March 1, 1966

sneak in the back way to try to get you to sell them now, and to try to tell people about them. You are opening the way for quackery here, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. PRITTIE: May I say that probably quackery exists now and should not be condoned. Perhaps one approach might be for the Food and Drug Directorate to be given the responsibility for approving any type of contraceptive method. For example, they would only deal at the moment with pills because there are chemical elements there, but it seems to me that most types of contraception used would not cause any problems. In fact I am not sure of what types of contraception you may be referring to here but you could designate federal agencies such as the Food and Drug Directorate to pass upon any type of contraceptive method made available to the public in Canada. At the moment they are just dealing with pills because there is a chemical element involved.

Mr. BRAND: What I would like to see is some method of deciding which one would be legal, in other words. This is wide open.

Mr. PRITTIE: Somebody, then, has to decide. You have to give the responsibility to someone.

Mr. BRAND: Yes.

Mr. RYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if we might not go too far afield in this. We are just dealing with the general principle. This has to go back to the house with our recommendation, as I understand it. If I am wrong you may so advise. Those legal points would all have to be ironed out in the House.

Mr. PRITTIE: I would think, Mr. Chairman, you might want to call the people from the Department of Justice and ask them about these points.

The CHAIRMAN: I should tell the committee that I have attempted to hold conversations with the Minister of Justice and his department but it is rather difficult at the present time with the estimates before the House.

Mr. RYNARD: That is correct. This has to go back to the House and ours is just a general recommendation.

Mr. ENNS: This does not mean the committee cannot consider the legal question. We can recommend limitations and Dr. Brand's point can be included in our consideration.

Mr. RYNARD: The legality of it can be brought up in the House later.

Mrs. MACINNIS (Vancouver-Kingsway): I would like to ask both Mr. Prittie and Mr. Basford whether they have had any indications from organizations within Canada on whether it would be better to cut this out of the Criminal Code altogether or whether they feel that a limited form is better for handling it. I refer to such organizations in the field of Family Planning, the Bar Association, and others.

Mr. BASFORD: The only indication I have is from the Family Planning Bureau of Toronto which, in so far as the four bills were concerned, supported Mr. Prittie's approach over the other approaches and adopted my position.

Mrs. MACINNIS (Vancouver-Kingsway): On what grounds, if I may ask?

Mr. BASFORD: They felt as I feel that this was not really a proper subject for the Criminal Code. If you are going to control advertising you do not do it