

*Private Members' Business*

We look forward to the work in the the legislative committee and to hearing not only appropriate witnesses from the aboriginal people and various research organizations, but interested people in northern development, as we define the north, to ensure that the commission not only is an effective and efficient commission but the best polar commission going.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Larrivée):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Larrivée):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Larrivée):** May I call it two o'clock and proceed to Private Members' Business?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1310)

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

### CRIMINAL CODE

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke)** moved that Bill C-300, an act to amend the Criminal Code (obscenity) be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, in a statement on February 8, I brought to the attention of the House an incident that had occurred involving a lingerie company's catalogue that had been delivered to residents on three Canadian Forces Bases in Ontario.

The catalogue in question arrived unwrapped and contained pictures that are obscene. In many cases children in the families were the first to see the catalogue. This has upset many parents who feel that their fundamental right to choose what is acceptable or not has been challenged. This is best described by a paragraph in a newspaper article which states:

The call for changes was sparked by a full-colour booklet that contained pictures of semi-clad women sent to residents of three military bases in Ontario late last year.

Porrier, who was offended when one of the 30-page catalogues arrived in her mailbox, was angry that it arrived without an envelope to prevent children from seeing it.

She and others have since complained.

That is why I bring this bill forward. I will read the first paragraph of the bill which really sets out its purpose. It states:

1. The Criminal Code is amended by adding, immediately after section 168 thereof, the following:

"168.1 (1) Everyone who makes use of the mails for the purpose of transmitting or delivering unsolicited visually obscene material is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Hence the purpose of the bill is to strengthen the provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with the mailing of obscene material.

The targeting of Canadian Forces Bases was unfortunate and a bad judgment call in itself. It indicates that the producer felt that he was tapping a willing market. This was insulting to those people. Content aside, this fact provoked those who received the catalogue.

In her letter to me one resident said:

My right to choose what is acceptable, or not acceptable in my home has been challenged—I feel violated. My freedom to choose has been taken from me. And something that I do not wish, has been thrust upon me.

In an effort to obtain some answers I wrote to Canada Post asking for an explanation of the review process that governs any distribution. I will just read one paragraph of that letter to Canada Post in which I stated:

From your legal point of view, I understand that the circulation of this catalogue does not violate any Canadian laws. I would like to clarify Canada Post's position on this issue. What criteria applies to the distribution of publications that might be deemed by some to be obscene? What is the review process that governs any distribution? What standards are applied to the distribution itself?