

tives to minors, and it is being done all the time, then I think we should not legislate. So these two additional reasons would, I think, prevent a distinction such as you mention.

Mr. ALLMAND: The other bills would allow advertising and supplying of information to all people, whether they were married or not, by family planning agencies or by medical journals and nurses in hospitals, and so forth, but it seems the other bills will not allow the propagation of this information to popular magazines in a way which might, I would think, undermine the family life of Canada because if you could advertise in an unlimited way and a cheap way in all types of magazines you might, I think, promote a society in which married life might just not exist because people might not bother getting married.

Mr. WAHN: I understand it might be possible to advertise in such a way as to be considered almost indecent or obscene. That is undoubtedly prohibited under other sections of the Criminal Code now. If advertising took place in such a way as to violate the sections dealing with obscene literature this would cover that particular point. It might not be a complete answer but it is a partial answer to the problem you raised.

Mr. PRITTE: May I comment on the last question? I do not know how you can regulate advertising in the way Mr. Wahn has just mentioned. Here is an article mentioned the other day which is in *Le Devoir*, surely a responsible journal, on how to obtain information on family planning. The article tells where to write in Montreal for it. So there is nothing wrong with this at all, an article telling how to get information. It is a straightforward article.

Mr. ALLMAND: What date?

Mr. PRITTE: February 15, 1966 in *Le Devoir*. There is nothing wrong with that but if you have an absolute prohibition on advertising then you prohibit this. It seems to me that the only way you could do it would be under the sections of the Criminal Code dealing with obscene literature.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen and ladies, if there are no further questions at this time perhaps we should move on to the next witness and I would ask Mr. Wahn to remain. There may be further questions he might like to comment on later. I would like to introduce Mr. Stanbury to discuss Bill No. C-22

Mr. STANBURY: Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the committee, I am the only one of the sponsors of these bills who has the privilege of sitting on the committee as well as being a witness, so I am not going to take advantage of that situation by making any complete argument on the bills at this time. I think as a member of the committee it is my duty to maintain an open mind and that I propose to do, but I would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Prittie for the ground work he has been doing for a long time in bringing this matter to the attention of parliament. As a new member, I felt strongly that parliament should be considering this problem and my bill represents an effort to try to ensure that it would be faced by parliament. I hope that it like the other bills, will be a stimulus for discussion and action.

I am not going to suggest that most people in Canada feel that this is a problem. I am only going to say that I feel it is. I feel that the law has fallen into disrepute and, as a lawyer as well as a legislator, I think this is to be regretted and demands correction. But, on the other hand, I think there has been a great deal of exaggeration of the extent to which the law has been