One clause of Bill C-192 state that a young person shall be, and I quote,

—dealt with as a misdirected and misguided young person requiring help, guidance, encouragement, treatment and supervision,—

The bill is in fact a miniature Criminal Code.

The same philosophy still prevails in other clauses of the Bill.

If the hon. minister, on the one hand, seeks to modernize legislation in this field it is obvious that his actions go much farther than his thoughts and, in fact, he puts young persons who have been found guilty of an offence in a situation where they will not be considered as juvenile delinquents but rather as juvenile criminals, a feature which stems from the bill now before us.

For instance, under clause 30 (4), a young person found guilty of an offence for which the minimum sentence is death or life imprisonment can be committed to a training school till age 21. Then, he shall be taken before a Superior Court which shall sentence him as if he had then and there been convicted of the offence that he was found to have committed. Otherwise, the young offender will be struck twice: the first time being committed to a training school—we should rather say a breaking-in school, as for animals—until he is 21, and the second time, at 21, when receiving a sentence now imposed by the Superior Court.

Mr. Speaker, this bill creates not only a criminal condition, but proves harsher for the young person found to have committed an offence than for the adult recognized as such under the Criminal Code.

I am now continuing my analysis and shall refer to clause 74. In fact, according to clause 74 of the proposed legislation, if the judge so orders, the Identification of Criminals Act can apply to a young person. In other words, the police can photograph the young person, take his fingerprints and bully him without the consideration due to a human being, as is still done today for adults.

Mr. Speaker, here again, a de tacts situation is created, the young person is being upset and no effort is made to understand him.

May I be allowed, on the conclusion of this analysis, to revert to this particular point.

According to paragraph (3) of clause 19, and I quote:

—a young person apparently over the age of fourteen years who cannot, in the opinion of the judge or the clerk of the court, be detained safely in any other available place, may be detained in a place where adults are detained pending his first appearance in court or during an adjournment of his hearing.

• (5:50 p.m.)

So, Mr. Speaker, not only is the young person immerged in a noxious legal situation, but still the society will not succeed in rehabilitating him, not even in understanding him. Not only will he be judged, not only will he be condemned, not only will he be sent forcibly to a reformatory, but in addition he will be thrown in prison with adult criminals, with men often perverted in their minds or acts, so that when the youth comes out he will be twice as bad, if I may use the expression, as before.

Under clause 30 (1), the judge may place the adolescent on probation, or place him in a foster home or group home, or again, place him under the care of a children's aid society for a period of two years at the most, which point is important. I am inclined to think that the minister did not dwell on that point, that he did not deal with both sides of the matter with regard to that period "not exceeding two years" during which the judge can still send the adolescent to a training school for a period of three years at the most.

Mr. Speaker, all this boils down to a sentence imposed by the judge for a minimum as well as a maximum period, exactly as is the case with criminals.

Under the present legislation the judge does not have that sentencing power. He commits the young person to one of the above-mentioned institutions until he is rehabilitated. Under the bill for which the minister seeks approval, the judge gives the young person a sentence of two or three years. It is a matter of "take it or leave it." No maximum or minimum sentence is imposed under the existing legislation but under the proposed measure there are definite sentences—for instance two or three years—against a youth depending on how serious the offence or whether the judge is competent or not.

Mr. Speaker, there is no clause in that bill dealing with the delinquent's rehabilitation nor with the humanization of his condition. If a young person has reached the point where he can be considered as young delinquent, in most cases it is because his family or school circle have not shown enough understanding, have forgotten or rejected him. Feeling psychologically rejected, he has reacted and has attempted to create his own society. This is the problem of our youth. Since society does not give him the opportunity to integrate and live like others, the youth breaks away and attacks that society which considers him guilty of offences.

Finally, our society, which is responsible for the situation of the teenager, condemns him because it is stronger. Under the pretext of improving the situation, the minister makes it more serious by considering it as criminal.

Mr. Speaker, reformatories for young offenders have long been considered as coercive institutes. The so-called Saint-Vallier Home, which is operated by the Corporation Berthelet-Saint-Vallier, has become a dump where more than 250 children and teen-agers are thrown together.

What is the minister doing? Absolutely nothing! But at the same time he considers the young offender as a criminal. Will he change this situation? No, Mr. Speaker. He will show obstinacy, he will argue with Quebec about who is responsible. There is the conflict of jurisdiction!

Mr. Speaker, for a long time we have confused the predelinquent and the delinquent as we still do today. Some delinquents are very dangerous individuals and yet