

of pornography, particularly hard core and violent pornography. I just want to ask the Hon. Member, given his speech today, if he would indicate to the House whether we have his support in our efforts to eradicate that serious problem in this country?

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows full well that the Official Opposition fully supports effective legislation to deal with the problems of pornography in Canada. In fact, on behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada, I responded to the legislation introduced to the nation before the summer. I indicated then, and I will indicate again, that we in the Liberal Party believe there is no penalty harsh enough for those who would sexually abuse children. There is no penalty severe enough to deal with those who would resort to pornography, violence and degradation. We fully intend to support any legislation brought forward which will combat the problem of pornography in Canada. We are committed to that goal.

● (1550)

The Government said in its Throne Speech that it is committed to stopping the importation of pornography into Canada and that it is declaring war on pornography and drugs. However, let us examine what it has done over the last number of months which will make it much easier to import pornography and drugs into Canada. The Government has adopted a new honour system within the Post Office. Parcels coming into Canada no longer have to be picked up by the addressee. The Post Office now delivers the parcel and subsequently invoices the individual for the duty. We all know that that will make it much easier for smugglers to bring more illicit drugs and pornography into Canada. The Government also cut 120 custom inspectors. If the Government is serious about the control of pornography and illicit drugs, it should increase the number of customs inspectors. The Government should rescind its decision on a new postal honour system which will make it easier to import narcotics into the country.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments of the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) with respect to the decision of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to move the proposed prison at Drummondville, Quebec, to Port-Cartier in his own constituency. Many of us in the House share a sense of concern at this waste of taxpayers' money, both in terms of capital cost and of annual operating costs. There is as well, Mr. Speaker, the question of the remote location of this prison. It is far away from the families of prisoners and from the support services which are so necessary.

I think the Hon. Member for York South—Weston will want to look a little further back in history than to the Port Cartier decision. Canadians remember very clearly that a Liberal Government made exactly the same decision with respect to the prison at Renous in the Province of New Brunswick. Another prison was to be built adjacent to Dorchester penitentiary but because of blatant political patronage on the part of the then Liberal Member for

The Address—Mr. Nunziata

Miramichi, who is no longer in the House, at substantial additional cost to the taxpayers of Canada the Atlantic institution was being constructed at Renous. Lo and behold, that prison as well was far away from the necessary support services and involved substantial additional costs.

The Hon. Member for York South—Weston is quite right to say that the Auditor General is examining the decision with respect to the prison at Port-Cartier. I suspect that the Auditor General will also have a thing or two to say about the waste of taxpayers' money involved in constructing the Atlantic institution at Renous, New Brunswick, for blatant political reasons as well.

Let us cut the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party on the issue of the location of prisons. They did the same thing when they were in power as the Conservative Government is doing today. That is why it is time for a real change in this country to an NDP Government to end these phoney arguments.

Mr. Nunziata: You have to hand it to the NDP, Mr. Speaker, they like to dream. We recognize the criticism which was leveled at our administration when we were in office. We did something about it. We commissioned an inquiry into the issue of the location of prisons in Canada. I know the Hon. Member is extremely familiar with the Carson Report. It was tabled in this House on November 30, 1984. That commission recommended that correctional institutions in Canada be located based on correctional considerations rather than on a need in the Prime Minister's riding or on political patronage. The Government has failed to respond to the recommendations of the Carson Report. It has also failed to respond to the report of the Nielsen task force which recommended a moratorium on all prison construction.

We recognize that Canada has one of the highest incarceration rates in the western world. The goal is to reduce the prison population in Canada. Of course, we must keep those who present a danger to society incarcerated, but we must try to reduce the prison population because of the extraordinary costs involved in constructing prisons and keeping inmates incarcerated. It costs \$40,000 a year to keep an individual in jail and in excess of \$70,000 to build an additional prison cell.

We on this side of the House adopt the recommendation of the Carson Report and that of the Nielsen task force report. We believe that there should be a moratorium on all future prison construction and that we should direct our efforts toward finding ways of decreasing the prison population in Canada.

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear the member of the Liberal Party from Toronto speak so strongly against regional development initiatives. This confirms the long-held suspicion that Atlantic Canadians had about the Liberal Government which was in Ottawa for the last two decades. The Liberals do not want to spend any money to bring about regional economic development. The Hon. Member cited the figure of \$15 million and suggested that