

NEWSLETTER



FALL

1984

Doctors on Trial in Toronto

The long awaited constitutional judgment in the Morgentaler clinic trial was delivered in Toronto on July 20, 1984. Associate Chief Justice Parker of the Supreme Court of Ontario dismissed defence counsel Morris Manning's motion to quash the indictment charging Drs. Morgentaler, Scott and Smoling with conspiracy to procure a miscarriage, contrary to Section 251 of the Criminal Code. Ten separate arguments had been advanced in the attempt to persuade the court that the abortion law is unconstitutional.

Because the validity of this law was upheld, the doctors must now go to trial. Manning launched an appeal of this decision to the Ontario Court of Appeal but it refused to consider the matter at this stage of the proceedings.

Decision Disappointing

The decision was a tremendous disappointment to all of us. Our hopes of seeing this unjust and unworkable law declared inoperative were destroyed by the result, and a reading of the 96-page judgment was frustrating because of the conservative, legalistic analysis used to justify the present law, and disturbing because of its implications for women's rights. In previous issues of the Newsletter we have written about some of the evidence that was led in support of the motion and the arguments that were made. In his



Pro-Choice supporters rallied outside the Mergentaler Clinic in Toronto on July 20, 1984.

reasons for judgment Mr. Justice Parker considered the arguments in a virtual vacuum. He did not deny the evidence as to the difficulties faced by women but he did not consider it relevant to a determination of the issue.

The inequities that exist, due to the variations in access across the country, were, according to Mr. Justice Parker, matters for Parliament alone to address. In finding that there is no violation of the right to equality before the law, as guaranteed by the **Bill of Rights**, he held that the law was valid because it was not discriminatory on its face. The court, he said could not consider the application of the law.

In the American constitution a right to privacy which encompasses a woman's right to choose an abortion has been found to be implied by the right to personal liberty. Our

[Continued on page 3]

In this Issue	
Message from the President	2
Features	
Doctors on Trial in Toronto	1
Election Notebook	4
Catholics Divided Over Fertility Control	5
Canadians Want Sex Ed	14
Controversy at World Population Conference	6
News	
Across Canada	8
Around the World	10
Reviews	
Books and Film	12
From Our Readers	
You Asked Us	11
You Told Us	7

Message from the President

You've probably noticed some changes in our newsletter this time - table of contents, better organization, new features, etc. This change is due, in large measure to the things you told us in our "supporter survey" of March 1984. Many of you said the newsletter was just great, that you read it from cover to cover, and that you relied on it to give you news of the abortion issue that you got nowhere else. This was particularly true of our members in smaller cities and towns where coverage is scant and often badly slanted against a woman's right to make the abortion decision.

The features you particularly liked were **Around the World** and **Across Canada**. You expressed your appreciation for sample letters and instructions on how to address and mail them. We've included one this time along with a new instruction sheet for addressing and mailing letters.

Some of you said you were so busy that you didn't have time to read the newsletter at all. Some of you said you thought it was too long. (I suspect this comment also came from busy people!) Some of you loved the tone and writing style and others didn't. Some chastised us for being too extreme, and others said we were not forceful enough.

Some said we were too feminist, and others not feminist enough.

When discussing your comments at a Board of Directors meeting, Board members agreed that the survey impressed upon us the diversity of our membership. It's clear that CARAL supporters are involved, caring, and intelligent, and definitely **not** homogeneous, except on the basic issue of a woman's right to make the abortion decision, free of interference by Church or state, and once that decision is made, the right to safe, legal abortion in humane and dignified surroundings.

We learned that we won't be able to please **all** of you **all** of the time. But we hope that your commitment to freedom of choice is strong enough that you'll stick by us—even if we don't always do things exactly as you would have done them. And by all means let us hear from you. We need your input.

More about survey results

Let me tell you a bit more about our survey results. A random sampling of the returns yielded some interesting information. Compared to the Canadian population, you are better educated and earn more money, and at least half of you are profes-

sionals. You read more magazines and journals than the general population, and if your record of charitable donation and support for social causes is any indication, you are more caring and socially aware.

CARAL supporters are found among all political persuasions, and as for religion, while many professed no affiliation at all, many indicated affiliation with the Protestant, Jewish and the Catholic religion. In relation to the total population, there is a higher proportion of women members, (is this a surprise?) and more of you live in cities.

One of our Board members undertook to read every questionnaire during her summer holidays.

She tells me the experience was remarkable and gratifying. Your comments were exhilarating, poignant, and provocative. You'll find some of them elsewhere in the Newsletter.

In response to our survey question "Is there anything you want to tell CARAL", one of you wrote "PERSIST". I want to assure you that persist we will! And triumph too, with your help.

Houma Scarborough

A Letter to Brian Mulroney

Enclosed with this issue is a letter to the new Prime Minister. As you know politicians pay far more attention to personal rather than form letters. This is why we ask you, if you possibly can, to re-write or re-type the sample letter, changing it as you wish to reflect your own personal style.

Failing that, add a few personal comments to the sample letter before sending it, and failing that, send the letter as is. **But do send it.** If all of you do, it can make a difference. Better still, copy the letter and get friends and relatives to send it too. Remember: **NO STAMP NEEDED.**

You and Direct Mail

Many of you joined CARAL through our direct mail program, but you may not be aware that we occasionally trade our mailing list with other groups. We do this in order to get names of others who may be interested in learning about CARAL, and this practice has been very successful for us. In turn, you learn about other groups whose work you may be interested in. We limit the number of trades we do to a few non-profit organizations each year on a one-time basis. However, if you do not want your name included in any trades, please notify our office in writing.

Pro-Choice Defence Fund

The response to our recent special appeal for funds was gratifying and we thank all those who responded to the letter from June Callwood. Of course, our need is an ongoing one, and the Fund will require further donations if we are to meet the continuing expenses involved in the legal proceedings.

All contributions are greatly appreciated and we urge those of you who belong to groups that could engage in some fund-raising activity to help. Whatever you can do will mean a lot to us.

Doctors on Trial

(continued from Page 1)

Charter of Rights guarantees "liberty and security of the person" but Mr. Justice Parker refused to find that such rights would encompass reproductive freedom. He said that in determining the meaning of our **Charter** we must have regard for "our traditions" and whether the right which is being claimed is so "deeply rooted in the conscience and traditions of our country as to be ranked as fundamental."

Only "Traditional" Rights Protected

He went on to say "the decision to marry and have children might be guaranteed constitutional protection because they are considered deeply rooted in our traditions, and fundamental to our way of life." Abortion having been prohibited in Canada for over 100 years, and having been permitted since 1969 only under limited circumstances, "no unfettered legal right to an abortion is deeply rooted in the traditions or conscience of this country." In relation to the argument that s.251 contravenes the right not to be subjected to "cruel and unusual treatment or punishment" Mr. Justice Parker said that the uncontradicted evidence of delays in the abortion procedure leading to medically more dangerous and psychologically more stressful operations, the need for women to travel out of their own communities for abortions, and the fact that women who cannot get abortions are forced to bear unwanted children, raised disturbing questions about the operation of this law. But, he said, the law is not a violation of the **Charter of Rights** because women who suffer hardships in these circumstances are not being willfully subjected by the state to a specified course of conduct. It is the women themselves who choose to seek abortions.

Freedom of conscience as a basis for the right to choose was also rejected in this decision. There was evidence that for adherents of some religions the decision to abort is a matter of informed conscience and

in taking away this right of self-determination the law is denying a woman her fundamental humanity. But Mr. Justice Parker decided that "conscience", in the Charter, means "religious conscience" and he distinguished fundamental doctrines or tenets of a religion from policy positions flowing therefrom.

The latter, he said, are **not** protected by the Charter, and the proper forum for debate by religious groups, on issues of this nature, is the political one. Unfortunately, no government has yet shown enough concern for the plight of Canadian women, and enough courage to stand up to the anti-choice lobby, to repeal this law. Anti-choice groups, of course, hailed the decision as a victory. But, in truth, the judgment rejected the defence submissions without, in any way relying on the "rights of the unborn."

As some commentators pointed out, the Court's recognition of the rights to marriage and childbirth is somewhat one-sided in its emphasis. Remaining single and childless are practices with a history as long as the history of marriage and childbirth. And if traditions must be "deeply rooted" to be protected by the Charter, then it will not be a tool which courts can employ to strike down legislation which offends our sense of fairness, so long as the injustice which is perpetuated has existed for many years.

Reactions Across the Nation

In Toronto a press conference was held with representation from the Ontario Federation of Labour, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, and the New Democratic Party, as well as CARAL, the Pro-Choice Defence Fund and the Ontario Coalition for Abortion Clinics. Dr. Morgentaler deplored the cowardice of Canadian politicians who lack the courage to act on views held by the majority of the population. Judy Rebick of OCAC spoke of the sexist traditions that underlie Mr. Justice Parker's reasoning, and June Callwood appealed for funds with which to continue the legal battle. Marion Bryden, NDP MPP for Beaches-Woodbine (Ontario) spoke very honestly and courageously of her convictions.

She said that as a Catholic she would personally never choose abortion, but that she nonetheless respects and supports every woman's right to make the choice herself. Later that day, a rally was held outside the clinic on Harbord Street in Toronto. Again spokespersons for CARAL, OCAC and NAC voiced their anger and disappointment over this decision, as well as their continued belief that with the support of the majority the pro-choice movement will triumph.

In Winnipeg pro-choice supporters rallied at the Legislative Buildings, and vowed to fight even harder. Elaine Newman called the decision a direct attack on equal rights for women. In Victoria, Jennifer Lowen spoke of how Canada lags far behind much of the world in liberalizing abortion laws.

In Moncton an hour-long candlelight vigil was held to protest the decision. Women and men participated, and Marie-Ange Fournier said that the time has come for politicians to recognize the right to freedom of choice and to stop "treating women like they have some sort of emotional handicap." In Sudbury Carolyn Campbell called the result disappointing and emphasized the need for money with which to carry on the struggle. In Kitchener-Waterloo Barbara Saunders called on all those who support choice to "stand up and be counted" and not to be intimidated by the tactics of the "no-choice" people. These were but some of the reactions.

Many supporters were generous in giving to CARAL and to the Pro-Choice Defence Fund, in the days immediately following July 20. One of our members enclosed with her cheque, a letter saying "It is more than I can afford, but this issue is so supremely and fundamentally important, that I feel I must support you all (and all women) to my utmost ability." Another member wrote to Dr. Morgentaler saying that he had followed accounts of the struggle in Quebec in the 70's and that "I was young, naive and had no real commitment then but I do remember feeling that the only criminal act was the incarceration of a professional who dared to bring abortion out into the open."

The trial resumed on October 15.

Anti-Choice Lobby Gets Free Broadcast Time During Election Campaign

A loophole in the Canada Elections Act was used by Campaign Life to obtain free air time to promote their anti-abortion message. The Elections Act permits any registered political party to claim free time even if it fields no candidates in the election. It also permits that party to buy additional time on the major networks on the same terms as parties with candidates. Pro Life, a group affiliated with Campaign Life, was permitted 2.75 minutes of free time on both CBC and CTV.

CARAL protested to the appropriate government officials, strongly suggesting that the Elections Act be changed to prevent such abuse of the democratic process. President Norma Scarborough also corresponded with the networks about the lack of balance resulting from the airing of these anti-choice commercials.

It is probable that the Act will be amended prior to the next federal election. As it now stands, a party has only to signal its **intention** to run candidates in order to get free time. Pro Life's opportunism in using this flaw in the Act to get free time so shocked a **Toronto Star** columnist who is usually sympathetic to the anti-choice movement that he enjoined them to give up the free time.

Catholics Told How to Vote

During the recent election Larry Henderson, editor of the Catholic Register, told his readers to stay away from the polls if they couldn't find a candidate who supported a "free vote" in Parliament on the question of abortion.

This directive seems to have dismayed many Catholics and caught the hierarchy of the Church off guard. Except for the Bishops of Manitoba and Hamilton who urged their flock to consider abortion the major issue and to vote for "pro-life" candidates only.

The Bishops were taken to task by a priest in Toronto who concluded a "commentary" for CBC Sunday Morning by saying: "For my part,

having tried to examine candidates and parties on a whole host of political, economic and social positions, I am actively working on the campaign of a candidate who is pro-choice but whose overall record on the struggle for peace and justice, in Canada and abroad, was exemplary during the last Parliament. I firmly believe that I am making a sound moral choice."

Anti-Choice Intimidation Tactics Prove Ineffective

In every election the anti-choice lobby embarks on a campaign of intimidation and harassment of candidates. And after every campaign they claim to have been instrumental in the defeat of some pro-choice candidates, and responsible for the election of anti-choice candidates. This is, in truth, more wishful thinking and bravado than reality.

In this election, the reality is that probably no single-issue group can claim responsibility for electing or defeating any candidates. People decided it was time for a change, and in most cases issues were not important.

We do know, however, that some rabidly anti-choice members of the last House went down to defeat and some good strong pro-choice members were re-elected. Gone are Dr. Stan Hudecki and Garnet Bloomfield, Liberal MPs who voted against their own government in the constitutional debate because the Charter of Rights didn't specifically give personhood to embryos and fetuses.

And in spite of being targeted by anti-choice groups, candidates like Don Johnston and Lucie Pepin in Quebec, Neil Young, Lynn MacDonald and Flora MacDonald in Ontario, and Svend Robinson and Margaret Mitchell in BC were all elected handily.

Moving?

If you are moving, please let us know. Include your name, old address and new address so we can identify you correctly. And if you know your new phone number please send that too.

Much Hard Work Ahead for Pro-Choice Canadians

The composition of the House has changed dramatically. Many former members were defeated and new members will be taking their places in the House when Parliament reconvenes in November. With the huge Conservative majority we cannot expect a highly sympathetic response, even though the Prime Minister has acknowledged the inequality of access under the current legislation. Many of the Conservative MPs have been endorsed by "Coalition for Life" as being "pro-life." Jake Epp, the new Minister of Health, is one of these as are Sinclair Stevens, James McGrath, and David Kilgour to name only a few. The job of CARAL and all pro-choice groups and individuals will be to impress upon the House the importance of a humane and rational policy on fertility control. And we must make sure that we work together with all like-minded groups to make the voice of the majority heard or we stand to lose what limited access we have.

Where Does Your MP Stand?

The best way to find out where your MP stands on freedom of choice is to write him or her a letter stating your position and asking for a reply. It doesn't matter if you know him to be anti-choice. He needs to know where his constituents stand. Use our literature to formulate your letters and begin a dialogue with your MP. And send us copies of anything you think we should know.

Thanks to CARAL Members for Questioning Candidates

Thanks to you we were able to determine the position of most of the candidates in the election — with the exception of Quebec. We thank you for returning your completed questionnaires and other bits of useful information (clippings, letters, etc). The next step is to write the newly elected Member of Parliament.

Catholics Divided Over Fertility Control

The first pope ever to visit Canada travelled from coast to coast in September of this year. Among the issues that Pope John Paul II addressed were such matters as controversy within the Church as homosexuality, celibacy, ordination of women, birth control and abortion. Restrictions on the practicing of natural means of birth control, the rectitude of "married celibacy," and the right to life from the moment of conception were all urged upon Roman Catholics by the Pope. Yet the majority of Catholics do not practice what the Pope preaches. Nor has the Church's position on abortion always been the same as that of today's Pope. The history of abortion in the Catholic Church shows changes in doctrine over the years. The belief that abortion is a serious sin and grounds for excommunication has only been part of official Church discipline since 1869 and a strong minority of theologians today believe that this view is based on faulty theology and that abortion is permissible in the early stages of pregnancy.

Polls conducted on the abortion issue among Catholics have shown that there is great division within the Church. In a 1982 Gallup poll, 64% of American Catholics said that they were opposed to "a ban on all abortion." Clearly the Pope's views are so out of touch with the modern world that they serve to alienate Catholics rather than to attract and unify adherents.

Catholic Women Leave Church

Prior to the Pope's arrival in Canada a coalition of Francophone women called upon other Roman Catholic women to denounce the Church because of its stand on birth control, abortion, divorce, homosexuality and the role of women in

the Church. Over 2,400 women signed such a petition and 1,140 of them announced their decision to withdraw from the Roman Catholic Church because of its "anti-women" law and teachings. Montreal residents forwarded their baptismal certificates to the head of that Archdiocese.

In the United States, Catholics for a Free Choice* have dismissed the current Pope's attitudes toward abortion as theologically unsound. Recently, CFFC and Daniel Maguire, a theology professor and former priest, issued a press release supporting the position of the Democratic vice-presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro. Ms Ferraro has been targeted by the anti-choice faction because of her courageous stand on this issue. She is a practising Catholic who says she would refuse abortion for herself but fully supports freedom of choice.

It is not surprising that in Europe and North America the Pope's words go unheeded by many. But what is frightening is the fact that in Third World countries with large Catholic populations he has considerable impact. In relation to impoverished nations with scarce resources, and human suffering exacerbated by overpopulation, the Pope's opposition to family planning is terribly misguided and dangerous.

The ongoing debate with the Church is unlikely to be resolved during this Pope's tenure. His intransigence on fertility control ensures that the gap between John Paul II and lay Catholics will be difficult to bridge.

**For more information on Catholics for a Free Choice please write to 2008 Seventeenth St. NW, Washington, DC 2009, USA. They have several excellent publications, and a regular periodical as well as memberships for Catholics and non-Catholic supporters.*

New Chapter

We are pleased to announce that Abortion by Choice in Edmonton, Alberta, formerly a member group, has now become a CARAL Chapter. Their address appears on the back page of this Newsletter. Those of you who live in the Edmonton area are encouraged to get in touch with them and to become involved in their ongoing activities.

Slide-tape Show Available

CARAL National has a nine-minute presentation which includes 99 slides and a 35mm carousel slide tray and a soundtrack on cassette. The tape has both audible and inaudible signals for use in automatic advance AV cassette recorders or manually with any cassette recorder. A 35mm Kodak carousel type projector and a cassette tape recorder are required for viewing. This program can be rented from the CARAL office for \$10 plus postage and insurance. It is available for two-week periods or by special arrangement.

Order by form below or call us at [416] 961-1507.

Name of Group or Individual

Address where slide-tape show to be sent

Name and telephone number of contact person

Date Needed

Date to be Returned

Controversy at World Population Conference

An anti-abortion stand taken by the American delegation at the International Conference on Population in August caused considerable controversy at the United Nations sponsored event in Mexico City. Representatives of 148 countries as well as various government organizations were in attendance and not surprisingly, there was little support for the Reagan administration's desire to impose its ideology on other nations. But with the United States as a contributor of one-quarter of worldwide aid spent on family planning activities, there was tremendous concern such programs might be jeopardized.

The largest organization that stands to be affected by the U.S. position is International Planned Parenthood which receives about \$12 million yearly from the American government. This comprises nearly 25% of its total budget, less than 1% of which is spent in support of abortion. Conservative estimates suggest that 84,000 women die each year because of illegal abortions, and demographers warned that the number would rise if access became more restrictive.

Global Population Increases Rapidly

Since the last population conference in 1974 the world's population has increased from 4 billion to about 4.8 billion. Experts predict that by the year 2,000 the world will have 6 billion people and that roughly 90% of the population growth will occur in the underdeveloped nations of the Third World. Although the annual growth rate has slowed from 2% in 1974 to 1.7% in the last year, the difference is primarily due to programs in China and India. But in portions of Africa fertility rates have **increased** over the past decade. The average number of children born to a woman in Kenya is now 8. In Bangladesh it is 6.3, and in India it is 4.7. In contrast to these figures, the

fertility rate in the USSR is 2.4, in the United States 1.8, and in Western Europe 1.6.

The consequences of a failure to stabilize the world's population at a manageable level are foreshadowed by developments in many overpopulated areas. Uncontrolled urban growth, inadequate food supplies, shortages in housing, dangerous levels of pollution, environmental hazards, sickness and premature death, high rates of unemployment and crime, and authoritarian government are only some of the problems already manifest.

The Reagan administration, in its policy statement released one month before the Conference, called abortion an "unnecessary and repugnant" method of population control. Its delegate at the Conference, James Buckley, began by announcing that U.S. funds would only be made available to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities if assurances were given that none of the money would be used for population control programs including abortion. Prior to the conference, CARAL wrote to the head of the Canadian delegation, Senator Lorna Marsden, expressing concern over the U.S. position and urging her to protest this imposition of Ronald Reagan's personal morality on other nations. Without making specific reference to abortion, Senator Marsden did indicate that "In relation specifically to family planning activities, Canada recognizes the right of sovereign governments to develop their own national policies".

The U.S., on the other hand, urged "capitalist policies" upon conference delegates as the most effective means of controlling growth and improving standards of living all across the world. But the Population Crisis Committee, a Washington-based organization, argued that in Mexico where incomes rose in the 1960's no significant decline in the birth rate occurred until the inception of a

government sponsored family-planning program. And in countries such as Thailand and Indonesia, where incomes are still quite low, family planning programs have resulted in lower birth rates. The American position was also criticized by experts such as Leon Tabah, former director of the U.N. population division, Sheldon Segal, director of population sciences at the Rockefeller Foundation, Carmen Miro, recipient (with Mr. Segal) of a U.N. award for population control work, Robert McNamara, former World Bank president and U.S. Secretary for Defence, and A. W. Clausen, current World Bank President.

In the end, after nine days of discussion and debate, compromises were reached on many of the thorny issues that had divided participants. Eighty-eight recommendations revising the World Population Plan of Action were approved, and a 23 point Declaration was issued. A resolution that governments help women avoid abortion "which in no case should be promoted as a method of family planning" was approved. A previous statement of this position made reference to "illegal abortion" and the deletion of "illegal" was the concession which the U.S.A., supported by the Holy See, succeeded in obtaining. Only the Swedish delegation expressed its concern over the amendment, and in an addendum to the statement referred to the serious health hazard posed by illegal abortions, and reiterated its position that a major step toward elimination of illegal abortions is the provision of safe, legal ones.

The UNFPA agreed that it would not allocate any of its funds to programs promoting abortions and consequently, it received \$19 million dollars from the U.S. at the close of the conference. But the question of funding for IPPF and other family planning agencies remains unresolved. The Reagan administration shows no sign of softening on this point.

“You Told Us...”

In the “supporter surveys” many of you told us about personal experiences that had much to do with your commitment to the struggle for choice. We want to share some of these comments with our Newsletter readers. Perhaps others will be inspired to write and tell us about their experiences. The comments set out in this issue are brief, but we would be happy to receive longer stories as well. We would not print your name or otherwise identify you in the Newsletter.

“I was obliged to have an illegal abortion in my youth, literally on the table with no anaesthetic. I don’t want Canadian women to have to go back to that.”

“I was the victim of a “butcher” abortion in my early twenties. I do not want my daughter or any other woman to ever be forced to such measures again.”

“I nearly lost my life twice trying to terminate an unwanted pregnancy and lived in fear the rest of the time. We must not let those days come back.”

“I have gone through the anguish of an unwanted pregnancy — years before abortions were available in Canada. The only thing a teenage girl could do then (in the ’60s) was to hide and lie and go through childbirth alone, then give up her child for adoption — and spend the rest of her life wondering where and how that child is — and cursing the society that put her through such an experience.”

“I had an abortion in 1947. The abortionist was a respected member of his community and forced me to have sex with him before agreeing to perform the abortion.”

“I was in nurse’s training in Montreal in 1957 when abortions were illegal. I saw so many women come in suffering the after-effects of

botched abortions — infections, bleeding, sterility.”

“A friend had an illegal abortion years ago. She hemorrhaged and had to be taken to the hospital. She was never able to bear children.”

“My childhood memories are haunted by women who were in constant terror of becoming pregnant and the desperate measures they took to avoid bringing another child into this world and being unable to give what every mother worth her salt feels is a child’s right.”

“Just after World War II the body of a young woman was found in my city. Some time later a doctor was charged with performing an abortion. He had gotten into serious difficulty and could not ask for help or send her to a hospital. The cruelty of this situation has always been on my mind.”

“Having been through an abortion myself I can say from personal experience that there were no traumatic feelings on my part — just a great sense of relief. I have raised two wonderful sons and a lovely daughter.”

“I have always believed in freedom of choice in principle. Two and a half years ago I was faced with an unexpected pregnancy and decided against having an abortion. However, I **did** consider abortion. Being a single mother is not easy but since it was **my** decision to have a child, my fears, frustrations etc. are not directed toward my child on the odd occasion when things get really tough. Had the possibility of abortion not been available to me my reactions might be very different. I still maintain my principles and believe that a woman has the right to choose. My own experience served to strengthen my beliefs.”

Thank You

Many individuals contributed to the production of this Newsletter and it would not be complete without some acknowledgement of their efforts. Thank you!

Literature Available

Some of you have asked about the various publications available from the CARAL office. The following is a list of such publications with suggested donations per copy. Please also include \$1.00 for postage and handling. For large orders, please contact us.

Freedom of Choice (also in French).....\$.20
Why Freedom of Choice?.....	.20
(also in French)	
You Know Them as “Right to Life”20
Reproductive Rights (also in French)....	.20
Abortion: A Question of Catholic Honesty	1.00
Abortion in Law and History.....	.40
(also in French)	
Badgley Report Quotations10
Childbirth by Choice (also in French)....	.25
Address by Jack London.....	2.00
Beware the “Research Shows” Ploy05
Gallup Polls - 1977, 198205
How to Be a Pro-Choice Activist05
One Woman’s Story (also in French)05
Abortion Clinics Under Seige05
The Politics of Abortion.....	1.00
Précis of “Medical Effects of Late Abortion and Mandatory Motherhood”10
Mental Health Consequences of Abortion and Refused Abortion.....	.25
Was Dred Scott a Fetus? - Reflections on a false analogy.....	.10
When Does Life Begin?.....	.10
Why Free-Standing Clinics? Why Now?10
Facts on Abortion20

Also Available

Childbirth by Choice - Sticker20
CARAL - Childbirth by Choice Poster with logo25

Submissions for Newsletter

If any of our readers would be interested in submitting items for our newsletter we would be most happy to receive them. Articles, photographs, graphics, news and commentaries; whatever your special interests or talents may be, you can contribute. We will, of course, have to consider space limitations and priorities in determining what to publish, and we reserve the right to edit. But please join us and make the newsletter an even more collective effort!

SASKATCHEWAN

Controversial Review Committee Continues its Work

The six-member committee appointed by Graham Taylor, Minister of Health, to examine the operation of TACs in the province has not yet completed its work, but chairperson Shirley Schneider commented on the preliminary findings. She said the TACs are doing their job correctly and working within the law. Some of the committees have "extremely stringent regulations" she said, and "We can be proud of how they are working". She also alluded to the need for follow-up procedures, counselling, and contraceptive information.

The "League for Human Life" has called for Ms. Schneider's resignation, criticizing her for having a bias in favour of abortion. Pro-choice groups continue to feel that the committee ought not to have been set up and that the government is seeking only to restrict access even further.

CRTC Orders Equal Time for Pro-Choice Perspective

CFQC-TV in Saskatoon has been asked by the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission to provide airtime to balance the unequal coverage given to the abortion issue in a program aired last year. The anti-choice broadcast included footage of a garbage can filled with fetuses, abortions in progress, and interviews with several anti-choice religious figures.

The film purported to present "the real story on abortion" but consisted of distorted "facts" and propaganda. No attempt was made to present the pro-choice position or to show the diversity of religious and scientific opinions on the issues. CFQC station manager, Ted Eadinger, has said he will comply with the CRTC request but not for another 12-18 months. Broadcasting it immediately would look "just as imbalanced as it was before" he said. Can someone explain that to us?

ALBERTA

Fort McMurray hospital vetoes abortion services

At a closed meeting in June, the Board of Trustees at Fort McMurray Regional Hospital voted against the establishment of abortion services at the facility. Consequently, local women seeking safe, legal abortion must still travel as far away as Grande Prairie or to the Seattle area. Dr. Johannes Asfeldt, a gynecologist with the hospital who supported setting up a therapeutic abortion committee, called the Board's action a "political decision". Dr. Asfeldt had submitted a proposal for abortion service to the Medical Advisory Committee which approved the program and passed it on to the Trustees. The entire medical staff as well as the entire hospital staff were surveyed and a majority favoured an abortion service. A professional opinion survey was then conducted by an Edmonton based firm that interviewed about 800 Fort McMurray residents by telephone. A 57% majority was in favour of the service. Finally the Board asked for petitions and letters from the community. The response was overwhelmingly anti-choice. Included in that response were letters written during class time by students of a local separate school. Relying on this "mandate" the Board refused to establish a TAC.

Estimates indicate that from 200 to 250 abortions are performed annually on women in the area served by the hospital, and in 1983, 135 women were referred by the Fort McMurray Health Unit to other places in Alberta and the United States. Many physicians refer women elsewhere without going through the health unit.

CARAL has written to Fort McMurray Regional Hospital protesting the emotional and financial hardships suffered by women seeking abortion and urging the hospital to consider its responsibility to the community.

NEWFOUNDLAND

Reduced access to abortion sparks debate

Deteriorating access to abortion services in Newfoundland has prompted letters of protest from both CARAL and the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. Though five of Newfoundland's hospitals have TACs, only one, The General Hospital in St. John's, has been performing abortions. Recent changes in its policy, calling for a more "conservative" approach in considering requests, have further reduced access to abortion for the province's women.

In a letter to Newfoundland's Minister of Health, CARAL drew attention to the importance of adequate reproductive care for women and urged the Minister to intervene at General Hospital. In his reply, the (Acting) Minister of Health referred to the present legislation, saying that any interpretation of the law "to imply abortion based on social considerations, or giving a woman free choice with respect to therapeutic abortions, are placing an incorrect interpretation on the law as it is now written." He went on to say that the law is "not a mechanism to enable Canadian women to terminate unplanned or unwanted pregnancies."

NAC president, Chaviva Hosek also criticized the hospital's change in policy and the way in which it has interpreted present legislation on abortion. She called on the Minister of Health to guarantee application of the definition of health adopted by the World Health Organization which refers to health as "a complete state of physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

Traduction française du bulletin

Si vous désirez recevoir la version française du bulletin, veuillez avertir le bureau national. Fournissez votre nom et adresse avec votre demande, s'il vous plait.

ONTARIO

Anti-Choice Attempt Fails

Anti-choice groups have failed in an attempt to take over the board of a hospital in Markham which has not yet been built. The York South "Right to Life" Association recruited members for the Markham-Stouffville hospital in a bid to elect anti-choice trustees. In response to pleas from local residents, CARAL became involved two days before the membership deadline.

At the meeting itself, the citizens of Markham-Stouffville came out in droves and rejected the anti-choice slate. They also decided to restrict voting in future elections to residents of the community. CARAL was delighted with the local response and is confident that, having witnessed the tactics of the anti-choice movement, the community will be vigilant to prevent a takeover next year.

Debate Between Morgentaler and Borowski

Dr. Henry Morgentaler and Joe Borowski appeared on September 19 at the University of Toronto Law School to debate the morality of abortion before a decidedly pro-choice audience, in a room filled to capacity with about 200 law students. Dr. Morgentaler emphasized the importance of choice in child-bearing, and the relationship between a loving and stable home environment and healthy emotional development. A recognition that not all sex has procreation as its purpose, and responsible attitudes towards family planning could contribute to a better society, he said.

Mr. Borowski, on the other hand, suggested that no one actually plans their family, and that the vision of a world where every child is a wanted child is a fool's Utopian dream. He also displayed a plastic replica and colour photograph of a fetus. In answering a question about his attitudes towards improved education and access in the area of contraception, he suggested to one female student that if she became a nun she could avoid all these problems.

Ottawa Hospital Developments

Opponents of choice held a Father's Day demonstration in June in front of the Civic Hospital in Ottawa. The demonstration was inspired by the **Medhurst** case, in which an Ontario Supreme Court Judge ruled that Alex Medhurst had no right to prevent his wife from obtaining an abortion. Each Sunday, the hospital is picketed by two or three members of an anti-choice group.

Civic, Riverside and Queensway-Carleton are the only three hospitals in the area where abortions can be obtained. Meanwhile, the Ottawa General Hospital has opted to continue its present policy not to perform therapeutic abortions. Hospital spokesman, Claude Dufault, justified the decision by saying that the hospital has always been a Roman Catholic institution. It has been funded by the Ontario Government since 1980. Dufault stated that members of the Board were opposed to providing abortions as it would run counter to the religious philosophy of the founders of the hospital.

ALBERTA

Catholic Agency Protests Funding of Planned Parenthood

In June the United Way of Edmonton reversed an earlier decision, and voted to award Planned Parenthood funding for its Education Outreach program. In reaction to this decision Catholic Social Services withdrew from United Way, saying it would not be associated with an agency offering abortion counselling and referrals. Not only does the Education Outreach program not offer counselling or referrals for women seeking abortion, but the agency's focus is family planning. Abortion is a "red herring" in this situation, and the incident serves only to confirm that opponents of all birth control methods prefer to disguise their position for politically expedient reasons.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Abolition of TAC Draws Protest

The Bulkley Valley District Hospital Board voted 5-4 on October 3 to dismantle its abortion committee for "moral reasons." Following an outcry from local residents and medical staff, a new committee was established October 15. Doctors had threatened to resign from all medical committees unless the decision was reversed, and consequently a compromise was reached. The new TAC is composed of doctors who, according to the Board, are "conservative" in their opinions regarding abortions. A spokesperson for the Bulkley Valley Pro-Choice Alliance says they will continue to protest this resolution of the dispute.

Anti-Choice Trustee Elected

In a recent election to fill four seats on the Board of the Vernon Jubilee Hospital anti-choice groups were successful in electing their candidates. This brings the number of declared anti-choice members on that 16-member board to six. The four candidates who ran in support of freedom of choice were defeated.

A motion calling for public election of hospital board members was defeated, despite argument that the present format leaves the board open to manipulation by single-issue groups.

PEI

Cancer Victim Refused Abortion

In the last Newsletter, CARAL informed members that in Summerside, PEI, the last TAC was saved. The anti-choice groups have since declared that they will be back "bigger and better" next year. The committee, however, operates according to guidelines so strict that when a cancer victim was referred to the hospital by her doctor for an abortion, she was refused because she didn't meet the criteria. It seems that PEI may as well have no TAC since the Prince County Hospital has not approved an abortion since 1982.

U.S.A.

Violence Against Reproductive Health Clinics

A powerful bomb placed outside the Annapolis, Maryland office of Planned Parenthood in July was the 10th violent attack this year on a U.S. abortion clinic. Clinics have been bombed, threatened, and machine-gunned. This time, damage was estimated at 40 to 50 thousand dollars.

The National Abortion Rights Action League reports that 147 incidents of violence and harassment against reproductive health clinics were carried out in 1983. There is no sign of a decrease in violence for 1984.

Politics, Religion and Abortion

Reproductive freedom has emerged as a controversial issue in the American presidential election campaign. Political differences on the issue of choice have been highlighted, and the proper role of the Church in a democratic state has been the subject of debate. Archbishop O'Connor of New York accused Democratic vice-presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro of having misrepresented the position of the Catholic Church on abortion, and suggested that no Catholic could, in good conscience, vote for a pro-choice candidate. Ms Ferraro is a member of Catholics For a Free Choice. She is a strong supporter of freedom of choice and feels that Catholics have no right to impose their own religious views on others. Other members of the Church hierarchy in the U.S., including the president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, joined in the attack, saying that the pro-choice position was not a tenable one for a Catholic.

Prominent American Catholics entered the fray, coming to the defence of Ferraro. Senator Edward Kennedy criticized the Archbishop for trying to impose his morality on others and warned against the dangers inherent in allowing government to become an "agent of religion." New York Governor Mario

Cuomo pointed out that the price of seeking to impose one's own religious beliefs on others is the loss of religious freedom for all. He argued against the criminalization of abortion, saying "We seem to be in the position of asking government to make criminal what we believe to be sinful, because we ourselves can't stop committing the sin."

Meanwhile, Ronald Reagan drew praise from the Cardinal in Philadelphia for his efforts to support federal aid to religious schools. The President, speaking at a Polish-American shrine, said he had sought Pope John Paul II's "advice and guidance on numerous occasions." Republican Vice-Presidential candidate George Bush maintained that he could not remember ever supporting public funding for abortions, despite the fact that he was confronted with 1980 news clips to the contrary.

AUSTRALIA

Medicolegal Controversy over Test-Tube Ova

The international spotlight was on Australia recently when a California couple were killed in an airplane crash, leaving two fertilized eggs frozen in test-tubes in a Melbourne hospital.

The couple left an estate valued at approximately one million dollars. Debate ensued over the responsibilities of the scientists—were they required to implant the ova in a surrogate mother? Questions were also raised about inheritance rights. As one clever commentator put it, did the zygotes have a claim to the estate, or did the estate have a claim on the zygotes?

On September 3, 1984 the Victoria state government recommended that the fertilized ova be destroyed. A three month public debate on the report containing that recommendation is to precede any action. Australian anti-choice groups are trying to prevent the disposal of the eggs. The government intends to require future participants in the test-tube programs to provide instructions in the event of their death or divorce.

ROMANIA

Childbearing Quotas to Further Government Objectives

In the last issue of our Newsletter we reported developments in Romania where the government has decreed that every woman shall bear at least four children. Married women in the state's industrial complexes will undergo monthly pregnancy tests, abortion will be punished by up to five years imprisonment, and failure to fulfill childbirth quotas will result in demotions or loss of employment.

It was suggested that President Ceausescu was motivated by a desire to relieve the national debt burden by increasing economic output. Another theory has since been advanced. Apparently, while the birth rate among ethnic Romanians has been dropping, the Gypsy population which comprises well over one million, has continued to have large families. With the proportion of Gypsies in the population rapidly rising, it seems that the President wishes to counter this tendency. Many and varied are the purposes which woman's reproductive capacities are made to serve by those with no regard for her humanity.

SOUTH AFRICA

Women Suffer From Illegal Abortions

In the Republic of South Africa, abortion is legal to preserve the woman's health, or in cases of rape or incest, and/or fetal defects. But statistics recently released by the Department of Health indicate that in 1982 legal abortions numbered 464 while 35,759 women were hospitalized for "removal of the residue," usually following illegal abortions.

French Translation of Newsletter

If you would like to have a French translation sent with your Newsletter, please let the CARAL office know. Be sure to include your name and address with your request.

BRAZIL

Government to Establish Family Planning Program

In Brazil population growth has, until recently, been encouraged in the interests of national development. Officials have now concluded that because of economic and social problems, a family planning program should be established. The decision has aroused controversy in a country where the Roman Catholic Church has many followers. The Church has argued that contraceptive methods stimulate sexual immorality and promiscuity. Leftist groups have also opposed the plan, in the belief that it is not motivated by concern for the social welfare of Brazilians, but rather by a deference to the wishes of the International Monetary Fund. Meanwhile, about 50% of women of child-bearing age already use some form of contraception and 75% favour family planning. Seventy-three of every 1,000 infants die before reaching their first birthday, and 15 million children under the age of 15 are unwanted, "abandoned" children.

Estimates on the number of abortions performed annually range from 500,000 to some 3 million. Brazil's total population is 52 million.

ITALY

Education in Birth Control

In Italy a \$3 million campaign, initiated by the government, is trying to encourage women to use contraceptive measures that will decrease the need for abortions. In the first half of 1981 there were 115,428 legal abortions, as well as countless illegal ones. Education in contraceptive measures is desperately needed in a country where most inhabitants are Roman Catholic. The Church, of course, disapproves of this campaign since Pope John Paul II continues to oppose any effective family planning.

ENGLAND

Confidentiality in Prescribing Contraceptives

In England the courts are being asked to determine whether doctors who prescribe contraceptives to girls under 16 must inform the parents. Victoria Gillick, a strict Catholic and a mother of ten, five of them girls, has failed in her claim before the High Court for such a declaration. She is appealing the ruling while also coordinating a campaign

to persuade the House of Commons to act on this matter. Present guidelines for medical professionals advise them not to contact parents without the patient's permission, although every effort should be made to persuade a patient under 16 to inform her parents. Experience has proved that without the necessary guarantee of confidentiality, young girls who may need contraceptive protection will not approach doctors or clinics.

If Mrs. Gillick is successful, we can probably expect to see more teenage pregnancies in England.

"You Asked Us"

In the many letters that CARAL receives from members and from others, and in the recent supporter surveys, questions often arise concerning various aspects of the abortion issue. Some of these questions can be answered quite simply; others call for more complex analysis. We try to respond to all these questions personally. In many cases our Newsletter readers may also be interested in our responses. For every individual who takes the time to write and ask, there are probably many others who have wondered about the same thing. So beginning with this issue, we will attempt to briefly address one such question in each Newsletter.

Q: What about the rights of the male partner when a woman decides to seek an abortion?

A: Earlier this year, in the **Medhurst** case, a husband was unsuccessful in his attempt to prevent his wife from undergoing an abortion authorized by a TAC. An Ontario Supreme Court Judge ruled that Alex Medhurst, as a person directly affected by the law on abortion, could apply to enforce compliance with it. However, in the absence of any evidence to suggest that the therapeutic abortion committee had not acted within the law, the Court would not interfere with the decision. Mr. Medhurst brought another application to a different Judge of the same Court, but with the same result. In that decision the Court emphasized the fact that it

was up to Mr. Medhurst to show that the hospital committee had not acted properly, and he could not do so.

Apart from the legal principles, there are issues of individual moral responsibility. In cases of unplanned pregnancy, the man's relationship with the pregnant woman will vary from that of a husband or otherwise committed partner, to a casual acquaintance, or perhaps even a rapist. The extent to which a woman chooses to involve the man in her decision-making process will naturally depend on the relationship that exists between them. We would hope that most couples who plan to continue their relationship would come to a decision together. In such cases, the man involved has a right to express his wishes and explain his point of view. But when a couple is unable to reach a unified decision, it must be recognized that it is the woman who must undergo the pregnancy and ultimately bear a mother's responsibility for the child.

No doubt, where there is disagreement, a man may find it very difficult to accept his partner's decision and that is understandable. But since nature has decreed that women shall be the childbearing sex, the responsibility that accompanies that role must also imply a right to choose it freely. If a man is determined to be the biological father of a child, he must find a woman who is a willing participant in the procreative process.

***Our Right To Choose:
Toward a New Ethic of
Abortion***

by Beverley Wildung Harrison —
Beacon Press \$25.95

Anyone seeking to clarify their own position, and base it on the life-affirming and person-respecting values of our Judeo-Christian heritage, should embark on Beverley Harrison's book.

The radical perspective informing *Our Right To Choose* is the insistence that women's right to procreative choice is a primary social good, and it is from this stance that the whole history of the church's teaching on sexuality and procreation has to be critiqued.

Harrison starts off by setting out the moral dimensions of the pro-choice position and identifying the contemporary range of theologies underlying the whole debate. Throughout, she brings into sharp relief the history of misogyny and the consequent mythologies of family and uncovers the historical experience of women. She resolutely shifts the grounds of debate from the isolated act of abortion to the more basic issue of women's responsible use of their procreative power; and from a focus on privatized choice in a medical model to the social context which so far has afforded male-dominated institutions control of this power.

"Freedom to say yes, which of course, also means the freedom to say no, is constitutive of the sacred covenant of life itself. Failure to see this is also failure to see how good, how strong and real, embodied existence is in this world we are making together... It is the capacity of women to understand the consummately moral action of childbearing that is threatened when the politics of abortion play fast and loose with women's lives."

This is only a taste of the powerful prose in which Beverley Harrison proclaims the new politics and spirituality of procreative choice for women. The book is compulsory reading for anyone who wants to understand emerging feminist consciousness as the principal force impelling a breakthrough in both the theology and politics of abortion.

(From a review of *Beverley Harrison's book* by Ruth Evans, *United Church of Canada*.)

***Abortion and the Politics of
Motherhood***

by Kristin Luker
University of California Press \$19.50

In her book Kristin Luker uses data from 20 years of public documents, newspaper accounts and interviews with over 200 people on both sides of the abortion debate to prove that abortion is an issue that will not go away. Using the California experience, she examines the issues, people and beliefs on both sides of the abortion conflict.

Luker argues that moral positions on abortion are intimately tied to views on sexual behaviour, the care of children, family life, technology and the importance of the individual. For example, according to her analysis, pro-choice women see the ability to plan childbearing as necessary to fulfilling their potential as human beings. Anti-choice women view pregnancy and childbearing as central to the lives of all women.

Because of the commitment of activists from the pro-choice and anti-choice factions, she predicts continued polarization of the issue.

For anyone interested in exploring how a moral issue became a political cause, Kristin Luker's book has answers to many of the questions.

Not An Easy Choice

by Kathleen McDonnell
published by Women's Press
pp.160/\$7.95

In her book *Not An Easy Choice*, Kathleen McDonnell tells feminists that they must develop a comprehensive feminist perspective on all aspects of reproduction—contraception, abortion, birthing and reproductive technology — if the pro-choice movement is to gain political momentum or even if it is to remain relevant. The pro-choice movement will only be a viable political force if it is able to obtain commitment from a broader cross-section of the community—specifically, those who feel that abortion is not just a political issue, but a personal dilemma with moral dimensions. And she claims the pro-choice movement will soon

be irrelevant if it cannot respond to the rapid developments in reproductive technology which threaten to make the female womb obsolete. McDonnell acknowledges that this re-evaluation of abortion will be hard, painful and even dangerous, since in the analytical process we will give ammunition to our enemies. However, she is optimistic that the process will be a dynamic one, and will result in a changed, deeper understanding of abortion. Not all readers will agree with McDonnell's analysis or her portrayal of the pro-choice movement as one-dimensional. But, without a doubt, *Not An Easy Choice* raises issues which feminists and pro-choice activists will find thought-provoking.

McDonnell observes that whereas other feminist issues — such as equal pay, pornography, rape and daycare — are now part of the status quo's consciousness, abortion continues to be seen as a "radical" notion. Many people feel much more ambivalent about discussing abortion than daycare. McDonnell suggests that if the pro-choice movement ceases to be single issue oriented and emphasizes instead all aspects of reproductive health, and if we assure potential allies that we agree that abortion is an issue with moral dimensions, we may increase our active support.

Pro-choice activists might strongly disagree with her characterization of the movement. Most people involved in the pro-choice struggle are also active in a number of social issues and certainly the pro-choice position is a moral one, with an overriding concern for the dignity of women.

McDonnell suggests that we must "let in" the fetus as an entity with competing rights, a position most pro-choice activists would find heretical. She points out that ethics based solely on rights — like "a woman's right to control her body" — are one-dimensional because this does not acknowledge that in a society our rights and choices are completely interdependent with those of the rest of society. She avoids conclusions about the "status" of the fetus, but states rather:

"We inevitably lead ourselves up blind alleys if we focus on the rights or personhood of the fetus

alone. But we must at least acknowledge it as a valid concern, one of many in our moral reckoning of abortion."

She suggests that we accord the fetus the concern it warrants when we only choose to have abortions in sufficiently serious circumstances. She goes on to enumerate almost every conceivable reason a woman might have for seeking an abortion, and finds the reasons serious enough to warrant the decision: but we in the pro-choice movement know that women don't choose abortion for trivial reasons. The exercise begins to look redundant but then McDonnell points out a possible reason for an abortion which most feminists would agree is not legitimate: sex selection, especially when seen as a wide-spread effort to abort female fetuses. She asks:

"Without surrendering our belief in the right to choose, do we not want to publicly question whether this is a proper use of that right? And what about abortion of "defective" fetuses: feminists may want to question whether the abortion of an abnormal fetus should be automatic. McDonnell argues that feminists should take principled stands on the issue of abortion, while refusing to make absolute judgments.

McDonnell criticizes the "choice" notion as being a bourgeois, middle-class concept. It fails to recognize that for many women, abortion is not a choice but a necessity, because their economic circumstances will not enable them to support a child and because the prospects for mothers in this society are so bleak. The author suggests that the "choice" notion was adopted partly because it was consistent with a liberal ideology which glorifies the individual at the expense of collective values. She argues for a more collective notion of reproductive rights which encompasses not only abortion, but economic and social support for parents, financial equality for women and universal day-care. Many readers may feel that she is being unduly critical of the pro-choice movement. Most activists are allied with other progressive groups which struggle for women's equality in all spheres (CARAL, for example, is active in the National Action Committee on

the Status of Women, which in turn represents many diverse feminist groups). No one movement could fight effectively for all women's equality issues at once without a serious loss of energy and focus.

Certainly many CARAL members will disagree with McDonnell when she advocates that feminists challenge the power of the medical profession in abortion. She argues rather naively that most illegal abortions were safe and harmless prior to the change in the law, and that the abortion procedure could be returned to "wise women" using folk methods, including herbalism and even magic. She claims:

"...abortion, like birth, has profound social, emotional and spiritual dimensions. Abortion, like birth, must be kept in the right hands, and, like birth, must be carried out by those who love and respect women, who believe in their right to control their own bodies and who share a deep reverence for both life and death. We need to reclaim abortion for ourselves, and free it from medical domination."

There will be women who prefer to have abortions performed by "wise women", but this should not be a priority item in our struggle for abortion rights. The majority of women want abortion to be recognized as an essential aspect of health care, covered by health insurance and provided by medically trained health care providers. McDonnell goes on to recommend that feminists and pro-choice activists should question the medical approach to free-standing abortion clinics, and suggests that they should be termed "reproductive health centres" to further demedicalize them. Both these suggestions will be very unwelcome to many who are actively struggling to support Dr. Morgentaler and his clinics. The pro-choice movement is attempting to garner all possible support, both moral and financial, as Morgentaler faces criminal prosecutions in both Toronto and Winnipeg. McDonnell's exhortations to "reclaim abortion" seem unrealistic in the present political reality.

McDonnell raises one area which is undeniably of vital concern to

women but which feminists and pro-choice activists have by and large not addressed: reproductive technology.

She points out that genetic engineering involves making judgments about which human traits are desirable and which are not; these are moral, social and political decisions rather than medical ones, and feminist input is vital. And in the area of artificial reproduction, McDonnell raises the frightening possibility that male control of women's reproductive capacity will be extended to unprecedented lengths and makes a very convincing case for feminist involvement in these developments.

Not An Easy Choice is thought-provoking. As McDonnell observes, feminists are often so busy with political action that they have no time to develop feminist theory. This book could be a spring-board for feminist debate about the fundamental right of reproductive control. The more well developed the analysis, the better equipped are we for the struggle.

New Film Released by National Film Board

The remarkable new film on abortion by filmmaker Gail Singer begins: "Abortion is a common daily occurrence in almost every country of the world. Only the laws and the conditions under which abortions are performed vary from place to place and time to time."

In an understated yet powerful documentary style, **Abortion: Stories North and South**, presents the disturbing picture of the plight of the world's women who try to limit their fertility. The film takes us to Ireland, Japan, Peru, Thailand, Canada and Colombia. We see women using herbal potions, receiving massage abortions, inserting noxious substances in their uteruses, being imprisoned, and resorting to infanticide.

The film reminds us, as one journalist so eloquently put it, that "women are victims of their biology and, when it comes to

[Continued on page 14]

[Continued from page 13]

fertility, often martyrs to it as well."

In the midst of this we are presented with the Canadian situation which, while better than that in many other places, is still woefully hypocritical and unjust.

The film is available for viewing without cost from the NFB. It can be requested by groups or individuals. (All you need is a projector.)

As Lynda Hurst said in her review of Singer's film in the *Toronto Star*, "Anyone who could watch the final scene of this film and still demand an end to reproductive choice is someone whose humanity has been destroyed by fanaticism."

Watch the next issue of the Newsletter for an interview with the filmmaker.

Correction

In our last Newsletter (June, 1984) we published an article by John Baglow ("Reports on Union Decision Misleading"). He is the Executive Secretary of the Ottawa and District Labour Council (not the ex-Secretary). Our apologies to John and our readers.

Gift Idea

With the holiday season approaching, why not consider giving a CARAL membership? You will be supporting the pro-choice cause while ensuring that one more person is informed on the subject.

New Member Groups

We are delighted to welcome the following new member groups: North Shore Association for Choice on Abortion, North Vancouver, BC.; Prince George Women's Resource Centre, Prince George, BC.

Canadians want sex education in home and school

A Gallup Poll conducted in May, 1984 for Planned Parenthood showed that 83% of Canadian adults believe that sex education should be taught in schools, and 94% believe that parents should discuss sex and sexual behaviour with their children. The poll also found that 9 out of 10 Canadians believe everyone should have the right to use birth control.

But what is the reality for Canadian adults and children? Only 50% of schools offer any sex education and only 25% offer it as a separate course. Only one in five adults was given the "facts of life" when growing up, while 64% would have liked more information.

Meanwhile, a vocal minority — could it be the anti-choice movement? — are constantly agitating to prevent efforts of any kind to help people get the information they need. For years they have attacked groups, like Planned Parenthood, which try to provide contraceptive services and information about how to limit, space or plan births. These anti-choice forces pretend they are after Planned Parenthood because it offers counselling about abortion as an option in decision-making about an unwanted pregnancy. In fact, they dislike Planned Parenthood just for being Planned Parenthood — it doesn't matter whether abortion information is offered or not. Some Planned Parenthood groups have discovered this — to their chagrin. Even after eliminating what minimal services they did provide on pregnancy termination, they still found themselves the target of anti-choice harassment.

What conclusion can be drawn from this? Only that the real evil in the eyes of the anti-choice lobby is the right to separate sexual activity from procreation and the right to control one's fertility. Thus any efforts to inform people about how to do this must be attacked. And too often such attacks succeed.

Manitoba Government Capitulates to Opponents of Sex Education Program

Wherever you see opposition to sex education courses it invariably comes from the anti-choice lobby in some incarnation. A recent example of such opposition involved the Manitoba government's planned comprehensive sex education program.

This experimental program, launched last year, drew outraged attacks from anti-choice opponents and this small minority managed to derail the program. Maureen Hemphill, Manitoba's Education Minister, announced the halt in September. Only one school district, in suburban Winnipeg, managed to hold firm in its determination to go ahead with the program. This was probably due to the courage of the chairman of the School Board in that community.

Familiar scare tactics were used by opponents of the program, such as flyers delivered to 20,000 homes raising the spectre of increased pregnancies, abortion, prostitution, venereal disease, divorce, and "secular humanism", and characterizing the program as "no more than a course in human plumbing."

The tragedy is that when information on sexuality, growing up, relationships, and birth control is denied, ignorance, anxiety, irresponsible behaviour, and sexual exploitation are perpetuated. We are all losers. But rather than promoting promiscuity, teen pregnancies, abortion, VD, divorce and family breakdown, education about sexuality helps prevent all of these problems.

Of course, parents are the primary sex educators of their children but, according to Planned Parenthood's poll, parents are asking for help from schools — and they should have it.

Isn't it time the school boards and governments heard from us — the majority? Don't our children deserve it? Wouldn't we have a healthier and happier society if we did a better job where sex education is concerned?

Some of you said . . .

In response to the supporter survey earlier this year some members said they weren't happy with the number of appeals they receive from us and from other organizations asking for funds. We realize that for some people this can be annoying, especially if they have recently contributed, or if they are completely unable to do so. But we hope that those of you who do feel this way will understand that without funds coming in to CARAL on a regular basis, we could not maintain our staff, publish our Newsletter, contribute to the Pro-Choice Defence Fund, lobby the politicians effectively or carry on all of our other educational and political activities. We do not receive any government grants nor do we have the kind of financial support the anti-choice groups get from religious organizations. And be assured that if you have just given or if you can't afford to give, we still want your moral support!

NAC Position on Abortion

We recently received a letter from one of our supporters asking what position the National Action Committee on the Status of Women takes on the abortion issue. (NAC is the umbrella organization for several hundred women's organizations across the country.)

NAC has always taken a pro-choice position and has many resolutions on its books supporting freedom of choice, repeal of the abortion law and the establishment of free-standing clinics. The reason for this support is simple: whether they are working for equal pay for women, better day care, transition houses for battered wives or any number of other concerns, most women know that reproductive control is the bottom line in the struggle for equality for women.

Help us grow

Dear Reader,

Amongst your friends, relatives and acquaintances there are probably many people who share our ideas but who have never become CARAL supporters. They might just need their attention drawn to our organization.

Would you help us grow by sending us the names of people you think might be interested? We will send some of our literature along with a membership application to each prospective supporter.

Name of possible supporter _____ _____ Address _____ Your name (leave blank if you do not wish us to mention it) _____	Name of possible supporter _____ _____ Address _____ Your name (leave blank if you do not wish us to mention it) _____
Name of possible supporter _____ _____ Address _____ Your name (leave blank if you do not wish us to mention it) _____	Name of possible supporter _____ _____ Address _____ Your name (leave blank if you do not wish us to mention it) _____

If you would like to suggest more than four possible supporters, just send in the additional names on another sheet of paper.

And in the alternative . . .

Bill Langas, Progressive Conservative candidate in the riding of Burnaby, BC, exemplified the kind of logic we have come to expect from the anti-choicers when he expressed his opposition to abortion. "The Peak", a student newspaper at Simon Fraser University, reported that Mr. Langas does not believe in freedom of choice because he believes that the fetus is living. But he apparently went on to say that if he is wrong on that score he has concerns based on cost. Abortion, according to Mr. Langas is "like having a face lift, it's having a nose job", and it is an unnecessary or an elective procedure. He is also reported as being supportive of the present law, although critical of how it is being administered! The successful candidate in Burnaby was the incumbent NDP Svend Robinson, a strong pro-choice supporter. Is it any wonder?

Who is my MP?

To find out who your MP is or what riding you live in, call your local library or any of the political parties. The latter, in particular, will be glad to help.



Globe & Mail, Feb. 14/84

I support the statement of purpose of CARAL and wish to become a member

Name..... Phone..... Date.....

Address..... City.....

Province..... Postal Code..... Occupation.....

Name of Federal Riding or Member

Indiv. Member \$10.00 Family \$15.00 Limited Income \$3.00
 Sustaining \$25.00 Affiliated Group \$25.00 Sponsor \$100.00 Donation \$.....

Your cancelled cheque is your receipt.

Return to CARAL, Box 935, Station "Q", Toronto, M4T 2P1

CARAL Chapters

National CARAL
Box 935, Station Q,
Toronto, Ont.,
M4T 2P1
(416) 961-1507

CARAL/CALGARY
Abortion By Choice
Box 152
Suite 188,
401 9th Ave. S.W.,
Calgary, Alberta,
T2P 3K5

CARAL/TORONTO
40 St. Clair Ave. E.
Suite 310,
Toronto, Ont.
M4T 1M9

CARAL/THUNDER BAY
Box 2175
Thunder Bay, Ont.
P7B 5E8

CARAL/HALIFAX
Box 101, Station M
Halifax, N.S. B3J 2L4

CARAL/VICTORIA
Box 6282, Depot C,
Victoria, B.C.
V8P 5L5

CARAL/UWO
c/o CARAL/London

CARAL/WINNIPEG
c/o 251 Garfield Street,
Winnipeg, Man.,
R3G 2M1

CARAL/LONDON
Box 2782, Station A,
London, Ont.
N6A 4H4

CARAL/MONCTON/ACDA
Box 474, Moncton, N.B.,
E1C 8L9

CARAL/ST. JOHN'S
Box 6075
St. John's, Nfld.,
A1C 5X8

CARAL/YORK REGION
94 Howlett Ave.,
Newmarket, Ont.,
L3Y 5S5

**CARAL/KITCHENER-
WATERLOO**
Box 747,
Waterloo, Ont.
N2J 4C2

CARAL/OTTAWA
c/o 179 Cameron Ave.,
Ottawa, Ont.,
K1S 0X4

CARAL/KINGSTON
Box 1541
Kingston, Ont.,
K7L 5C7

CARAL/REGINA
Citizens for
Reproductive Choice,
Box 3474,
Regina, Sask.,
S4P 3J8

CUARAL
c/o Carleton University
Women's Centre,
Colonel By Dr.,
Ottawa, Ont.

CARAL/EDMONTON
Abortion By Choice
Box 4098
Edmonton, Alta.
T6E 2A0

Member & Endorsing Groups

Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Moncton, N.B.
 Alberta N.D.P. Women's Section, Edmonton, Alta.
 British Columbia Teachers Federation, Vancouver
 Calgary Birth Control Association, Calgary, Alta.
 Calgary Status of Women Action Committee, Calgary, Alta.
 Canadian Air Line Flight Attendants' Association,
 Vancouver, B.C. and Mississauga, Ont.
 Canadian Unitarian Council, Toronto
 Carleton University Women's Centre, Ottawa
 Central Alberta Women's Emergency Shelter, Red Deer,
 Alta.
 Centre de santé des femmes, Sherbrooke, P.Q.
 La clinique des femmes de l'Outaouais, Hull, P.Q.
 Chilliwack Citizens for Choice, Sardis, B.C.
 Citizens for Reproductive Rights, Moose Jaw, Sask.
 C.L.S.C. Centre-Sud, Montréal
 Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Winnipeg, Man.
 Collectif féministe de Rouyn, Noranda pour la santé des
 femmes, Rouyn, P.Q.
 Comité condition féminine, Montréal
 Community Health Services, Saskatoon, Sask.
 Concerned Citizens for Choice on Abortion, Vancouver
 Cranbrook Women's Health Network, Cranbrook, B.C.
 Doctors for Repeal of the Abortion Law (DRAL)
 Fédération du Québec pour le planning des naissances,
 Montréal
 Fédération Québécoise des Infirmières et Infirmiers,
 Montréal
 Elizabeth Fry Society, Hamilton, Ont.
 Hamilton Committee for Choice, Hamilton, Ont.
 Horizons, The Manitoba Women's Newspaper, Winnipeg, Man.
 Humanist Association of Canada
 Kelowna Concerned Citizens, Kelowna, B.C.
 Kelowna Status of Women, Kelowna, B.C.
 Kingston Action Committee on the Status of Women,
 Kingston, Ont.
 Kingston Sexual Assault Centre, Kingston, Ont.
 Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Don Mills, Ont.

Lakeshore Unitarian Church, Pointe Claire, P.Q.
 Les Editions du Remue-Ménage, Montréal
 London Status of Women Action Group, London, Ont.
 Maternal Health Society, B.C.
 Montreal Health Press Inc., Montréal
 National Action Committee, Status of Women, Toronto
 National Association of Women and the Law, Ottawa
 National Association of Women and the Law, P.E.I. Caucus,
 Charlottetown, P.E.I.
 National Association of Women and the Law, University of
 Victoria, Victoria, B.C.
 Nellie's Hostel, Toronto
 North Bay Women's Centre, North Bay, Ont.
 North Shore Women's Centre, North Vancouver
 North Shore Association for Choice on Abortion, North
 Vancouver
 Ontario Coalition for Abortion Clinics, Toronto
 Ontario Coalition of Rape Crisis Centres, Peterborough, Ont.
 Ontario Committee on the Status of Women, Toronto
 Ontario New Democratic Party Women's Committee,
 Toronto
 Participation of Women Committee, N.D.P., Ottawa
 Personal Rights Association, Weyburn, Sask.
 Planned Parenthood, Edmonton, Alta.
 Planned Parenthood, Westmount, P.Q.
 Port Coquitlam Area Women's Centre, Port Coquitlam, B.C.
 Prince Albert District Pro-Choice Coalition,
 Prince Albert, Sask.
 Prince George Women's Resource Centre,
 Prince George, B.C.
 Queen's Women's Centre, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.
 Queen's Women's Law Caucus, Queen's University,
 Kingston, Ont.
 Rape Crisis Centre, Hamilton, Ont.
 Regina Women's Committee Centre, Regina, Sask.
 Richmond Women's Centre, Richmond, B.C.
 Room of One's Own, Vancouver
 Saskatchewan Action Committee on the Status of Women,
 Regina, Sask.

Saskatchewan Working Women, Saskatoon, Sask.
 Saskatoon Abortion Rights Association, Saskatoon, Sask.
 Saskatoon Women's Reproductive Rights Movement,
 Saskatoon, Sask.
 Simon Fraser University, Burnaby Women's Centre, B.C.
 Status of Women Action Committee, Calgary, Alta.
 Sudbury Women's Centre, Sudbury, Ont.
 Timmins Sexual Assault Centre, Timmins, Ont.
 Toronto Business & Professional Women's Club, Toronto
 University of Waterloo Birth Control, Waterloo, Ont.
 Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation
 Vancouver Women's Health Collective, Vancouver
 Victoria Faulkner Women's Centre, Whitehorse, Yukon
 Victoria Status of Women Action Group, Victoria, B.C.
 WAWAW/Women's Health Network, Guelph, Ont.
 West Kootenay Women's Association, Nelson, B.C.
 Wellspring Women's Association, Whitecourt, Alta.
 Women Against Violence Against Women/Rape Crisis
 Centre, Vancouver
 Women of Halton Action Movement, Ont.
 Women's Centre of Hamilton-Wentworth, Hamilton, Ont.
 Women's Centre, Students Union, Ryerson Polytechnical
 Institute, Toronto
 Women's Centre, University of Regina, Regina, Sask.
 Women's Counselling, Referral and Education Centre,
 Toronto
 Women's Directorate, Saskatoon, Sask.
 Women's Health Clinic, Winnipeg, Man.
 Women's Issues Commission, University of Western Ontario,
 London, Ont.
 Women's Research and Resource Centre, Toronto
 Women's Resource Centre, St. John's, Nfld.
 Young Women's Christian Assoc. of Canada (YWCA),
 Toronto
 YWCA of Metro Toronto, Toronto
 Yukon Status of Women Council, Whitehorse, Yukon

October/84