

that they do receive help so that they can extricate themselves from that terrible situation of crime.

We would urge members opposite to see the wisdom of this far thinking and far-sighted amendment. They should adopt this progressive piece of legislation.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I find it quite interesting how people seem to talk about this matter with a great deal of confusion. They interchange words like "punishment", "rehabilitation" and "treatment", as if they are all the same thing. I really think we have to start looking at what our court system and our penal system do.

I used to have a professor in criminology many years ago who said that if we set out to design a penal system and a court system that would guarantee hardened criminals, we could not have done anything better than what we have done in Canada with our jails and our federal penitentiaries. We could not have done anything better to guarantee hardened, life-long criminals.

Let us not talk about transferring of juveniles and sentencing them to adult penitentiaries in the same breath that we talk about rehabilitation treatment. That is just so much malarkey. I wonder how many members in this facility have actually visited places like the old B.C. penitentiary or Kent Institution or Matsqui and have talked to inmates, particularly inmates who are young and vulnerable in that population, about what has happened to them. Did the the fact that they were raped contribute to their rehabilitation? Did the fact that they were abused by other inmates contribute to their treatment? Did the fact that they were manipulated by guards and correctional staff contribute to them becoming responsible adults?

We have to make a fundamental decision in this country. We on this side are saying that youth must be protected from the ravages of adult correctional facilities. Therefore we oppose transferring them, but we are saying that we should give the judges more options based on the ability and need to treat this person. We may not be able to provide treatment in less than three years or five years or seven years.

Who are these kids that we are talking about? There has been repeated documentation indicating that a percentage of these kids are offenders who have come

from abusive homes, have been abused themselves, have failed in educational facilities, have learning disabilities and have psychiatric and emotional problems. We need time to provide treatment, but not treatment in a federal penitentiary. It should be treatment in a juvenile facility.

This is why I support my colleague's amendment which addresses periods of three, five or seven years based not only on the seriousness of the offence but on the seriousness of the youth's problems. That is a concept that somehow in all of this is being abandoned. What we are talking about is treatment and rehabilitation. That takes time. With some children their backgrounds are such that they have difficulty functioning in a community on a constructive basis.

I cannot help but comment on a remark that a lot of juveniles are being used in organized crimes because organized crime knows that they are not going to get lengthy sentences. For anybody so naive as to think that if we increase juvenile sentences organized crime is going to stop using them is nonsense.

I have worked on the streets of Vancouver where organized crime does not give a dang—I could use stronger language—about the fact that its exploiting 14 or 15 year old girls. It does not care that those youths are in danger of a long sentence of four, five or ten years. Those youth are endangering their lives from drug addiction, from being put at jeopardy with violent johns. Organized crime does not care. These kids are expendable.

If you think you are going to solve the problem of organized crime by increasing the penalties for juveniles, you must never have been involved with criminal behaviour in this country.

An hon. member: Have you ever said that?

Mr. Karpoff: The member asks: "Have you ever said that?" That was one of the arguments used for increasing the penalties, that it would stop organized crime from using youth. That argument has no bearing on it. We must have the ability to provide treatment, rehabilitation and education for youth at appropriate times and for appropriate lengths of times in youth facilities.

I commend my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam for his amendments. I think they are based on the