ries existed. However, we must be concerned with protecting individuals in society against crime and violence.

We must also treat younger offenders with the greatest care and concern possible. That does not mean we should be too passive or indulgent. We all know what the overly permissive society of the 1960s and 1970s brought us, and I do not think we did that generation any favour.

In summary, my question is to the Solicitor General, asking him to agree to implement a review of the Young Offenders Act, taking into consideration the points I have raised now and the points that colleagues have also brought to his attention.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the genuine concern of the Hon. Member with this very important matter and I congratulate him for expressing his interest.

The Young Offenders Act, proclaimed in force on April 2, 1984, constitutes a major reform of the juvenile justice process in Canada. The most fundamental reform, in my opinion, is its clear recognition that young people are responsible for their conduct and thus should be held accountable for their criminal transgressions. The Act also recognizes, however, that young people should not be treated the same as adults; that because of their immaturity and dependence they require specialized services and dispositions that allow for flexibility and compassion, if the situation necessitates it.

In establishing the uniform maximum age of under 18, the Act clearly recognizes that young persons can commit serious crimes. Although three years is the maximum sentence possible under the new legislation, Section 16 allows for the transfer of young persons aged 14 years or older to the ordinary courts where they are subject to the full sanctions of the Criminal Code.

The Young Offenders Act requires that the youth court consider a number of factors in determining whether to order a transfer to the ordinary court, including the seriousness and circumstances of the offence, the background and criminal record of the accused, the capacity of the adult system as opposed to the juvenile justice law and system to deal with the accused if a transfer is ordered and submissions made by the Attorney General. As such, the Act contains a "safety valve" for the handling of serious offences. In short, it enables the Youth Court Judge, with full knowledge of the circumstances surrounding a specific offence, to select court procedure which will most appropriately balance the needs of the community and those of the accused.

• (1810)

I believe that the Young Offenders Act is a positive, not a negative, step which has balanced the rights and responsibilities of young people with a full and clear recognition of the rights of the victim and the community at large. In stating this, I do not preclude the possibility that future changes to provisions of the Act may be required. In January 1985 the Solicitor General (Mr. MacKay) met with the provincial ministers responsible for the administration of juvenile justices. It was agreed that our respective governments would establish a continuing federal-provincial mechanism to carry out a variety of co-operative tasks, including the consideration of amendments to the Young Offenders Act which the Hon. Member requested.

To aid in this process, the Ministry of the Solicitor General is, on an on-going basis, evaluating the effectiveness of the new legislation.

As the Act is thoroughly tested and new provincial programs and statutes are fully implemented, the information needed to assess the effectiveness of our new juvenile justice legislation will become available. Where problems are clearly identified and solutions become known, amendments will be brought forward for consideration. In this way, the best interest of young people, the community and the administration of justice will be served. I am sure the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell) will continue to be a part of the process.

CANADA DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION—COMMITTEE STUDY

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed a question to the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) about the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Minister had appointed a private sector firm to review the corporation and to make some recommendations for change. I asked whether these recommendations would be in our hands soon, because with two recent financial institutions having made heavy demands on that corporation it seemed important that we get on with making whatever changes are necessary before we are further overtaken by events.

The Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is generally known as the CDIC, was established in 1967. All chartered banks and federally incorporated trust, mortgage and loan companies must be members. In addition, provincially incorporated trust and loan companies can apply to be members. The main purpose of the corporation is to maintain an insurance fund as a protection of savings of Canadians held in member institutions.

At the end of 1983 there were 137 federal member institutions and 51 provincial member institutions. By law members of the corporation have to remain members; if they are undergoing a difficult time they simply cannot withdraw.

The CDIC now insures savings to a maximum of $60,000 per depositor per institution, that ceiling having been introduced in the last Parliament in response to failures of trust companies in Ontario. Since this enactment in 1967 the CDIC has stipulated that deposit instruments for periods of longer than five years are not protected by deposit insurance. One situation arose recently when some depositors who had certificates with a six or seven year term thought they were insured and found to their distress that they were not.

The by-laws of the CDIC stipulate that uninsured instruments should be clearly marked on their face: "This is not an insured deposit as defined by the Canada Deposit Insurance