

Mr. ENNS: Oh, yes. Perhaps we should take the approach in Mr. Prittie's bill rather than the approach in Mr. Basford's bill. Of course Mr. Basford agrees with this himself. This is why I say the committee is in some difficulty.

● (12: 00 noon)

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind the committee they are not considering or debating the bills but the subject of the bills, which is birth control in its widest form. The bills represent two different approaches to the same problem.

Mr. ENNS: Beyond this I did want to say that I was very impressed with Mr. Basford's argument that this certainly does apply to the question of population control and, in this sense, I think he has given the discussion of this committee a wider dimension than was probably intended earlier by Mr. Prittie. I think the significant statements made as far as they affect Canada's foreign policy in this regard is very interesting to myself.

Mr. PRITTIE: May I make a comment there? I still do not think the question of world population, in which I am interested, is too relevant to the subject matter of these bills, but since Mr. Basford introduced it I will say that Canada, in fact, has changed its position. I first became interested in this subject when I was parliamentary observer at the United Nations in December 1962. I noticed Canada abstained when a resolution on this subject came up but in Geneva last July at the meeting of the Economic and Social Council a permissive type of resolution was introduced which authorized the Economic and Social Council and its agencies to give this kind of aid and Canada did vote in favour. And, as Mr. Basford mentioned, a similar resolution came up at the United Nations in New York in December, 1965. The resolution was postponed until the next General Assembly, but the Canadian delegate announced that Canada was prepared to vote for it, so in fact we have changed our position in the external field.

Mr. BRAND: I will say at the outset that I support the idea of legalizing what has in fact become common practice the dissemination of this information but Mr. Prittie's bill is really a broad bill. You are leaving it wide open, Mr. Prittie, for all the other methods—and we see lots of them in the medical profession—coming across from Germany and the United States, other quasi methods of contraception which are being sold, and I personally would not like to see this field completely wide open to methods which are not approved by medical associations or others of this nature. Here it is completely wide open if you take this out of the bill. I favour the idea that this is one place where guidelines may be suitable. I think we go along with Mr. Stanbury's bill. He and Mr. Basford refer to the people who might be allowed to disseminate this information and Mr. Stanbury's bill probably has a little more merit to it. I would not like to see it wide open to every quack in the business to come up with some method of contraception. This is in fact what you are doing.

Mr. PRITTIE: Are you referring to surgical methods such as vasectomy?

Mr. BRAND: No, not necessarily. I am referring to other methods that are sold—I have seen them; as a matter of fact I have some of them—which are purported to be methods of preventing conception. They are illegal and they