

*Criminal Code*

ment of the people, and to work for a better distribution of food, of work and of wealth. Let it not be said finally that we are merely legalizing what is being done anyway. This argument is pragmatism at its lowest and its very worst, and unworthy of public mention, unworthy of representatives and unworthy of this house. Such an argument could extend to anything, for instance to a certification of firearms and their indiscriminate use, and we would then witness assassination and mass murder. How pragmatic can we get?

The answer to the problem of poverty, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. We must increase the supply of food and jobs, and certainly not decrease the population. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, not wishing to emphasize the obvious, I oppose this bill in practice, on principle and in all conscience.

**Mr. Charles J. M. Willoughby (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion I did so because I support the amendment and consider the act as it now reads as being a serious hypocrisy. The law as the act now stands is not being enforced, which makes the hypocrisy even more obvious. I feel this bill involves a great national issue and affects the enforcement of law and order not only in this regard but in regard to other laws, and leads to a disregard for laws generally.

This bill also has some international implication. The last speaker made a very pertinent remark when he suggested one of our duties in this country involves the distribution of food. I do not intend to go into this subject in detail, but I wonder whether he is aware of the fact that the world population today is almost three billion, that four out of every five deaths in the world today are directly or indirectly the result of lack of proper nourishment, and that empty stomachs know no laws? I am sure he is aware that communism thrives when stomachs are empty. Statistics have been presented which indicate that in 40 years the population of this continent will have doubled, and that in 65 years, at the present rate of growth, the world population will be in the neighbourhood of 50 billion. To support the population expected in the United States within 25 or 30 years that country will have to find 400 million more arable acres of land.

**Mr. Habel:** Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he not now, by the remarks he is making, departing from what the hon. member who sponsored the bill said was not its concern, namely the world population?

**Mr. Willoughby:** I recognize the fact that this bill does not directly implicate world population, but how can we assist the world population conscientiously while at the same time remaining hypocrites in our own country? We must increase the world food supply. I suggest there are only two ways out of the problem created by world population explosions. One is to create more arable land and grow more agricultural products—growing four blades of grass where only one grows now—or assist in curtailing the increase in the world population. How can we do this with conscience and yet remain hypocrites? Canada has ample space and an ample food supply, but we have an international duty.

I suggest the problem envisaged by the mover of this bill is not a religious one. I have the greatest respect for any religion and would be the last one to criticize, but because of our hypocritical attitude, if the law involved was enforced most medical men and druggists at the present time would be in jail. How ridiculous can a situation become? No one is permitted to accept advice in respect of contraceptives as the law is now, and no one will be compelled to accept that advice if and when the law is changed. Let us put all the cards on the table rather than pushing some of them under it.

I should like to conclude by endorsing the remarks of the proposer of this bill, and by emphasizing at the present time that most religious organizations in Canada are prepared to support the amendment. The Canadian bar association has recommended that this amendment be made. The Canadian medical association has also recommended that this amendment be made. Most religious bodies, if they have not endorsed the amendment, do approve of family planning.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, on the average family planning has not curtailed the number of children in most families in Canada. It has been done in such a way that it has been for the benefit not only of the parents but also of the children. The result is that on the average Canadian families are larger today than they were before this subject was ever introduced. There is nothing to worry about on that score.

As a medical man, the big factor so far as I am concerned is that this type of proper instruction will overcome the terrible illegal abortions that are performed. I do not think we should overlook that fact for one minute. I endorse the bill because the present provision in the act is hypocritical and a real farce. The amendment is endorsed by all the