has to do only half of his work. So much so that the young person will not find either justice or protection in that court. And finally, the young person who will have been submitted to this over-accelerated process— because, in this field as in others, production comes first—will be entrusted to education centres.

Now, nothing proves that it will be possible to re-educate this young person in such rehabilitation centres as Saint-Vallier for instance.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Champlain (Mr. Matte) quoted earlier long extracts from a very well drafted brief by the Boscoville authorities, and it is to be noted that in this brief, the emphasis is on rehabilitation. I read with great interest the speech that the Solicitor General (Mr. Goyer) made when this bill was introduced. I think that he is quite sincere there and I trust that the representations made today will give results, because he is young, and because he is as much interested in this problem as the rest of us.

As I said in my speech of January 13 last, if hon members would forget their political opinions to really consider the problems facing these young people who are called criminals but who, in fact, are not in most cases, we would then draw our inspiration from another philosophy.

I should like to make it clear to the minister. This bill is not actually bad in itself because several of its clauses are quite acceptable and have long been hoped for. I commend the minister for it. However, some provisions do not provide the necessary tools to reach the objective.

What is this objective? Is it to find criminals in order to pass judgement on them, or else is it not to retrace juveniles and give them opportunities they did not have in their youth?

What is our goal? Are we seeking to increase the number of criminals, somewhat in the way we are now increasing the number of unemployed, or are we really seeking to help young people?

Mr. Speaker, if really we want to help them, before presenting such a bill—I do not say it is bad, but I say it is putting the cart before the horse-we must first finance new rehabilitation centres and foster homes, appoint more judges so that justice may be speeded up and gone into more deeply, so that individual justice may truly be meted out. We want, not quantity justice, but quality justice, in other words justice which respects the rights of all and gives to all the required opportunities. Last Thursday I called on Justice Marcel Trahan, in Montreal, and on Chief Justice J.-P. Lavallée who sit in the same court. I went there on my own. I wanted to talk to young offenders. Above all I wanted to become acquainted with the problems of the judge and to try to put myself in his place, not that I credit myself with his talents, but as a member of Parliament, if one wants the laws to reflect reality, one must not be afraid to get involved and find out what is going on.

Therefore I met Judge Trahan and Judge Lavallée. I attended hearings. I understood the problem. I saw countless people place their trust in the judge, and they were very pleased to get help because, on the whole, 99.9 per

Young Offenders Act

cent of those people cannot financially, morally, physically or otherwise, help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, our society's first responsibility is to help those who cannot help themselves. That is why I was shocked, flabbergasted at the sight of the judges' problem.

In the speech I delivered on January 13 and 14, I said that many of the present judges were appointed either through political influence or because of their many years of service for the cause of justice. It is very well if they were selected on account of their vast experience, but I was inclined to believe that many of them did their work so as to get rid of it.

I was able to realize that although we have excellent judges, although in the province of Quebec, for instance, courts had many excellent judges, the problem would not be solved. As a matter of fact, in the welfare court at 410 Bellechasse Street East in Montreal—for the information of the Solicitor General—there are 18 of them, each of whom hears more than 3,000 cases per year. One can imagine the results.

Let us pass the bill we want, let us make the partisan policy we want in connection with this bill, let us judge as many young people as we want, let us appoint the best judges we want, if we do not meet these two basic conditions, we will still be left with a system of poultices on wooden legs and nothing will be settled. On the contrary, the crime rate will increase as well as the number of repeaters.

Mr. Speaker, we must not only appoint a greater number of judges to grant better justice to those young people but we must—and this is most urgent—set up the required rehabilitation centres to put them back into a climate that will help them develop their personality.

If you put a rotten apple inside a barrel of good apples the rotten apple will not be changed by the barrel of good apples. It is more likely that the whole barrel will go bad because of that single rotten apple. The only way to deal with this problem, in the barrel of apples, is to take the rotten apple and put it elsewhere or make marmelade with it. We must prevent this rotten apple from infecting the rest of the barrel. This depends on our priorities. I hope I will be forgiven this example taken from nature but things have gone that far today with criminality in Canada.

If we genuinely want to help the young—and I do not mean they should be put in an ivory tower—the should be given an opportunity to truly live their lives thanks to personal rehabilitation, and psychologists, psychoanalists, social workers, probation officers, and so forth, could help them achieve it.

Mr. Speaker, when attending hearings before the Welfare Court, when examining the cases before a judge, when witnessing the speed with which the work must be done, because there are too few judges, and this, even though the technical means are enormous, one cannot but doubt that the administration of the bill now before the House will bring effective results.