provide for uniformity of treatment and penal responsibility for all children between the ages of 10 and 17. Adolescence creates a barrier between the two groups within that range, and the fourteenth birthday may be a convenient barrier.

I want to speak about another aspect of this legislation that has already been dealt with in a number of speeches. I wish to speak about the combined effect of clause 31(a) and clause 34. Mr. Speaker, the combined effect of clauses 31(a) and 34 of the bill is grotesque. It appears that under these provisions a juvenile court judge can either prevent a superior court judge from sentencing a young offender or compel him to do so, as if he were convicted on his twenty first birthday. Does that mean that if the young offender is convicted of a murder which he committed at the age of ten, and if he has been detained until he has reached the age of 21 and is now before a supreme court judge, that that judge should now sentence him to life imprisonment, or to six months, or to four years or put him on probation? This provision should be entirely omitted, since it offends against the Bill of Rights as interpreted in the famous Drybones case, and because it imposes discriminations among classes of Canadians. It discriminates against young Canadians. I say that this is wrong and should be removed from the bill. If we believe that we should be punitive or retributive about homicide, why not do as the British legislation does and have the child tried in the criminal courts from the beginning for offences of that nature?

The other provisions, Mr. Speaker, will have to be dealt with in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs; and there are a great many of them. One extraordinary provision found in clause 31(a) and 32(1)(a) indicates that a judge may in certain cases prohibit the driving of a motor vehicle or the operating of a power boat for life. Imagine taking a child of 10 or 12 and saying, "You have driven a car or boat negligently, and therefore you cannot drive one again for the rest of your life." I suggest that this is obviously grotesque and ridiculous. There should be a limitation of three years; that should be the maximum limitation.

The stated principles of the new bill are all very well. Clause 4 reads:

> This Act shall be liberally construed to the end that where a young person is found under section 29 to have committed an offence, he will be dealt with as a misdirected and misguided young person requiring help, guidance, encouragement, treatment and supervision and to the end that the care, custody and discipline of that young person will approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by such a young person's parents.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the rest of the bill, by the rigidity of its provisions, distorts these very principles and makes them difficult of application. I have had an opportunity of discussing this bill with those who are actually in this field in the province of Ontario. I have discussed it with people who have the responsibility of looking after children in trouble. They are alarmed and depressed about the proposals of this bill.

[Mr. Brewin.]

One can assume that when a bill is introduced under our parliamentary system, the prestige of the government depends on the bill being passed. For this reason, I suppose that an appeal to the government and to the minister to take a further look at the bill and either oppose it or withdraw it at second reading may be an illusory gesture. It is difficult to imagine a subject with such social consequences as this which ought less to be a matter of partisan considerations and of a vote along party lines. However, bearing in mind the way we do things in this House, I suppose the vote on the bill will be on party lines. I appeal to the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer), if he cannot and will not withdraw the bill at this stage, to insist that the process of revision in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs be broad enough and non partisan enough to enable the rethinking of the bill as a whole. If the principle of the bill is embodied in clause 4, which I have already recounted then, in my view, substantial amendment must be made to the bill to make it consistent with this admirable statement of principle.

I hope that the new Solicitor General, to whom I wish the best of luck in his new responsibilities, will accept the criticisms of the bill which have been made by opposition speakers. These criticisms do not always embody their own views only. They are the views of people experienced in this field. We hope that he will accept these criticisms, and if he cannot withdraw the bill, that he will at least ensure the approval and consideration of a substantial number of amendments in the committee.

Mr. C. Terrence Murphy (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to add my congratulations to those of the previous speaker. I congratulate the new minister and wish him every success in his new field. I enter this debate, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that although many good things have been said on the other side of the House about this bill, I, like my friend from York East (Mr. Otto), do not think it is a perfect bill. Many changes will have to be made or discussed in committee. Nevertheless, I feel that some of the criticisms which have been levelled at it from the opposition side of the House have been highly unfair and highly inaccurate.

I am referring particularly, Mr. Speaker, to certain comments that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) made in his speech yesterday. I notice that he is not in the House at this time. I feel that I must draw the attention of the House to some of the serious errors wich appear in the comments he made yesterday. He began by saying, as recorded at page 2374 of *Hansard*, that he hoped the minister would read the bill thoroughly. That was a fair comment, because a few sentences later he said, "...may I say that I have examined the bill carefully." He suggested that the minister had not been briefed properly. If the minister had not been briefed properly by the member of his department, then may I suggest in all earnestness and fairness that, in view of what he said, the hon. member for Calgary North must have been briefed by the writers of "Laugh-in" or of the "Red Skelton Show". At page 2374 of *Hansard* the hon.