

something in the way of humane consideration that could be put in place so that we are not playing the role of the Grinch that stole Christmas retroactively, or something like that.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, as I explained in the correspondence with the hon. member, it is certainly not the intention of the commission to play that heavy role in this area. It merely comes down, in many cases, to the choice of the older worker who, because of the existence of a collective agreement, is given the right to choose voluntarily to be laid off and thereby provide the remaining work space for a younger worker. That choice is made usually in the circumstances where the collective agreement provides for a sub, where there is a payment procedure through the collective agreement for a lay-off.

Of course, where we get caught in the cross-fire is that we see that, according to the legislative framework, as a voluntary lay-off without just cause and a six-week penalty is therefore imposed for doing that. We understand that that may be done for good reasons. One may want to help the younger worker to stay on the job and that may bear ultimately on the sub. But to make that change, to take into account that peculiar case in that collective agreement would mean that we would open up the whole question of a large number of people who could take voluntary lay-offs and therefore be held to receive these benefits, and that, as you know, would run counter to the wishes of Parliament when they made the amendments earlier. That is the reason for the problem.

I will take a look at this correspondence again to see if we can come up with a more satisfactory answer. I suppose that perhaps when we get to the larger bill and if we have time to discuss it in committee, we can get to a better exchange on this matter at that time.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 4.10 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions, private bills.

• (1610)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall all orders preceding No. 111 stand by unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Broadcasting Act

BROADCASTING ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT ADVERTISING ON CHILDREN'S TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East) moved that Bill C-311, to amend the Broadcasting Act (advertising on children's programs) be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much of the time of the House except to bring the House up to date on a measure that has been before it now for approximately 13 years. The bill was first introduced in the House in 1970, and it was at the second reading stage on November 22, 1971. Of course, at that time it was talked out.

Just by way of interest let me point out that during the course of that debate there was a very distinguished intervention by Your Honour, which I am sure you will want to read at page 9945 of *Hansard* for November 26, 1971.

Let me bring it up to date a little bit further. The bill was again introduced in 1973 as Bill C-22, and at that time it was agreed that the bill would be withdrawn and the order withdrawn and the subject matter referred to the then Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts. We held very substantial hearings indeed. We heard from a number of witnesses, 19 altogether. Indeed, the hearings were comprehensive and resulted in a very interesting report to the House, which hon. members can find if they refer back to the first session of the Twenty-ninth Parliament in 1973. I presume the *Journals* for July of that year would have the report. It should interest the House if I put on the record the recommendations of the committee, which were unanimously concurred in by the House, as follows:

In the opinion of your committee, it is recommended that consideration be given to the advisability of taking whatever action is necessary, including the introduction of legislation to accomplish the following objectives:

- 1) that the CRTC pass regulations which would provide that advertising must not be directed exclusively to children;
- 2) that the CRTC limit further the number of commercial minutes per hour during children's programmes;
- 3) that the CRTC require the deletion of advertising directed to children from American programming distributed on the Canadian cable systems;
- 4) that the Income Tax Act be amended so that advertising directed at Canada on foreign television stations would no longer be considered deductible for income tax purposes;
- 5) that ways and means be found to expand the Canadian programme production industry with particular emphasis on the creation of children's programmes.

As I say, those recommendations were unanimously concurred in by the House, and it would be well for us to consider what has happened since that time. Indeed, that is the purpose for bringing on the bill at this time, to enable the House to bring itself up to date on just exactly what has happened since the House unanimously concurred on those five recommendations.

I believe hon. members will find there is a disposition on the part of the House to do just that by way of an amendment which would have the effect of withdrawing the bill and the order at second reading and having the subject matter referred