

Senator Langlois: Well, my honourable friend said the other day that he had had only one bad experience before a jury, and, as far as I am concerned, I never had any in my life. I think my opinion is independent and not based on others' experience, which is not all that bad.

The other day—and I open with a parenthesis here—I was very surprised to see that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, took a dislike to me—

Senator Flynn: Never.

Senator Langlois:—for using a typical expression from Quebec because my position was based on the opinion of the former Prime Minister of Canada. This is the first time I agreed with this political leader and I do not know why I should be blamed because I agreed with him on this occasion. I wonder what crime I committed by doing so, but in any event—

Senator Flynn: I always worry when both of you agree.

● (1440)

Senator Langlois: Maybe, but you have agreed with him more often than I have.

Senator Flynn: No, no, that is not what I am talking about.

Senator Langlois: Anyway, as regards the remarks of Senator Asselin, he has outlined—and I agree with him, as I said earlier—that the argument based on new law as raised by Senator Flynn is worthy of consideration. I do not think it necessary to go over that aspect again. I am in total agreement with him on this point.

As regards provisions concerning impaired driving and the breathalyzer, I was surprised by Senator Asselin's comments, though I know that this debate lent itself to such a departure from the subject, when he suggested a rehabilitation and detection system. I agree with him in this regard but I do not think such an argument should be made during the debate on a bill that falls within the federal jurisdiction, a bill concerning the Criminal Code, whereas detection, rehabilitation and treatment of alcoholics are rather matters of provincial jurisdiction, more precisely the Department of Health. Yet he may have been justified in making such a comment, since I myself, when explaining this bill, as recorded on page 1731 of *Hansard* for February 5, made the following suggestion as regards the provisions of the bill, and I quote:

While the amendments provide for heavier maximum fines and longer maximum periods of detention than previously, there is also provision for the judge to grant a conditional discharge to allow the accused driver to undergo treatment and undertake a program for alcohol abuse.

Perhaps this remark led Senator Asselin to make such statements and hence to depart from the subject matter when he dealt with the rehabilitation and treatment of alcoholics. In my view, the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics is necessary since alcohol abuse is a disease of our times, and I think all our efforts must tend toward a very elaborate treatment of this disease, this condition of our fellow citizens. I would add, however, that if there is one way to reduce often fatal traffic accidents, that way is to apply the principle on which the proposed amendment is based. In other words, to remove alcoholics from the high-

ways before they can get involved in accidents, or give them the benefit of release through conditional discharge so they may get treated or, better still, get cured from their sickness.

I would even say that a known alcoholic should never hold a driving licence. This would protect not only the general public, but the alcoholic himself against his own disability.

I would now comment on the remarks made by Senator Asselin on the clauses concerning rape. As I understood him, Senator Asselin favours *in camera* proceedings, and the limitation of evidence on the complainant's sexual antecedents, in order to protect rape victims. I believe the proposed provisions are absolutely perfect. I believe they are introduced to remedy a situation where the complainant is victimized a second time by such public exposure, by exposing aspects of her own private intimacy often having but very indirect connection with the crime before the court.

● (1450)

Finally, I come back to the other crimes mentioned by Senator Asselin: kidnapping, extortion, organized crime. I expected he would refer directly—he did so indirectly—to the work done by the Organized Crime Inquiry Commission in our province. I believe he referred to it at least indirectly. You may correct me if you did so more directly, but I am under the impression that you did refer to it. However, I believe that you avoided talking about wiretapping. I would especially like to refer to the report submitted a few days ago. This report comes from the Solicitor General and, according to my interpretation, it aims at establishing that the restrictions on wiretapping which were introduced a year and a half or two years ago interfere with the detection and the pursuit of criminals. I hope that the Canadian Parliament will come back on its decision and follow the suggestions made by the Senate at that time. I believe that if the amendment of the Senate had been passed at that time, the report of the Solicitor General would now be different from that which was submitted a few days ago.

Now, I would like to speak to Senator Asselin's last comment about internationally protected persons. The senator seemed to agree with the purpose of the bill. He quoted—I believe he was not in the house when I moved second reading of the bill—he quoted very closely what I said on the subject, that the new provision is aimed at permitting Canada to meet its international commitments under the Geneva Convention, and that this amendment was amply justified by the events which have occurred throughout the world where diplomats have been attacked, assassinated or kidnapped in various countries. I believe that if we want to continue enjoying the benefits of a diplomatic corps which does its job in the various countries of the world with the necessary serenity and freedom of action, its members must be protected adequately, and the bill aims at giving this protection.

Finally, and I will conclude with these words so that my honourable friends do not lose their patience, I must say that I agree with the opinion voiced, I believe by Senator Flynn and by Senator Asselin, namely, that these omnibus bills are difficult to deal with on second reading. Their provisions are so different and often so heterogenous that