

Adjournment Debate

effects, as well as teratogenic effects. That is, they are suspected of being able to cause injury to a foetus without affecting the mother. They are also suspected of inducing growth inhibition and hypertension.

The Hon. Member's motion focuses on lead in paint. It states:

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of reducing the allowable lead content in all consumer paints, particularly those used on products for children, from the existing level of 0.5 per cent to 0.06 per cent.

I believe it can be demonstrated that consumer safeguards already on the books give Canadians more than adequate protection from chronic exposure to low levels of lead.

Health and Welfare Canada expressed its concerns about the potential effects of lead pollution on human health in the early 1970s, and it identified those human sources of it that contributed to an increased body-burden of lead.

Consequently, action was taken on many fronts. Baby foods were put into lead-free containers. The lead content of paint was regulated. Lead emissions from secondary smelters were controlled. The maximum lead content of gasoline was initially set at 0.77 grams per litre and has since been lowered even further, as I will explain later.

Let us examine the use of lead in paint since that is the area singled out by the Hon. Member's motion. The use of lead in paint in Canada is subject to the requirements under the Hazardous Products Act. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to this motion, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I regret that I must interrupt the Hon. Member.

[*Translation*]

The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—RECOMMENDED TELEVISION
COVERAGE OF CRIMINAL TRIALS

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Madam Speaker, as you know the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms has in it a provision, Section 11(d), which sets out that any person charged with an offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal. Every single

word in that particular section of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is significant and important. Perhaps it is impossible to pick out one phrase or one word that is more important than another but there is particular significance in the two words in that section "public hearing". Those are very important words and they are in the section for a reason. That reason is that all hearings and trials held over the years in our courts were not always held in public. In fact, traditionally many of them were held in private and the public had no access whatever to those courts or hearings.

It was as a result of that that some very unfortunate and frightening things went on behind closed doors of courts and hearing rooms which were not open to the public. One thing that comes to my mind is the history of intimidation, even the torture, of some witnesses to confess or to tell a story which perhaps was not true. In many cases it was not true at all. In the courts years ago there was behind closed doors this effort to fabricate evidence by torture and by other means that would not be exposed to the light of day because the public could not see what was happening.

Years ago in England those courts were known as the Courts of Star Chamber. It was because of the Courts of Star Chamber and the horrible reputation which they had, a reputation which I suggest would approach the courts of the Spanish Inquisition, which made the public and the legal system realize how significant and important it was to have open and public hearings. As a result that has become part of our civil liberties and it has become enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Until recently when we thought of public hearings and public court trials, we thought in terms of a court room which the public could come in and out of at will, subject to not disrupting proceedings. The door was open and members of the public could come into a court room, sit down, watch and listen and leave when they wanted to. That is what we have traditionally thought of as a public hearing.

Very recently as you are aware, Madam Speaker, there has been a change in the concept of a public hearing. With the new electronic media it is quite possible to have television in a court room or a hearing room so that not only a few members of the public, limited by the size of the seating capacity, but virtually every person in the world would have access and could be part of that public hearing process. That is a new concept, something which we have not come to as yet in this country.

We have seen in the United States on American cable television the broadcasting and televising of some rather interesting and perhaps lurid trials, some of them murder and some of them divorce trials. Some have caught a great deal of public attention. Through that publicity and through the fact that Americans have had the advantage of television in public hearings and in court rooms, we in Canada have started to become interested in this concept. Approximately six different royal commission hearings in Canada have been televised. The public has been able to watch and see on a daily basis,