

Private Members' Business

Shall all orders listed under Private Members' Public Bills preceding order No. 475 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: I will let it go on division. I am not going to make any issue of it. I do want it noted that I protest on the part of a great number of Members in this House against the procedures that are adopted.

Just to go on a little bit. I do not have any material here but if the Clerk will pull out a Bill that is in my name, I will take it.

● (1520)

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): A point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Of course I will recognize the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) on a point of order, but I indicated in my remarks that I hoped the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) had realized I was aware of the point he raised and that it was my feeling the problem was on the verge of resolution. Having said that, that is no more than an effort to ask the Hon. member for Edmonton West whether he would accept my indication in the present circumstances. If he does not accept that view and does not wish to give his consent to proceed, that is entirely his right as an Hon. Member of the House, and I would respect that right without any hesitation whatsoever.

I have indicated that I will recognize the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi, but I want to indicate that if the matter becomes one of increasing debate, the probability is that we will not be able to proceed today in the usual fashion.

Mr. Lambert: Well, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will now recognize the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, obviously I did not rise to debate a point but simply to raise a point of order. When you asked for unanimous consent, it was not given. Consent on division is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, in light of what you said, I was prepared to go ahead with any Bill of mine they want to bring forward. I will withdraw that for today. I have done this, but I want to underline that I disapprove of the procedure under which we are going forward with Private Members' Bills and that we should return next week to the appropriate procedure which had been laid down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Edmonton West has made his point, and has made it strongly. I hope other Hon. Members realize that he feels strongly about the issue and that recommendations to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization might be considered

in the circumstances. He has also indicated that he is prepared to give his consent toward a unanimous consent that we might proceed as we do in the ordinary course of events. Accordingly, I will put the question again. Shall all orders listed under Private Members' Public Bills preceding order No. 475 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT**AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT ABUSIVE COMMENT ON THE BASIS OF SEX**

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood) moved that Bill C-675, an Act to amend the Broadcasting Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity to debate my Private Member's Bill, Bill C-675, this afternoon. It is a very simple amendment to the Broadcasting Act. All it will do is to add the following sentence:

Notwithstanding paragraph (c), no station, network operator or pay television licensee shall broadcast any abusive comment or abusive pictorial representation of any race, religion, creed or sex.

This is a phrase which has been taken from the existing broadcasting regulations established by the CRTC. It is necessary for Parliament to put this clause into the Broadcasting Act because the existing phrase in the regulations includes only the first three criteria—race, religion or creed. Abuse on the basis of sex is not there despite many recommendations that it be added to the list. The broadcasting regulations are hopelessly out of date. Regulation amendments were proposed more than a year ago by the CRTC task force on sex stereotyping in the media. They have been advocated by groups like the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, Media Watch and various organizations. The CRTC has persistently refused to amend its own broadcasting regulations, so it is now up to Parliament to take the necessary action.

One proposal has been that as well as race, religion, creed and sex there should be other criteria added, for example, age and physical or mental handicap. Some people have suggested that the Act should include all categories which are now in the Charter of Rights. I would certainly be in agreement with doing this. The appropriate time to do this, I would suggest, is at committee. The real problem in broadcasting right now is the abuse of women, the problem of pornography. That is the real problem.

I am a practical person. I am directing my efforts toward solving a most important problem that we have to face in abusive broadcasting. That is why the proposal is the way I framed it. Race, religion and creed have already been accepted. Now we have to add sex to the list. Certainly it would be appropriate to add the other categories. There is some symbolic importance in doing this, to make clear the kind of protec-