

will need and extra abundance of trust in that force. It will not be easy to build that.

The second reason we need to maintain the force under the aegis of the RCMP is that of the internal factors. It has to do with discipline. What do you do if things go wrong? The best force in the world will have things go wrong. The most well intentioned officers of that force will experience times when they either use excessive force, have poor judgment or miscalculate and things will go wrong. Personnel will do things that are wrong. The Bill proposes that ultimately that kind of problem will be dealt with in a quasi political fashion through the deputy, the Minister or Members of the Cabinet in a quasi if not a totally political manner. That is not good. The fact that the RCMP already has a structure for enforcing discipline makes it a very attractive way of handling that problem.

My colleague from Bow River gave an example of creating discipline through the system of promotion. You start as a constable and work your way up through the system by means of promotion, a system of tried and true escalation of authority. There is a built-in force of discipline. Second, if somebody has done something wrong, there could be a court martial. There is an enforced procedural judicial structure within the force so that when somebody does something wrong there is a procedure in place that will deal with it in a non-political way. When things went wrong in Quebec the politicians who presumably asked them to do something wrong let them hang out to dry.

When you have a system that is separated from politics and any other kind of internal discipline, how do you handle it? That concept has some attractiveness for the civilian security force. Those two aspects that would seem to make it attractive would weigh very lightly in the face of the very positive attributes to the concept of leaving it with the RCMP. May I call it nine o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

• (2100)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

PORNOGRAPHY—UNITED STATES LEGISLATIVE ACTION— CANADIAN POSITION. (B) GOVERNMENT PLANS

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, on May 22 to be precise, I rose to ask a question of the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) regarding the government's plans to introduce legislation that would deal with the very grave problem we are having with child pornography in our country. I had travelled to Ottawa the day before and on the airplane I picked up a copy of that day's issue of the *The Globe and Mail*. I saw a front page story entitled "U.S. porn law advocated for Canada". I found out that a

Adjournment Debate

gentleman in Toronto by the name of Mr. Scott who has organized an anti-pornography activist group has advocated that Canada adopt parallel legislation to that which Mr. Reagan in the United States has now endorsed.

The fact is, Sir, that the American legislation contains some very attractive features. First, it provides for a commission which will examine the link between pornography and obscenity. The new act will increase fines for trafficking in child pornography, raise the age of children covered by the law to 18 from 16 and will broaden some investigative and prosecutorial powers of the U.S. Department of Justice.

In addition to that, the Americans did something that I think was very smart. Before they announced and promulgated signed legislation they held a two-day seminar on the production and dissemination of pornography. That seminar was sponsored by the Justice Department. The people who were invited to attend were U.S. Attorneys, 20 post office workers, 20 local law enforcement officers and 40 members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They were briefed on the new legislation and were told how to investigate and prosecute cases involving the distribution of pornographic material such as magazines and videotape cassettes.

That is the kind of serious action that our country ought to take when it comes to pursuing this particular issue. Frankly, we in Canada have taken a very milquetoast approach to the subject and to the destruction that child pornography wreaks across Canada. There are some grave problems.

When I asked the Solicitor General whether or not he would implement such legislation, he told me that a couple of years ago the Government had introduced legislation dealing with child pornography. However, I would remind the House that that legislation was drafted so poorly and badly the Government withdrew. There was no way it could handle that legislation. Every group in the country saw that legislation as being a big problem.

The Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), several other Hon. Members and I have been working on this theme for a number of years in the hopes that the Government would do something constructive and concrete to make sure that the lives of our young people would be protected from rather than contaminated by the kind of filth that is being sold for profit all across the country. You know, Mr. Speaker, that most of the pornography in Canada is imported from the United States. About 80 per cent of it comes from the United States, with another percentage from overseas. Very little child pornography is produced in Canada. However, the fact is that some of it is produced in Canada. If it comes in from the United States, it should be even more easily controlled, and it would be if there were some teeth in the Customs Act and the Post Office Act and if we had the kind of resources required to control it.

I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary who will respond to my question to urge his colleagues to do something constructive so there will be some kind of protection for our young people and our children.