

Supply—Justice

Mr. Drew: We are not dealing with individuals. We are dealing with the principle of carrying this case to a court where the minister thought that cases should not longer be carried. In this particular case the minister did say exactly what the hon. member for Lake Centre interpreted in his own words at the outset, and it is found at page 73 of *Hansard* of the autumn session of 1949. The minister said:

Indeed, sir, we desire in our supreme court to emulate that greatness—

He is referring to the privy council.

—as a court of ultimate exclusive appellate jurisdiction; and we think that the best, if not the only way, in which we can begin to do so, is to make our own supreme court also one of exclusive appellate and ultimate jurisdiction, by passing the bill we now have before us.

In other words, to give our own supreme court its dignity we must stop going to the privy council. Then in his closing remarks he said:

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have here a country which from the beginning has had many qualities of greatness, which is more united, magnanimous and powerful today than it has ever been, and whose resources and possibilities seem to require only that we should ourselves act as the citizens of a great country to make our Canada achieve the destiny of which she is capable. We, the citizens of such a country, should not ask those of another, even though they be of our own blood, to decide our lawsuits for us, interpret for us the laws which we pass here, and provide amendments for our constitution at our request when we need them.

The same minister who said that on September 20, 1949, now says that they seek a definitive judgment to interpret our laws for us. What is more, the same minister has indicated that in addition they are making public, at the time that this case is *sub judice*, the threat that no matter what the decision is they will take care of it anyway. If that is consistent with an approach to our judicial processes, then I think that we still have a great deal to learn in this country about the dignity of our courts. In any event, whether or not this case proceeds, the minister has one course before him which he could well adopt to be consistent with what he has said before. He could make it perfectly clear that he has no thought of carrying out the threat that he made in saying: Unless we get what we want at the privy council then we will ride high, wide and handsome over the laws as they have been interpreted by this final court of appeal.

Mr. Wylie: Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I speak in the house, and I have no intention of getting into an argument with the Minister of Justice. I also have no intention of delaying the house, but I have a problem that I think should be brought before

[Mr. Garson.]

the Minister of Justice. I regret having to wait until the last day of the session to discuss it.

An hon. Member: So do we.

Mr. Wylie: However, it has happened that the minister's estimates have come up on the last day. The matter has to do with comics, sex comics, crime comics, or whatever you might call them. Perhaps the Minister of Justice knows something about what has developed in Medicine Hat during the past two months so far as crime comics are concerned. Possibly I could discuss this matter under a particular item but as it is fairly general I feel I am quite in order now. We have got into a situation where I feel something should be done about it. It will be recalled that I took an active part in trying to get crime comics and sexy comics banned in Canada. I certainly appreciated what the government did in 1949 to do away with many comics that were on our newsstands.

However, what has happened today is that they have changed the outside cover while the inside is still the same. In Medicine Hat we have a news agent who is very well known and is a highly respected citizen. He had no intention of making money out of sex comics as they were published before 1949. Mr. Watson has the same idea today. I admire him for it, but just because he has refused to handle some publications put out by certain firms in Toronto he is going to lose the handling of many good publications. I am going to refer to a few of the publications that he is liable to lose. I have two letters here that I might read to the minister. However, I am sure he will give the matter consideration without my wasting time doing that. This man is liable to lose the handling of *Time*, *Life*, *Newsweek*, *Look*, *Popular Mechanics*, *Field and Stream*, *Collier's*, *Woman's Home Companion* and *American*. Those are just a few. I should like to read to the minister what I have on file.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Wylie: You can yell "carried" all you like but it will not make any difference to me. It seems to me that there is a monopoly in comics and magazines in Canada. I think it is about time that the government, through the Minister of Justice, did something about it so that news agents in our cities will not be compelled to handle all this—I do not know just what word to use; I know what I should like to use.

Mr. Knowles: Trash.

Mr. Wylie: Yes, trash, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says. I do not think our news agents should be compelled to