the causes of young people getting into difficulty. In the report "One Million Children," Dr. Roberts and Dr. Lazure sum up their approach to the problems of young people as follows:

> We believe that the process of labelling a juvenile as delinquent, and the associated names—incorrigible, truant, sexually immoral, vagrant, is unsupportable because the effect is to increase the alienation of the child from society by defining him in a derogatory way and isolating him from his normal social environment.

• (9:20 p.m.)

If it is wrong to label young people delinquents, it is just as wrong to label them offenders, because the two terms are in fact synonymous. The report is critical of the use of detention during the pre-hearing period and in the period between trial or hearing and the day the judge disposes of the case. It points out that there are few institutions which accept delinquents for a course of real treatment, because these courses are difficult to carry out. They present a demanding task requiring highly trained staff, which we do not have. They wind up their relatively short section on the child as offender by making a number of recommendations that I should like to put on the record. One realizes, on listening to the recommendations, how far short this bill falls in meeting the recommendations which Dr. Roberts and Dr. Lazure propose. The report recommends:

> That the juvenile courts/tribunals for minors be restricted to the 14 to 18-year age group.

This bill provides that the act, which defined a child offender as someone over the age of seven, will be amended, so the age is raised to ten. I suggest that nobody aged 10, 11 or 12 should be labelled a juvenile delinquent, a child delinquent or an offender. The report also recommends:

> That children under the age of 14 be brought before the courts only under child protection legislation.

That provision is not made in the bill, either. The report recommends:

> That only violations of the Criminal Code or provincial or municipal statutes be classed as delinquent behaviour requiring appearance in juvenile court.
>
> That legal counsel be easily and freely available to the offender appearing before the juvenile court and to the parents accused of neglect of a child who is alleged to be in need of protection.
>
> That professional schools training personnel for work with children and adolescents or for the administration of justice include delinquency in their curriculum.
>
> That juvenile courts and training schools encourage the participation of individuals and community groups in the planning and operation of existing programs to increase the community understanding and support for the needs of the juvenile delinquent.

My colleague from Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) said that this method is being used in Great Britain, and I think my colleague from Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) said it was also being used in Sweden. Instead of this, we are more and more to rely upon a very legalistic approach, more and more to rely, if this legislation is passed in its present form, upon a judge to make the decision as to what shall be done in a given case. The report also recommends:

> That the personnel working with the young offender have access to a variety of community, education, health and welfare services.
>
> That all juvenile courts use specialists in child and adolescent behaviour to assist in the diagnosis of the problems and needs of the young offender and to formulate rehabilitation programs.
>
> That aftercare services for delinquents be given budget priority to increase the number of staff involved in this function and to improve their training.

I have read those recommendations into the record to show just how much we have ignored such proposals and just how far we have gone in the direction of a much more rigid, more legalistic and punitive approach to those young people who get into difficulty and break our laws.

I want to spend a few moments to put on the record arguments advanced in opposition to the bill by the Canadian Mental Health Association. I do so because to my knowledge no organization has made a greater contribution to a better understanding of the problems of people who get into difficulties, be they adults or the young, than has this organization. This organization has over the years called for greater concentration on rational methods of dealing with people who find themselves in this sort of difficulty. This is an organization that has called again and again for governments to stop using punitive measures and to begin adopting humane approaches which will have positive effects in assisting those who have fallen afoul of the law. In a letter that the Canadian Mental Health Association sent to all members of this House and to the members of the other place, the following paragraph appears:

> To appreciate the significance of our association's strong objection to this act, it must be recognized that the psychological and physical needs of children are different from those of adults . . . A Criminal Code based on the notion that specific offences merit a specified range of punitive procedures may be appropriate for adults but definitely not for children—
>
> Basically it is the position of this association that there should be a separation between the judicial process and the process of determining appropriate treatment, training, supervision and aftercare. The former should be considered to be a matter of due process—

In other words, considered by the court.

> —while the latter deals with decisions concerning the particular needs of the child with a special emphasis on his rehabilitation. For this reason, decisions concerning the disposition of the child should be for an indefinite period with his civil rights fully protected by provisions of an independent external review board for review at stated intervals—

What this bill provides is exactly the opposite; it provides that judges shall impose sentences for specific periods of time. The Mental Health Association goes on to say:

> With these principles in mind, it is obvious that the proposed legislation limits the options of the court for making disposition for the child. No provision whatever is made for after-care and rehabilitation—and the suggestion that a child would benefit by being "sentenced" to become a ward of the Children's Aid Society for a period "not exceeding two years" is not only impractical—it is ridiculous.