

sary. Those examples include pictures of naked and tied up women with a knife or a razor close to them. According to the present legislation, that is not obscene because no men are seen in the picture. In another example, a woman is shown fully dressed, but on her hands and knees and held on a leash like a dog. That is degradation, of course, but it is not obscene!

The debate on pornography has recently taken a very constructive turn, in my opinion. In its brief to the subcommittee, a delegation of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women has called for legal protection on grounds of the right to equality or non discrimination. Those women have told us that it is a human right to be represented as a human being, and that it would be a breach of that right to be shown as a dog or a vile being without self-respect who agrees to be tortured or enjoys vulgarities. I would suggest that the links between pornographic and real violence are strong enough to justify legislative amendments, particularly more severe sanctions. According to that line of reasoning, there is no need to establish such links to justify stronger legislation. The right to equality, human rights, call for that kind of protection.

● (1805)

[English]

The obscenity provisions brought forward in this legislation, which we have not debated, do go in the right direction and deal with degradation, and we need them, but I believe there is one thing that is wrong with the Minister's proposal. It would seem to be a loophole on account of the expectation that all provinces have censorship laws. This is a provision to require the permission of the Attorney General to prosecute when a film or video cassette has gone through a provincial classification censorship board.

However, not all provinces have censorship. The Province of Manitoba does not. It only has classification. Quebec, in effect, does not censor films or cassettes. This would impede prosecution for films or cassettes which could be extremely pornographic. I do not think that is a step in the right direction.

To conclude, I would ask the Minister again to move quickly on this issue. The problems are important. If he is really serious about dealing with violent pornography, we do not want more press conferences or promises, we want to get legislation in the House and have it passed.

**Mr. Al MacBain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the intervention of the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), I just want to point out that the subject matter of Bill C-19, the omnibus Criminal Code amendments Bill, is before the House Leaders at this time. They will be deciding if there can be an agreement between them about how to deal with this Bill. I would not want to prejudice those negotiations at this time by any remarks I might make.

### Adjournment Debate

TRADE—BEEF IMPORTS FROM COMMON MARKET COUNTRIES.  
(B) GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond in the adjournment debate this evening with respect to my question to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Regan) which I posed last May 24, which appears at page 4010 of *Hansard*. At that time, the matter concerned beef imports into Canada from the European Common Market.

I want to take a moment to thank the Minister for International Trade, even though he is not in the House, for what I would call his careful answer on this subject at that time. I would point out as well that he was previously briefed several weeks ago by myself during a meeting of the External Affairs Committee when the Minister was a witness and I was on the committee.

I will give the Minister credit for a much better response last week in the House than the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) provided on this same beef import issue when it was raised just one day earlier, on May 23, by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer). On that occasion the Minister of Agriculture deliberately avoided the beef import issue and instead gave us all a sermon on the benefits of marketing boards with supply management powers for our Canadian beef cattle industry. That subject was not the issue at all.

My personal concern about this matter is that we in Canada are the only country in the world with an established and significant beef cattle industry of our own that imposes no meaningful restraints on subsidized foreign beef exports. Our only practical limitation on this matter is our global beef quota of 145.1 million pounds under our Beef Import Act plus the companion Guaranteed Minimum Access, generally known as the GMA under the GATT Agreement.

Canada's total beef cattle industry is presently very upset and angry over the dramatic increase in European Common Market exports to Canada from countries such as the Irish Republic, Denmark, Holland, West Germany and possibly others. Such imported beef is presently entering Canada with export subsidies of 50 cents per pound or higher. That is in Canadian currency, paid for by the exporting country within the Common Market. We are understandably concerned about that huge stockpile of over 600,000 tonnes presently in storage in the common market.

● (1810)

I was particularly pleased with the Minister's response to my supplementary question when he extended a personal invitation in this House for me to visit with him in his office to discuss this issue later that same day. I was pleased to accept that invitation. I am sure the ensuing session was well worth while to both of us. As a result of that excellent private meeting, I would seriously suggest that the Minister for International Trade has received some inaccurate background information from his advisory staff on two items.