

Adjournment Debate

The most severe penal sanctions would apply to first level productions which include visual representation of an individual under age 18 taking part in explicit sexual activities.

Mr. Speaker, it stands to reason that if we want to solve those problems we should not begin by directing our efforts towards the adult population. The way to proceed is to strike at the root, and by that I mean the young people of today who are directly involved in pornography. The first level would also include productions which promote, endorse or depict as being normal any sexual attack against children, as well as others that could not have been produced without inflicting severe physical lesions on the individuals portrayed.

Mr. Speaker, these words do not need to be explained further. It is clear that these young people will have recorded in their subconscious these acts of extreme physical violence and they will develop them into some sort of automatic response, a means of defence, release and expression, something unbelievable for those who will have to administer our society of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the productions of the second level should be subject to less severe penalties. The second level would comprise material or shows which describe or represent violent sexual behaviour, bestiality, incest or necrophilia. When I say less severe penalties, I do not mean full absolution, for is there any human act which is more bestial and degrading than incest? It is aberrant and inexplicable. Mr. Speaker, as the happy father of a son and daughter, I just cannot accept that parents could be involved in an incestuous relationship with their children.

Mr. Speaker, the productions of the third level would be subject to penalties, because they are exposed in public, without warning, or sold or made available to people under 18 years of age. This third level would comprise visual pornographic presentations or shows not involving people under 18 years of age.

● (1800)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

AGRICULTURE—IMPACT ON CANADIAN FARMERS OF PROPOSED UNITED STATES LEGISLATION. (B) REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER MAKE REPRESENTATIONS TO UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I put a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) concerning the situation which exists in the Canadian farm community with regard to the United States farm legislation bill that was passed a few weeks ago.

A recent study by Chase Econometrics indicates that it will cause a net reduction of 20 per cent for farm incomes across the country due to the lower prices of grain, corn and other commodities. I asked what action the Minister would take in light of this American farm bill. Of course, the impact of the Bill is not only the reduction in the commodity prices. It will also have a negative impact because the legislation has a massive system of bonuses for export sales.

The response I received from the Parliamentary Secretary was very inadequate. He never indicated what action would be taken to assist the farmers in this country as a result of the very adverse and negative impact of this U.S. farm bill. He did not seem to realize that it would reduce farm incomes 20 per cent below the 1984 level.

In my supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), I asked if the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would personally intervene with President Reagan this weekend at the Washington Summit to ask that some consideration be given to Canada in the way the U.S. Farm Bill is applied. I received essentially no response or commitment from the Minister that the Prime Minister would personally intervene to ask that the American \$1.5 billion bonus program for export sales would not be used in markets into which Canada has traditionally sold grain. The Secretary of State simply said that the Prime Minister will speak for all interests of Canada at the Summit with the President.

Last evening, I received this background paper entitled "The Washington Summit March 18-19". The very disconcerting result I expected took place because there is nary a word on the agenda of issues to be discussed by the Prime Minister and the President this weekend about this U.S. Farm Bill which will have the greatest and most severe impact on Canadian agriculture of any initiative taken in the United States. The agenda includes other important issues such as softwood lumber; the fish countervailing duty investigation; sugar-containing products; steel; asbestos and others under Section 201. However, the whole question about the negative impact of the U.S. Farm Bill is not even included on the agenda. Therefore, we are continuing to seek assurances.

● (1805)

I hope the Parliamentary Secretary, in responding this evening, will be able to give an ironclad commitment that the Prime Minister will raise this matter, and that he will push it as forcefully as possible with the President this weekend to ensure that the negative impact of the United States Farm Bill, with its commodity prices, will be lessened, and that the