

those two bills. Apart from the reasons stated by Mr. Prittie, my bill makes no provision for the position of manufacturers of contraceptive devices, or contraceptive pharmaceuticals and it makes no provision either for their operation or for the dissemination of information on their product in even medical journals or pharmaceutical journals. The amendment proposed by myself has no provision for sale by way of wholesale those manufactures and, of course, there should be a legitimate operation.

There are many reasons why I have put this bill in and why I am interested in this subject. The committee will wish to go into and hear experts on all of those matters, but perhaps I might summarize my own views and deal with one situation that Mr. Prittie did not deal with. Surely, this is a question of private morality; a private matter between husband and wife; a matter for their own consciences and their own morality. Surely it can only generate contempt for our law when we have a law on the statute books which is daily not being observed by great sections of our population, and when it is not being observed even by our own government in its Food and Drug Directorate which authorizes and licences the manufacture and sale of, for example, the now well known contraceptive pill. Yet while the Food and Drug Director authorizes its manufacture and distribution, according to the Criminal Code, it is illegal to sell it. I would think the committee would want to examine the relationship between family size and poverty, and the statistics which indicate that there is a definite relationship between them. The committee will want to consider whether this is not a matter of private religious freedom among those who want to practise family planning, and that now when most of our major Protestant churches urge their members and parishioners that it is their moral duty to plan their families responsibly we have an act which prevents them from doing it.

I want to deal with the provisions of the Criminal Code and their effect on the foreign policy of Canada which I do not think the committee can completely ignore. While I agree entirely with what Mr. Prittie has said, I do disagree with one statement to the effect that we are not concerned here with the population explosion, or with the world situation.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are, because I think that the provisions in our Criminal Code have been instrumental in affecting Canada's foreign policy at the United Nations and at other international agencies. The position of Canada at the United Nations and in international agencies towards providing technical assistance for population studies and population planning to those countries that wanted such assistance has been negative and timid to say the least. Whenever this subject came before the United Nations in the past we have abstained on every resolution dealing with it until last December when it was indicated we would support a resolution that provided technical assistance in population studies to those countries desirous of receiving it. I suggest to a great extent this policy of Canada outside of Canada has been governed by our own domestic law and surely we are not in a position to assist or advise other countries who may wish assistance or advice on matters which our own law says is illegal in Canada. As a result of that law, at the United Nations and the specialized agencies we have a completely negative point of view, and have in no way endeavoured to initiate any assistance to countries. I am not a specialist in world population, I am not a demographer, but I have a few figures which I find disturbing. In 1961 the world population was increasing by 1.7 per cent; in 1962 it was up to 1.8 per cent; and 1963, 2.1 per cent. In parts of Latin America