

Nuclear Disarmament

MR. MCKINNON: I have just a couple of questions. Mr. Stark, if I understood you correctly when you were answering Mr. Wenman, you said the Warsaw Pact nations all assured you they would support your motion at the United Nations and would conduct a referendum within their countries. Did I understand you correctly?

MR. STARK: Yes.

MR. MCKINNON: What level was the Russian who told you they would conduct a referendum in their country?

MR. STARK: In New York I met with two representatives; the ambassador and one other. In Canada, I have discussed this with Ambassador Alexander Yakovlev at the Soviet Embassy and with the ambassadors of other Warsaw Pact nations. We had a representative of the Soviet Union at our conference last November on a panel with an American who said—stressing that they do not need a referendum in their country. He said publicly that they would support it in the UN and conduct it in their country. As I mentioned earlier, it would be a very inefficient, in fact, misleading initiative unless we were sure the Soviet nations would also participate. Frankly, we would have folded up the organization, Operation Dismantle, in 1979 had we not had an indication that the Soviets would participate.

Everyone knows that the Soviets did not participate and are not going to participate. The final proof of that might be a news item in *The Globe and Mail* dated May 23, and I quote:

Soviet dissident jailed for circulating petition

A member of an unofficial Moscow peace group has been jailed for 15 days for collecting 300 signatures on a petition calling for improved U.S.-Soviet relations, dissident sources said yesterday. Alexander Rubchenko, a 24-year-old artist, was sentenced Monday on charges of hooliganism. He was one of four members of the "Group of Trust" picked up on Friday. The others were released after police warned them they will be ordered to live away from Moscow if they petition people again. One member of the group said they will continue collecting signatures.

Therefore, this is going to be a one-sided effort if it ever did come to pass that we would declare ourselves to be a nuclear free zone, and convince other states to do likewise. So that I do not get accused of talking out this Bill, I will draw my remarks to a conclusion before six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the time is about ended for this debate. However, I would like to go on record as saying that I support in principle what the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) has been trying to say. Unfortunately, the Bill is substantially the same as the Bill we had last week, namely, Bill C-204. However, there are a couple of differences in the Bill and I suppose you might say that Bill C-203 does in effect improve Bill C-204. In any event, I believe the topic we are discussing, that is, the motion for a world referendum—

The Acting Speaker (Mr., Herbert): Order, please. I sincerely regret to interrupt the Hon. Member—

[Translation]

—but the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

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

CRIMINAL CODE—PRESENTATION OF OBSCENITY AMENDMENT

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, on April 18 I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) to consider taking out of the Criminal Code amendments in Bill C-19 the clauses on obscenity and bring them into the House for swift passage. I raised this because we know that obscenity is getting worse, pornography is growing, it is getting more violent and the police are saying that they are helpless to do anything about it. We have had examples in Toronto of stores selling video tapes, including very violent ones, to children. I do not want to get into the argument as to whether "snuff" movies, which have been reported to be sold, are real or not. Certainly we know that the violence is bad enough.

However, the Minister was very complacent. He said there are many parts of the Criminal Code which are of the utmost urgency. We need all of that Bill, not just parts of it. Well, there are other parts of Bill C-19 I would like to see passed as well. But certainly one of the most important must be the obscenity section. I remind the House that the Minister has had an entire year. He brought in draft legislation to this effect last June, yet we have not actually had any debate on the Bill. He is not moving ahead on this specific and very important part, nor is he moving ahead on the other parts of Bill C-19.

[Translation]

I am wondering whether the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada (Mr. MacGuigan) is more interested in publicity for his Liberal Party leadership campaign than in concrete improvements or in amendments to the Criminal Code.

Two committees and one subcommittee are now considering that issue, but the Bill in question, Bill C-19, remains on the Order Paper and has not come up for debate. The Bill was given first reading in January, but since then the Government has not even set a single day aside for debate. In the meantime, pornography problems are growing worse. Yesterday, a representative of the *Réseau d'action et d'information pour les femmes* tabled before the subcommittee a brief describing his attempts to file a complaint against pornographic magazines in Quebec, and I had an opportunity to examine magazines depicting very violent scenes.

The police in Quebec have refused to act on those complaints because of loopholes in the existing legislation. It is quite obvious that legislative amendments have become neces-