

noted by researchers that those who are heavy viewers of TV have a corresponding false conception about the role of women, the ratio of professionals to labour, and threat versus safety in society. When we consider that 250,000 adult people have written to Marcus Welby for medical advice, surely we must ponder on the degree that television distorts reality for our children and young people who watch television programming. Because I think this is a very important piece of data to share with members of this House, perhaps I might quote the following:

More than half of all characters on prime time TV are involved in some violence, about one-tenth in killing. To control this mayhem, the forces of law and order dominate prime time. Among those TV males with identifiable occupations, about 20 per cent are engaged in law enforcement. In the real world, the proportion runs less than one per cent. Heavy viewers of television were 18 per cent more likely than light viewers to overestimate the number of males employed in law enforcement, regardless of age, sex, education or reading habits.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that if in prime time viewing one half of all the characters are involved in some form of violence, surely the government does not have the right or privilege at this time to be talking about reward or punishment relating to violence in our society but, rather, should be doing something about the very factors which shape the behaviour of human beings whether they be nutrition, the state of the economy or child abuse. In other words, the government should be dealing with television in some meaningful way and should be dealing with the question of housing and architecture, because all aspects of these things show that in those areas where they are poorly planned and organized or structured, the stress levels on humans increases. It is not without surprise that we learn that the murder rate in apartments is far higher than it is in individual dwelling homes.

When we begin to study something about the effect or crowding and what this does to stresses in people, we begin to recognize that all we have to do with rats is to put too many in a cage and they begin to take on violent reactions one to another. They will even go to the extreme of eating one another, which is not normal behaviour for a Norwegian rat or a white rat. Yet when there is overcrowding this happens. That certainly must be part of the perspective of why we have per 100,000 people such an increase in the violent crime rate as we go from the small rural communities to the larger cities in this country.

So I would say that on the whole question of whether or not we should have an abolitionist state, my position simply is that this is a condition that the government must earn. It is a position one earns by not focusing first on the question of what punishment. We have derived a society from 5,000 years or more which believes that punishment and behaviour are factors related together in a cultural context. Without the government first having done those things that give a sense of true peace and security—not just the words in Bill C-83 or in Bill C-84, but an earned sense of peace and security to the populace of this nation then it has no business forcing a new moral structure on Canadians.

To continue with some of the comments on violence in television, I would point out that violence on television leads viewers to perceive the real world as more dangerous than it really is. That, in turn, has shifted the thinking of children into the belief that as they gear up for adult life,

Private Members' Motions

they must in fact be prepared for violence. It is also a cultural orientation, largely because of television, that in our society it is manly to be violent; that one of the characteristics in respect of a boy proving manhood is that he be able to react and respond in an aggressive and physical manner.

The heavy viewers were 30 per cent more likely than light viewers to pick such fearful estimates as it is 50 or 100 times more likely that there would be threat of death to them than there was for those who were lighter viewers of television. I think that points out some pretty interesting data from some studies, which should give us some perspective concerning whether or not the government has earned the right to bring in capital punishment or an abolitionist state at this time.

I intend to vote against Bill C-84 because I think it is a case of ordering priorities. It is not a case of whether or not one should be an abolitionist. It is a case that the whole nation, if that is the right position, will come to that conclusion when the people have felt there is a real and true sense of peace and security in this society. The nation will come to that view when we do those 50 to 100 things governments at all levels ought to be doing which make for a more peaceful and contented society.

Mr. Speaker, I have further comments I would like to make in this discussion. However, I note that it is five o'clock. Perhaps we are at a good breaking point when I might call it five o'clock, and I will resume at 8 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Transport—Date of report of task force review of search and rescue operations; the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—External Affairs—Possibility ratification of non-proliferation treaty being requirement prior to sale of nuclear reactors.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to order made on Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Shall motion No. 2, in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) stand?