. Nunziata: Be patient, we are not finished yet.

Criminal Law Amendments

Mr. Speyer: The critic for the Official Opposition was the one who said this morning that not only does he favour telewarrants but he thought that he initiated them.

I say to the Hon. Member that, sure, it is important that this Bill be passed and I suspect very strongly that it will be passed before the end of January. It would be nice if it could be passed in a day or two, but the fact is that it will go to committee where people will have the opportunity to pose questions if they have any.

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, regarding the new proposals concerning deterrence, does the Parliamentary Secretary know of a study being done or does he have any information available about where legislation of this type has acted as a deterrent in other sectors of society or in other countries?

Mr. Speyer: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer as best I can. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway referred to a study done in Buffalo on whether deterrence was effective. I think there are certain limits on deterrence. It is important, but after people become used to it, it may very well be that they will still drink and drive. I can tell the Hon. Member that in Sweden the laws are dramatically tougher than they are here. As a result of public pressure a number of years ago, Germany became far more severe. In the state of Maine and the state of New Jersey, dramatically new and tougher legislation has gone into place. Many states in the U.S. are contemplating these changes because there is an ethos going around the world that drinking and driving will not be permitted. If one is going to indulge in this form of conduct, then he or she will be punished more severely. I am not in a position right now to cite to the Hon. Member any studies that have been done, but I undertake to send him a letter on the subject when the Department gives me the list of studies that are available.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The period for questions and comments is now terminated.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South-Weston): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this Bill. As a new Member it is my first opportunity to speak on a new legislative proposal. I would like to begin by indicating how chagrined I am by the fact that this Government should wait so long to introduce a Bill which was introduced by the Liberal Government on February 7 of this year.

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Then pass it today.

Mr. Nunziata: On the admission of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), it is, with respect to the drunk driving provisions, virtually identical to the Bill introduced by the Liberal Government and the then Minister, Mark MacGuigan. This extremely important and urgent Bill could have been introduced by the Government some seven weeks ago in order to afford an opportunity for the House to take a very close look at its various provisions. But for some unknown reason the Government decided to wait. It is crucial that signals be sent out to the community as early as possible that drunk driving is a very serious problem. But this Bill was a Liberal initiative.