

*The Address—Mr. Hogarth*

which I have spoken. At page 2 of *Hansard* for October 23 appears this paragraph:

A disturbing element in many countries of the world has been the rising tide of unrest, particularly among young people. It has expressed itself in many ways, in public debate, in peaceful protest and sometimes in violence. Our profound disapproval of the excesses must not blind us to deeply felt and legitimate aspirations. Many citizens in our own country believe that they are entitled to assume greater responsibility for the destiny of our society. Such demands, in so far as they do not conflict with the general welfare, are the expression of a truly democratic ideal. They must be satisfied if our society is to attain its goals of peace and justice.

This is exactly what the activists have been saying. The expression "such demands, in so far as they do not conflict with the general welfare" indicates to me that the government is going to remain the final arbiter of what general welfare is. It is the "establishment" that determines what is general welfare. It appears to me that the inference there is that, unless the young people stay within the framework of those concepts that we have decided shall govern in the future, then reforms and activism are unacceptable.

I do not think this is the way we should look at reform. Neither do I think it is the way we should look at our changing society. After all, what have we done for our young people? Following those euphemistic words in the Speech from the Throne the only provision we made for them was the lowering of the voting age to 18. We must go much further than this, and not only in parliament; we must go further in our political processes. We must encourage our young people to join political parties. Although everyone says we do this, we must make sure we provide the structure that will allow them to voice their requirements. Through their vote they can influence government.

A young person who joins a political party today has a difficult time in getting his views adopted. If he is successful in getting a resolution passed, it is not binding on the government of the day, even if it is his own party that is in power. Modest steps have been taken in our caucus to correct this situation. We are looking forward to reforms that will at last permit elected representatives to have a say in government policy. But that is not enough. We should have our political processes structured from the grass roots to the East Block so these things are acceptable and understood.

[Mr. Hogarth.]

• (12:40 p.m.)

Another passage from the speech is most disconcerting. We have put some emphasis on reforms to the Criminal Law and these are long overdue. The speech outlines what we mean by this in the following sentences:

The size, complexity and fallability of the structures that technology imposes on modern societies are often in conflict with the protection and development of individual values. The workings of both private and public institutions may endanger the individual's free expression of his unique personality. He must therefore be protected from anything that jeopardizes his rights or limits his personal development.

What do we do? It appears that the elephant has given birth to a rabbit. The only reforms we have are amendments to the Criminal Code pertaining to bail and wire tapping. We have an also ran from the Solicitor General's department dealing with pardons, which is really only going to have a psychological effect. We have also a bill from the Senate on hate literature. When you consider what is necessary, you must realize that these reforms are pitifully inadequate. Oddly enough, we use the most altruistic motives but you will note that not one of these amendments is going to cost any money. If we are going to have Criminal Law reform and justice, we must be prepared to meet the cost.

Consider what we should be doing. In 1929 the Juvenile Delinquents Act was passed. It was known early in the game that it was not satisfactory, and it certainly is not satisfactory now. In 1965, four years ago, we had a departmental committee set up which prepared an excellent report after travelling all over Canada discussing these problems with sociologists, lawyers and judges. That report was filed in 1965 but nothing has been done since 1965 about that Act. We should have it before us this session, and it should have been before Parliament at the last one. We wonder what the delay is and why it is not before us.

Let us consider the Ouimet report which we received ten days ago. I was pleased to hear the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) say today, and I note he is in the house, that he is open for suggestions as to what to do with it. That very splendid report should have been automatically referred to a standing committee of this house, or we should have a special committee set up to consider it. The reforms in it are far-reaching and if we do not get at it soon, by the time we do get at it the reforms it suggests will themselves need reforming.