

*Criminal Code*

• (3:50 p.m.)

There are also some extremely worth-while revisions touching on the relationship between drinking and driving. I am glad to see that in the revised bill there are stringent criteria for establishing the alcohol content of blood. Similar provisions in previous legislation were not realistic. Although the new provision will impose great responsibilities on law enforcement officers, it at least is beginning to attack what is a great social problem today, the drinking driver. It is simplistic to say that drink only is responsible for the deaths of 5,000 who die on our highways each year. But we do know that in a great percentage of accidents drink is involved and that there is a relationship between the alcohol the driver has consumed and his susceptibility to accidents. Yet we should not fool ourselves into thinking that simply by passing this law we shall prevent death or mutilation on our streets and highways. Frankly, I am disturbed at the cavalier attitude we have displayed to automobile manufacturers who produce motor vehicles that may not be safe. We do not know how safe they are. Also, we spend too little on enforcing high standards of safety in highway construction and in bringing about safe driving standards.

If a disease were on the rampage in North America that claimed the lives of 55,000 people annually and injured about a million others, some of them permanently, we would soon set up royal commissions and invest millions of dollars in setting up new departments to deal with that specific problem. Although we applaud the minister for adopting a new standard to be applied against drinking drivers, may I point out that the drinking driver represents only one aspect of a serious social problem which needs be dealt with now.

May I refer to another amendment contained in the bill, the one having to do with lotteries. I am surprised that in a country wishing to be identified as progressive and in a bill that seeks to bring in reforms we should take the retrograde step, a step considered by many as economically regressive, of permitting lotteries. I suppose the idea is that lotteries will benefit individuals and groups as well as governments, federal and provincial. It is thought that lotteries in some way will bring in many millions of dollars of revenue. I suspect that this amendment was included in the bill as a result of lobby pressures exerted on the minister and his department and not as a result of any widespread examination of what lotteries would do to

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

help provincial or federal budgets. I have seen lotteries operating in other countries and seen data pertinent to lotteries, and I have yet to be convinced that lotteries benefit society or inculcate the people of the area with a desire to increase their productivity or wealth through working. Considering the social effects of lotteries, the inclusion of this amendment in the bill is ludicrous. When this amendment is debated in committee I hope we shall have an opportunity to examine the implications of lotteries in other countries. Perhaps hon. members may change their minds about the advisability of permitting lotteries here.

It will be obvious to those who have listened to this debate or read it in *Hansard* that there is a wide divergence of opinion in our party on many aspects of this bill, and this is as it should be. Many of its amendments touch matters of conscience much more than they touch on political ideology, philosophy or principle. I think that hon. members on both sides of the house ought to express themselves on the bill; if they do not do so on second reading they ought to do so when the bill is in committee or when it is before the house at the third reading stage. Above all, I think they should express here what their consciences dictate, particularly on the key sections of the bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** That they should be able to do so was the intention of our original amendment. Although Your Honour did not accept that amendment we hope that when we come to vote hon. members will be permitted to vote according to the dictates of their consciences.

In conclusion, may I say how pleased I am to learn from the minister that shortly there will be established a new national law reform commission. May I suggest that preliminary to the establishment of that commission serious consideration should be given to the full implications of anti-social or criminal behaviour in our society. May I also suggest in all humility that the membership of that commission should not consist entirely of those whose business or profession it is to associate with the law. Many of my colleagues on this side of the house are lawyers and I have friends in other places who have dealings with the law. Nevertheless, I think public opinion in this country demands that persons representing a wide cross-section of opinion in our society should be members of such a