

what other government supporters have to say about this matter.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my colleagues on the motion put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis).

Mr. Skoberg: The hon. member has three minutes left.

Mr. Pringle: I must agree with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker. More consideration must be given to those who are responsible not only for the formation of certain reports but for their distribution. It is vital for the people of Canada that we are not hindered in any way in obtaining all necessary information. Sometimes it is essential for us to withhold some information which has been submitted in report form. Hon. members should understand this. This point relates to the motion being considered.

I regret that I do not have more time in which to express some of my thoughts. I believe that when we have talked about amendments to the Criminal Code and matters relating to abortion, too much emphasis has been placed on permissive attitudes, on the reproduction of the human race, and not enough on family life and the moral approach to this question. We should give more consideration to preventive methods and to family planning, to the use of oral contraceptives, if you like, which according to the Food and Drug Directorate constitute the safest and, until now, the best method of birth control. However, we are a long way from the termination of any exhaustive research with regard to oral contraceptives.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair. The House will resume at eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

PROVISIONS REGARDING CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Goyer that Bill C-192, respecting young offenders and to repeal the Juvenile Delinquents Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And the amendment thereto of Mr. Woolliams.

Young Offenders Act

Mr. C. Terrence Murphy (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue the remarks I was making at five o'clock. I was dealing with the differences between the proposed legislation, the young offenders act, and the provisions of the old act, the Juvenile Delinquents Act. I was pointing out the improvements in the new act. One difference that I did not mention at that time is that which exists for the young offender, under the provisions of the proposed act, who is charged with an offence for which he might be imprisoned for life or sentenced to hang. Under the act which is now in force, a young man under the age of 15 who is convicted of murder or where it is found that he has—committed the offence of murder—

Mr. Woolliams: That is the same thing, is it not?

Mr. Murphy: It is probably the same. If he were convicted in the criminal court and sentenced to life imprisonment, there would be no way in which the minimum sentence would be reviewed for a period of at least ten years, even by the Parole Board. Even if the Parole Board after ten years recommended that the person should be let out immediately or at an early date, as the law now stands that decisions would have to be approved by the governor in council, or the cabinet. Under the new legislation, a young man convicted at the age of 15 could be—not would be—detained in a training school until the age of 21 and then brought before a supreme court judge. At that time the supreme court judge could deal with him in whatever way he thought fit, having regard to the circumstances existing at the time and the background of the case. He could conceivably discharge that young man at that time, with no further problem.

That advantage far surpasses the possible disadvantages mentioned by some opposition members, particularly the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). The hon. member for Greenwood referred to this provision. He thought that it would be discriminatory in respect of the young person. I cannot follow his reasoning on that point. It is discriminatory in the sense that the young person could be dealt with more leniently than an adult offender. I feel that discrimination in this way is not adverse to the young person.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I had the impression from the comments this afternoon of the hon. member for Greenwood that he felt the discrimination would be too adverse to the interests of the young offender. I cannot agree with him. So there we have another difference between the present legislation and the proposed legislation which I think is a distinct improvement.

The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) during the course of his speech in this debate suggested that we in this country might follow the English system or even the Scandinavian system of dealing with youthful offenders. In some respects I do not disagree; no doubt we might consider some aspects of the English system and beneficially adapt them to our system. However, we cannot simply say that the British system is much better