

# Reports and Review Essays



*I was allowed to ask a question.*

# “The Politics of Abortion: Trends in Canadian Fertility Policy” by Larry Collins - Revisited<sup>1</sup>

Mary F. Bishop  
The University of British Columbia

The thesis of the late Dr. Collins that, in the early 1970s, the Canadian Government created the Family Planning Division (FPD) of the Department of National Health and Welfare, and built up two voluntary organizations—the Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada (PPFC) and Service de régulation des naissances (SERENA)—to deflect criticism of the 1969 amendment of the Criminal Code of Canada concerning induced abortion, may be correct. As most of Collins’s sources are not available to others, his thesis cannot be directly challenged.<sup>2</sup> Based on research conducted into the history of the birth control movement in Canada as well as personal recollections,<sup>3</sup> it can be suggested that the federal government had a positive interest in promoting birth control information and services in Canada and abroad, that this interest predated the uproar over the abortion law amendment, and that SERENA funding was an afterthought. Far from being exploited, the PPFC was eager to fill the historical role of the birth control movement as the catalyst of government action. In addition, concern has been generated by Dr. Collins’s statement that the government “recruited

private groups *on each side of the issue*” (italics mine). Both the PPFC and SERENA were on the side of contraception. The PPFC did not develop a policy concerning legally induced abortion until 1972 when considerable controversy over the issue had developed. (Even then, it did not advocate abortion as a method of fertility control.) The suggestion that the PPFC was “steered” is only valid insofar as funding of certain programs was given on a project basis. Otherwise, the PPFC was left alone to work out its program as it wished.

The absence of historical research and publication on the Canadian birth control movement and the flexibility of the movement in regard to changing public attitudes has led to misunderstanding of definitions and objectives. The term “birth control” was invented by Margaret Sanger and her colleagues prior to World War I. It meant prevention of unwanted pregnancy through the voluntary use of contraception. As Sanger and her colleagues defined it, birth control was also the alternative to induced illegal abortion. “Birth control” and “Contraception” were synonymous in those days, and remain so

today. The terms "Family Planning" and "Planned Parenthood", were adopted in the early years of World War II by the British and American organizations respectively. As birth-rates in Europe had been declining, some countries feared shrinking populations. Forced sterilization was being imposed on "undesirables" in Hitler's Germany. Hence, the new titles seemed more descriptive of what the voluntary organizations were trying to accomplish. Pregnancy "spacing" was stressed.

The PPFC, first organized in 1963 as the "Canadian Federation of Societies for Population Planning," reflected contemporary interest in world population growth and birth control. As its main focus shifted to contraception for all who wanted it, the Federation leaders decided in 1968 to change the name of PPFC, to "Family Planning Federation of Canada." At that point, some people thought that the name meant family budgeting and household management. In the meantime, many governments had borrowed the term "family planning" for their own programs. Some had even decided to include induced abortion. Finally, in 1975 the Canadian Federation changed its name to "Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada." This would underline the prevention of *unplanned* pregnancies; and would also identify the PPFC more closely with the International Planned Parenthood Federation. In 1983, the international federation (IPPF) consisted of 114 independent national birth control organizations, each having its own priorities. The Planned Parenthood Federation of America in the United States has no connection with its Canadian neighbour other than through the IPPF. Its policies and program are its own.

As health services are a provincial responsibility in Canada, the federal government was limited from the outset to the provision of information and the support of training and research. Because provincial responses to the idea of contraception services were varied and

sometimes fearful, it was decided by Health and Welfare Canada to expand the PPFC in the hope that its advocacy across the country would prove the acceptability of the idea and speed the provinces' response. Finances presented no obstacles as programs could be supported under existing federal/provincial cost-sharing agreements in the health and welfare fields. Responsibility for induced abortions did not require "shifting" from the federal to provincial spheres as it already lay within (provincial) hospitals' jurisdictions. Hospitals as health service providers, are private societies, run by elected Boards of Directors, and set their own policies on what services will be provided. The abortion law amendments of 1969 had to recognize these facts.

As publicly funded contraception in Canada had been the goal of the volunteers for more than 40 years, the PPFC also recognized that the building of a birth control program in Canada was the only way of introducing this type of foreign aid to the "developing" world. For its part, the Canadian government had become embarrassed by its inability to respond to such requests. As the PPFC also wanted to promote assistance to the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the plan was mutually satisfactory.

From the beginning of this arrangement, federal money was to be "seed money." The PPFC was warned that support would eventually be reduced. Unfortunately, during the five years of substantial federal funding, the PPFC was preoccupied with advocacy. In addition, the leaders of PPFC were busy professionals in their everyday lives, not fund raisers. (PPFC financing is another story for another time.) This paper will describe the PPFC aims and its contacts with the Department of National Health and Welfare from 1965 to the fade out of the Family Planning Division in 1978. In order to understand these events, it should be remembered that during the 1950's and 1960's, two parallel campaigns were aimed at persuading the Canadian government

to “reform” different sections of the Criminal Code of Canada relating to human reproduction.

Birth control groups and their supporters were working for the removal of a phrase, “preventing conception or” from Section 150 of the Criminal Code dealing with obscenity. Enforcement of this law had been a dead letter for more than 30 years. However, its retention had enabled governments at all levels in Canada and most health and welfare professionals to side-step a growing demand for free birth control information and services. The volunteers of PPFC wanted information to be made available to all Canadians as a human right—not just on an “under the counter” basis to the rich. As there was widespread interest in the “world population explosion,” the birth control advocates also hoped to promote population education in Canadian schools and universities. Furthermore, if they could hasten a rational population policy in Canada instead of *ad hoc* responses to whatever political winds blew strongest, so much the better. Public approval was also strong.

The second campaign was promoted by the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Bar Association, conservative as well as feminist women’s organizations, some churches, and individuals, for modernization of the law on induced abortion. Dr. Collins suggested that this campaign may have been launched because the medical profession wanted legalization of what its members were already doing within hospitals. In addition, some of its members in private practice were making fortunes on the side by providing medically safe, illegal abortions. Some women were aborting, or trying to abort themselves, often with tragic results.

Other factors were also at work. The Pill and the Intrauterine Device (IUD) had been added to contraceptive methods; a “sexual revolution” was under way. In addition, the social gospel and eugenics concerns of the 1920’s and 1930’s persisted among many social reformers. The

British movement had enjoyed Royal patronage for forty years. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s support in the United States, approval by the late Roman Catholic President John F. Kennedy, and also by his successor, President Lyndon Johnson, were well known. Within Canada, even Prime Minister Lester Pearson (1963-68) favoured “family planning” as one means toward international development. In Quebec, where the Quiet Revolution brought change, there was increased support for family planning. As a member of the cabinet of Jean Lesage, René Lévesque had funded Le Centre de Planning Familial in Montreal. In addition, there were other favorable pressures among Quebec sociologists and physicians.<sup>4</sup> For a variety of reasons, four private members’ bills were introduced in the House of Commons during the mid 1960’s in efforts to persuade the government to move on contraception.

In 1966, the Commons Standing Committee on Health and Welfare commenced hearings on the removal of the outdated prohibition of contraception from Section 150 of the Criminal Code. Most submissions were favourable, including strong support received from the major non-Catholic churches. The Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops submitted a brief which said that, although artificial contraception was not approved in Catholic doctrine, they had no wish to impose their views on non-Catholics. As the law was no longer enforceable, and the availability of contraception was inequitable, they would not oppose the change.<sup>5</sup> What the bishops did not mention was that, without this reform, even the teaching of “natural” methods of birth control was illegal! In December 1966, the Commons Committee recommended deleting the phrase in question from Section 150, and amending the Food and Drugs legislation to regulate the dispensing of contraceptives and to set guidelines for advertising. Except for the Créditistes in the House of Commons, and a few conservative Catholic and fundamentalist complaints, con-

traception was no longer a very controversial issue.

By January 1967, the Committee had moved on to holding hearings on proposed amendments concerning induced abortion. Four more private members' bills had been introduced. Controversy raged back and forth both in the hearings and in the media. Finally, the Committee made recommendations on how hospitals should deal with the procedure in future. Not only was it a very divisive process but, nearly 15 years after the event, neither the pro-choice nor the anti-abortion factions are satisfied; the moral issue for or against "choice" is no closer to settlement.

Although the PFFC had earlier submitted its own brief on reform concerning contraception and had rallied support from church and other organizations, it took no part in the pressure for change in abortion provisions. Having advocated for many years its own tradition that contraception was the alternative to unwanted pregnancy and illegally induced abortion, it had no policy on legal terminations and no plan to develop one. It had achieved its own objective.

To understand more clearly the role of the PFFC *vis-à-vis* the federal government, a brief look at the history of the Canadian birth control movement itself is required. Since the 1920's, family planning volunteers had advocated democratization of contraception for maternal and child health as well as human rights reasons. They had also urged that free information and services for all Canadians be provided through public funding. Opposition to the volunteer efforts had repeatedly been expressed by pro-natalist interest groups of which the Roman Catholic Church was the most obvious and persistent. However, the birth control movement had already grown internationally and, in Western countries more and more Christians (including Roman Catholics) were practising artificial contraception by choice.

In 1930, the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops gave cautious approval of birth control. Most of the other major Protestant churches had joined the chorus of support in Europe and North America. Reformed Jewish sects had also agreed. Accordingly, in 1930 Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical on marriage, *Casti Connubii* which was a hard-nosed letter to the Faithful reminding them that marriage was for procreation and education of children in the Roman Catholic faith, and for no other purpose. No matter how ill or poverty-stricken a Catholic wife might be, her first duty was to produce children for the Church.

Following the encyclical of 1930, overt attacks on the birth control advocates increased in western countries. For example, in Canada, Bishop McNally of Hamilton publicly castigated as "devils and whores" the socially prominent community leaders who were sponsors of the newly-formed Hamilton Birth Control Society.<sup>6</sup> Later, he told a meeting of the Catholic Women's League in Brantford, Ontario, that *contraception* was "murder."<sup>7</sup> In 1936, Dorothea Palmer, an employee of A.R. Kaufman's Parents' Information Bureau in Kitchener, was arrested in Vanier (then Eastview, a French-speaking Catholic community on the eastern edge of Ottawa) for dispensing information on birth control. (She had responded to the requests of about twenty wives for information about birth control.) After a lengthy and much publicized defence, financed by Kaufman, Palmer was acquitted. At the time of the trial most of the population of Eastview was poor and unemployed. Hence, the judge argued that Palmer's efforts were "for the public good."<sup>8</sup> Pressure from the Roman Catholic Church did not stop after this important court decision. In 1938, the MacMillan Company of Canada was threatened with loss of contracts for Catholic textbooks unless it ceased to publish a best seller, *Sex, Marriage and Birth Control*, by Rev. A.H. Tyrer, a retired Anglican clergyman in Toronto. MacMillan, fearing loss of badly needed revenue, acquiesced to the pressure.

When the birth control movement began to expand after World War II, other obstacles were created. After it became a national organization in 1963, incorporation in Ontario was denied for five years because of religious opposition. Charitable status was similarly delayed from 1968 to 1970 by a member of the federal National Revenue bureaucracy. Although the "rhythm" method had gained minimal recognition by Pope Pius XII in 1951, and Vatican II in the mid-1960's had broadened insight into marriage doctrine by accepting personalism as another aim of marriage, "responsible parenthood" was the guideline, but the Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada continued to be seen as a threat by conservatives within the Roman Catholic church. Although Pope Paul VI's encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*, was severely criticized in 1968 by many Canadian Catholics, opposition to a government sponsored "family planning" program remained strong among so-called "Good Catholics." Nevertheless, within the federal government, the Department of External Affairs was considering the question of aid in this field and the Hon. John Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare, held liberal views on the subject. Other cabinet ministers concurred with Munro.

Munro was in frequent touch with birth control advocates in his own city of Hamilton and with George Cadbury of Oakville, Ontario, the prime mover in the organization of the PPF. A retrospective look at the emergence of the PPF as an established advocacy group is also required. George Cadbury, an economist, had worked in the 1950's within the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration as Director of Operations under Dr. Hugh Keenlyside. After 3 years in New York, he had undertaken field work in South Asia and the Caribbean. Then, in 1960, he and his wife, Barbara, travelled in Asian countries as "Special Representatives" of the IPPF. When they returned to Canada in 1961, they detected a weakness in birth control activity in Canada and decided to mend it. The Cadburys

set their sights on building a national organization, securing support from the federal government for a nation-wide program and, eventually, support for the IPPF and its member countries in the Third World. Birth control groups already existed in Vancouver, Winnipeg and Hamilton. Barbara Cadbury organized Planned Parenthood of Toronto, and the four cities became the nucleus of the PPF. At that point, the orientation of PPF members was toward both population education as well as family planning, so that in 1963 the new organization became the Canadian Federation of Societies for Population Planning. The Cadburys arranged for its speedy acceptance in the Western Hemisphere Region of the IPPF, and within the IPPF itself the same year. Formed in 1961, Vancouver became a registered provincial society and joined the Federation in 1963. A bilingual group in Montreal joined in 1964. Ottawa, Calgary, and Edmonton were soon added to the ranks as well as the provincial association of Manitoba. Further support came from new and important directions, including affiliation of the United, Anglican and Presbyterian Churches, as well as the Canadian Unitarian Council. In February 1966, Dr. Maurice Jobin of Montreal became the first French-speaking national vice-president after a bilingual symposium on contraception had been held in Montreal.<sup>9</sup>

At the Cadburys' instigation, Mead Johnson, Ortho, and Searle pharmaceutical companies financed conferences on birth control clinics, counselling skills, and responsible parenthood. Notable international speakers participated, and a representative assortment of church, educational and medical personnel attended. The new federation was ready to plan its assault on Parliament Hill. When the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare in the House of Commons held its hearings on the Criminal Code Amendments, the PPF was of sufficient stature to recommend to Hon. Pierre Elliot Trudeau, then Minister of Justice, that contraception and induced abortion be kept entirely separate in the

Committee's proceedings. By agreement of the members, this was done at the Committee's first session.

By mid-1967, the Salvation Army and the Canadian Home Economics Association had affiliated with the PPFC. It was also significant that the Planned Parenthood Association of British Columbia, was accepted as a participating agency in the Community Chest and Councils (now United Way) of Greater Vancouver. Member organizations in different parts of Canada sponsored public panels on population, birth control, and sex education. Labour unions in Toronto and Hamilton were helping in practical ways. The provincial governments of Ontario and Manitoba established birth control clinics in Public Health premises at several locations. In addition, the Government of British Columbia was beginning to think about making its first sustaining grant to the British Columbia association.

The Federation invited A.R. Kaufman and his national birth control service, the Parents' Information Bureau in Kitchener, to join. While Kaufman indicated that he preferred his service to remain as a separate organization, he pledged continuing cooperation. SERENA, though still a small "natural methods" group based in Hull, Quebec, also refused several invitations to join.<sup>10</sup> Thus, by the end of 1968, the PPFC was a national, bilingual, voluntary organization with branches from Montreal to Vancouver. It had two provincial associations, financial support from a few generous donors including the Anglican Church of Canada, a slender budget, but many interested, hard-working volunteers. The Federation was a member of one of the largest non-governmental organizations in the world, but the IPPF in turn had consultative status in the United Nations Economic and Social Council.<sup>11</sup> Dr. Collins's claim that the Federation was transformed from "struggling local operations" into a full-blown national organization through government funding from 1972 is therefore

somewhat exaggerated.<sup>12</sup> Though it was still impoverished, the PPFC by 1968 was already a national organization of some stature.

In November 1968, a "working party" in the Department of Health and Welfare was discussing whether or not Cabinet approval was required before a family planning program could be put in place, or whether the idea should be dropped altogether. There was some "Good Catholic" opposition, but non-Catholic support was pressing. Others feared opposition from Quebec but René Lévesque had already supported the idea of government intervention. The Department of Health and Welfare was staffed by anglophones, and a search was being conducted for a French-speaking Deputy Minister. Dr. Maurice LeClair agreed to take the post.

The federal Department agreed to "beef up" the PPFC "to do the things [the government] couldn't do. It was evident also that the provinces were afraid to start their own programs, but would welcome leadership by the voluntary sector."<sup>13</sup> The new law was not yet proclaimed but, on February 8, 1969, Hon. John Munro, as Minister, and seven staff representatives from related programs, including one from the planning division of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), met in Ottawa with ten representatives of the PPFC, including George Cadbury. According to Eric Smit, who was a member of the former group "Cadbury and Company really laid it on the line" that once the door to family planning was opened, the government should proceed. In other words, Munro should follow up the change in the law with a government program. The time was ripe.

As a direct result of that meeting, an ad hoc committee was established within the Department to develop a government plan. Although its members favored the idea (Eric Smit and Norman Knight had belonged to the Planned Parenthood Society of Ottawa), they had not organized any pressure within the Department

to persuade the Minister to adopt a family planning scheme. The only one of the group with any previous professional experience in that field was Dr. Robert Lennox, a McGill graduate, who had arrived the previous year as Chief of the Division of Maternal and Child Health. (During a contract as a faculty member at Tulane University in Louisiana, Dr. Lennox had participated in a program.) Each of the committee was detached from his regular duties and, from that point, February, 1969, the Family Planning Division (FPD) was in being. As provincial financing could be accommodated under the cost-sharing arrangements with the provinces, the Committee did not expect any serious obstacles. The task which remained was to put the PPFC to work.<sup>14</sup>

On April 25-26, 1969, the PPFC held its annual general meeting in Hamilton with Hon. John Munro featured as the speaker at its dinner. The birth control advocates were prepared to offer cooperation; so when Munro stressed that cooperation between government and private agencies was needed, his words were well-received.<sup>15</sup>

News of these plans soon spread. In response, conservative Catholics reiterated a campaign started a year earlier that there was "no public demand" for birth control services in Canada.<sup>16</sup> There was also some opposition in Cabinet. However, in spite of a delay in passing the enabling legislation, Munro was prepared to fight for his plan. On December 16th, 1969, he wrote to George Cadbury that the program was continuing to develop. The FPD would produce information and advice, a mechanism for project grants would be available but, the PPFC should expect to take responsibility for promotion. This arrangement should help to persuade the provinces that the idea was a popular one.<sup>17</sup>

In the meantime, Cadbury was working on plans for private fund-raising. The PPFC had applied to the Department of National Revenue for charitable status in 1968 but the registration

number had been withheld. Cadbury complained of the delay to Munro. Tax exemption was finally granted in February, 1970. In addition, in January 1970, the *Victor-Bostrom Fund for the IPPF* contributed \$12,000 to set up the fund-raising mechanism. The PPFC was now able to proceed.

Brian Strehler (later Executive Director of the PPFC) was employed as a fund-raiser and, in the first year, through the Toronto *Miles for Millions* campaign, produced \$35,000. The popularity of the walk was eroded eventually by competing walks, swims and sales of such items as light bulbs. Grass roots funding for the national office had not been developed. Hence, as the public began to say, "Let the government do it," PPFC fund-raising fell on hard times. When a few local branches were accepted on United Way rosters, direct fund-raising was prohibited. Government funding became increasingly attractive.

During Question Period in the House of Commons on March 5th, 1970, Gordon Ritchie, M.P. asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare what had become of the family planning program, which had been prepared at his own request by the PPFC. "Had it been dropped?" Munro's reply was, "No, Mr. Speaker."<sup>18</sup> In fact, Munro had followed the custom of gaining approval in principle from Cabinet, then progressing from the initial request to a case for specific funding. Authorization was given; on 18 September 1970, Munro made an announcement in the House that the Department would support public information, training and research. On October 9, 1970 the Minister wrote to Cadbury that he was now

...able to give you some indication of our position in this matter. The Federal Government recognizes the right of all Canadians to exercise free choice in the practice of family planning, and all must have access to information and means....Freedom of choice implies the absence of all kinds of



restrictions, either material or psychological....There is opposition to the plan for fear that contraceptives and information would lead to abuse and license. Health and welfare is a provincial responsibility, but the Government has opened the door.

As well as promoting research, training and information, the Department would facilitate method improvement, attitudinal and motivational research, and demonstration projects. It would also give assistance in training professional staff. In addition, a small unit within the Department was designated to initiate and advise on program development, and to serve as a clearing house and liaison with other departments.<sup>19</sup>

By January 1971, the departmental task force, consisting of Dr. E.L. Watkinson, Richard Splane, Norman Knight and Michael Palko, were hard at work on plans for a government-sponsored national conference. In the next month, a group of "family planning experts" from across Canada was invited to come to Ottawa to assist, not only in the work of the conference, but on the general program. In March, there was a two-day meeting with provincial/territorial government representatives to ascertain their wishes.<sup>20</sup> Thus, although it was not formally constituted until January of 1972, the FPD had been functioning for more than 2 years. The major breakthrough for both the volunteers and for the FPD was the Hon. John Munro's announcement made in the House of Commons on May 6th, 1971, concerning the government's program—its background, policy, and how it was being implemented.

The Department of Health and Welfare's family planning objective was to ensure the availability of family planning information and services to those who wanted it. The removal of legal restrictions on contraception in 1969 had permitted the advertising of non-prescription methods providing these methods were not promoted through the mails or hawked from door to

door. Information materials were purchased for immediate distribution from the United States and Britain, including films, booklets on birth control, and teaching guides for nurses and social workers. A medical textbook by the IPPF was mailed to gynecologists across Canada. Expenditures in the fiscal year 1970-71 totalled about \$90,000.

Public Health Research Grants, the Medical Research Council, and the Canada Council were asked to give priority to training and research in family planning. The provinces had agreed to give priority to demography, communications, reproductive physiology, and studies of knowledge, attitudes and practices in relation to family planning. Project funds were also made available under National Welfare grants for disadvantaged groups. In 1970-71, research grants totalled \$850,000. Services could now be given under medical care insurance plans; contraceptives could be provided through provincial and municipal assistance programs.

The PPFC had received \$100,000 to promote its own growth. The government-sponsored national conference of PPFC was to be held in 1972 with participation by provincial governments, professional associations, citizens' groups, voluntary organizations, and others throughout Canada.<sup>21</sup>

Contrary to Dr. Collins's claim, the Hon. John Munro was not hiding behind the PPFC to deflect criticism over the abortion issue. This was now a birth control campaign of his own, and he knew that the PPFC was a willing catalyst.<sup>22</sup> As Peter Smith said, John Munro was an activist: "He wasn't fooling around. If there was an area that was developing, the Minister and his staff were going to have an impact...there was none of this business of bureaucrats running the Ministry." The prime movers in implementation were George Cadbury on the outside, and Norman Knight on the inside.<sup>23</sup>

In 1971, *The Canadian Churchman*, published by the Anglican Church of Canada, ran a series of articles written by Bernard Daly of the Canadian Catholic Conference entitled "Viewpoint." In the June 5th, 1971 issue, Daly protested the support given the PPFC by the federal government, claiming that the PPFC was controlled by a small board with arbitrary powers, and only 13 member groups were listed in its annual report of 1970. Citing SERENA's program as "family-oriented," and that it consisted of couple-to-couple teaching and was not "dependent on institutional props," Daly continued:

While the instinct for monopoly is hard to control and apparently cannot be killed, one must expect that Mr. Munro's \$100,000 for the PPFC is the first of many such government aids to a variety of approaches in a field where needs and wishes are anything but monopolistic.

In a draft letter to the *Churchman* written for signature of the President of PPFC, Dr. T.M. Roulston of Winnipeg, George Cadbury was bitter about omissions from the article. Daly's connection with the Canadian Catholic Conference had not been noted, and Daly had not admitted that the SERENA organization had been invited several times to join the PPFC. Cadbury stated that the PPFC taught all methods, whereas SERENA taught only one. Member groups were allowed to run their own affairs, but it was not surprising that the umbrella organization (of PPFC) wished to have standards of affiliation. All member groups were represented in policy-making.<sup>24</sup>

By the fall of 1971, when Dr. R.W. Tooley was appointed head of the FPD, plans for the national conference were almost complete. Various individuals, including myself, were requested to prepare papers, and to take leading roles. In January 1972, some 300 people were invited to attend the meetings held in Ottawa from February 28 to March 2. Although there

were conflicts among the delegates at the end as to whether the definition of "family planning" should include "induced abortion", most were satisfied with the exchange of information and views. The proceedings were published; the event helped to convince the provincial governments that family planning could be a useful preventive health program. At the conference, Mr. Munro presented PPFC with another cheque for \$385,000 (about \$250,000 of which was to be spent on a national media campaign) and SERENA was given \$40,000, having already received through Dr. LeClair's intervention \$25,000 a few months before. During my interview with Peter Smith in September 1978, he stated that it was not intended originally to include SERENA in the "pump priming." Few had ever heard of the organization. It did not receive help until after Smith had left in 1971 to teach for three years at St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia.

Family planning was intended originally to be a joint health and welfare program. However, Dr. LeClair showed little interest. Hence, the FPD was put under the wing of Joseph Willard, Deputy Minister for Welfare. According to Michael Palko, education consultant of the Division, Willard was one of the most helpful members of the Department. Active in UNICEF, Willard believed that it was important for Canada to assist in family planning abroad. Without his support, little could have been accomplished in either the domestic or the international fields.<sup>25</sup> The first grant to the IPPF was for \$750,000 in 1971. Additional grants were increased in 1972 to \$1 million and grew proportionately from year to year.<sup>26</sup>

If there was any doubt about the demand for birth control information, the PPFC media campaigns conducted for three months in the fall of 1972 and for three months in the spring of 1973 put an end to it. It promoted knowledge of the "8 Methods of Birth Control" in newspapers, radio, and bus advertising in selected centres across Canada. The Planned Parenthood branch-

es were nearly swamped with mail and phone requests (including inquiries from native people) for information in verbal or printed form.

By agreement with the FPD, the PPFC published and distributed thousands of leaflets in various languages, flip charts for teaching, and resource catalogues. It expected to develop its news bulletin into a journal. However, the PPFC efforts were frustrated by the eager publications staff of the FPD which gradually preempted the publications field. Although the PPFC was unhappy with this development, the FPD publications were well-prepared and filled the need for more information. Provincial government and voluntary agencies were eager to distribute FPD pamphlets; volume was no problem to the FPD once the process was in motion. Dr. Collins has suggested that insistence on preliminary orders was a hindrance, but without these precautions there was no way of anticipating demand, and vast quantities of public money would have been squandered.

One of the first FPD publications was a colorful leaflet, *Birth Control: Facts for Teenagers*, which showed the reproductive organs, explained birth control methods, and included a section on venereal disease. Another booklet designed for adults was *VD*. Male and female sterilization was the subject of yet another publication. A 47-page booklet, *Facts and Fancy About Birth Control, Sex Education, and Family Planning* with cartoons, was popular among both age groups. In 1973 and 1974, the FPD issued a timely two-volume manual by Meredith Moore, on how to set up *Community Family Planning* services. The author, Moore, had spent some time researching the clinics and services of planned parenthood organizations, especially those operated by the Planned Parenthood Association of B.C. A resource manual for nurses by Constance Swinton followed in 1975. Then, the FPD in 1976 published a 645-page source book, *Family Planning for Social Workers*, edited by a staff member, Cenovia Addy. A *Sex Education Guide*

*for Teachers*, undated, contained six booklets, and included information on teaching about sexuality, sexual activities, human reproduction, birth control methods, world population, VD, and abortion. Contrary to Dr. Collins's statement, the booklet on abortion described what abortion is, how it is done, pros and cons, and differing moral views. Advocacy and referral would have been "asking for trouble." However, the subject had not been proscribed. Two other source books edited by Ben Schlesinger and published by the University of Toronto Press dealt with *Family Planning in Canada* (1974) and *Sexual Behaviour in Canada* (1977). Each publication was financed by an FPD grant. Altogether, the FPD publications were popular, remarkably frank, and realistic.

Other ventures were planned. For example, a national fertility survey was to be financed by the FPD. It was designed by a group of sociologists under the direction of Professor Ian Pool, then of Carleton University. Leroy Stone, a respected demographer within Statistics Canada, was among them. The plan was strongly supported by Sylvia Ostry, then head of Statistics Canada. Unfortunately, it was cancelled in June 1977 after Ostry left for the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). The reasons for its cancellation are not clear.<sup>28</sup>

Relations between the PPFC and FPD remained cordial even during the "wheeling and dealing" concerning the United Nations World Population Year in 1974. The PPFC suggested hearings across Canada and offered to organize them. Not to be outdone, Bernard Daly also offered the services of his so-called *Interchurch Project on Population*. External Affairs finally solved the dilemma by arranging for hearings to be organized by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs (CIIA), with Davidson Dunton as Chairman. The panel was comprised of Daly, Kathleen Livingstone of the International YWCA, and Rev. Claude De Mestral of the PPFC, a United Church minister from Mon-

trear. Six cities were visited. In each one, Catholic opponents of birth control dominated the hearings. Debate and dissension occurred between these opponents and those promoting contraception as a useful contribution to development. The proceedings were published by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs in May 1974.

In May, also, a two-day conference was co-sponsored by the PPFC, Canadian Save the Children Fund, and the Canadian Council on International Cooperation in order to discuss the forthcoming United Nations World Population Conference. Similar conflicts occurred with the pro-lifers eventually packing the meeting and managing to obtain a vote against induced abortion—a subject which was never on the agenda. Representatives of non-governmental organizations who were to attend as observers in Bucharest were chosen.

In 1977, the FPD hired John MacDonald to evaluate the PPFC. If his massive findings were ever condensed within a report, the PPFC was not allowed to see it. Dr. Collins states on page 10 of his article that the PPFC was invited to evaluate the FPD. However, I have been unable to find verification of this idea from the PPFC or any other source. *The Family Planning Evaluation Report, 1977*, on which Dr. Collins based his views, seems to have vanished. Among other comments in Dr. Collins's article which need clarification is the statement on page 9 concerning FPD refusal to publish research findings. As far as I know, many of the research or other project grants included funds for publication, or there was provision for publication on application when the work was completed. Many were published. If some were refused, I was not aware of it. Unnecessary delays in approving grant applications were also cited. But such was not the case in British Columbia.

From 1972 to 1977, British Columbia had a provincial grants co-ordinating committee. It

was chaired by a representative of the Planned Parenthood Association of British Columbia and included representatives of the medical faculty at the University of British Columbia and of the provincial Departments of Health and Human Resources. Unless there were duplications, the committee processed applications quickly. The only delays occurred when applicants lacked an understanding of how to fill in the request forms at which point the committee provided considerable help. Criteria, set by the FPD in 1972 in the handbook for applicants were not unreasonably narrow. As only a few provinces had similar committees, delays elsewhere might have been caused by overload in Ottawa. However, inexperience in filling out applications did create delays. As for the refusal to fund abortion items, at least one project in British Columbia which concerned abortion funding was granted to social workers at the Vancouver General Hospital in order to test counselling on contraception with abortion patients before and after the procedure. The report was published, as well as a handbook for future abortion patients. *Birth Control and Abortion* explained reproduction, birth control methods, and alternatives to abortion, but it also described *what to expect in the hospital abortion procedure and abortion methods*.

Finally, on page 18, column 1, Collins in his article states that "...it propagated the myth that abortion and birth control were two different things." As already noted, birth control is *contraception* and does not include abortion. The latter would be a contradiction in terms. Today in countries where values are different, "family planning" or "fertility control" may include abortion, but the two were separated in Canada for reasons of PPFC tradition and public policy.

In summary, there is no doubt that, once the law concerning birth control was amended in Canada, once it was obvious that a national "family planning" program promoted by the government was feasible, and once it was known

that the PPFC would welcome financial support as a preventive health agency, the individuals in the FPD saw the opportunity to achieve their objectives through PPFC advocacy. The PPFC was aware of the plan and, for many reasons already noted in this study, accepted it without hesitation. In Canada, advocacy was a traditional role and collaboration with a government was common in other countries.

In 1978, the FPD was dismantled; grants to the PPFC and SERENA were reduced. The real reason behind the federal government's loss of interest in "family planning" is obscure. One explanation may be that financial resources were beginning to shrink, the government was obsessed with new priorities relating to block funding of health and welfare programs within the provinces, and it was decided to reorganize the Department of National Health and Welfare. Family planning promotion as well as service were seen to be a provincial responsibility. Hence, the FPD Director was shorn of staff and role, and shifted into Health Services and Promotion. By 1983, both the PPFC and SERENA grants were drastically reduced. Aside from project grants, the PPFC, at any rate, will have to develop grass roots funding from the "bottom up" rather than "from the top down."

If the government intended to deflect criticism over the abortion law amendment, it succeeded to some extent through the Committee on the Operation of the Abortion Law (the Badgley Report of 1977). The PPFC and SERENA are not victims of an abortion-related bureaucratic or political conspiracy. Both were concerned with prevention of unplanned conception from their beginnings. Yet, the agitation to tighten or loosen the restrictions on induced abortion continues to rage, and the anticipated brave new world of family planning information and services across Canada has been allowed to become a patchwork of government-funded and volunteer programs, few of which are adequate to the need. Pro-life accusations against the PPFC con-

tinue, both in print and in speeches made in the House of Commons, obliging the current Minister of National Health and Welfare in conscience to defend the offspring of a once-passionate relationship.

#### NOTES

1. *Atlantis*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring, 1982), pp. 2-20.
2. The specific problem in Dr. Collins's article is that 25 of 86 references are derived from the *Family Planning Evaluation Report* of 1977. Access to this report (and those references) has been denied even to the Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada. It is also unavailable through inter-library loan. Personal access to this report is refused with the explanation that the report "cannot be identified." In addition, 23 other notes are derived from interviews with ten faceless bureaucrats and PPFC personnel whose competence and biases are unknown. The fact that the whole birth control/abortion issue arose within the world-wide and continental contexts of humanitarian and economic pressures is also neglected.
3. The interviews which elicited some of the information contained in this paper were conducted in Ottawa in late August and early September, 1978 with C. Norman Knight, MSW, Robert Lennox, M.D. C.M., Eric Smit, MSW, Michael Palko, M.E.D., and G. Peter Smith, Ph.D. All were consultants to the Department of National Health and Welfare in a variety of roles before and after the formation of the Family Planning Division, and, at the time of the interviews, three were civil servants. Permission to use the transcripts was freely given by each person interviewed. The first four were interviewed together. Norman Knight was also interviewed a few weeks later in Vancouver. Peter Smith's separate recollections of his role as a member of Hon. John Munro's staff confirm the statements of the others, and reveal interesting facts concerning the Minister's motivation in sponsoring the government family planning program as well as external events which influenced Cabinet decisions in favour of the program.
4. Peter Smith interview, 1 September, 1978.
5. *Contraception, Divorce, Abortion*, three statements by the Canadian Catholic Conference, and Discussion outline. Ottawa, August, 1968. See also *Proceedings, House of Commons Standing Committee on Health and Welfare*, No. 18, Oct. 11, 1966, pp. 576.
6. Interviews with Thelma Will, Hamilton, Ontario, 24 September, 1978, and Dr. Elizabeth Bagshaw, Hamilton, Ontario, 23 September, 1978.
7. *Brantford Expositor*, 19 December, 1933; *Hamilton Spectator*, 7 June, 1933.
8. Interview with Dorothea Palmer, Ottawa, 23 August, 1978.
9. *News from Planned Parenthood*, Toronto, announcement of Federation annual meeting, 1966, and the letterhead of the Federation.
10. In 1955, SERENA was formed in Lachine, Quebec by Gilles and Rita Breault. It was the only family planning organization the Roman Catholic Church would recognize and support.
11. Granted August 13th, 1964. Beryl Suiters, *Be Brave and Angry; Chronicles of the International Planned Parenthood Federation*, (London, 1973), page 281.
12. *Atlantis* p. 6, col. 1.
13. Peter Smith interview, *op. cit.*
14. Interview, Norman Knight, Robert Lennox, Michael Palko, Eric Smit, 30 August, 1978.

15. Peter Smith interview, *op. cit.*
16. Hon. Paul Martin's Parliamentary Secretary, 1 February, 1968, PPFC file, Ottawa.
17. *Ibid.*; also Peter Smith interview, *op. cit.*
18. "Cadbury—Keeping file," PPFC, Ottawa.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Document on Family Planning* as tabled in the House by the Hon. John Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare, Thursday, May 6, 1971.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Interview, Knight, Lennox, Palko, Smit, *op. cit.*
23. Interview, Peter Smith, *op. cit.*
24. Interview, George and Barbara Cadbury, Oakville, 21 September, 1978. Also draft letter to *Churchman*, PPFC file.
25. Interview, Knight, Lennox, *et al.*, *op. cit.*
26. Cadbury correspondence, PPFC file.
27. Interview, Knight, Lennox *et al.*, *op. cit.*
28. Interview, Peter Smith, *op. cit.*