

Section 159(2) of the Criminal Code reads:

Every one commits an offence who knowingly, without lawful justification or excuse, sells, exposes to public view or has in his possession for such a purpose, any obscene written matter, picture, model, phonograph record or other thing whatsoever.

Forgive me for wondering if the hon. member for Selkirk has been to a newsstand lately. Can he pretend that this provision against what we might call hard core pornography is successfully enforced? I doubt that he would say that. And if he would, I certainly would not.

Now we are being asked to subdivide obscene matter into what amounts to hard core and soft core pornography, and to add a few words to the Criminal Code which would also make it an offence to peddle the soft core variety in any outlet frequented by persons who are, or appear to be, under the age of 18 years. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are not many magazine outlets in this country which are not frequented by persons of such a tender age. And if our present definition of and provision against obscenity are poorly enforced, how can we hope for better results from writing into the Criminal Code more words to the same effect?

There must be better ways of removing this filth from the reach of our children. I am inclined to support the initiatives of the Most Reverend Philip Pocock, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto, who has urged decent citizens to speak out and to register their concern where it will be most effective. In a paid advertisement in the *Toronto Star* of December 3, Archbishop Pocock called upon concerned people "to refrain from patronizing" what he called "these publications, theatres, and places of business which encourage the pornographic."

He asked every decent citizen to walk up to his neighbourhood confectionery, theatre, or newsstand and to tell the proprietor what he thinks about the merchandise on display. And he suggested we boycott the magazine outlet or theatre which refuses to comply with our own moral standards—the standards of most patrons. He said:

I ask their support in affirming what is positive and wholesome in the media and (in) publicly opposing what is not. I urge them to pray for decency in the community and the country.

Ernest Howse, in the *Toronto Star* of December 11, commented on Archbishop Pocock's action as follows:

He has suggested a practical method of making public opinion effective. It is that concerned people individually make their feelings known to the purveyors of pornography, and refrain from patronizing their establishments. Bookstores might have to make the choice of no pornography or only pornography. To handle the stuff might cost more than its worth.

The individual proprietor, Mr. Speaker, cannot be allowed to go on thinking that his concern for the moral development of children in his own neighbourhood can be less than for his own family. He cannot be allowed any longer to consider himself an upstanding and upright member of his community if he is responsible for supplying his community and his neighbours' children with obscene literature.

There is nothing more to be feared than the righteous wrath of an outraged populace. Let those who are intent upon the perversion of our children beware of the collective judgment of the society in which they market their wares. And let every

Obscene Literature

decent citizen be aware of his own power and his own duty to make his feelings known at the point of sale.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill only because I am convinced that it will not do what it is intended to do. It will not effectively prevent the distribution of obscene materials of a restricted nature, as they are termed in this bill.

Even the present law cannot work properly because public opinion is divided on the meaning of obscenity and, indeed, on the need to keep anything from the eyes and ears of our children. If anyone doubts this, let him turn to the *Globe and Mail* of January 5, this year, which, to the everlasting disgrace of that newspaper, wrote:

We fear the licence to produce pornographic material far less than we fear the licence to control it.

Hollower words were never written.

But there are too many—far too many Canadians who have been seduced by the "Playboy" philosophy of "use them and lose them"—far too many to allow us to think that a few more words in the Criminal Code can substitute for the individual and collective action of the decent majority. I will finish by saying it is our obligation to remind the people peddling this filth that they are part of our society and have an obligation to their own children as well as to ours.

● (1740)

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (York South): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by congratulating the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway) for bringing forward this bill. As a concerned parent I support it. It is most heartwarming to find that people in this country are thinking of the good of all our children, of the good of Canadian children as a whole. The bill is timely. I wish it had been brought forward in December, to coincide with the beginning of Archbishop Pocock's campaign. Unfortunately such was not the case. However, I am happy to tell the hon. member for Selkirk that the campaign which began in Toronto at the beginning of December is succeeding and its success is growing by the day. The participants do not include only Catholics and those of known religious affiliations. Noted atheists are also participating. The question is, what will happen in future?

Like my colleague on this side of the House, I think that one of the difficulties concerns our own tax and tariff laws. Allow me to quote part of a letter dated September 29, 1976, which originated from the office of the Minister of National Revenue (Miss Bégin). Knowing and admiring the minister as I do, I know she did not write the letter itself. Obviously it was written by a bureaucrat. It reads in part:

We have endeavoured to follow the standards of the community at large and as a result, these standards of acceptance for publications entering Canada have become much more liberal over the past few years.

The author of the letter confused "liberal" with "libertine". I happen to be proudly liberal, but am decidedly not a libertine.

After receipt of this letter, and following the campaign to which my colleague on this side referred, on December 10 a