

that this bill be given second reading as soon as possible and sent to the committee for study and possible amendment.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to inform the House that it has not been possible to reach an agreement under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the second reading stage of Bill C-83, an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime which is now under discussion. I therefore give notice of my intention to propose, at the next sitting of the House, a motion pursuant to Standing Order 75C for the purpose of allocating four further days for the consideration and disposal of proceedings on that stage of this bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**An hon. Member:** You are afraid of your own shadow, and afraid of your own legislation.

**An hon. Member:** It won't stand up to public scrutiny.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave):** Order, please. The hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has the floor. The last minute or so will not be counted against his time.

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** I am always astounded at the word "Shame" which is pronounced by members of the opposition with big smiles on their faces. They smile and yell "Shame". I wonder how serious they are.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** I should like to have the amendments put into this bill, but hon. members opposite do not want the amendments put in because they do not want to go into committee.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

[Translation]

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** Taking for granted, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues have all read Bill C-83 and knowing already that my constituents have received the documentation I sent them concerning the public order and security program, I will not deal with the subject as a whole since its factors or components are well known and largely publicized. I will rather emphasize an important element which is not included in the explanatory notes on the program, in the part dealing with the prevention of crime.

The basic principle of the amendment I would like to see examined by the committee would be to prevent any broadcaster from airing before 9 o'clock p.m. any program likely to promote, glorify or justify the use of firearms to settle conflicts. The previous speaker, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) talked about violence on television. It is that matter, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to discuss.

### *Measures Against Crime*

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the Canadian society, through its representatives, wants to take the necessary measures to get better protection against perpetrators of violent and other crimes, in so far as protection against crime requires by its very nature that we identify all the measures to be taken to prevent a rise in crime.

One of these factors has not been mentioned, in spite of the undeniable and increasing impact of its social import in our modern society. I refer to television or, in other words, to the daily presence of violence in every Canadian's life and particularly in the education of our youth. This problem is a very important one with which we must come to grips if we really want to prevent recurrence of violence which is often an underlying aspect of television programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a few comments from a speech delivered by Dr. Northrop Frye of the CRTIC about violence in general. This is what he said:

[English]

I am somewhat disturbed by the fact that the opposite of violence seems always to be non-violence, as though violence was a positive thing and we had nothing to put against it except a negation. Wherever there is one human being there is a very considerable output of mental and physical energy, and wherever there is more than one human being those energies are going to conflict. It seems to me that violence, as we have been using the word here, is misapplied energy. It is to energy what prostitution is to sexual love. As such, it really is a negative force, and controlling violence would be the way to set human energy free for its proper tasks. I quote the following:

● (1720)

Controlling violence means, first of all, raising the level of society. The people who produce and sell socially irresponsible programs are thinking of their viewers as a mob rather than a community. The mob is the lowest form of community: it is a completely homogeneous society organized for hatred, and will not remain a mob long unless it can find someone to beat up, or, failing that, something to smash. When a television program depicts someone being slowly beaten to death, the primary appeal is: "Look at this: isn't fun?" As soon as anyone begins to object that this may be a wrong kind of fun, the violence is immediately rationalized, and turns self-righteous. All rationalized violence has much the same argument, the argument behind all fights on school playgrounds is: he started it. That is, whenever violence is rationalized it is asserted to be counterviolence. Somebody else did something first, and we have to resist it. That is true of the violence of capital punishment; it is true of the violence of Palestinian terrorists. Fictional violence, however, may be rationalized more simply as a refusal to take a positive attitude in a violent world: for example, this is what we're all involved in, whether we like it or not, etc. But the real reason is simply lack of imagination: depicting violence is easy, quick, and profitable. It is easy partly because violence is a mechanical form of human energy: so mechanical that it can even be quantified or classified as "heavy" or "light". As a mechanical cause producing a mechanical response, violence never accomplishes anything: the pendulum of aggression and counteraggression simply goes on swinging all through history.

[Translation]

This quotation from a speech by Dr. Frye with which I agree, is a brief summary of an overall problem. In dictionaries, violence is defined as "intense force". No one would deny that when we use our most developed senses, hearing and sight, we are subject to television and no one would deny the importance and power of this media. Let us not be mistaken about my purpose here.