

was a responsible agency, that the responsibility of the Government should make itself manifest and that it was the responsibility of the Opposition to ensure that that responsibility was fulfilled. I find that is not the situation today. I will come to the area of Crown corporations because to my way of thinking it is the most outrageous demonstration of the manner in which the parliamentary process is being endangered through the multiplication and proliferation of Crown corporations.

From my academic beginnings under the guidance of MacGregor Dawson and Alexander Brady, I was led to other authorities from Elizabethan times, Coke and also Blackstone from the eighteenth century, both of whom I have read. This gave me a feeling that when I came to Parliament I would find an institution which was responsive and responsible and that the notion of responsibility would be amply displayed. Today I find that is not the case, and that is where my feeling of deception is. It is unfortunate that we have to put forward a motion of this sort.

I would like to refer to the Lambert Report which was prepared in 1978 or 1979. In the opening of Chapter 21, Mr. Lambert, a Royal Commissioner charged with looking into the matter of financial management and accountability, reported:

Accountability is the working principle of our parliamentary system.

That is as simple as can be. It should be that way. He continued:

Therefore, we have chosen to end our Report with our conclusions about Parliament's role in the accountability process, for it is in that institution, as our mandate foresaw, that accountability culminates.

On page 370 he referred to the relations between governments and parliaments. He indicated:

This means that the relationship is so unequal that the principles of responsible government, while still generally accepted, are in danger of becoming irrelevant to the actual situation.

That is the danger I foresee and that is what brought this motion forward. Then on page 371 he said:

—we have concluded that ways must be found to improve the accountability of the Government to Parliament and its committees.

That is what I deplore, the deception of coming to Parliament and finding that it is not responsive to popular need, nor responsible to the Opposition, in its governing and its expenditure of public funds.

For example, in three years in this session of Parliament—and we are now getting into the fourth year—we have been asked to approve authority for the Government to borrow over \$73 billion, which is about \$24 billion for each of those years. The most recent Bill did not give us any indication of how that money was to be spent. That is not responsibility, and that is what worries me. That is why today we had to bring forward a motion of this kind. The motion says that we are in danger of losing this institution which has grown up over the last 700 or 800 years, gradually developing a responsiveness to public need and demand, and also the institution of give and take across the floor. Principally, the notion of responsibility in Government is to be accountable to the Opposition and to the country. The accountability is not just on election day. It is throughout

Adjournment Debate

the life of Parliament. That is what I find so unfortunate, and that is what the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) was saying. He wants responsibility to be restored to this House. He is seeking in that Special Committee, along with my colleague for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), a means whereby responsibility can be restored.

● (1800)

I see that the hour approaches. I have many more comments to make, but I do appreciate the division of time which permitted me to say these few words. At least I got that part of it in.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

CRIMINAL CODE—PORNOGRAPHY—INQUIRY RESPECTING MINISTERIAL ACTION—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION—DEFINITION OF OBSCENITY

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question on pornography in broadcasting was answered by the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) who said that he was considering amendments to the law of obscenity which would apply everywhere, including broadcasting. He said this was a better way to proceed than attempting to segment particular areas and to have a special law which relates to them. This response is inadequate.

Where special problems exist, special laws are needed. There are already well demonstrated problems with pornography in broadcasting. Broadcasting happens to be a highly regulated media. There are regulations for patent medicines, drugs, booze, children's advertising, religious broadcasting, politics, lotteries, how venereal disease can be discussed, and birth control, but not, in the case of Pay TV at least, pornography, a rather important item that is missing from the list of regulations.

[*Translation*]

Radio and television broadcasting regulations now forbid abuse on grounds of race or religious beliefs. However, abuse on grounds of sex—in other words, abuse of women—is acceptable to the CRTC. Children are also victims of sexual abuse, but pornography's main victims are women. Could anyone imagine a religious minority being abused in the same way as women are abused by pornography? Take, for instance, anti-Semitism. Unfortunately, it does exist in our society. Could anyone imagine anti-Semitic pornography? I shall give you a sketch. For three hours every evening, late enough to keep children from watching, TV programs are broadcast in which Jews appear naked and non-Jews are dressed. Jews are