

*Criminal Code*

and penal reform. If the failure of our legislators in the past continues into the future, we will bring the criminal law into contempt and disrepute.

Some of the anachronisms in the present Criminal Code are absolutely hilarious. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the definition of what is known as a game called "three-card monte". I have yet to meet a person who knows what three-card monte might be. However, if you look at the definition of three-card monte in the Criminal Code, or if you are charged with being in a place, or keeping a place, where three-card monte is being played, think of what you have to face! The definition reads as follows:

In this section "three-card monte" means the game commonly known as three-card monte and includes any other game that is similar to it, whether or not the game is played with cards and notwithstanding the number of cards or other things that are used for the purpose of playing.

That provision is presently in our Criminal Code. It would seem to me that if we are going to amend our gaming provisions, "three-card monte" should be thrown out of the window.

We are also proceeding to amend the provisions pertaining to cruelty to animals. We are greatly concerned about cruelty to animals in our society today, but look what happens to the rooster! Consider the provisions of section 388 (2), which read as follows:

● (9:00 p.m.)

A peace officer who finds cocks in a cock-pit or on premises where a cock-pit is located shall seize them and take them before a justice who shall order them to be destroyed.

That subsection is not part of a section pertaining to cruelty to animals. A rooster has very little to crow about under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Many other deep and far reaching changes are required and we have heard suggestions about those from hon. members during the last few days of debate. I think the Solicitor General is well aware of what changes are required. The Juvenile Delinquents Act has not been substantially changed since 1929. Its anachronistic provisions have failed to keep pace with modern aspects of society and modern knowledge about the behaviour of juvenile delinquents. In my respectful opinion, and I have had a certain amount of experience in this field, the Juvenile Delinquents Act more than almost anything else in our society today contributes to juvenile delinquency. We need forensic

clinics authorized across Canada under federal auspices to deal with those who show propensities towards criminal insanity. In particular, such clinics ought to deal with those who, under our modern ideas, fall into the category of those possessing psychopathic tendencies.

Within the last decade in British Columbia several vicious homicides have been committed by psychopathic juveniles. There are limited resources for detecting and treating such juveniles. If they could have been identified and treated, perhaps these vicious crimes would not have occurred.

Many other reforms are required. Certainly, as some hon. members have said, we require reforms in the fields of bail and contraceptives. Any modern society permitting the provisions of section 150 of the Criminal Code to remain in force is bizarre.

Sections pertaining to corporal punishment and to narcotics and drugs in other legislation will have to be dealt with. Laws pertaining to contemporary problems must be reformed adequately if we are to fulfil in future our commitments to our respective communities.

You see, Mr. Speaker, our difficulty stems from the fact that the house must deal with a good many different problems. We must deal with agricultural problems as well as financial problems. In addition, we must direct our attention to specific aspects of human life. We can only do that by introducing an omnibus bill. It could easily be argued that this bill should be split one, two, three or four ways, and I could concur in that argument quite easily. If the bill were to be split I should want it split into 25 or 30 different sections. But if we did that we should be here for three or four years; debate would be endless, and at the end of that time we should only have taken a few steps towards the revision of the law. Admittedly one can argue in favour of having an omnibus bill just as one can argue against it. I remember a drug prosecutor saying in Vancouver, "You know, My Lord, there are pros and cons in favour of the offence and there are pros and cons against it." The omnibus bill is before us and we must do our job. Naturally, individual people will have reservations about certain parts of the omnibus bill. That must be so when you have a bill with 120 clauses. I have reservations about parts of the bill, in particular about clause 2, the extended definition of the Attorney General. I also have reservations about clause 45 which has to do with the manner of preferring an indictment in the