the sparks struck but in terms of the content of the speeches and the information presented to the House by hon. members. In that regard I think I can point to the speech of my colleague, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), and that of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) this afternoon.

It is therefore with some reluctance that I rise to speak on the measure, because I do not consider myself to be in any way well versed in the subject matter encompassed by the young offenders bill. However, I have been impressed by the number of representations which I have received on the subject. I have been impressed by the quality of the presentations and by the qualifications of the people making them. Opposition to the bill has come from the Canadian Mental Health Association, from officials associated with juvenile courts, from social workers, from children's aid societies, from sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists and persons associated with foster parent plans.

After looking at the attack on the bill and the bill itself, on one side of the question—the social agencies concerned with rehabilitation—and on the other side the law officers of the Crown who are concerned with protecting society and the legal and procedural rights of young persons who have come into conflict with the established rules of society, it occurred to me that this might be an appropriate place for the intervention of an amateur whose views have not been shaped by professional involvement with one side of the problem or the other.

It would seem to me—here again I speak with some trepidation, not possessing any great degree of expert knowledge—that there are three major considerations to take into account in examining this bill, and that the public concern which has manifested itself results from the fact that the bill deals, as a result of jurisdictional problems, I suspect, with only one of the three major areas of concern. Because the bill deals with only one of the three areas, people are justifiably concerned about the effects it will have if implemented. They justifiably argue that it should not be implemented until there is further clarification of its potential effects.

The three factors which must be weighed in the consideration of this bill are, I submit, the following. First, what is to be our over-all philosophy of dealing with young persons who have run afoul of the law? Are we to consider them to be, in effect, young criminals requiring punishment? Are we to consider them to be persons not responsible for their actions, who need assistance in understanding the strictures imposed by life in a community? Or are we to consider them to have understood that they were acting wrongly and that they did so because of some social or psychological maladjustment? Obviously, there are many other philosophical approaches which should be considered; but the philosophy which governs this act must be well defined.

The second consideration is, how are we as a society to determine if a young person has offended against society? What are the procedures we wish to employ in so determining, and what safeguards for the civil liberties of persons involved in such procedures is it necessary for us as a society to offer? The third consideration is, once guilt—if I may so term it—or culpability has been determined, what facilities are available to us as a society to effectively carry out the actions implied by the established philosophy for dealing with young persons who have acted in a manner unacceptable to society?

Those are the three considerations that are encompassed by this bill. It would appear to me that those who drafted the bill have concentrated almost entirely upon the second of the three factors, the determination of guilt and the protection of the legal rights of individuals involved in such procedures. Here let me say in all fairness that in this regard the bill does make some progress. In this respect I should like to quote from a document presented to some members of the House, entitled "A critique of Bill C-192, the Young Offenders Act" which was prepared by John A. MacDonald, assistant professor in the school of social work at the University of British Columbia. In his critique of the bill he notes the following:

> Bill C-192 also contains a number of positive features. Thus the bill has a number of welcome provisions designed to limit the arrest and pre-trial detention of juveniles. It also, for the first time, provides juveniles with appeal provisions similar to those available to adult offenders. The bill also contains an excellent section designed to restrict the dissemination of information from the records of the juvenile court. The bill also abolishes the much-criticized offence of "contributing to juvenile delinquency" while at the same time making formal provision for trial in juvenile court of criminal offences primarily affecting family members.

In all fairness, those provisions of the bill are of value. Those who prepared it should be congratulated for including those provisions. In preparing it and in making this progress they were obviously involved to some extent in deciding, perhaps in an unstated fashion, the major philosophical premise which must govern our treatment of young persons who have run afoul of the law. But the bill does not in any way involve the third factor which I have mentioned, namely, the treatment facilities which are necessary for the administration of this law. I suspect, as I have already said, that this factor is not encompassed in the bill for jurisdictional reasons, but I suggest it is within the treatment facilities that the crux of the problem lies.

Moreover, I suggest that since the bill does not deal with treatment facilities, since in addition neither members of this House nor the Canadian public have any knowledge or information about the sort of facilities the provinces intend to make available to administer the act, and since, further, there is no clear understanding of the philosophy which will govern our dealings with young offenders, as the bill terms them, it would be entirely wrong for us to proceed with this legislation. It leaves too much to chance in an area where society cannot afford to take chances. I speak of society's treatment of its young.

I am extremely sorry, for these reasons, that the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was not acceptable to the government. For the same reasons I hope that the government will accept the suggestion made last evening by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Tolmie) that it be in no particular rush to