philosophy of referring offenders to retraining schools for reform so that they may be brought back into the mainstream of community life. It is hardly necessary to repeat the argument that there are not adequate facilities in Canada to enable this to be done effectively. In any case, the whole idea of separation from family and community goes contrary to the emphasis which has been placed recently on probation and suspended sentences when dealing with young offenders.

It is just a year ago that the former Solicitor General led a group of members to my city of Brandon to inaugurate a significant extension of the parole service in western Manitoba. I can still hear the ringing words of the speech he made at that time. This was to be the new approach to dealing with young offenders—not to incarcerate them in jails and training schools but to provide for their rehabilitation within the bosom of their homes and communities. Yet for some unexpected reason Bill C-192 harks right back to the form of treatment which was criticized in the old Juvenile Delinquents Act.

Perhaps the greatest weakness of the bill is that it still places its greatest emphasis on punishment rather than on reform. Under one of its clauses it would be possible to incarcerate a child of 10 years of age, if he were found guilty of a serious offence, until he was 21 and then bring him before a court of law to be dealt with under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Obviously, this is a reversion to nineteenth century penology. Anyone who has worked in this field knows that training schools, reform schools, jails, penitentiaries, are training schools for crime. Time and time again those who are exposed to the atmosphere of such institutions become recidivists for life.

These are some of the major criticisms to be directed against the bill before us. For these reasons, and others, it should be referred back to the committee in order that we may bring in amendments which would restore the spirit of reform inherent in the recommendations of the justice committee. If the House would vote accordingly, we should be able to work together in the interest of a more positive and humane penal system.

Mr. McCleave: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think there is general agreement among all parties that the speech we have just heard will close the debate on the amendment of my hon. friend from Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and that the vote will take place immediately after the question period tomorrow.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would be agreeable to defer the division until tomorrow when orders are called.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is understood, however, that the question will now be put and a determination made as to whether we should like a vote so that this will not have to be done tomorrow. After that has been decided, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to raise about what we do during the remaining minutes before ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair understands that the question will be put now and that if the House determines that there shall be a division, the division will be the first item under Orders of the Day tomorrow when those orders are called. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment to the main motion. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In accordance with the special order made a moment or two ago, the recorded division will be taken as the first item of business when Orders of the Day are called tomorrow.

* * *

YUKON MINERALS ACT

ADMINISTRATION, ACQUISITION AND RECORDING OF CLAIMS, ETC.

On the order: Government orders:

March 5, 1971—Resuming debate on the motion of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development that Bill C-187, an act respecting minerals in the Yukon Territory, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development:

And on the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Aiken—That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months hence."

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier this evening the Government House Leader did indicate to me that if the previous debate ended we would move to this item. What we did not discuss was the time of night at which this might happen. It is now five minutes to ten. If one goes back to *Hansard* for March 5 when the debate was last before the House, one finds that the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) had the floor. He had spoken for 30 minutes and his speech was interrupted by the clock. If we call the debate now, the hon. member gets only five minutes and another five minutes tomorrow. Therefore, I wonder whether we should not now call it ten o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed to call it ten o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.