

# **Birth Control**

Is Canada out of step with Rome?

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Foy, Vincent, 1915-

Birth control : is Canada out of step with Rome? / Vincent N. Foy.

Includes index.

ISBN 1-895599-15-6

1. Contraception--Canada--Religious aspects--Catholic Church.  
2. Birth control--Canada--Religious aspects--Catholic Church.  
3. Canadian bishops' statement on the encyclical "Humanae Vitae". 4. Catholic Church. Pope (1963-1978 : Paul VI). *Humanae Vitae*. I. Life Ethics Centre II. Title.

HQ766.3.F688 2005

241'.66

C2005-904349-0

Author: Msgr. Vincent Foy is a priest of the Archdiocese of Toronto, a canon lawyer and a former director of catechetics. He has spent much of his retirement reflecting and writing on the sexual and family moral teaching of the Catholic Church, especially in defence of Pope Paul's 1968 encyclical *Humanae vitae*.

General Editor: Fr. Alphonse de Valk

Book design: Mary Ellen Tardif

Copyright: © 2005 Life Ethics Information Centre

Printer: Ave Maria Press, Toronto, Ontario

Publisher: Life Ethics Information Centre



104 Bond Street, Suite 300  
Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1X9 Canada  
(416) 204-9601  
[www.leic.com](http://www.leic.com)

# **Birth Control**

Is Canada out of step with Rome?

*VINCENT N. FOY*



**LIFE ETHICS INFORMATION CENTRE.  
TORONTO**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	<b>Battle for the future.....7</b>
Chapter I	<b><i>Humanae vitae:</i> From “failure” to freedom..... 13</b>
Chapter II	<b>Contraception and abortion: A comparison and some implications.....25</b>
Chapter III	<b>Homosexuality, marriage and truth.....41</b>
Chapter IV	<b>Confusion surrounds the Winnipeg Statement ....51</b> •Foreword “Fifty reasons” (Fr. Leonard Kennedy) •Canadian Bishops’Statement on the Encyclical <i>Humanae Vitae</i> (“Winnipeg Statement”, September 1968) •Fifty reasons why the Winnipeg Statement should be recalled (October 2003)
Chapter V	<b>Testimonies to Confusion.....79</b> •A letter from Mrs. J.M. Glover •NIB: New state- ment why contraception is wrong •Bishop Galeone’s pastoral letter •Winnipeg Statement to blame for “gay” agenda? •A letter from Norman W. Lower (June 2004) •A letter from Filippo Mecozzi •A letter from Linda Vandenberg •From Jim Verrault re Catholic cri- sis (July/August 2005)
Chapter VI	<b>A Response to Father Michael Prieur’s defence of the Winnipeg Statement..... 91</b>
Chapter VII	<b>Text of <i>Humanae vitae</i> (On the regulation of birth) Encyclical of Pope Paul VI, July 1968..103</b>
	<b>Index..... 125</b>



Foreword

# Battle for the future

(May 2005)

**DAVID DOOLEY**

In 1922 Aldous Huxley wrote a novel, *Crome Yellow*, in which an elderly reprobate called Mr. Scogan predicted the coming separation of Eros, the god of love, from Lucina, the goddess of childbirth. Surveying the animals in a barnyard, he startled and inspired a naive young girl, Mary Gracegirdle, by contending that nature's clumsy method of producing human beings was going to be superseded by the production of babies in bottles. Ten years later, in *Brave New World*, Huxley expanded on this theme by depicting a society from which motherhood has been banished and babies are produced in bottles on an assembly line. This society is devoted to pleasure-seeking. Promiscuity is normal and casually accepted. "Everyone belongs to everyone else." The Malthusian belts which women wear ensure that intercourse will have no unpleasant effects.

But *Brave New World* is not a utopia but an anti-utopia or dystopia; hedonism is not the road to happiness. Huxley could not know that the sexual revolution which he predicted would soon take place, mainly because of the development of the birth-control pill.

## **Two revolutions**

The 20<sup>th</sup> century saw two great revolutions, that associated with the atomic bomb, and that associated with the separation of sex from procreation. When "the pill" came on the scene in the sixties, many Catholics welcomed it as a way of getting around

the Church's ban on the use of birth-control measures. In 1963 Dr. John Rock, one of the scientists who worked on the development of the pill, published a book titled *The Time Has Come: A Catholic Doctor's Proposal to End the Battle Over Birth Control*.

A Papal Commission for the Study of Problems of the Family, Population, and Birth Rate was established by Pope John XXIII and carried on by Pope Paul VI. Its proceedings were supposed to be secret, but after a report of them had been completed by 1966 it was leaked to *The Tablet* in England and the *National Catholic Reporter* in the United States. A majority of those on the Commission were in favour of allowing the use of the pill, the report showed; if the Holy Father agreed, as seemed most likely, the traditional prohibition of contraception would end.

However, when the Pope issued his encyclical *Humanae vitae* (*On the regulation of birth*), he did not eliminate but rather reinforced the ban on birth control. Many of the theologians reacted in disbelief, and many of the bishops asked in effect, "*How do we get around this?*" The Canadian bishops, meeting in Winnipeg, issued a statement which contained one paragraph which was confusing and certainly controversial:

*"Counsellors may meet others who, accepting the teaching of the Holy Father, find, because of particular circumstances they are involved in, what seems to be a clear conflict of duties, e.g., the reconciling of conjugal love and responsible parenthood with the education of children already born or with the health of the mother. In accord with the accepted principles of moral theology, if these persons have tried sincerely but without success to pursue a line of conduct in keeping with the given directives, they may be safely assured that whoever honestly chooses that course which seems right to him, does so in good conscience" (#26).*

Monsignor Vincent Foy, former head of the Toronto Archdiocesan Marriage Tribunal, Toronto pastor of St. John's Church, and the last Canadian to be made a Monsignor by Pope Pius XII, read this statement in amazement.

It has stayed in his mind to this day; in fact most of his writing since it was published has been directed towards showing that the Winnipeg Statement did **not** reflect the teaching of the

Church and that the bishops were in error.

The Church says that a person must follow his own conscience; but conscience does not make its own rules. A believer has the obligation of conforming his conduct to what the Church teaches. The teaching of the Magisterium is the cornerstone upon which the judgment of conscience must be built. And in this case the teaching authority was the Supreme Pastor himself.

The mission which Monsignor Foy set himself to carry out seemed a quixotic one: to convince the Canadian hierarchy to overturn the Winnipeg Statement. He set forth his reason in a lengthy paper titled *Tragedy at Winnipeg (Challenge, October 1988, pp. 14-20, reprinted by Human Life International)*.

Over the years he produced many variants of his argument. Thirty years after *Humanae vitae* appeared, the Canadian bishops held a plenary session in Niagara Falls, and again he pleaded with them to issue a recantation of their 1968 statement, but they were opposed to doing so. As he showed, the effects of the Winnipeg Statement were far-reaching; long after it should have been forgotten, it kept being quoted in manuals providing advice for young people.

Monsignor Foy wrote on many related issues as they came up. For example, in the essay on "Contraception and Abortion" (see Chapter II), he discusses the contraceptive mentality. He has written six short articles on the evil of contraception, contending among other things that it is anti-family. He rejected the family life sex education series used in Catholic schools, *Fully Alive*, in a booklet titled *From Winnipeg to Fully Alive*.<sup>1</sup> In a letter on *Fully Alive* he stated that the series flies in the face of Catholic teaching.

In response to the promotion of condoms in some Catholic schools, he wrote *AIDS, Condoms, and Catholic Education*, published as a booklet by Human Life International in 1996. In response to the ruling by three Ontario judges in June 2002 that the traditional definition of marriage is discriminatory, he wrote a repudiation of the ruling, titled *Homosexuality, Marriage, and Truth* (see Chapter IV).

In 1997 Monsignor Foy returned to the Winnipeg Statement in a systematic exposition titled *A Search for the Truth: Did Pope Paul VI approve the Winnipeg Statement?*<sup>2</sup> His thesis was, again, that the well-being of the Church in Canada depends on the

Canadian bishops retracting their 1968 statement and the need to preach, teach, and promote the message of *Humanae vitae*.

A special concern of Monsignor Foy has always been catechesis. The Vatican statement on it, *Catechesi tradendae*, came after the synod of 1977, and he published an article on it subsequently. Later he declared, in *The Catholic Teacher, Teaching, and Canon Law*, that catechesis has been in crisis in Canada since the introduction of the New Catechetics in the nineteen sixties; specifically, he wrote, in *Catechetical Chaos in Canada*, that the *Come to the Father* series and the *Born of the Spirit* series have left most Catholic children spiritually illiterate.

With his great devotion to the Holy Father and the Magisterium, Monsignor Foy has little patience with dissenters. He wrote a scathing review of a book by a Benedictine monk, Philip S. Kaufman, titled *Why You Can Disagree and Remain a Faithful Catholic*. In the mid-nineties, the Monsignor said, "We now have a glimmering of what might be. It is exemplified in the Cologne Declaration of 163 theologians against Roman Centralism. Every divinely revealed truth and moral precept is now under attack."

Concerning the scandal of former priest Gregory Baum's being allowed to speak at Regis College in 1996, and also at the Newman Centre at the University of Toronto, Monsignor Foy said that in his opinion Baum has done more to weaken the Church in Canada than anyone else, through false ecumenism, theological errors, and opposition to *Humanae vitae*.

If we seek to find the dominant note of Monsignor's career, it is easy to discover it: fidelity. When he sent a message of support to Pope Paul VI in connection with his encyclical *Humanae vitae*, a very appreciative acknowledgement came from Cardinal Cicognani, the Vatican Secretary of State. Dated December 5, 1968, it said that the Holy Father expressed gratitude for the loyalty and support manifested in Monsignor's message, and said that such a ready acceptance of the teaching of Christ's Vicar on earth was a sign of the lively faith which animates the heart of a true Christian. "His Holiness therefore greatly appreciates this token of fidelity ... and prayerfully bestows on you, in pledge of the heavenly reward of a living faith, his special Apostolic Blessing."

Few Canadians can ever have received such a warm letter from the Holy See. It did not come to Monsignor directly, but through diplomatic channels, to the Papal Nuncio in Ottawa, and then to the bishop of the diocese, Archbishop Pocock. As a matter of fact, the latter said nothing. He handed the letter to Monsignor Foy without a word.

### **Endnotes**

- 1 From Winnipeg to Fully Alive, Human Life International, 1992, 33 pages. Also *From Humanae vitae to Veritatis splendor*, Ottawa, 1994, 24 pages.
- 2 *A search for the truth*, Life Ethics Information Centre, Toronto, 1997, 64 pages with an index.



## Chapter I

# *Humanae vitae* From “failure” to freedom

(Catholic Insight, July/August 2000)

**MSGR. VINCENT N. FOY**

**I**n the Irish Dominican publication *Doctrine and Life* for January 1999, is an article by Séan Fagan, S.M., entitled, “*Humanae vitae*, 30 Years On.” The author follows in the footsteps of Charles Curran, Hans Kung, Gregory Baum and a long list of others in defending what is arguably the greatest moral evil in the world: the contraceptive act. While the Church celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the encyclical *Humanae vitae* with gratitude and joy, the dissenters continue their rebellion with thirty-year-old arguments. All they proved is that Séan Fagan and companions are not in full communion with the Church.

### **Authority**

Fagan complains that “any debate on the subject quickly moves on to the question of authority and obedience, and acceptance of the condemnation (of contraception) is often seen as a test of loyalty.” This is as it should be. As Cardinal Newman pointed out, the essence of revealed religion must be authority. That authority comes through Christ to Peter and his successors to us by direct line.

The Fathers of Vatican II tell us that the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ, and pastor of the whole Church, has full, supreme and universal power over the Church; and he can always exercise this power freely (cf. *Lumen gentium*, n.22).

In *Humanae vitae* Pope Paul VI invoked the authority of Christ (cf. n.6). Pope John Paul II has made it clear that its teaching is supported by the authority of Christ: “I myself today, with the same conviction of Paul VI, ratify the teaching of this encyclical, which was put forth by my Predecessor by virtue of the mandate entrusted to us by Christ” (Address to American Bishops at Chicago, Oct. 8, 1979).

Now we know how to evaluate the voices of bishops or theologians who, by virtue of their own authority, question that of the Pope. Do we listen to the Pope or rather to the mini-popes who usurp his divinely delegated role?

There is one more consideration of the gravest importance. As Archbishop Chaput of Denver, Colorado, said in his pastoral letter on the thirtieth anniversary of *Humanae vitae*: “Selective dissent from *Humanae vitae* soon fueled broad dissent from Church authority and attacks on the credibility of the Church herself. The irony is that the people who dismissed Church teaching in the 1960s soon discovered that they had subverted their own ability to pass on anything along to their children”—if they had any.

### **Conscience**

Many have used an erroneous notion of conscience as an escape-hatch from the sacrifices demanded by *Humanae vitae*. Seán Fagan sees many Catholics agonizing over “the gap between Church teaching and the demands of responsible parenthood” who are “now experiencing a special presence of the Spirit in joy and peace and a good conscience.”

The Holy Spirit does not guide any couple into the contraceptive act.

There is no gap between Church teaching and the demands of responsible parenthood. Nor is conscience a source of truth. As Cormac Burke has said, truth is independent of conscience, but conscience is not independent of truth. In moral matters, by the Will of God, the Church is the teacher of truth. A good conscience is informed and then conformed, or it is deformed with the frightful consequences inherent in objective evil. One of the

greatest theologians of our time wrote, "It is nonsense for a Catholic to set up in opposition to the authority of the Encyclical the authority of his own personal conscience" (Cardinal C. Journet, "The Light of the Encyclical," *L'Osservatore Romano*, Oct. 10, 1968, p.10). It is nonsense, but still repeated, as we now observe.

We find the true doctrine of responsible parenthood in Vatican II: "The moral aspect of any procedure must be determined by objective standards. Sons of the Church may not undertake methods of regulating procreation which are found blameworthy by the teaching authority of the Church in its unfolding of the divine law" (*Gaudium et spes*, n.51).

### **The Holy Spirit set against the Pope**

It is strange, even perverse, that dissenters seem to find the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth, wherever they wish to find it, but not in the authoritative voice of Christ's Vicar.

Fagan implies that the bishops of Vatican II were in some way opposed to the traditional teaching against contraception. He says, "It is difficult to accept that the Holy Spirit would ignore the world gathering of bishops in the Second Vatican Council."

But nothing in the documents of Vatican II opposes the teaching on *Humanae vitae*. Pope John XXIII had withdrawn the subject of the Pill and contraception from the Council. Pope Paul VI inherited this decision. The Vatican II Fathers, on Nov. 20, 1964, by 1592 votes to 427, deferred decisions on marital morality to the Pope.

What the bishops of Vatican II said was: "Married people should realize that in their behaviour they may not simply follow their own fancy but must be ruled by conscience—and conscience ought to be conformed to the law of God in the light of the teaching authority of the Church which is the authentic interpretation of divine law" (*Gaudium et spes*, n.50).

Fagan says it is difficult to accept that the Holy Spirit would pay no attention to the special papal commission set up to study the question. The Holy Spirit, we can be certain, guided the Pope to give very special attention to that papal commission and to

accept the opinions of those members of the commission who upheld the truth of the Church's tradition. This commission did not play the major part in the evaluative process. The Holy Father wrote to the pastoral bishops of the world asking for a detailed report, giving not only their opinions but those of the theological experts in their dioceses. This request was labeled *sub secreto*. I helped one bishop in the preparation of his report.

Fagan says it is difficult to accept that the Holy Spirit would allow the thousands of testimonies from committed married Catholics from all over the world to sink into oblivion. What was the nature of these testimonies? We do not know. We do know that committed married Catholics with properly formed consciences would never contracept. The Holy Father had as advisor the teaching and experience of all past ages to prophesy the evil fruits of the contraceptive act.

Fagan appears not to admit that the Roman Pontiff has full, supreme and universal power over the whole Church; a power which he can always exercise unhindered (*Lumen gentium*, n. 22).

## **Bishops against the Church**

Against the encyclical Fagan quotes two bishops.

### **1. Cardinal König**

We are told that Cardinal König, retired Archbishop of Vienna, in a debate with Cardinal Ratzinger in 1992, dismissed "the irritating distinction between artificial and natural contraception." That the distinction is irritating to Cardinal König is not an argument.

The Church teaches "that it is licit to take into account the natural rhythm immanent in the generative functions—the Church is coherent with herself when She considers recourse to the infecund periods to be licit while at the same time condemning, as being always illicit, the use of means directly contrary to fecundation" (*Humanae vitae*, n. 16).

Pope Paul VI was confirming the teaching of Pius XII and it has also been confirmed by Pope John Paul II. Numerous authors have capably demonstrated the essential difference between the

contraceptive act and abstention from intercourse for valid reasons (cf. Janet E. Smith, *Humanae vitae*, a *Generation Later*, Catholic University of America Press, pp. 118-128). The difference is between virtue and vice, and maybe that between heaven and hell.

## **2. Bishop Christopher Butler**

We are told that Bishop Christopher Butler, "one of the most respected participants in the Second Vatican Council, asserted that the fact that the encyclical was not 'received' by the Church could be seen as 'invalidating' its teaching."

Whether or not Bishop Butler was much respected at Vatican II is not the question. Perhaps he was respected because then he upheld Church teaching. He said: "the test of loyalty and orthodoxy is, and will always be, sincere assent to the decisions of the Magisterium" (*The Tablet*, Sept. 28, 1962). It was only after the Council that he turned away from loyalty and orthodoxy.

Bishop Butler is in error in stating that the encyclical was not received by the Church. It was received by the Church when Paul VI signed it. The Pope has the right to speak in the name of the Church (*Lumen gentium*, n. 22). He exercised that right in the encyclical: "The Church teaches that each and every marriage act must remain open to the transmission of life" (*Humanae vitae*, n. 11).

Whether *Humanae vitae* was accepted by observance is not pertinent. Ten billion sinners do not invalidate the Ten Commandments. Many of Christ's disciples did not accept His teaching on the Eucharist because it was "a hard saying."

The principal reason *Humanae vitae* has not been received by observance is that it has not been taught as the Pope requested, "without compromise." Dissenting bishops, theologians and priests have blown uncertain and discordant trumpets and even encouraged the rejection of the encyclical.

## **3. Episcopal Conferences**

Fagan says: "Many Episcopal conferences (surely a part of the teaching Church) issued pastoral statements to help people

understand the encyclical and they considerably softened the declaration of paragraph 14 condemning all artificial means of contraception.”

Bishops’ conferences as well as individual bishops are a part of the teaching Church when they are faithful to it. About twelve national conferences of bishops so distorted the teaching of the encyclical as to effectively destroy it. Their statements were by that tragic process reduced from collegial and magisterial status to the level of private dissenting opinion which the faithful person was obliged to reject.

### **Theologians against the Church**

We are told that shortly after the encyclical was published, over six hundred top US theologians signed a document saying that “spouses may responsibly decide according to their conscience that artificial contraception in some circumstances is permissible and indeed even necessary to preserve and foster the value and sacredness of their marriage.”

More precisely, this was the statement issued by Father Charles Curran on July 29, 1968, who by then had mustered support from seventy-seven “theologians.” The encyclical had been signed on July 25, 1968 and many of these “theologians” had not yet read it. The unscholarly nature of the American dissent is described by Msgr. George Kelly in *The Battle for the American Church* (Doubleday and Co., 1979).

Dissenting theologians included brilliant men like Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan. There were brilliant defenders of the encyclical like Cardinal Charles Journet, Jean Guittou, and Dietrich and Alice von Hildebrand. Nor were dissenters always dissenters. Edward Schillebeeckx, for example, said in 1963: “It is unthinkable that in such an important question of daily life the Church could err in its solemn teaching.” But by 1968 he, too, had joined the opposition.

It is evident that brilliance is no guarantee of Catholic orthodoxy nor is it an obstacle to it. It is evident also that only by authority could the issue be settled. Before the encyclical that later arch-advocate of contraception Fr. F.X. Murphy wrote,

“What seems obvious, is that the issue cannot be solved by logical argument alone. What the Catholic people and the world want is a clear statement” (*The Tablet*, May 11, 1968).

The Catholic Church has the competency to decide the role of the Catholic theologian. She has done this in unambiguous terms. The right role of the theologian is always pursued in communion with the Magisterium and never apart from it (cf. *Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian*, n.6; see also the encyclical *Veritatis splendor*, n.110).

Pope John Paul II excoriates dissenting theologians—“What is taught by the Church on contraception does not belong to material freely debatable among theologians.” Those who argue otherwise “in open contrast with the law of God, authentically taught by the Church, guide couples down a wrong path” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, June 6, 1987).

What then is the state of those in dissent? They are not Catholic theologians. Bishop B.C. Butler once said: “the Roman Church teaches that schism is a grave sin and that a schismatic is one who refuses to be subject to the Holy See” (*The Idea of the Church*, p. 43). Canon 751 of the Code of Canon Law defines schism as the refusal of submission to the Roman Pontiff or of communion with the members of the Church subject to him.” Do not dissenters from *Humanae vitae* refuse submission to the Roman Pontiff?

### **The fruits of dissent: prophecies fulfilled**

Pope Paul VI predicted the effects of the contraceptive mentality:

1. Widespread use of contraception would lead to conjugal infidelity and the general lowering of morality.
2. Man would lose respect for woman and would tend to consider her as a mere instrument of selfish enjoyment and no longer as his respected and beloved companion.
3. Widespread acceptance of contraception would be a weapon in the hands of public authorities who take no heed of “moral exigencies.”
4. The more contraception was accepted, the more man

would believe he had unlimited sovereignty over his body.

All of Paul VI's prophecies have been fulfilled. The contraceptive mentality has led to spiritual, moral, psychological, sociological, political and even demographic evils. Many competent authors have detailed these effects; e.g., Janet E. Smith in her Introduction to *Why Humanae vitae was Right* (Ignatius Press, 1993). See also "The Scandal of the Century: Thirty Years of Prophecy Ignored" by John Mallon in *Inside the Vatican*, Aug./Sept., 1998).

Dissenters are silent when faced with the evident evils consequent upon widespread contraceptive behaviour. They ignore the family dissension caused when one spouse resists contraceptive use and the other insists on it. They do not speak of the millions of abortions caused by contraceptive chemicals, the Pill and devices like the IUD. They are silent about the evils of sterilization. They do not speak of the invalidity of many marriages occasioned by the contraceptive mentality. When one spouse or both intend to exclude the right to children either temporarily or perpetually, the marriage is null.

Contraception is not evil because of the many evils it spawns; but because it is evil in itself it has evil consequences. It destroys the procreative meaning of the marriage act. It is an affront to God's creative prerogative and the co-creative nature of the marital union. The awful consequences of rebellion against God's law of Life and Love are that wherever the teaching of *Humanae vitae* is not observed the family and the Church are dying.

### **Developments**

Speaking of *Humanae vitae*, Séan Fagan says that Pope Paul VI "invited theologians and scientists to continue their research to find arguments that would convince people of the truth of his teaching." He claims that "in the past thirty years not a single new argument has been found to change the situation."

Paul VI did not invite scientists to find arguments that would convince people of the truth of his teaching. That was not in their

competency. He asked them to pool their efforts to "explain more thoroughly the various conditions favouring a proper regulation of birth" (n.24). In this he was quoting directly from Vatican II (*Gaudium et spes*, n.52). He also referred to the wish of Pius XII that medical science might succeed in providing "a sufficiently secure basis for a regulation of birth founded on the observance of natural rhythm" (n.24).

Nor did the Pope in the encyclical invite theologians to find arguments that would convince people of the truth of his teaching. To priests he said: "Your first task—especially in the case of those who teach moral theology—is to expound the Church's teaching on marriage without ambiguity" (n.25).

Nevertheless, there has been considerable development in the disciplines which directly or indirectly affect the present debate. The medical and social sciences give a clearer picture of the evils following widespread contraceptive practice. There is development in understanding the role of the theologian; e.g., in the *Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian* (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, May 29, 1990). The encyclical *Veritatis splendor* of August 6, 1993, fulfills its purpose "to state the principles for discerning what is contrary to sound doctrine" (n.30). The Church has clearly defined the unacceptability of dissent from authoritative teaching (cf. Cardinal Ratzinger's commentary on the *motu proprio* of John Paul II, *Ad tuendam fidem* of May 18, 1998).

There has been development in understanding the philosophical and theological bases of *Humanae vitae*. Pope John Paul II has contributed to this understanding in "*Reflections on Humanae vitae*", given in audiences from July 11, 1984, to Nov. 7, 1984. Some eminent scholars have contributed to our understanding of orthodox teaching; e.g., Cardinal Charles Journet, Ermingildo Lio, Dietrich and Alice von Hildebrand, Cormac Burke, G.E.M. Anscombe, John M. Finnis, Carlo Caffarra, Janet E. Smith, Elizebieta Wojcik, and John F. Kippley.

It must be admitted that no developments or new insights will convince some dissenters. "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." That is precisely why we need the

voice of authority and in this case divine authority. Cardinal Newman gives us this penetrating insight: “the sense of right and wrong, which is the first element in religion, is so delicate, so fitful, so easily puzzled, obscured, perverted, so subtle in its argumentative methods, so impressible by education, so biased by pride and passion, so unsteady in its course, that the Church, the Pope, the Hierarchy, are, in the divine purpose, the supply of an urgent demand.” He says of the Pope, “The championship of the Moral Law and of conscience are his ‘raison d’être.’”

### **Humanae vitae is forever**

Dissenting theologians are figuratively knocking their heads against a rock, the Rock of Peter. The Church has not, does not, and cannot change her teaching concerning the intrinsic evil of contraception.

When professor John T. Noonan wrote his book in 1966 on the history of the teaching on contraception, he expected that he might trace the teaching to the mid-eighteenth century. He found the doctrine against contraception taught by Clement of Alexandria at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. In other words, the encyclical rightly refers to the “constant teaching” of the Church (n.10).

In a footnote to *Humanae vitae* we are referred to these words of Pope Pius XII:

*“No alleged indication or need can convert an intrinsically immoral act into a moral and lawful one. This precept is as valid today as it was yesterday, and it will be the same tomorrow and always....”*

Pope John Paul II affirms that “it is not, in fact, a doctrine invented by man; it was stamped in the very nature of the human person by God the Creator’s hand and confirmed by Him in revelation.” Calling it into question, therefore is equivalent to refusing God Himself the obedience of our intelligence (Nov. 12, 1988).

### Recovering the truth

Is not the solution to dissent, which is a rebellion against authority, the right use of authority?

In the midst of a crisis sparked by the *Dutch Catechism*, Pope Paul VI convened an extraordinary synod "On Dangerous Opinions and on Atheism." In the subsequent report of Oct. 28, 1967, *Ratione habita*, it was recommended that there be a firm exercise of authority in directing the Church of God "according to the mind of the Second Vatican Council to the exclusion of abuses and deviations whether in doctrinal matters or in pastoral or liturgical questions. Those who are rash or imprudent should be warned in all charity; those who are pertinacious should be removed from office."

Despite the grave wound inflicted on the Church by dissident theologians, the Synod of 1967 was largely ignored. After 1968, dissent from *Humanae vitae* ravaged the Church. Nor has there been a diminution of dissent since the *motu proprio* of John Paul II *Ad Tuendam fidem* of 1998.

Is it not legitimate to ask:

1. Why would a Catholic review print an attack on the teaching of the Church as presented in *Humanae vitae* and a hundred other magisterial documents?
2. Why would the Superior of Father Séan Fagan permit him to continue attacking the teaching of the Church?
3. Why would the Superior of the great Dominican Order allow a publication under its authority to attack *Humanae vitae*, the very foundation of the Catholic family?
4. Should not the responsible bishop intervene?

All need to pray for the restoration of the teaching and observance of God's law on Life and Love. Wherever *Humanae vitae* is rejected, in due time the Church will cease to exist.

*Nota bene:* Father Séan Fagan's 1997 book entitled *Does morality change?* was formally rejected by the Irish bishops in their *Notification on recent developments in moral theology and their implications for the Church and society*, Irish Bishops Conference, July 2004.



## Chapter II

# Contraception & abortion

## *A comparison and some complications*

*(Catholic Insight, October 2001)*

**R**ev. John Hardon, the well-known Jesuit theologian in the United States, in a talk just before his recent death, said that the greatest evil in the Church today is contraception and its effect, the general dissent in the Church. The contraceptive mentality is a selfish attitude toward sexuality and married life, and ultimately toward many other things. Monsignor Foy points out its danger to the salvation of many Catholics. —**Editor**

**MSGR. VINCENT N. FOY**

*“From man in regard to his fellow-man  
I will demand an accounting for human life”  
(God to Noah, Genesis 9:5).*

**T**hough his thinking in general is deeply warped, the philosopher Hegel in his *Philosophy of History* is not far from the truth when he says that human history is one vast slaughterhouse. Despite repeated warnings in God’s revelation encapsulated in the command “Thou shalt not kill,” the Culture of Death now permeates society as never before. We are not surprised to hear warning after warning from our Holy Father about this transcendent evil. On Feb. 14, 2001, he said:

*“The promotion of the culture of life should be the highest priority in our societies ... If the right to life is not defended decisively as a condition for all other rights of the person, all other references to human rights*

*remain deceitful and illusory.”*

The two principal causes of the Culture of Death are abortion and contraception. Abortion means death to the unborn. Contraception has been described as “creeping death.” It is of paramount importance to assess the relationship between these two killers of society and souls to formulate plans and strategies to promote the Culture of Life.

The evaluation of the comparative roles of abortion and contraception in attacking human life is not as simple as might be thought. They are often intertwined in their intent. Abortifacients are often called contraceptives. At first murder seems a more heinous crime than the prevention of life, but there are hidden factors. Despite difficulties, some comparisons can be made which indicate how the whole pro-life movement should move. We consider some of these comparisons.

### **Abortion as sin**

Abortion is a grave or mortal sin against the Fifth Commandment of God: “Thou shalt not kill” (*Exodus* 20:13). “God alone is the Lord of life from the beginning until its end: no one can under any circumstances claim for himself the right directly to destroy an innocent human being” (*Donum vitae [Gift of life]* 1986, Introduction, n.5). The person murdered through abortion has precisely the same right to life as the abortionist, or the one who cooperates in the abortion, or the politician who legislates the “right” to kill. To speak of one’s right over one’s body as justification for abortion is sophistry. There is not one body, but two, not one person, but two, with an equal right to life. So the church calls abortion an “unspeakable crime” (*Gaudium et spes*, n.51). Since it is a mortal sin, it carries with it, unless there is repentance, the frightful sanction of eternal death.

Abortion kills the body of the victim and the soul of the killer, but not the soul of the victim. That soul will live forever in God’s love, with that degree of happiness which God’s love and mercy bestows.

The crime of abortion is nearly always a chain sin. A cluster

of persons share the guilt: abortionist, assistants, office staff, hospital management, advertisers, and responsible politicians—and those who remained passive when they should have spoken or acted or prayed.

### **Contraception as sin**

Contraception is also a grave or mortal sin with the sanction of spiritual death. In this the Church's teaching—speaking with Christ's authority—is constant. Pope Pius XI, in the encyclical *Casti connubii* (*Chastity in marriage*) of Dec. 31, 1930, declared: "Our mouth proclaims anew: any use of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offence against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of grave sin."

Numerous papal and episcopal statements underline the gravity of the sin of the contraceptive act. Here I quote only a few episcopal statements from the last century, before some bishops turned away from listening to the voice of Christ to the voice of dissenters:

- (a) Contraception is "a vice against nature and a sin crying to Heaven" (Belgian bishops, June 2, 1909).
- (b) Contraception is a "serious sin, a very serious sin, with whatever means and whatever way it occurs" (German bishops, Aug. 20, 1913).
- (c) "The theories and practices which teach or encourage the restriction of birth are as disastrous as they are criminal" (French bishops, May 17, 1919).
- (d) "The selfishness which leads to race suicide with or without the pretext of bettering the species is, in God's sight, a detestable thing. It is a crime for which, eventually, the nation must suffer" (Cardinal Gibbons on behalf of the U.S. hierarchy, Sept. 20, 1919).
- (e) Contraception "whether within the married state or outside it, is an unnatural vice, sinning against the nature which the Creator bestowed upon us, and therefore grievously displeasing in His sight" (Cardinal Bourne of

Westminster, Oct. 9, 1930).

- (f) “Contraceptive methods were, are, and always will be a sin; it was reserved to our generation to glorify vice with the name of virtue” (Bishops of India, 1957).

In sum, the Church has never deviated from the teaching that contraception is a grave violation of God’s Fifth Commandment.

### **The sanction for abortion**

Excommunication is the ecclesiastical sanction imposed by the Church on abortionists: “A person who actually procures an abortion incurs a *latae sententiae* excommunication” (canon 1398, Code of Canon Law). This means that the excommunication is automatic. In the case of *latae sententiae* excommunications, those also come under the penalty if the crime would not have been committed without them (cf. canon 1319). So abortionists, those taking part in the abortion, and counsellors of the abortion, are also excommunicated.

It is within the authority of the Church to impose the penalty of excommunication on those who are co-operators in abortion in a more remote way; e.g., legislators who introduce, promote, or vote for pro-abortion laws. There is a rising chorus of voices calling for the excommunication of politicians who promote abortion and, therefore, have the blood of innocent children on their hands. Such Catholic politicians are a scandal and disgrace. In Canada, we have Jean Chrétien and Joe Clark and Allan Rock. The US has Senator Edward Kennedy and former Governor Cuomo. (On this subject see “Should Rock be excommunicated?” by Fr. Alphonse de Valk, C.S.B., *Catholic Insight*, March 2001.)

### **The sanction for contraception**

In the matter of contraception even “abortifacient contraception,” although there is not specific ecclesiastical penalty, there remains the supreme penalty of the loss of God’s grace.

In some places and times there have been ecclesiastical penalties for contraception. In Spain in 1936, absolution from the sin of contraception was reserved to the bishop in eight dioceses (cf. *Catholic Priests’ Association Newsletter*, Vol. III and IV, 1972,

p.60).

That there is an excommunication attached to abortion and not to contraception does not mean that the former is a greater crime. It means that the good order of the Church as a visible society is more obviously disturbed.

### **The number of abortions**

Who can compute the number of abortions? God alone knows that tragic statistic. One report says that in 1995 there were approximately twenty-six million legal and twenty million illegal abortions performed worldwide (cf. Heritage House '76: Abortion Facts.com). The same source reports that in the U.S. there were 580,760 surgical abortions in 1972 and 1,210,883 in 1995.

In *Statistics Canada*, we read that Canadian women obtained 114,848 surgical abortions in 1997, a 2.9% increase from 111,649 a year earlier. The national abortion rate for every one hundred live births in 1997 was thirty three. Even worse are the Quebec numbers. We read in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of March 13, 2000: "Over the past two decades the number of abortions in Quebec has more than doubled, giving the Canadian province one of the world's highest abortion rates outside of Eastern Europe. The Quebec Bureau of Statistics reported that forty-one abortions were performed for every one hundred live births in 1998."

Reported statistics are only a portion of aborted persons. One must add the lives terminated by abortifacient contraceptives. "Throughout the world, an estimated 250 million abortions are caused by the IUD and pill each year" (*Faith and Facts*, Emmaus Road Publishing, 1999, p.114). Is it an exaggeration to describe the world as a slaughterhouse?

### **The number of contraceptive acts**

As large as are the numbers of those murdered by abortion, much more numerous are those deprived of human life and spiritual growth by contraception. One must number in these tragic statistics those millions of babies who should have been and are

not because of tubal ligations and vasectomies. Adding to the disgrace of this pandemic deprivation of human souls is that, in general, the contraceptive rate among Catholics in Europe and North America is not lower than that of the general population.

### **The effects of abortion**

The primary effect of abortion is the brutal termination of a human life at the time of its greatest potentiality. It is indescribably callous. When a baby is born there is rejoicing. Even the death of one baby brings great sorrow. The headline in the *Toronto Star* for Feb. 18, 2001, was: "Why did my baby have to die?" Even the stillborn child is the subject of mourning. Yet the aborted child is a pariah: its tiny broken body cast away in a garbage bag shroud or incinerated. We are reminded of the words of St. Augustine in his *Confessions*, that, in this life, "The more they deserve tears, the less likely will men sorrow for them."

There is a worse death occasioned by abortion: the spiritual death of the participants. All those who participate in the abortion, and that includes those who legalize abortion, suffer this death. The aborted child will live forever in God's love; the abortionists become spiritual corpses.

Abortion kills countries. In Canada, the fertility rate has been below the replacement rate since the mid-seventies. As Fr. Paul Marx wrote in a letter (2000), the whole of Europe is dying except Albania. The average family size in Europe is 1.4 children. Even Ireland is down to 1.9 children per family (*Editor*: the minimum replacement rate is 2.1).

Abortion places an especially heavy burden on the conscience of the aborting mother. She knows in her heart that she has murdered her own child. "Could a mother ever forget her own infant, and not take compassion on the child of her womb?" (*Isaiah 49:15*).

It is true of course that, through repentance and God's mercy, there can be complete forgiveness and even a blossoming into a dedication to the pro-life cause. Abortion leaves great gaps in the family, in the Church, and in society. There are missing brothers and sisters, sons and daughters; gaps in productive citizens, gaps

in vocations to the priesthood and religious life and the professions. There are great gaps in those who ought to be listening to the Call to Holiness. Abortion leads to euthanasia. Laws permitting euthanasia would not have been possible had they not been preceded by laws allowing abortion.

These and other evils are the effects of abortion.

### **The effects of contraception**

The primary effect of contraception is the gross deformity of the marriage act, the act designed by God to people earth and heaven. Contraception transforms the marriage act from an act of love into an act of hate, from self-giving to mutual abuse. Although some forms of contraception do not kill, they prevent life and so demonstrate a willingness to put self-gratification before life. Abortion is a single crime.

Contraception is usually a habit which tends to harden the heart with the passage of time. Although the conscience may not suffer the trauma that normally accompanies abortion, contraceptive practice more likely sedates the conscience, with all the deadly consequences of the sinful state, including the loss of faith. Contraception leaves all the great gaps listed under abortion, but multiplies them as the attack on life is multiplied.

The encyclical *Humanae vitae*, under the heading of “Grave consequences of methods of artificial birth control,” lists the most notable effects of contraception: “the wide and easy road opened to conjugal infidelity and general lowering of morality;” the lowering of respect for the woman who becomes an “instrument of selfish enjoyment” and no longer a respected and beloved companion; the dangerous weapon placed in the hands of evil authorities (cf. n. 17).

Following in the wake of contraceptive practice is the acceptance of that other sterile deformity of sex called homosexuality. Christians long recognized the relationship between the two. It is interesting to note that Martin Luther saw this in his condemnation of contraception. He said, “This is a most disgraceful sin. It is far more atrocious than incest and adultery. We call it unchastity, yes, a sodomistic sin” (*Faith Facts*, p. 113). A contra-

cepting society, with sex separated from love and life, leads to a society tolerant of homosexual conduct.

### **The death chain**

Comparing contraception and abortion enables us to see that they are linked in a death chain. Contraception is at the top of the chain. Contraception gives birth to abortion deaths and to the acceptance of sterile sodomy. Abortion gives birth to euthanasia. All of these give birth to the acceptance of a pervasive pornography. When these are widespread, we have the Culture of Death. This Culture of Death gives birth to the death of the family, to the death of society, to the death of the Church, and to the perpetual death of immortal souls.

Father John Hardon, S.J., a truly great theologian, summed up the effects of the contraceptive mentality:

“It has been correctly said that *Humanae vitae* divides the Catholic Church into two periods of history. The Church will survive only among those who believe that contraception is deadly both to Christianity and the promise of a heavenly reward. Contraception is fatal to the true faith and to eternal life.”

Recognition of the death chain leads to many implications. We consider two major ones.

### **Implications for the pro-life movement**

Considering the essential link between contraception and abortion, it follows with inexorable logic that no pro-life group can truly be such if it does not repudiate contraception. Yet there are groups that propose “safe sex” through condom use as the solution to abortion; other “pro-life” groups accept members who uphold contraception as an alternative to abortion.

Most pro-life associations recognize that they must combat the contraceptive mentality if they are to succeed. Among these are *Human Life International*, founded by that great Apostle of Life, Fr. Paul Marx, O.S.B. Among these also are *Priests for Life*, now an international movement. A new group in Canada, which strikes at the heart of the problem, is *Catholics Against Contraception*. We also are privileged to have in Canada, under

the dedicated leadership of Sr. Lucille Durocher, the completely orthodox movement *St. Joseph's Workers for Life and Family Pharmacists for Life International* say in their advertising brochure: "Contraception is the Achilles' heel of the pro-life movement. If we do not take clear steps against contraception, it will destroy the pro-life movement just as assuredly as it destroys the smallest life." The motto of Pharmacists for Life is "No exceptions, no compromises, no apologies."

Also, *Campaign Life Coalition*, the national public-interest organization in Canada, rejects all government-sponsored and public-funded promotion of contraception, including teaching it to public health nurses and other health professionals (National policy, June 27, 2000).

Not to recognize the evil of contraception while fighting abortion is like working to kill the termites on the roof of a house, while the whole structure is being eaten away from within. It is like leaning over a deck to chip away at an iceberg, while the ship is being gutted beneath the waterline.

It is not permissible to soft-pedal contraception in the interests of a so-called pro-life ecumenism. This is not a denominational issue, pertaining to Catholics alone. The prohibition of contraception is founded on divine natural law. Only groups which in their underlying philosophy are anti-contraception, anti-sterilization, and anti-abortion have the right to full endorsement.

Immense benefits flow when pro-life groups are in harmony with God's Truth. Here are a few:

- (a) They have a right to unqualified support from all, including the Catholic hierarchy.
- (b) They can readily network and support one another in organizing protests, demonstrations, conferences, letter-writing campaigns, and other projects.
- (c) Their unity in Truth will add immeasurably to their strength and appeals for prayers and financial help.
- (d) Their unity of purpose will inspire the formulation of greater projects and methods to help restore the Culture of Life.

### **Implications for teaching the truth**

A second implication from the consideration of the evils of contraception and abortion is the necessity of teaching the truth. Too many voices have been silent, too many voices have distorted the truth given to us by Christ through the Church. Responsibility for teaching the truth about human life rests primarily with our bishops (cf. c. 375, *Code of Canon Law*). To bishops, Pope Paul VI said in *Humanae vitae*: “Consider this mission as one of your most urgent responsibilities at the present time” (n. 30).

As we know, Catholic bishops chiefly responsible for teaching *Humanae vitae* have been the primary factors in its rejection. Following dissenting theologians rather than Christ, about twelve national hierarchies so distorted the teaching of the encyclical as to virtually destroy it. Among the worst offenders were the Canadian bishops by their Winnipeg Statement of September 1968. As night follows the day, Canadian Catholics now live in the dark Culture of Death.

In Canada, as in many other places, we desperately need bishops who will go against those who have subjected the truth to a pseudo-collegiality of moral compromise. We need bishops who will not subordinate the truth to uniformity. We need bishops who speak and do not take refuge in silence on life issues. We need bishops who will sweep their dioceses clean of all errors against Life and Love. We need bishops not afraid to challenge those civil authorities who initiate legislation against the family.

We need bishops who will insist that Catholic hospitals be in conformity with Catholic ethics. We need bishops who will remove from their schools the *Fully Alive* sex education course which initiates children in grade school into sexual perversion and teaches them the illicit means of contraception. We need bishops ready to suffer criticism and media-abuse and humiliation in defence of human life. We need bishops ready to die for Life. For such bishops we ought to pray. For all bishops we ought to pray and pray.

## The Nineveh solution

### The situation

The situation in many countries is desperate. Extrapolating from the statistics, the typical parish in Canada is dying. Its birth rate is suicidal. Most of the parents of childbearing age are either sterilized or contracepting. The majority of those contracepting who go to Mass receive Holy Communion, an objective sacrilege. The children going to a Catholic school are educated in contraception in grade eight. Few go to Sunday Mass. Vocations to the priesthood and religious life are insufficient to sustain a flourishing, evangelizing Church. It is impossible for the Church to survive where *Humanae vitae* is not taught and lived.

### There is hope

The situation looks hopeless. Humanly speaking, it is hopeless. Yet there is hope.

The book of Jonah gives us a clue. God through Jonah threatened to destroy Nineveh. “Arise, go to Nineveh, that great city, and cry against it; for their wickedness has come up before Me” (*Jonah* 1:2). Nineveh repented by prayer and penance and it was spared. A quite marvelous example of the power of prayer is given us in a book called *The Shadow of His Wings*, the true story of Fr. Gereon Goldmann, OFM (Ignatius Press). I suggest that every Catholic would benefit from reading this book. When Fr. Goldmann was a boy, he met a Franciscan missionary from Japan and yearned to go back to Japan with him. He was told that if he said one Hail Mary a day he would one day go as a missionary to Japan. He said that Hail Mary and how he got to Japan is a remarkable, even miraculous, series of events—through countless obstacles, including a sentence of death.

Prayer and penance would save the Church in Canada. That is the Nineveh solution. Every Canadian Catholic saying one Hail Mary a day for Life could do it. We are reminded of the words of Tertullian: “Prayer is the one thing that can conquer God.”

### **Prayer suggestions**

Prayer for life can take many forms. Here are a few suggestions.

It would surely be a fruitful prayer if a pro-life *oratio imperata* (required oration) were added to the Mass, making every Mass a petition for life. We recall that an added oration for peace was ordered by many bishops during World War II. The Prayer of the Faithful at Mass could always include a petition for an end to abortion and contraception. Pro-life prayer cards could be more widely distributed, especially by pro-life groups. The prayer could include a petition for an end to contraception. The daily prayers in every school could include a pro-life petition. Especially pleasing to God would be the prayer of all contemplative religious on behalf of human life.

Perpetual Eucharistic Adoration is spreading in Canada and in many other countries. This means having extended exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, either part-time or for twenty-four hours a day. It is the intention of the Holy Father that this devotion “be established in all parishes and Christian communities” (International Eucharistic Congress, 1993). More and more pastors are introducing this transforming devotion. All engaged in Eucharistic Adoration could spend more time in remembering the cause of Life.

Every Catholic, in daily prayer, could ask for an end to contraception and abortion. In our prayers, we ought to pray that qualified pro-life leaders would seek election to government. We ought also to pray for the conversion of abortionists and all those associated with abortion “clinics.” To his or her prayers every Catholic could add some acts of self-denial and penance.

We live in a new Nineveh. We can choose Life or Death. Is there enough Faith left to choose Life?

From Patrick Sheahan  
re October article by Msgr. Foy  
(*Catholic Insight*, December 2001)

I read the October 2001 issue of *Catholic Insight* and feel you owe me and your readers an apology for the article written by Msgr. Vincent Foy. In his article on contraception and abortion, Msgr. Foy directed appalling and disparaging comments at all married Catholic couples. I can't believe you devoted five pages to this garbage. I refer specifically to his comments about contraception, not abortion.

His outrageous comments included the following; "disgrace of this pandemic deprivation of human souls;" "contraception is also a grave sin with the sanction of spiritual death;" "contraception transforms the marriage act from an act of love into an act of hate, from self-giving to mutual abuse."

I thought it was interesting Msgr. Foy used lots of papal and episcopal statements to support his view, but no scriptural passages, probably because he knew Christ never spoke in this way to the people He loved and towards whom He had so much compassion and mercy. But Christ certainly spoke of how the Pharisees loved to burden the people with laws.

So after having two sons, if my wife and I chose to use contraception as a responsible act, Msgr. Foy would have us believe our intimacy is now an act of hate and mutual abuse. Msgr. Foy fails to share with us his experiences with a woman he loves, because as a priest he has never been in a loving relationship with a woman. He has never enjoyed the beauty of the sexual act between two committed and loving partners.

As the editor of this publication, I have to ask you how could you have allowed the Monsignor to stray into his insane comments about "contraceptive practice leading to the acceptance of homosexuality."

Finally, if Msgr. Foy believes contraception and abortion are the cause of insufficient vocations to the priesthood and religious life, he may want to re-examine his own vocation and the mis-

guided article he contributed to *Catholic Insight* as a reason many Catholics would never be attracted to religious life. A flourishing and evangelizing Church depends upon every follower of Christ responding to the Great Commission instead of relying upon our clergy to do the job for Christ. I look forward to the November issue to see what response *Catholic Insight* will deem appropriate for its readers and the reaction of other readers as well.

**Hamilton, ON**

**Msgr. Foy replies:**

*I would like to point out that neither Patrick Sheahan nor I determine whether contraception is good or bad. That is the prerogative of God, the author of moral law.*

*Because it is divine law, the Church's teaching against contraception is unchanging and unchangeable. It is expressed in the words of Pope John Paul II at a seminar on responsible parenthood on September 17, 1983: "Contraception contradicts the truth of conjugal love. Contraception is to be judged objectively so profoundly unlawful as never to be, for any reason, justified. To think or say the contrary is equal to maintaining that, in human life, situations may arise in which it is lawful not to recognize God as God."*

*Marriage vows give the right to "those actions which of their nature lead to procreation." They do not give the right to contraception and, therefore, contraception is never a responsible act. In itself it is an act of mutual abuse and hate because it deprives the soul of grace, unfits one for receiving Holy Communion, and destroys the capacity for supernatural merit. In short, it is a spiritual tragedy.*

*It is untenable to separate the teaching of Christ on moral issues from the teaching of the Church. The Church teaches by and only by Christ's authority. As Pope Paul VI said in the encyclical *Humanae vitae*, "We now intend, by virtue of the mandate entrusted us by Christ, to give our reply to these grave questions" (n. 6).*

*In determining right and wrong, experience is irrelevant. A judge does not need to be a murderer to know that murder is wrong. A priest does not need to be married to know that adultery, abortion, and contraception are contrary to God's law and love. Vocations to the priesthood and religious life generally come from*

*good Catholic families faithful to the teaching of the Church.*

*Patrick Sheahan calls insane the comment about “contraceptive practice leading to the acceptance of homosexuality.” I said, “A contraceptive society, with sex separated from love and life, leads to a society tolerant of homosexual conduct.” Both contraceptive and homosexual acts are sins of lust inherently sterile, acts of mutual self-abuse. To attempt to justify one is to attempt to justify the other. This is why contraception is sometimes called sodomistic, as even Martin Luther called it. That is why acceptance of contraception leads to greater tolerance of homosexual activity.*

*I would suggest to Mr. Sheahan a study of the book *Sex and the Marriage Covenant*, by John F. Kippley, published by the Couple to Couple League International of Cincinnati, Ohio. Those “on-line” would find a rich source of information on the website of “Catholics against contraception” at: [www.catholicsagainstcontraception.com](http://www.catholicsagainstcontraception.com).*



## Chapter III

### *Homosexuality, marriage & truth*

*(Catholic Insight, November 2002)*

**MSGR. VINCENT N. FOY**

**L**ike the proverbial frog, which allowed itself to be boiled to death in a pot because the heat was turned up only gradually, society is in mortal danger because of graduated attacks on the family.

The family frog has been sitting in a warming pan for a long time. Its health and very life are threatened by no-fault divorce, contraception, sterilization, infidelity, abortion, and other societal evils like pornography and vulgarity. In Canada, the latest threat to the family is the campaign to redefine marriage so that it includes the cohabitation of homosexuals.

#### **The attack**

The attack on the family through the call for homosexual “marriage” comes principally from the media, some judges, some politicians, some city councillors, and some homosexual groups.

In Ontario, three Justices of the Superior Court of Justice unanimously ruled, in a Divisional Court decision released July 17, 2002, that the current legal definition of marriage as a union between a man and a woman is discriminatory, and ordered it be changed to include recognition of same-sex marriage. The court said that denying gay couples the option of marriage is unconstitutional and a violation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The ruling was suspended for two years to give governments time to revise the definition of the term “marriage”.

Ontario Premier Ernie Eves answered that Ontario would not appeal; that is, it accepts the decree of the Ontario judges as final.

In the *Toronto Star* for August 4, 2002, there is an article with the headline: "Recognize same-sex marriages, Rock urges." We read that Canada's Industry Minister, Allan Rock, a nominal Catholic, says he will work with the government to push for the recognition of same-sex marriage. In Vancouver to attend the city's Gay Pride Parade on August 4, 2002, Foreign Affairs Minister Bill Graham said that "allowing homosexuals to marry would strengthen the institution of marriage." The call for the "right" of homosexuals to marry has been supported by MP Svend Robinson, federal Heritage Minister Sheila Copps, and Amateur Sport Minister Paul De Villiers.

The ultimate outcome is uncertain. Federal Justice Minister Martin Cauchon said on July 29, 2002, that the federal government will appeal the decree of the Ontario Supreme Court. On August 1, 2002, Toronto city councillors voted overwhelmingly to request Martin Cauchon to abandon the federal appeal. On September 6, Justice Louise Lemelin, Quebec Superior Court Judge, echoed the Ontario decision by declaring that the opposite-sex definition of marriage is discriminatory and unjustified under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Prime Minister Jean Chrétien has said that a Parliamentary Committee will hold national hearings and study the way other jurisdictions are handling the issue.

The latest development, as of this writing, is that in a report from *LifeSite News* dated September 17, we read, "In a written appeal to the Ontario Court of Appeals, the federal justice department has argued in favour of retaining the traditional definition of marriage as exclusive to heterosexuals."

### **The truth**

In the present attack on family values it would be hoped that politicians, judges, homosexuals, and others would want the outcome to be based on truth: the truth about marriage, the truth about homosexuality, and the truth about homosexuals.

Is it true that homosexuals can marry? Justice Ian Pitfield of the B.C. Supreme Court ruled in October 2000 that any change in the definition of marriage requires a constitutional amendment because the definition of marriage, rooted in the common law, precedes the constitution. This reasoning is legally correct but profoundly inadequate. Marriage precedes common law.

Sadly, truth is often at the mercy of whim and wish. The first temptation, directed to our first parents by Satan, was to disregard a command of God because “You will be like gods who know what is good and what is evil” (*Genesis* 3:5). Now judges act as though they were gods. Some legislators who supported the June 1999 Parliamentary motion upholding the traditional definition of marriage now call for rejection of that motion. Are they gods who can change the nature of marriage from one year to the next? So we must ask in this matter the question which Pilate put to Christ: “What is truth?”

### **The truth about marriage**

The first relevant truth about marriage is that it was instituted by God our Creator. God, not man, determined its essential nature. Man would need to be God to change it. There is a treasure of truth about marriage in the apostolic exhortation of Pope John Paul II entitled *Familiaris consortio* (*On the role of the Christian family in the modern world*) (November 22, 1981). Again and again we are told that marriage is of divine origin. The document quotes Vatican Council II:

“Since the Creator of all things has established the conjugal partnership as the beginning and basis of human society,” the family is “the first and vital cell of society” (n. 42).

The second relevant truth about marriage is that it is not only a divine institution but a union of a man and woman, ordained by its nature to the continuation of the human race. Christ put it this way: “Have you not read that He who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said,

‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, so the two shall become one?’ So they are no longer two but one. What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder” (*Matthew*, 19: 4-6).

So the truth is that marriage is of divine origin and between a man and a woman. There is not only the witness of Revelation but the witness of the major religions, of countless generations and societies. There is also the witness of reason, of the complementary nature of man and woman and the non-complementary nature of man and man and woman and woman. Revelation, tradition and reason instruct us about the truth of marriage.

### **The truth about homosexuality**

A compendium of the truth about homosexuality is given to us in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (n.2357). We are told that Sacred Scripture presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, that tradition has always declared that homosexual acts are gravely disordered and that they are contrary to natural law.

For those who wish to explore the Scriptural teaching on homosexuality, the following are the principal texts: *Genesis* 19:14-21; *Leviticus* 18:22; 20:13; *Romans* 1:26,27; *1 Corinthians* 6:9,10; *1 Timothy* 1:9,10. Nowhere is homosexual behaviour presented as good or praiseworthy. It is consistently presented as a grave moral evil, worthy of death and hell. It should be sufficient here to quote one passage, taken from the letter of St. Paul to the Romans (1:26, 27):

*“For this reason God gave them up to dishonourable passions. Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameful acts with men and receiving in their own persons the due penalty for their error.”*

Christian tradition confirms the evil of homosexual practice.

It was consistently affirmed by the Fathers of the Church. Sodomy was considered one of those frightful sins which cry to heaven for vengeance, according to the ancient adage: “*Clamat ad coelum vox sanguinis et sodomorum, vox oppressorum, merces detenta laborum.*” This may be freely translated: “The voice of blood (murder) and of sodomy, of the oppressed, and of those labourers defrauded of their wages cry out to heaven.” Sodomy was considered the blood brother of murder. Both crimes were directed against the preservation of the human race.

As the Protestant theologian Roger Shinn observes: “The Christian tradition over the centuries has affirmed the heterosexual, monogamous, faithful marital union as normative for the divinely given meaning of the intimate sexual relationship” (quoted by Fr. John Harvey, O.S.F.S., in the booklet *Pastoral Care and the Homosexual*, page 14, published by the Knights of Columbus).

Nor was the evaluation of homosexual practice as a grave moral evil found only in the Judaeo-Christian tradition. All major religions and societies until this age have condemned it.

There remains the argument from reason. Human anatomy proclaims sodomy unnatural. The complementarity of man and woman, physically, psychologically, and emotionally, declares it. The very body cries out against it, for disease is much more readily contracted through sodomy than through natural relations.

In sum, the argument against the evil of homosexual acts is based on revelation, tradition, and reason.

### **The truth about homosexuals**

The truth about homosexuals is that they are human persons created in the image and likeness of God. For them Christ died. To them, as to every human person, are addressed the words of St. Paul: “You are not called to immorality but to holiness.” Right pastoral care is always in accordance with the truth. Combining the truth about marriage and homosexuality, we must conclude that homosexuals are not called to homosexual “marriage” but to live lives of chastity and love of God and others, as are we all.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* tells us that men and women who have homosexual tendencies are to be accepted with

“respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided” (n.2358).

- We treat homosexuals with respect when we treat them as human persons with all the rights and obligations of human persons.
- We treat them with compassion when we encourage them to live their lives in accordance with their noble calling to chastity and virtue.
- We treat homosexuals with sensitivity when we show good will towards them, when we condemn all violence against them, when we avoid all derogatory remarks and labels, when we support them in all that is right and just, when we regard them as brothers and sisters in Christ.

On the contrary, we do not show “respect, compassion and sensitivity” towards homosexuals when we support laws that reward homosexual behaviour, or applaud the vulgarity and even obscenity of “gay rights” parades, when we co operate in imprisoning them in sterile, depraved and spiritually dead unions which call lust love. An excellent document on this matter is entitled *And the truth will make you free*, a Letter to Bishops of the Catholic Church *On the pastoral care of homosexual persons* (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, October 1, 1986).

## **Consequences**

*Grave evils have grave consequences.*

When a society attacks the very foundation on which it is built, the nuclear family, one can predict with certainty the decline and fall of that society.

- Homosexual “marriage” would further demean fatherhood and motherhood and place an additional financial strain on parents raising a family.
- Homosexual unions are notoriously unstable despite the exceptions. The “marriage” of homosexuals would lead to an

increase in divorce and litigation with accompanying financial and psychological problems.

- Homosexual “marriages” would not be the end of the deformation of marriage. It is certain that there would be pressure for the legalization of more bizarre unions. Mark Lowery, professor of moral theology at the University of Dallas, says: “If society were to give marriage benefits to homosexual persons then it could have to give the same benefits to any set of friends who so desired them” (*Catholic Dossier*, Vol. 7, n. 2, p. 13).

- Homosexual “marriage” would result in a further deterioration of sex education in schools. Children would be taught that homosexuality is as normal as heterosexuality. They would be more easily seduced into homosexual experimentation. Children reared by homosexuals have their own set of problems, including the absence of a mother or father.

- Most clergymen licensed to witness marriages would refuse to assist at homosexual “marriages.” This would result in a new conglomerate of confrontations. It would be more difficult to uphold the essential distinction between sin and sinner. Condemning homosexual behaviour would be more likely interpreted as a form of “homophobia.”

- Above all else is the spiritual havoc which homosexual “marriage” would bring upon society in general and homosexuals in particular. There would inevitably be a lessening of already low standards of morality and a further loss of the sense of sin.

- Homosexuals themselves would be victims. Caged in a legal prison, those who wished to extricate themselves to live lives of chastity would find a new obstacle in their path.

Finally, all must face God in judgment. Judges, lawyers, and politicians who participate in the campaign to legalize homosexual “marriage” must answer for it. Catholics in the public forum, who ostensibly call Christ Lord and His Church mother and teacher, but scorn divine precepts, sin grievously. They speak from the valley of spiritual death. Should they not heed the words of the prophet Ezekiel: “But as for those whose hearts are devoted to detestable abominations, I will bring down their conduct

upon their heads.” Nor is this said through lack of love or concern for all. As St. Paul said: “Have I then become your enemy by preaching the truth?”

### **The Charter of Rights and Freedoms**

It would be ludicrous if it were not tragic to see federal ministers, provincial judges, and city councillors claim that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms demands a change in the definition of marriage. They are, in words from Shakespeare, “Bidding the law make curtsy to their will, hooking both right and wrong to the appetite” (Isabella in *Measure for Measure*).

One recalls the threat of dire punishment predicted by the prophet Ezekiel for the prince of Tyre: “Because you are haughty of heart and say ‘a god am I.’” Now we have a multitude of princes of Tyre claiming the prerogative of changing divine law. There is no right to vice, and freedom is not denied when wrong is restricted.

There are worse sins than those of the flesh. One of these is the wilful rejection of truth. Christ said of those places which rejected the message of truth given by His apostles: “Truly, I say to you, it shall be more tolerable on the day of judgment for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah than for that town” (*Matthew* 10:15). The truth about marriage is an eternal truth, beyond the decree or whim of judge or parliament.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, if faithful to the truth, would not grant benefits to homosexual behaviour. Its right interpretation would recognize that for homosexuals freedom is the right to live in chastity, free from the cage and restraints placed upon them by contracts which bind them in an unnatural union. The Supreme Court ought to recognize that for God, and universally recognized tradition, and reason, it is an Inferior Court.

### **Action**

There is a clear and present danger in Canada to the family, the capstone of our society, through the campaign to legislate the “right to homosexual marriage.” Surely the strongest action is in

order.

Already there is a wholesome reaction from some groups and individuals. Alberta Premier Ralph Klein has promised to defend the traditional definition of marriage by invoking the notwithstanding clause if the Supreme Court of Canada allows same-sex “marriage.” Some members of parliament have declared their opposition to homosexual “marriage.” Among those are Liberal MP Tom Wappel and Liberal MP Dan McTeague, and many members of the Canadian Alliance. We need far more Liberals and Tories to speak out.

Among groups fighting the attack on marriage are Campaign Life Coalition, RealWomen of Canada, Priests for Life, and St. Joseph’s Workers on Life and Family. This could be a major project for the C.W.L., the Knights of Columbus, and all pro-life and pro-family societies. The Catholic press and indeed the press of other denominations can play a major role. *Catholic Insight*, *The Interim*, and others are already active.

Most important of all would be a strong and united intervention from our bishops. In the Letter of the Holy See to Bishops of the Catholic Church *On the pastoral care of homosexual persons* (1986), we read: “In assessing proposed legislation, the bishops should keep as their uppermost concern the responsibility to defend and promote family life.” Already, through the CCCB, they have written urging an appeal to the decision of the three Ontario Supreme Court judges. Their continued intervention is vital. We look to them for leadership and we pray for them. But much more should be done by individual bishops in rallying the faithful.

Finally, we as individuals can do our part. St. Augustine says that “prayer ascends and mercy descends.” If enough pray and offer suffrages, the present threatened attack on the family will be forestalled and truth will prevail.



## Chapter IV

# Controversy surrounds The Winnipeg Statement

REV. LEONARD A. KENNEDY, C.S.B.

**A**fter almost two thousand years during which Christians had taught the immorality of contraception, Anglican leaders at their decennial meeting in England in 1930 taught that contraception could be practised under certain conditions. Pope Pius XI (1923-39) immediately issued an encyclical, *Casti connubii* (*On chastity in marriage*), which said, in part:

*“No reason, however grave, may be put forward by which anything intrinsically against nature may become conformable to nature and the moral good. Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who, in exercising it, deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose, sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious.”*

This teaching was reinforced by his successor, Pope Pius XII (1939-58). Pius XII was succeeded in the papacy by John XXIII (1958-63) and by Paul VI (1963-78), who in 1968 wrote the encyclical *Humanae vitae* (*On human life*) on marriage, abortion, and contraception. This encyclical stated in exceedingly strong terms that contraception is sinful:

*“No member of the faithful could possibly deny*

*that the Church is competent in her Magisterium [her teaching office] to interpret the natural moral law (#4).... We, by virtue of the mandate entrusted to the us by Christ, intend to give our reply to this series of grave questions (#6).... The Church, in urging men to the observance of the precepts of the natural law, which it interprets by its constant doctrine, teaches that each and every marital act must of necessity retain its intrinsic relationship to the procreation of human life. This particular doctrine, often expounded by the Magisterium of the Church, is based on the inseparable connection, established by God, between the unitive significance and the procreative significance which are both inherent in the marriage act (#11-12).... The teaching of the Church regarding the proper regulation of birth is a promulgation of the law of God Himself (#20).... The Holy Spirit of God is present to the Magisterium proclaiming sound doctrine (#29).... This we do relying on the unshakable teaching of the Church, which teaching Peter's successor together with his brothers in the Catholic episcopate faithfully guards and interprets (#31)."* (See the full text of the encyclical on pages 85-99.)

The Canadian bishops, meeting in Winnipeg two months later, refused to accept the intrinsic immorality of contraception taught by *Humanae vitae* and allowed the practice of contraception under certain conditions. Not one percent of Catholics who practise contraception today know anything of these conditions.

The Winnipeg Statement has had the effect, whether intended or not, of meaning that Catholics are free to do as they see fit, including to practise contraception. John Webster Grant, a leading historian of religion in Canada, in his *The Church in the Canadian Era*, said: "The Canadian bishops headed off a threat of overt rebellion by pointedly declining to instruct the faithful in their duty." And Janet Smith wrote, in her *Humanae Vitae: A Generation Later*: "Of all the world's bishops, the Canadians have

been the most straightforward in making a case for Catholics who want to use contraceptives.” The effects of this contraceptive mentality are clearly stated in Monsignor Foy’s *Fifty reasons why the Canadian Bishops should recall the Winnipeg Statement* (Editor: see below).

Monsignor Vincent Foy has done more to urge this recall than any other Canadian. He was born in Toronto on August 15, 1915, and took his primary and secondary education in Catholic schools. In 1933 he entered St. Augustine’s Seminary, Toronto, and was ordained on June 3, 1939. He spent three years studying Canon Law at Laval University, Quebec City, and, on receiving his doctorate, was appointed secretary of the new Toronto Regional Tribunal, and Vice-Chancellor. Ten years later he was named a Domestic Prelate and became Director of Catechetics and Vice-Official of the Tribunal. In 1966 he was named pastor of his natal parish.

About two months after the Winnipeg Statement was issued, Monsignor produced “*A Commentary on the Canadian Bishops’ Statement on Humanae Vitae*” (mimeographed, November, 1968). It contained a thorough history and critique of the Statement, and was sent to priests and bishops.

At least six bishops disagreed with the Winnipeg Statement but the majority of bishops prevented them from issuing a minority report. Today, with a better and more theological understanding of the powers and rights of Episcopal Conferences we know that the Statement was invalid. Bishops’ Conferences can issue binding teaching only when there is total unanimity among all bishops. The reason is that each bishop is the only authorized teacher in his diocese. That teaching, moreover, must always be in harmony with that of the Universal Magisterium, that is, with the Pope. The Winnipeg Statement fails on both counts.

Since 1968, some Canadian bishops repudiated the Winnipeg Statement, if not explicitly at least implicitly. In the late 1980s all the bishops of Manitoba issued a pastoral letter in which they said that the proper place for sexual intercourse

*“is within marriage, and that the conjugal act by*

*its nature is both love-giving and life-giving in such a way that one meaning and purpose may not be artificially separated from the other. Hence the conjugal act that is not love-giving is unnatural and wrong and the conjugal act that is artificially prevented from being life-giving is likewise unnatural and wrong."*

Pope John Paul II has constantly insisted on the sinfulness of contraception, and in his 1993 encyclical *Veritatis splendor* (*The Splendour of Truth*) he reinforced the teaching that it is intrinsically evil (#80). Despite this very clear magisterial teaching, Monsignor James Weisgerber, then the General Secretary of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, now Archbishop of Winnipeg, repeated the teaching of the Winnipeg Statement (*Ottawa Citizen*, Sept. 25, 1993). The Assistant General Secretary, Mr. Bede Hubbard, used the occasion to defend the Winnipeg Statement (*Catholic Register*, Oct. 16, 1993; *Prairie Messenger*, Oct. 18, 1993) with arguments that were demolished by a devastating critique (*Catholic Insight*, December, 1993, pp. 14-15).

In Quebec some 1200 theologians, priests, pastoral workers, middle-management catechists, and teachers of religious education rejected *Veritatis splendor*, most specifically because it reiterated the mandatory character of *Humanae vitae*.

However, a Canadian bishop, Bishop Roman Danylak, at that time the Apostolic Administrator of the Ukrainian Eparchy of Toronto, broke ranks and wrote an article which stated: "Unfortunately it [the Statement] communicated a false notion of the role of conscience . . . . Before God I believe it is my duty to call for the retraction of the Winnipeg Statement . . . . All Canadian bishops would surely join me in the hope that, when we appear before Christ in judgment, we may be able to say with Paul VI: 'I did not betray the Truth'" (*Catholic Insight*, July/Aug., 1998, pp. 17-19).

This article led a predominantly lay organization in Canada called the *Society for Catholic Life and Culture* to ask the Canadian bishops to reconsider the Winnipeg Statement at their annual meeting in Niagara Falls that year. The Bishops discussed the

matter of retracting it and by secret vote – estimated to have been six to one against retraction – they rejected the proposal, saying that it was not “opportune.”

### **The future**

The Church in Canada will not be healthy until the truth about contraception is preached in our churches, and this will not happen until the Canadian bishops order that this be done and see that it is done. Never was the time for doing this more “opportune.”

*“There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune. Omitted, all the voyage of their life is spent in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat, and we must take the current when it serves or lose our ventures”*  
(Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*).

Another group, both lay and clerical, has vowed to get the Statement retracted, no matter how long it takes. To get information about it, consult its website at [www.therosarium.ca](http://www.therosarium.ca).

Monsignor Foy’s *Fifty Reasons* gives an indication of the spiritual harm that has been done by the Winnipeg Statement. Contraception is at the heart of all dissent. It has wreaked destruction especially in the area of sexuality, amongst married people and amongst unmarried people. I don’t know what percentage of Canadian Catholic couples of childbearing age practise contraception; but David Carlin, in his fine book *The Decline and Fall of the Catholic Church in America* (2004), gives as one sign of the decline of the Catholic faith in the United States the result of a poll which showed that only 10% of the elementary teachers in Catholic schools there accept the teaching of the Church on contraception. I know of no reason to think that Canada might be better, but of one reason, the Winnipeg Statement, to think that it might be worse.

**(MAY 2005)**

# The Winnipeg Statement:

## Canadian bishops' statement on the Encyclical *Humanae vitae*

**Editor's note:** This is the text of the statement on Pope Paul VI's Encyclical Letter *Humanae vitae*, issued by the bishops of Canada, September 27, 1968, at their Plenary Assembly held at Winnipeg, Man.

*Please carefully read paragraphs #17, 25, 26 and 34. These represent the most objectionable parts of the Statement, especially paragraph 26.*

1. Pope Paul VI in his recent encyclical *On the regulation of birth* has spoken on a profound human problem as is clearly evidenced by the immediate and universal reaction to his message. It is evident that he has written out of concern and love, and in a spirit of service to all mankind. Conscious of the current controversy and deep differences of opinion as to how to harmonize married love and the responsible transmission of life, we, the Canadian bishops, offer our help to the priests and Catholic people, believing it to be their pastoral duty.

### **I - Solidarity with the Pope**

2. We are in accord with the teaching of the Holy Father concerning the dignity of married life, and the necessity of a truly Christian relationship between conjugal love and responsible parenthood. We share the pastoral concern which has led him to

offer counsel and direction in an area which, while controverted, could hardly be more important to human happiness.

3. By divine commission clarification of these difficult problems of morality is required from the teaching authority of the Church (1). The Canadian bishops will endeavor to discharge their obligation to the best of their ability. In this pursuit we are acting consistently with our recent submissions to the federal government on contraception, divorce and abortion, nor is there anything in those submissions which does not harmonize with the encyclical.

## **II - Solidarity with the Faithful**

4. In the same spirit of solidarity we declare ourselves one with the People of God in the difficulties they experience in understanding, making their own, and living, this teaching.

5. In accord with the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, the recent encyclical (2) recognizes the nobility of conjugal love which is "uniquely expressed and perfected through the marital act" (3). Many married people experience a truly agonizing difficulty in reconciling the need to express conjugal love with the responsible transmission of human life (4).

6. This difficulty is recognized in deep sympathy and is shared by bishops and priests as counselors and confessors in their service of the faithful. We know that we are unable to provide easy answers to this difficult problem made more acute by the great variety of solutions proposed in an open society.

7. A clearer understanding of these problems and progress toward their solution will result from a common effort in dialogue, research and study on the part of all, laity, priests and bishops, guided by faith and sustained by grace. To this undertaking the Canadian bishops pledge themselves.

### **III - Christian conscience and divine law**

8. Of recent years many have entertained doubts about the validity of arguments proposed to forbid any positive intervention which would prevent the transmission of human life. As a result there have arisen opinions and practices contrary to traditional moral theology. Because of this many had been expecting official confirmation of their views. This helps to explain the negative reaction the encyclical received in many quarters. Many Catholics face a grave problem of conscience.

9. Christian theology regarding conscience has its roots in the teaching of St. Paul (5). This has been echoed in our day by Vatican II: "Conscience is the most secret core and sanctuary of man. There he is alone with God, whose voice echoes in his depths." (6) "On his part man acknowledges the imperatives of the divine law through the mediation of conscience. In all his activity a man is bound to follow his conscience faithfully, in order that he may come to God for whom he was created" (7). The dignity of man consists precisely in his ability to achieve his fulfillment in God through the exercise of a knowing and free choice.

10. However this does not exempt a man from the responsibility of forming his conscience according to truly Christian values and principles. This implies a spirit of openness to the teaching of the Church which is an essential aspect of the Christian's baptismal vocation. It likewise implies sound personal motivation free from selfishness and undue external pressure which are incompatible with the spirit of Christ. Nor will he succeed in this difficult task without the help of God. Man is prone to sin and evil and unless he humbly asks and gratefully receives the grace of God this basic freedom will inevitably lead to abuse.

### **IV - Teaching office of the Church**

11. Belief in the Church which is the prolongation of Christ in the world, belief in the Incarnation, demands a cheerful readiness to hear that Church to whose first apostles Christ said: "He

who hears you hears me” (8). True freedom of conscience does not consist, then, in the freedom to do as one likes, but rather to do as a responsible conscience directs.

12. Vatican Council II applies this concept forcefully. Christians “therefore must always be governed according to a conscience dutifully conformed to the divine law itself and should be submissive towards the Church’s teaching office which authentically interprets that law in the light of the Gospel. That divine law reveals and protects the integral meaning of conjugal love and impels it towards truly human fulfillment.” (9).

13. Today, the Holy Father has spoken on the question of morally acceptable means to harmonize conjugal love and responsible parenthood. Christians must examine in all honesty their reaction to what he has said.

14. The Church is competent to hand on the truth contained in the revealed word of God and to interpret its meaning. But its role is not limited to this function. In his pilgrimage to salvation, man achieves final happiness by all his human conduct and his whole moral life. Since the Church is man’s guide in this pilgrimage, she is called upon to exercise her role as teacher, even in those matters which do not demand the absolute assent of faith.

15. Of this sort of teaching Vatican II wrote: “This religious submission of will and of mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking *ex cathedra*. That is, it must be shown in such a way that his supreme teaching service is acknowledged with reverence, the judgments made by him are sincerely adhered to, according to his manifest mind and will” (10).

16. It follows that those who have been commissioned by the Church to teach in her name will recognize their responsibility to refrain from public opposition to the encyclical; to do otherwise would compound confusion and be a source of scandal to

God's people. However, this must not be interpreted as a restriction on the legitimate and recognized freedom of theologians to pursue loyally and conscientiously their research with a view to greater depth and clarity in the teaching of the Church.

17. It is a fact that a certain number of Catholics, although admittedly subject to the teaching of the encyclical, find it either extremely difficult or even impossible to make their own all elements of this doctrine. In particular, the argumentation and rational foundation of the encyclical, which are only briefly indicated, have failed in some cases to win the assent of men of science, or indeed of some men of culture and education who share in the contemporary empirical and scientific mode of thought. We must appreciate the difficulty experienced by contemporary man in understanding and appropriating some of the points of this encyclical, and we must make every effort to learn from the insights of Catholic scientists and intellectuals, who are of undoubted loyalty to Christian truth, to the Church and to the authority of the Holy See. *Since they are not denying any point of divine and Catholic faith nor rejecting the teaching authority of the Church, these Catholics should not be considered, or consider themselves, shut off from the body of the faithful* [Editor's italics]. But they should remember that their good faith will be dependent on a sincere self-examination to determine the true motives and grounds for such suspension of assent and on continued effort to understand and deepen their knowledge of the teaching of the Church.

18. The difficulties of this situation have been felt by the priests of the Church, and by many others. We have been requested to provide guidelines to assist them. This we will endeavour to accomplish in a subsequent document. We are conscious that continuing dialogue, study and reflection will be required by all members of the Church in order to meet as best we can the complexities and exigencies of the problem.

19. We point out that the particular norms which we may

offer will prove of little value unless they are placed in the context of man's human and Christian vocation and all of the values of Christian marriage. This formation of conscience and this education in true love will be achieved only by a well balanced pastoral insistence upon the primary importance of love which is human, total, faithful and exclusive as well as generously faithful (11).

### **V - Preliminary pastoral guidance**

20. For the moment, in conformity with traditional Christian morality, we request priests and all who may be called to guide or counsel the consciences of others to give their attention to the following considerations.

21. The pastoral directives given by Pope Paul VI in the encyclical are inspired by a positive sacramental approach. The Eucharist is always the great expression of Christian love and union. Married couples will always find in this celebration a meeting place with the Lord which will never fail to strengthen their own mutual love. With regard to the sacrament of penance the spirit is one of encouragement both for penitents and confessor and avoids both extremes of laxity and rigorism.

22. The encyclical suggests an attitude towards the sacrament of penance which is at once less juridical, more pastoral and more respectful of persons. There is real concern for their growth, however slow at times, and for the hope of the future.

23. Confession should never be envisaged under the cloud of agonizing fear or severity. It should be an exercise in confidence and respect of consciences. Paul VI invited married couples to "...have recourse with humble perseverance to the mercy of God, which is poured forth in the Sacrament of Penance" (12). Confession is a meeting between a sincere conscience and Christ Our Lord who was "indeed intransigent with evil, but merciful towards individuals" (13).

24. Such is the general atmosphere in which the confessor and counsellor must work. We complete the concept with a few more particular applications.

25. In the situation we described earlier in this statement (par. 17) the confessor or counsellor must show sympathetic understanding and reverence for the sincere good faith of those who fall in their effort to accept some point of the encyclical.

26. Counsellors may meet others who, accepting the teaching of the Holy Father, find because of particular circumstances they are involved in what seems to them a clear conflict of duties, e.g., the reconciling of conjugal love and responsible parenthood with the education of children already born or with the health of the mother. *In accord with the accepted principles of moral theology, if these persons have tried sincerely but without success to pursue a line of conduct in keeping with the given directives, they may be safely assured that whoever honestly chooses that course which seems right to him does so in good conscience [Editor's italics].*

27. Good pastoral practice for other and perhaps more difficult cases will be developed in continuing communication among bishops, priests and laity, and in particular in the document we have promised to prepare. In the meantime we earnestly solicit the help of medical scientists and biologists in their research into human fertility. While it would be an illusion to hope for the solution of all human problems through scientific technology, such research can bring effective help to the alleviation and solution of problems of conscience in this area.

## **VI - Invitation to social pastoral action**

28. The whole world is conscious of the growing preoccupation with the social impact of all men's thoughts, words and actions. Sexuality in all its aspects is obviously an area of the greatest human and social impact. The norms and values which govern this so vital human concern merit the attention and cooperation of all. Our world evolves at a frightening rate, creating at

once a vivid sense of unity and a set of conflicting forces which could destroy us.

29. This concern will be fruitful only if it leads all of us to recognize our true human worth in the possession of our inner powers by which we are distinctively ourselves with the full recognition of our complementary sexual differences on the physical, the psychological and the spiritual plane. Only in this manner will we achieve marriages that are truly unions of love in the service of life.

30. To this end there must be brought into play all the positive forces of the family, the school, the state, the Church. No one may stand aloof, nor are there really national boundaries in a matter of such universal application. With this in mind we call on all members of the Church to realize on every level from the very youngest to the various possibilities of adult education.

31. Without wishing to specify in detail we single out for special mention a few aspects which may have richer possibilities. We place first the dialogue and cooperation, which have been so encouraging, among all members of the Church and, through the ecumenical movement with other Churches.

32. We note with deep satisfaction the spread and strength of so many activities calculated to prepare for marriage or to deepen the appreciation of married persons of this sublime state. For example, marriage preparation courses, family apostolates, discussion groups, etc.

33. Educators, too, are to be commended for their growing attention to the question. Everywhere the problem of sex education and family life is being studied. And this education is happily being deepened by scientific research and diffused through the creative use of mass media. Nothing less than this mobilization of all human forces will suffice to meet the challenge of divisive and destructive forces which begin deep in the willful selfishness of man and inhibit the true expression of his love. We pledge our-

selves to the pastoral priority of encouraging and promoting these programs whenever and wherever possible.

34. We conclude by asking all to pray fervently that the Holy Spirit will continue to guide his Church through all darkness and suffering. We, the People of God, cannot escape this hour of crisis but there is no reason to believe that it will create division and despair. The unity of the Church does not consist in a bland conformity in all ideas, but rather in a union of faith and heart, in submission to God's will and a humble but honest and ongoing search for the truth. That unity of love and faith is founded in Christ and as long as we are true to Him nothing can separate us. We stand in union with the Bishop of Rome the successor of Peter, the sign and contributing cause of our unity with Christ and with one another. But this very union postulates such a love of the Church that we can do no less than to place all of our love and all of our intelligence at its service. If this sometimes means that in our desire to make the Church more intelligible and more beautiful we must, as pilgrims do, falter in the way or differ as to the way, no one should conclude that our common faith is lost or our loving purpose blunted. The great Cardinal Newman once wrote: "Lead kindly light amidst the encircling gloom." We believe that the Kindly Light will lead us to a greater understanding of the ways of God and the love of man."

### **Endnotes**

- (1) *On the regulation of birth*, n. 4 & 18
- (2) *On the regulation of birth*, n. 8
- (3) *The Church Today*, n. 49
- (4) *The Church Today*, n. 51
- (5) *Rom. 14:23 and I Cor. 10*
- (6) *The Church Today*, n. 16
- (7) *On Religious Freedom*, n. 3; *the Church Today*, nn. 16, 17
- (8) *Luke 10:16*
- (9) *Const. on the Church*, n. 50
- (10) *Constitution on the Church*, n. 25
- (11) *On the regulation of birth*, n. 9
- (12) *On the regulation of birth*, n. 25
- (13) *On the regulation of birth*, n. 29

# Fifty reasons why the Winnipeg Statement should be recalled

CATHOLIC INSIGHT, OCTOBER 2003, PP. 20-25

*At 87 years of age, Msgr. Vincent Foy of Toronto continues to drive home that, where principles of faith are concerned, time alone does not bring healing. The error itself must be eradicated.—Editor*

## MSGR. VINCENT FOY

*“But you, O Lord, are close; Your commands are truth;  
Long have I known that your will is established forever.”*

—Psalm 119

This year is the 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the great charter of life and love called “*Humanae vitae*.” It was signed by Pope Paul VI on July 25<sup>th</sup>, 1968. This year is also the 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary of a commentary on that encyclical given by the Canadian bishops. It was published on Friday September 27<sup>th</sup>, 1968, at the Fort Garry Hotel in Winnipeg, and was entitled “*Canadian Bishops’ Statement on the Encyclical Humanae vitae*.”

The encyclical *Humanae vitae* and the Winnipeg Statement do not say the same thing. The encyclical declares, invoking the authority of Christ, that contraception is to be “absolutely excluded as a licit means of regulating birth” (n. 14). The Winnipeg Statement, not on the authority of Christ, but on the authority of the Canadian bishops, says:

“Counsellors may meet others who, accepting the teaching of the Holy Father, find because of particular circumstances they are involved in, what seems to them a clear conflict of duties, e.g., the reconciling of conjugal love and responsible parenthood with the education of children already born or with the health of the mother. In accord with the accepted principles of moral theology, if these persons have tried sincerely but without success to pursue a line of conduct in keeping with the given directives, they may be safely assured that whoever honestly chooses that course which seems right to him, does so in good conscience” (n. 26).

While the Church teaches that the prohibition of contraception is a moral absolute, the Canadian bishops say it is not. It is the same as saying that there are circumstances in which fornication and adultery and sodomy are legitimate.

It is evident, both philosophically and empirically, that the Church cannot survive where the doctrine of *Humanae vitae* is not taught and lived. In the Winnipeg Statement, through sophistry, are sown the seeds of the destruction of the Catholic Church in Canada. In truth, because of that Statement, the Church in Canada is now stricken and dying. There is no hope for a viable and evangelizing Church here until the teaching of that Statement is cancelled and replaced with the truth.

One other observation is in order. There is an ungodly similarity between the Winnipeg Statement and the statement that started the revolt against the truth about married love and contraception. Until 1930 all Christian communities considered contraception a grave moral evil. In 1908, at a Lambeth Conference, the Anglicans reaffirmed constant Christian doctrine in saying it “earnestly calls upon all Christian people to discontinue the use of all artificial means (of contraception) as demoralizing to character and hostile to national welfare” (Resolution 41). The betrayal of truth came at the Lambeth Conference in 1930. Then

it was declared that a couple could use contraceptives “where there is a clearly felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood” (Resolution 15). By 1958 the Anglican Church considered contraception “a right and an important factor in Christian family life.” The Winnipeg Statement is a near clone of the Lambeth betrayal. Soon after it, countless Canadian Catholics claimed that the practice of contraception was a “right.”

It is not difficult to marshal many reasons why the Winnipeg Statement should be recalled. I cite here fifty, but that is an arbitrary number. Many taken individually, and certainly all taken together, indict and convict the Winnipeg Statement of the crime of leading our beloved Church in Canada deep into the Valley of Death.

1. The Winnipeg Statement is tantamount to blasphemy. It is God who determines what is morally good and evil. The Church authentically interprets this natural moral law (cf. *Humanae vitae*, n.4).

*“Contraception is to be judged objectively so profoundly unlawful, as never to be, for any reason justified. To think or say the contrary is equal to maintaining that in human life, situations may arise in which it is lawful not to recognize God as God”* (Pope John Paul II, *L'Osservatore Romano*, Oct. 10<sup>th</sup>, 1983).

The Winnipeg Statement permits the negation of divine law. Is this not blasphemous?

2. It is contrary to the first commandment of God. As the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* tells us, Jesus summed up man's duties to God in the words: “*You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind*” (*Matthew 22:37*). We serve God with all our mind when, enlightened by faith and grace, that mind is conformed to the mind of God through being conformed to the mind of His Church. In the Winnipeg Statement that conformity is tragically absent.

3. The Winnipeg Statement is against the second great commandment of God: "*You shall love your neighbour as yourself*" (Mark 12: 31). In the spiritual order, that order which concerns itself with eternal salvation, contraception is an act of hate. It is a grave offence against one's marriage vows which consents to the eternal damnation of one's spouse.

4. It puts into doubt defined doctrine concerning the sufficiency of grace. The Council of Trent declares to be heretical that opinion which says it is impossible to keep God's commandments. *Humanae vitae* points out the sufficiency of God's grace to keep the divine natural law prohibiting contraception (cf. nos. 20, 21). The Winnipeg Statement says: "A certain number of Catholics find it either extremely difficult or even impossible to make their own all elements of this doctrine" (n.17). Paragraph 26 implies that the law against contraception cannot be observed by some.

5. It substitutes the authority of man for the authority of Christ. The encyclical is given with the authority of Christ (n.6). Bishop Alexander Carter, President of the Canadian Bishops' Conference in 1968, said: "*We faced the necessity of making a Statement which many felt could not be a simple Amen, a total and formal endorsement of the doctrine of the encyclical—We had to reckon with the fact of widespread dissent from some points of his (the Pope's) teaching among the Catholic faithful, priests, theologians, and probably some of our own number*" (America, October 19, 1968, p.349). So human authority was substituted for the divine.

6. It has increased tolerance for dissent. The eradication of the destructive evil of dissent in the Church was the prime purpose of the extraordinary synod of bishops in 1967. The bishops declared, concerning all dissent, whether in doctrinal matters, or in pastoral or liturgical questions: "*Those who are rash or imprudent should be warned in all charity; those who are contumacious should be removed from office*" (Ratione habitae, October 28, 1967).

The Winnipeg Statement undercut the directives of this synod and made its implementation in Canada practically impossible. So we have had dissent in Catholic seminaries, colleges, and schools. It has given rise to a dissenting “Catholic” press, e.g. *Catholic New Times* and *The Island Catholic News*. It was a factor in the “legitimization” of selling dissenting literature in “Catholic” bookstores and parish pamphlet racks.

7. It is against Church unity by endorsing a national morality. Perhaps for the first time since the so-called Reformation, we see bishops passing judgment on the authoritative teaching of the Supreme Pontiff. In an editorial in the *Toronto Catholic Register* regarding the Winnipeg Statement we read: “It will take weeks, perhaps months, for Canadians to appreciate and really believe what happened at Winnipeg last week. It has not happened in the Church anywhere for centuries. And in Canada perhaps for the first time in our history we can become a truly Canadian Church in the deepest sense of the word” (October 5, 1968).

8. Contrary to what some believe, the Winnipeg Statement is not magisterial. In the book *“Married in the Lord”* (Liturgical Commission, Diocese of London, 1976, 1978) it is asserted that, concerning statements of national hierarchies, “their official declarations are official teachings of the Magisterium of the Church” (p. 61). This is false. Bishops exercise their office of teaching only in so far as they are in communion with the head of the episcopal college, the Holy Father (cf. Canon 375 of the *Code of Canon Law*). Canadian Catholics have a right to magisterial teaching from their bishops on the vital issue of human life.

9. The Winnipeg Statement has clouded the meaning of collegiality. The claim has been made that the Statement is collegial. Collegiality exists only in union with the head of the College of bishops, the Holy Father (cf. Vatican II, *Lumen gentium*, n. 21).

10. The Winnipeg Statement advocates relativism or what is

called situation ethics. The phrase in paragraph 26, “Whoever honestly chooses that course which seems right to him does so in good conscience,” is a cluster bomb attack on objective morality. What if the course which seems right to him does not seem right to her? What if his counsellor or confessor does not agree with her counsellor or confessor? What if the course which seems right to him or her kills a human person? Surely this moral relativism cries out for redress.

11. It teaches an erroneous doctrine on conscience. The Winnipeg Statement says, in effect, that in some circumstances one may form one’s conscience in opposition to God’s law. Vatican II says that the spouses “must always be governed according to a conscience dutifully conformed to the ‘divine law itself’” (*Gaudium et spes*, n. 50). The Winnipeg Statement, in rejecting this teaching, has deformed the consciences of countless Canadian Catholics.

12. The Winnipeg Statement was not corrected by the lengthy “*Statement on the Formation of Conscience*” which the Canadian Bishops published in December 1973. While that was a good statement on conscience, it carefully avoided any mention of the Winnipeg Statement or the question of contraception or even *Humanae vitae*. The result was that many texts and marriage preparation courses continued to quote the Winnipeg Statement as though the *Statement on conscience* had never been written.

13. The Winnipeg Statement was an act of disobedience to the Holy See. Just before the release of the encyclical *On the regulation of birth*, bishops were asked through Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, to stand firm with the Pope in the presentation of the Church’s teaching and “to explain and justify the reason for it.” This mandate of the Holy See was deliberately rejected. As Father Edward Sheridan, S.J., one of the dissenting “periti” (experts) at Winnipeg, wrote: “The Statement contained no general profession of assent to the whole teaching of Human Life; and nothing that could be interpreted as adding the local author-

ity of the Canadian Hierarchy to that of the encyclical in general” (*America*, October 19, 1968, p. 349).

14. It is not a right pastoral application of *Humanae vitae*. The Winnipeg Statement has been defended on the grounds that it is only a pastoral application of *Humanae vitae*. Bishops have said: “We tried at Winnipeg to make a pastoral application of the encyclical.” But right pastoral application is always in accordance with the truth, and the Winnipeg Statement is in accordance with a lie: that contraception is not always a grave moral evil. In truth, the “pastoral application” of the Winnipeg Statement is a betrayal, a deceit, and a fraud.

15. It is not enough to say: “The Winnipeg Statement needs only to be properly interpreted.” There is no way, if words mean what they say, that Paragraph 26 can be interpreted in accordance with the Church’s teaching on conscience.

16. Largely as a result of the Winnipeg permissiveness, Canadian theologians and others have felt free to dissent from the Church’s teaching not only on contraception but on a wide spectrum of magisterial teachings, e.g. on homosexuality, the ordination of women, on the fundamental option, even on abortion. Witness the revolt of 63 Quebec “theologians” against the encyclical *Veritatis splendor* in 1993.

17. It has led to discord between bishops and bishops, bishops and priests, priests and priests, pastors and associates, priests and laity, husbands and wives.

18. The resulting confusion in Canada over life issues has been an impediment to evangelization. A Church divided against itself does not present an attractive model of Christian living.

19. The Winnipeg Statement has been a major factor in Canada’s suicidal birthrate. The birth rate among Catholics is no higher than among the general population. Once Catholic,

Quebec has gone from having the highest birthrate in Canada to having the lowest, with now the highest rate of male and female sterilization in all of North America.

20. It has been a major factor in Canada in the crisis of vocations to the priesthood and religious life. Such vocations are in general the fruit of parents living their Faith.

21. Directly or indirectly, it has destroyed or weakened the faith of many Canadian Catholics.

22. Whereas hope and joy should permeate any commentary on the charter of life and love called *Humanae vitae*, the Winnipeg Statement is sprinkled with expressions of doom and gloom. In paragraph 34 we read: "We conclude by asking all to pray that the Holy Spirit will continue to guide his Church through all darkness and suffering." Again, "We, the People of God, cannot escape this hour of crisis" (*ibid.*). It concludes with a quotation from Cardinal Newman: "Lead kindly light amidst the encircling gloom." It has been the Winnipeg Statement that has brought to the Church in Canada an encircling gloom.

23. It has, in general, lowered the level of grace and love in the Church in Canada, leaving countless Catholics open to the seduction of secular relativism.

24. It resulted in the death of our Catholic hospitals. In 1970 a *Medical-Moral Guide* was approved by the Canadian bishops for use in Catholic hospitals. While it condemned sterilization as a means of contraception (article 18) and contraception itself (article 19), it attached this addendum: "Reference should be made to the Canadian bishops' documents on the pastoral application of this general directive." That was the death-knell for our Catholic hospitals. Soon they went the Winnipeg way, and were allowing direct sterilization and the prescription of contraceptive and abortifacient pills and devices for "pastoral" reasons.

25. The Winnipeg Statement was the seed bed which gave birth to the new and disastrous sex-education courses like *Fully Alive*. In paragraph 33 the bishops said: "Everywhere the problem of sex education and family life is being studied. And this education is happily being deepened by scientific research and diffused through the creative use of mass media. We pledge ourselves to the pastoral priority of encouraging and promoting these programs whenever and wherever possible."

26. It is corrosive of the authority of Canadian bishops. Bishops maintain their divinely endowed authority through their union with the Holy Father. Deviation from this unity is disastrous to the bishops' right to be heard and obeyed. Early in the Winnipeg meeting a motion was passed forbidding a minority report. It was claimed that the Bishops' Statement would be merely a pastoral, not a doctrinal, one. This erroneous claim was an infringement on bishops' authority in their own dioceses. The effect of the Winnipeg Statement was to diminish respect for the Canadian bishops' authority not only in Canada, but throughout the Catholic world.

27. The Winnipeg Statement was not corrected, as some have said, by the Press Release, "*Statement on Family Life and Related Matters*," of the Plenary Assembly of Canadian bishops on April 18, 1969. In that Statement the bishops said: "Nothing could be gained and much lost by any attempt to rephrase our Winnipeg Statement. We stand squarely behind that position but we feel it our duty to insist on a proper interpretation of the same."

**[Nota bene:** That interpretation was provided in the December 1973 document *Formation of Conscience*.]

28. The Winnipeg Statement, in effect, put the Canadian bishops in thrall to their own bureaucracy and to dissenting theologians. Fifteen Directors of the Canadian Catholic Conference signed a petition calling for a "Vatican II approach." They said that a large number of priests were agonizing "in acute crises of

conscience because of the apparent directives of *Humanae vitae*.” The “periti” or so-called experts at Winnipeg were dissenters Fathers Edward Sheridan, S.J., André Naud, and Charles St. Onge. Surely the first requirement of those selected to advise the bishops should be their fidelity to the Magisterium.

29. Because of their adherence to the Winnipeg Statement, all subsequent programs of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, e.g., the *Working Paper: Responsible Procreation*, 1983, have proven fruitless. They have ignored the fundamental cause of most family problems to-day: the contraceptive mentality

30. It has silenced many pulpits. Many priests have been hesitant to preach against contraception not only because of a backlash from parishioners but even from their bishops. At least one bishop told his priests not to preach on *Humanae vitae*.

31. Some priests were marginalized because they dared to dissent from the Winnipeg Statement. Assent to the dissent of the Winnipeg Statement was sometimes rewarded with promotion.

32. It has unfitted some priests for the hearing of confessions. It is well known that some priests do not refuse absolution from the grave sin of contraception even when there is no purpose of amendment. This invalidates the absolution.

33. It has led to erroneous confessional directives in some dioceses.

34. In a chain reaction, it has lowered the level of ethics among Catholic politicians, judges, lawyers, doctors, pharmacists, nurses, hospital staff, teachers, and catechists.

35. It has facilitated anti-life and immoral government legislation, as predicted by Pope Paul VI (“*Humanae vitae*”, n.17). It made it more difficult to discipline nominal Catholics like Mark

McGuigan, Pierre Trudeau, John Turner, and Jean Chrétien, who have been principally responsible for the chasm between Church and State in the area of divine moral law.

36. It has led to an aging society with all the concomitant negative societal effects, including a disproportionate financial burden on the shoulders of the young.

37. It has often deprived spouses of married love. Married love never separates the unitive and procreative natures of the marital act. With true married love come the joy and the graces which God showers upon those who are living lives conformed to His will.

38. In a true sense, the Winnipeg Statement permits extra-marital sex. Marriage consent is an act of the will by which each party gives to the other, permanently and exclusively, the right to those acts which of their nature tend to procreation. It does not give the right to contraceptive acts. These are acts of marital unchastity and infidelity.

39. The Winnipeg Statement has often pitted spouses against one another. It has been used as a tool for the seduction of one's spouse into contraceptive conduct.

40. It has led to countless objective sacrileges. Countless contracepting couples receive Holy Communion with no purpose of giving up the practice of contraception.

41. Through its tolerance of contraception, the Winnipeg Statement has led to a lowered respect for women. In the words of *Humanae vitae*, through contraceptive practice, a husband "comes to the point of considering her (the wife) as a mere instrument of selfish enjoyment, and no longer as his respected and beloved companion" (n.17).

42. Many good couples who have been faithful to the Church's teaching, often at the expense of great personal sacri-

fice, have felt betrayed and unsupported by their shepherds.

43. The Winnipeg Statement has often made right teaching of Natural Family Planning more difficult. Natural Family Planning is often taught without moral evaluation or reference to the “weighty” cause required for its practice.

44. The Winnipeg Statement has been responsible for many childless homes and deprived countless children of brothers and sisters.

45. The Winnipeg Statement has deprived countless children of proper role models. Contracepting parents cannot give their children a right example of chastity and self-giving.

46. It has been the cause of many marital breakups. Contraceptive practice is spiritually an act of mutual hate. The subconscious dynamisms of the contraceptive relationship erode mutual love and respect. A true coroner’s report on the break-up of many marriages would read: “Cause of Death: the Winnipeg Statement.”

47. It has been the cause of invalid marriages. To exclude the right to have children, whether for a time, indefinitely or forever, whether on the part of one or both parties, or by mutual agreement, invalidates the marriage. Numerous couples have invoked the Winnipeg Statement to assert a “right” to exclude children and have brought this intention into a defective marital consent.

48. The Winnipeg Statement has adversely affected married life not only in Canada but in many other countries. One example was the neo-modernist book “*Christ Among Us*,” by ex-priest Anthony Wilhelm. It approvingly quoted the Winnipeg Statement. Before its *Imprimatur* was removed by order of the Holy See in 1984, 3,000,000 copies of it had been sold throughout the world. In 1968 there was an immense diaspora of the Winnipeg error by such periodicals as *Time* magazine, the *Tablet*,

*America*, the *National Catholic Reporter*, *Commonweal*, and *Catholic Mind*. In Australia, it was promoted by a book called “*Catholics Ask*”, by Father Bill O’Shea.

49. The Winnipeg Statement does not distinguish between abortifacient and non-abortifacient contraceptives. It has led to the killing of countless persons through abortifacient pills and devices.

50. Even the principal author of paragraph 26 of the Winnipeg Statement recognized its deceptive wording. In a private letter dated June 15, 1995, the late Cardinal Carter wrote: “I am not prepared to defend paragraph 26 (of the Winnipeg Statement) totally. In a sense, the phraseology was misleading and could give the impression that the bishops were saying that one was free to dissent at will from the Pope’s teaching.”

Fifty reasons have been given why the Winnipeg Statement should be revoked. There are many more. In truth their number is legion. There are as many reasons as there are persons who have been infected or may yet be infected with its deadly virus.

In the final analysis, the Winnipeg Statement is evil because it is a betrayal of the Truth—the Truth about Life and Love.

Christ said: “I am the Truth.” He also said: “For this I came into the world, to give witness to the Truth” (*John* 18:37). He entrusted the Truth to His Church, to be transmitted through Peter, the Apostles, and their successors. So St. Paul could say: “The Truth of Christ is in me” (*2 Corinthians* 11:16). So the Truth about Life is taught in the first century in the *Didache*. So in 1978, Pope Paul VI would say three times, in confirming *Humanae vitae* in his last sermon in St. Peter’s: “I did not betray the Truth.” We are considering here the most fundamental of all Truths—that dealing with Life and Love. Pope John Paul II expressed this verity in these words: “The promotion of the Culture of Life should be the highest priority of our societies.... If the right to life is not defended decisively as a condition for all other rights of the person, all other references to human rights

remain deceitful and illusory” (February 14, 2001).

Put flesh on the Winnipeg Lie, make it operative, and it turns into a Frankenstein’s monster capable of destroying the family, society, and the Church. That is now a work in progress. We have seen how civil society is corrupted by contraception. In Canada first came the law allowing the sale of contraceptives, then abortion (1969), then the licensing of widespread pornography, and now the betrayal of homosexuals by the blasphemy of homosexual “marriage.” All of this came about with the complicity of nominal Catholic politicians.

We ought to pray for our bishops, by divine providence successors to the Apostles and guardians and transmitters of the Truth of Christ. The great majority of living Canadian bishops had nothing to do with the Winnipeg Statement. May God strengthen them to reject it.

Catholics justly beg that the Truth of *Humanae vitae* be taught in Canada, because it must be taught and known and loved before it is lived.

## Chapter V

# Testimonies to Confusion

WE THANK ALL FOR THEIR KIND PERMISSION

From Mrs. J.M. Glover

*Catholic Insight*, January 2004, Letters, p. 7

In the November 23 issue of *The Catholic Register*, Dr. Moira McQueen, of the Faculty of Theology, St. Michael's College, in an otherwise beautiful article on sexuality within marriage, stumbles and falls when she gets to the part about *Humanae vitae*. She states:

*“Not only lay people but many well-known theologians have difficulty understanding the teaching. It is important to remember that Humanae vitae is not an infallible document, but it does demand that we show reverential respect for its guidance. As in any area of moral decision-making, what is demanded of Roman Catholics is a sincere, committed judgment of conscience.”*

Now this statement by Dr. McQueen is not acceptable. The *Catholic Catechism* asserts that “the education of conscience is indispensable for human beings who are subjected to negative influences and tempted by sin to prefer their own judgment and to reject authoritative teachings” (#1783); and, “In the formation of conscience, ... we are assisted by the gifts of the Holy

Spirit, aided by the witness or advice of others and guided by the authoritative teaching of the Church" (#1785).

*Humanae vitae* says, "No believer will wish to deny that the teaching authority of the Church is competent to interpret even the natural moral law. It is, in fact, indisputable, as our predecessors have many times declared, that Jesus Christ, when communicating to Peter and to the apostles His divine authority,... constituted them as guardians and authentic interpreters of all the moral law, not only, that is, of the law of the Gospel, but also of the natural law..." (#4).

As professor of Christian ethics Germain Grisez states: "With *Humanae vitae*, Paul VI reaffirmed the constant and very firm teaching of the Church excluding contraception. I believe and have argued that teaching had already been proposed **infallibly** by the ordinary Magisterium. Together, they had taught for many centuries that using contraceptives is always a grave matter. Their manner of teaching implied that what they taught was a truth to be held definitively. Thus, the teaching on contraception met the conditions for infallible teaching, without a solemn definition, articulated by Vatican II in *Lumen gentium*, n.25." (*The Wanderer*, July 24, 2003, p.1)

On June 30, 1998, Pope John Paul II released the apostolic letter *Ad tuendam fidem* (*To defend the faith*). He declared that the purpose of the letter was "to protect the Catholic faith against errors arising on the part of some of the Christian faithful, in particular among those who studiously dedicate themselves to the discipline of sacred theology." Section 9 of the letter discusses the deposit of faith (*depositum fidei*) in the matter of infallibility.

Footnote (17) to that section is quoted as follows: "It should be noted that the **infallible teaching** of the ordinary and universal Magisterium is not only set forth with an explicit declaration of a doctrine to be believed or held definitively, but is also expressed by a **doctrine implicitly contained** in a practice of the Church's faith, derived from revelation or, in any case, necessary for eternal salvation and attested to by the uninterrupted tradition. Such an infallible teaching is thus objectively set forth by the whole episcopal body, understood in a diachronic and not

necessarily merely synchronic sense. Furthermore, the intention of the ordinary and universal Magisterium to set forth a doctrine as definitive is not generally linked to technical formulations of particular solemnity; it is enough that this be clear from the tenor of the words used and from their context” (emphasis mine).

In regurgitating the oft-quoted dissent of the Canadian Catholic bishops from the teaching of *Humanae vitae* at the time (“whoever honestly chooses the course which seems right does so in a good conscience”), Dr. McQueen falls into the same “I decide what’s right for me” guidance that has led several generations of Catholics to use contraceptives within marriage, then outside marriage (“How can the Church tell me it’s wrong when it feels so good?”), to a wholesale rejection of Catholic teaching not only in the area of morality, but in all facets of our faith.

**Etobicoke, ON**

## New statement explains why contraception is wrong

*Catholic Insight*, January 2004, News in Brief

**Washington, DC**—American bishops have agreed to prepare a new statement explaining why contraception is not acceptable. News reporter Paul Likoudis writes as follows:

“Recognizing that the Church in America’s crisis in vocations reflects a crisis in marriage and family life, the U.S. bishops agreed to produce a statement, directed to young adults and married couples, explaining why contraception is wrong.

“The idea for such a document came from Denver’s Archbishop Charles Chaput, O.F.M. Cap., who is the interim director of the bishops’ office for pro-life activities since the retirement of Philadelphia’s Anthony Cardinal Bevilacqua. “The statement is intended to be published in the form of an attractive brochure, which would seek a wide distribution in parish bookracks, and would also be taught to high school and college students. The statement should be ready for discussion by next year’s November plenary meeting.

“Archbishop Chaput said Catholics need to know what the

Church teaches about contraception because the ‘teaching on contraception has been a battleground for those with differing views of Church authority, and, additionally, it would be a fitting tribute to the Pope to put into laymen’s terms the teaching of John Paul II on the human body.’” (*Wanderer*, November 20, 2003)

### **New sex education document**

The bishops are also preparing, writes Likoudis, (1) a new sex education document, “that emphasizes the teaching of morality and parental rights; (2) a document on faith and politics, which reminds Catholic voters and politicians they have a serious moral obligation to manifest their Catholic faith in public life by their votes, political activity, and legislation; (3) a user-friendly pamphlet outlining the Church’s opposition to legislation supporting same-sex unions; (4) production of an adult catechism based on *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, and development of guidelines for high school catechisms.

“The most outstanding example of a sea-change in the attitude of bishops and the operation of the bishops’ bureaucracy was a presentation by Archbishop Alfred Hughes of New Orleans on the first day of the meeting, in which he bluntly told the bishops the overwhelming majority of Catholic catechisms or religious education books used by America’s high school age Catholics are not Catholic and are incapable of being brought into conformity with Church teaching.” (*Wanderer*, November 20, 2003)

In other words, he admitted that the Catholic catechisms used in Catholic high schools and parish education programs are leading students out of the Church.

\*\*\*

## **Bishop Galzone’s pastoral letter**

*Catholic Insight*, March 2004, News in Brief

**Florida**—A stunningly clear explanation of the Theology of the Body and the evils of contraception has been issued by Bishop Victor Galeone of St. Augustine, Florida. The text of Bishop

Galeone's pastoral letter, *Marriage: a Communion of Life and Love*, was published January 4, 2004, in Winnipeg's Ukrainian Catholic newspaper *Progress*, edited by Most Rev. David Motiuk.

Drawing on Pope John Paul's Theology of the Body, Bishop Galeone points out that "sexual communication uses many of the same terms that verbal communication does: intercourse, to know (carnally), to conceive, etc."

The bishop then asks: "Is it normal for a wife to insert ear plugs while listening to her husband? Is it normal for a husband to muffle his mouth while speaking to his wife?" It is equally absurd, the pastoral states, to destroy sexual communication through the use of a diaphragm, birth control pills, or condoms. Carrying the analogy over to the area of sterilization, the pastoral asks:

"How can one justify a husband having a surgeon clip his robust vocal chords, or a wife having her healthy eardrums surgically removed? Yet in the area of sexual communication how do such horrific examples differ from a vasectomy or a tubal ligation?" God fashioned our bodies male and female to communicate both life and love, writes Bishop Galeone, and every time a husband and wife deliberately frustrate this twofold purpose through contraception, they are acting out a lie. "The body language of the marital act says, 'I'm all yours,' but the contraceptive device adds, 'except for my fertility.'"

To illustrate the difference between contraception and NFP (periodic abstinence), Bishop Galeone uses the "theology of the body" again: "to say that NFP is no different from contraception is like saying that maintaining silence is the equivalent of telling a lie."

Citing statistics that show 90% of North American citizens, regardless of denomination, use contraception, the bishop states, "I fear that much of what I have said seems harshly critical of couples using contraceptives. In reality, I am not blaming them for what has occurred during the past four decades. It was not their fault. With rare exceptions, because of our silence, we bishops and priests are to blame."

In order to counter this silence, the bishop calls for the implementation of several guidelines in his diocese:

All pastoral ministers should study and teach to others the message of the Theology of the Body; confessors should become familiar with the *Vademecum for Confessors Concerning Some Aspects of the Morality of Conjugal Life*; priests and deacons should present homilies on why contraceptive behaviour is wrong; NFP is to become part of all marriage preparation programs; high school, religious education, and RCIA classes should clearly teach the immorality of contraception.

In the introduction to his pastoral letter, Bishop Galeone mentioned two social developments that prompted him to write the letter, namely, legislation redefining marriage to include same sex unions, and escalating divorce rates. But these latest developments, says the bishop, “are mere symptoms of a vastly more serious disorder. Until the taproot of that disorder is cut, I fear that we will continue to reap the fruit of failed marriages and worsening sexual behavior at every level of society.”

Bishop Galeone is among the growing number of Catholics who have the insight to identify the “taproot” of our current social disintegration as being rejection of *Humanae vitae*. In Canada in December 2003, a similar insight was demonstrated by the launching of a new Ottawa apostolate which identifies contraception as the root of the “cultural and social disaster besieging our country” and which is seeking support for a petition to the Canadian bishops for a retraction of the Winnipeg Statement. See “Rosarium seeks retraction of Winnipeg Statement” under Canada *News in Brief* (Source: L. Collins).

\*\*\*

## A new apostolate: The Rosarium

*Catholic Insight*, March 2004, *News in Brief*

On December 8, 2003, two laymen and three priests in Ottawa launched a new apostolate dedicated to countering the culture of death in Canada. The new apostolate is called “The Rosarium,” named for Pope John Paul’s encyclical on the rosary.

Topping their agenda is gathering signatures on a petition to the bishops of Canada for retraction of the Winnipeg Statement: “We view the Winnipeg Statement, in particular Paragraph 26 of this statement, as a capitulation to this culture of death. We believe that this Statement has played an instrumental role in ushering in the cultural and social disaster now besieging our once free and glorious country. We believe that unless the Canadian bishops clearly reaffirm Catholic moral teaching on human life, both the Catholic Church in Canada and Canadian civilization itself will one day cease to exist as we now know it.”

The Rosarium has an excellent web site at [www.therosarium.ca](http://www.therosarium.ca), which carries the text of the petition to the bishops along with a call for Catholics who are willing to serve as “prayer warriors” in support of this initiative. For the intention of having the Winnipeg Statement retracted, “prayer warriors” are asked to pray the Rosary and the prayer to St. Michael the Archangel every day, and to fast on the 27th of each month (the day the Winnipeg Statement rejecting *Humanae vitae* was issued by the Canadian bishops in 1968). E-mail: [retract@therosarium.ca](mailto:retract@therosarium.ca) (Source: L. Collins).

The petition can be signed directly through the Rosarium web site. Readers who do not have access to the Internet can sign the petition by sending their name and address (along with supporting comments) to the following postal address:

**The Rosarium  
P.O. Box 11400, Station H, Nepean, ON., K2H 7V1, Canada**

\*\*\*

From Norman W. Lower  
re contraception

*Catholic Insight*, June 2004, Letters

I am getting caught up in my previous issues of *Catholic Insight*. In a letter to the editor, December 2003 issue, Patrick J. Sheahan from Hamilton, Ontario, says sarcastically:

“Msgr. Foy forgot to mention that the Winnipeg Statement

also was the cause of the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the recession of 1990, and AIDS in Africa, etc.” I assume that this remark is in reference to Msgr. Foy’s excellent essay in the October 2003 issue, “Fifty reasons why the Winnipeg Statement should be recalled.”

It appears to me that Mr. Sheahan does not fully comprehend that Msgr. Foy is clearly identifying what the late Bishop Glennon Flavin (Lincoln, Nebraska) called “the greatest evil in the Catholic Church today - contraception.” If Mr. Sheahan has difficulty accepting what Msgr. Foy says, then let him heed the words of Christopher Zakrzewski, former editor of *Nazareth Family Journal*, who describes in an excellent article the negative consequences to his marriage of the practice of contraception:

“But as we look back on those seventeen years between the birth of our second daughter and the birth of our first son after the restoration of my fertility [from sterilization] we can see that instead of bringing us release from fear, anxiety, and financial worry, that decision [to be sterilized] reaped a grim harvest of self-doubt, spiritual confusion, guilt, discord, and family dysfunctionality. In my wife’s case, it brought on a profound sense of loss of her womanhood.... Contraception is a blight on the entire Body of Christ. It is too large a problem to be dropped in the lap of our young married couples. All sectors of the Church must be marshalled in its eradication. It is arguably, in our culture at the least, the greatest single cause of our failure to pass on the authentic Catholic faith to our children. Recent sociological surveys have shown parents that far and away the main cause of children falling away from the faith of their parents is dysfunctionality in the parents’ relationship, and discord is one of the most predictable bitter fruits of the contraceptive lifestyle. [“Our Journey with *Humanae Vitae* Revisited,” *Catholic Life and Family* (Priests for Life Canada), Vol. 2003, Issue 2.]

Msgr. Foy is correct that the eradication of the evil of contraception in the Catholic Church in Canada cannot be realized until the Canadian bishops revoke their 1968 dissenting Winnipeg Statement.

Your editorial comment at the end of Mr. Sheahan’s letter is an excellent reply to what he said.

## From Filippo Mæcozzi re Winnipeg Statement

*Catholic Insight*, July/August 2004, Letters

The Winnipeg Statement (Msgr. Foy, *C.I.*, October 2003) is not an “error to be eradicated” as a consequence of incompetence or misinformation by the 80 bishops in plenary session in 1968; rather it is a libel of schism contradicting the creational order, honoured since creation up to the invention of mechanical, chemical, and surgical contraceptive means. At the same time, it denies papal infallibility in moral matters.

In my opinion, the recall of the Winnipeg Statement should be more openly and vigorously debated in *Catholic Insight*.

**Colborne, ON**

*P.S.* I enclosed the article “Schism persisting” by Joseph Pope, *Challenge*, March 2004.

\*\*\*

## From Linda Vandenberg

*Catholic Insight*, November 2004, Letters

Mr. Beneteau’s letter of September 2004 [**Editor:** *not printed here*] was quite informative about Natural Family Planning, but I question the generalizations made concerning those whom he refers to as “contraceptive” couples.

First, I and many other Catholic couples (married 30 years) were counselled by the clergy regarding contraception, birth control, vasectomies and various other issues when we asked what we should do. Many of us found no help other than, “You should follow your conscience.”

We should have been taught about what married life, and children in that marriage, really mean. Certainly, we understood that children are part of the family God envisions for us, but the teachings of the Church at that time did not come out very

strongly either way. As a result, many of us became “contraceptive couples.”

The insensitive way in which Mr. Beneteau dismisses and lumps us into a group that will “employ abortion” for “accidents,” is totally distasteful to me. I may have prevented conception and also may have unknowingly aborted an embryo through the use of the contraceptive pill or IUD, but I have never supported abortion. Even the idea that I may have hurt an unborn child hurts me to the core. I am not alone in this.

We are all, as Catholics, becoming more aware of what the Church teaches especially through the publications of our Holy Father, Pope John Paul II. The clergy are also becoming more aware as well as more responsible to their parishioners. I thank God for this enlightenment.

Understanding and education of all Catholics on many subjects should be the goals of all the organizations affiliated with the Catholic Church. Harmful generalizations on subjects the writer of this letter seems to know so much about may only serve to create a rift between those who know and those who are trying to learn how to be better.

**High Prairie, AB**

\*\*\*

## From Jim Verrault re Catholic crisis

*Catholic Insight*, July/August 2005, Letters

Please forgive the tardiness of this letter, as I am a little behind on my reading, but I would like to point out a major flaw in Hugh Buckley’s argument in his article, “Enough appeasement already” (C.I., Feb. ’05, pp. 14-15). Mr. Buckley correctly points out the scandal caused by Catholics in positions of higher authority, such as our pseudo-Catholic politicians. His solution to the problem is to encourage our Canadian bishops, who are seemingly trapped in a policy of appeasement, to discipline our wayward politicians.

Mr. Buckley’s reasoning, however, misses a critical point.

When they issued their infamous Winnipeg Statement in 1968, it was the Canadian Catholic bishops who laid the foundations for such widespread scandal and, by obstinately refusing to rescind the Statement, they have no moral claim to rebuke Catholic politicians who are merely sliding along behind them, down the slippery slope of disobedience. If our bishops cannot be obedient to the Holy See, then why should our politicians be obedient to them? And if our politicians cannot be obedient, it is only because they know the Canadian Catholic laity are, for the most part, as disobedient as themselves.

It has been said that we get the leadership we deserve, and until the Catholic laity in this country either stand behind Rome, or find the integrity to leave a Church they no longer believe in, our inexorable descent into dissolution will continue unabated. What is to be done, Mr. Buckley? We must appeal to an authority higher than that of our Canadian bishops. We must pray for the courage to stand up for the Truth in this country, even if such defence demands of us the blood of martyrs. Yet, given our track record, are we Canadian Catholics even remotely prepared to make such a sacrifice?

**Red Deer, AB**



## Chapter VI

### *A response to Fr. Michael Prieur's defence of the Winnipeg Statement*

**O**n June 3, 2005, I happened to have a telephone conversation with Mr. Tom Smaak in Calgary. At one point he mentioned having sent a letter to his bishop (Bishop Fred Henry) asking for the bishops of Canada to retract the September 1968 Winnipeg Statement dealing with the application of the encyclical *Humanae vitae*. In response the bishop had sent him a two-page letter written by Fr. Michael Prieur defending the Winnipeg Statement. On my request Mr. Smaak sent me a copy of the document which I then forwarded to Msgr. Foy for comment, who was very surprised to see it.

Secondly, the Latin (and Vatican) custom is to spell titles with only one capital: *Humanae vitae* rather than the American custom of capitalizing **all** words in a title *Humanae Vitae*. The latter is used whenever Msgr. Foy quotes from another source. —**Editor**

#### **MSGR. VINCENT N. FOY**

**I**t is distressing to learn that Fr. Michael Prieur, professor of moral theology at St. Peter's Seminary, London, Ontario, is trying to defend the indefensible, i.e. the Winnipeg Statement of the Canadian Bishops on the encyclical *Humanae vitae*.

He attempts this in his "Comments on the Canadian Bishops' Winnipeg Statement," dated March 6, 2005. He divides his comments into two sections, one on the "Winnipeg Statement" and the second on "Solid Teaching on *Humanae Vitae* (HV) and the Winnipeg Statement (WS)."

In this response I follow the sequence of his paragraphs.

### Section A

I. Father Prieur says that the WS needs to be taken in context with two other statements of the Canadian Bishops: a second statement in April of 1969 and a third Statement on Conscience in 1973.

Here I give my comments on these subsequent statements in an article written for *Challenge* magazine in December 1989:

"In the wake of much criticism of the Winnipeg Statement a special 'ad hoc' Committee on the Family was set up by the CCCB. The purpose was "to follow up 1968 Statement on *Humanae Vitae*." Its fruit was a report adopted by the General Assembly of the Canadian Bishops on April 18, 1969. It said in part:

*'Nothing could be gained and much could be lost by an attempt to rephrase what we have said at Winnipeg. We stand squarely behind our position but we feel it our duty to insist on a proper interpretation of that position.'*

"In the midst of continuing criticism and confusion, the CCCB released a statement on *The Formation of Conscience* on Dec. 12, 1973. It was a good statement on conscience in general. This seemed to be the opportune occasion to provide confessional guidelines for priests promised at Winnipeg. These were not given. The statement listed some intrinsic evils: killing the innocent, adultery, theft. Nowhere is contraception mentioned, nor is *Humanae vitae*.

"Indirectly this was the basis for subsequent equivocation. In later guidelines one sees the statement on conscience quoted next to Par. 26 of the Winnipeg Statement. By this syncretic method contraception seems sometimes acceptable." It is the context of HV that counts.

The truth is that the WS should rather be considered in the context of HV. Here its grave deficiencies become apparent. The

Canadian Bishops were asked to confirm the encyclical and explain it. Instead they deliberately subverted it. Here we have the sad spectacle of bishops, sworn to fidelity to the Holy See, making a Statement **undermining** what was given to the universal Church with the authority of Christ (HV,6).

a) Father Prieur says that it must be noted that none of the Statements of the Canadian Bishops were ever subjected to any kind of correction by Rome. He presumes from this that they did not need correction. The fact is that a number of defective Episcopal Statements were not corrected by the Holy See directly. Indirectly they were criticized by the constant affirmation of HV by Pope Paul VI.

b) At the request of Cardinal O'Boyle of Washington, I wrote a critical analysis of the WS for the American Bishops. Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, wrote to thank me and said that the Holy Father also thanked me. This letter was sent open to the Canadian Apostolic Delegate, to be forwarded to Archbishop Pocock, who had instructions to personally give it to me. This he did with no comment. Why would the Holy Father thank me for attacking the WS, if he approved of it?

c) It should be added that the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* refused to print the WS though it printed the Statements of other hierarchies. When a Canadian bishop complained personally to the editor of *L'Osservatore Romano*, Fr. Lambert Greenan, O.P., the latter replied that it had not been printed because it was a disgrace. The other Statements were cleared by the Secretariat of State. The WS was not. It is relevant to recall that when an article on Catholic Education by Archbishop Pocock was printed in *L'Osservatore Romano* Pocock complained that to appear in *L'Osservatore Romano* was "the kiss of death to a Liberal." He was then heavily under the influence of Gregory Baum, a main dissenter from HV.

### **Is the Winnipeg Statement faithful to HV?**

2. Father Prieur tells us that although some groups are urging the bishops to change or withdraw the WS, this is not necessary because the WS is faithful both to the teachings of HV and teachings on conscience as understood by moral theology.

First, I thank God that we have groups and individuals working and praying for the recall of the WS and the teaching without compromise of HV. Among these are the Rosarium group under Tony and Diane Liuzzo and John and Laura Pacheco; *Catholic Insight* under Fr. Alphonse de Valk, C.S.B.; the Witness group under Jim Duffy; Bishop Danylak; Fr. Leonard Kennedy, C.S.B.; Fr. Paul Marx, O.S.B., founder of Human Life International; Fr. Joseph Thompson; John F. Kippley, founder of the Couple to Couple League; Dr. John Shea; David Dooley; John Stone; J.K. MacKenzie, Q.C.; Norman Lower; Deacon Daniel Dauvin; Joseph Pope; Edward and Lorene Collins; and countless other priests and laity. We do not forget those heroic parents, like Doug and Marie Lavoie, of Cochrane, Alberta, who, after making many sacrifices to raise a large family, were shocked and scandalized by the WS.

It is not true that the WS is faithful to HV. It carefully avoided full agreement with HV. This is evident in paragraph 2, where the bishops say: “*We are in accord with the teaching of the Holy Father concerning the dignity of married life, and the necessity of a truly Christian relationship between conjugal love and responsible parenthood.*”

They rejected the wording of their theological commission: “*We are one with the Holy Father in his teaching and pastoral concerns about conjugal love and responsible parenthood.*” Please note the essential difference, that is, the word ‘teaching’ was omitted in reference to conjugal love and responsible parenthood.

The Statement speaks as though the Church were still searching for the answers which the Pope and Church had already given (cf. para. 3,4,6,7,13,18,34). We see a reflection of Fr. Charles Curran’s *Dissent in and for the Church* in par. 34: “We stand in union with the Bishop of Rome—If this sometimes means that we falter in the way, or differ as to the way, no one should conclude that our common faith is lost or our loving purpose blunted.”

They did falter and they did differ. Instead of rejoicing in our heritage of truth about life and love, the last paragraph of the WS quotes Cardinal Newman's *Lead kindly light amidst the encircling gloom*. The Statement was to bring that encircling gloom.

That the WS was not in harmony with HV was admitted by Bishop Alexander Carter, President of the CCCB in 1968. He said:

"For the first time we faced the necessity of making a statement which many felt could not be a simple Amen, a total and formal endorsement of the doctrine of the encyclical." ("Canadian bishops on *Of Human Life*," by Rev. Edward Sheridan, S.J., *America*, October 19, 1968, p.349). Father Sheridan gave a correct assessment when he wrote:

*"The Statement contained no general profession of assent to the whole teaching of HV, and nothing that could be interpreted as adding the local authority of the Canadian Bishops to that of the encyclical in general" (ibid.).*

How can Father Prieur say that the WS is faithful to the teachings of HV when its writers admit that it is not?

Father Prieur says the WS is faithful to the teachings on conscience as understood by moral theology. This is treated below.

### **Objective and Subjective**

3. Father Prieur states that the bishops chose to uphold the objective teachings of HV and then bring to bear what moral theology has taught for many years about what someone may have to do subjectively when several duties seem impossible to achieve in their circumstances.

First, nowhere in the WS do the bishops uphold the objective teachings of HV. The talk of conflict of duties is a smoke screen for what should more accurately be described as difficult duties. There are no principles of moral theology which would permit one to licitly counsel the performance of an intrinsically evil act. Pope John Paul II puts it this way:

*"Contraception is to be judged objectively so profoundly unlawful, as never to be, for any reason, justified. To think or say the contrary is equal to maintain-*

*ing that in human life, situations may arise in which it is lawful not to recognize God as God.” (L’Osservatore Romano, October 10, 1983).*

Vatican II gives us true and clear teaching on conscience. The Vatican II document *Gaudium et spes* tells us that:

*“Married couples should realize that in their behaviour they may not follow their own fancy but must be ruled by conscience - and conscience ought to be conformed to the law of God in the light of the teaching authority of the Church which is the authentic interpreter of divine law” (#50).*

Put simply, conscience is to be informed and conformed; otherwise it is deformed. Cardinal Newman’s remarks on conscience are valid today. He wrote: “Conscience is a stern monitor but in this century it has been replaced by a counterfeit: self-will” (*Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*).

### **Guilt and the intrinsically evil act**

4. In this paragraph Father Prieur cites a reply from the Congregation of the Clergy to a group of dissident priests in Washington, D.C. It correctly affirms that circumstances can make an intrinsically evil act diminished in guilt or even without guilt. He says that the WS is a pastoral way of saying this.

This is not a correct pastoral application of the principles governing subjective guilt. The subjective conscience may be an erroneous conscience, warped or deformed or corrupted by habit. Out of it may come fornication, adultery, contraception, sodomy, abortion, euthanasia, and other evils. May these then be sometimes counselled? Right pastoral response must be based on truth, not error. It is the objective order which the Church upholds and must uphold, whether in teaching, preaching, or in the confessional.

Anne Roche Muggerridge correctly assessed the WS when she wrote: “*The Canadian Bishops, like the Protestant reformers,*

*reversed the order of importance in moral judgment, that is, they put the private subjective elements of morality before the universal and objective” (Anne Roche Muggeridge, *The Desolate City: The Catholic Church in Ruins*; Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986; pp. 97-98).*

The WS and Father Prieur reject the defined doctrine expressed in HV that grace is always sufficient. Bishop Emmett Carter put it this way:

*“Our statement was definitely meant to indicate to the people of Canada that if they found, as we anticipated, and God knows history has proven us to be correct, that they couldn’t follow the directives of the encyclical, then they were not to consider themselves as cut off from the church.”*

Pope John Paul II expresses his rejection of this heresy in these words:

*“To hold out for exceptions in the matter of the prohibition of contraceptives as if God’s grace were not sufficient is a form of atheism” (September 17, 1983).*

The end result of the Winnipeg tragedy is that it created erroneous consciences. Before he left Winnipeg, Archbishop Pocock wrote to me saying that the Canadian Bishops had spoken with a nearly unanimous voice and that he expected me to accept that statement and to absolve those contracepting in good faith. Is this not counselling an erroneous conscience?

Not long ago a man told me that, before he married, his pastor told him that if he had difficulties in having a family he could invoke the Canadian Bishops and his wife could use the Pill. She had some unpleasant side effects from the Pill and so he was sterilized. The marriage broke up not long after. He stopped going to Mass, but recently, at his Mother’s funeral Mass, he went to Holy Communion. He said: “My conscience is clear.” The WS created erroneous consciences in countless priests and people.

**'Conflict of duties'**

5. Here we are given a list of difficulties which married couples faced in 1968. Father Prieur, concludes that "the category of 'conflict of duties' was most apt for this situation."

As already affirmed, difficulties do not bring a conflict of duties. The duty is clear: to obey God's law. Using a metaphor employed by Pope John Paul II, no reasons piled high as heaven can justify the contraceptive act. The means of grace are always there. In detail these are described in HV #25 and 26 and in even greater detail in *Reflections on Humanae Vitae*, in the section entitled "Prayer, penance and the eucharist are the principal sources of spirituality for married couples"(General audience, October 3, 1984).

**Section B: Solid teaching on HV and WS**

There is, of course, a critical need for solid teaching on HV. There is no acceptable teaching on the WS except that which points out its grave errors.

I & 2. In these paragraphs, Father Prieur endorses his book *Married in the Lord*. He says: "After almost thirty years I am happy to report that the content is still most cogent regarding the whole struggle which Catholics experience about contraception."

I believe I can do no better than reprint here a critique of *Married in the Lord* which I wrote for *Challenge Magazine* (Dec.'89):

"*Married in the Lord* (Liturgical Commission, Diocese of London, 1976, 1978) is a 'Handbook for those Assisting Christian Couples Prepare for Marriage.' The author, Fr. Michael Prieur, is professor of moral theology at St. Peter's Seminary, London, Ontario. Although now out of print, this manual helped shape the views of many still-young couples. The pagination is that of the second revised edition.

"Fr. Prieur warns against the conclusion: '*The Pope has spoken and that's that*' (p.63). He says: '*This kind of rigidity tends to eliminate any fruitful discussion of some of the real difficulties in the teaching.*'"

In fact, the matter is closed precisely because the Pope **has** spoken and invoked the authority of Christ in doing so (HV6).

**Prieur:** “We are told that the teaching of HV could be revised if fresh data or new insights warranted it (p.57).”

**Foy:** The Church, through four Popes, has said the teaching cannot be changed since it is divine law.

**Prieur:** Regarding statements of national hierarchies we read: ‘These official declarations are official teachings of the Magisterium of the Church’ (p.61).

**Foy:** This is untrue. Bishops exercise their office of teaching only insofar as they are in communion with the head of the episcopal college, the Holy Father (cf. Canon 375).

Father Prieur quotes with approval Par.26 of the WS (p.102, though it is called Par.16). He also quotes the misleading Par.17 (p.102, though it is called Par.16) “*concerning those who find it either extremely difficult or even impossible to make their own all elements of this doctrine....*”

**Prieur:** “Since they are not denying any point of divine and Catholic faith nor rejecting the teaching authority of the Church, these Catholics should not be considered or consider themselves shut off from the body of the faithful.”

**Foy:** This paragraph equivalently denies the sufficiency of grace and incorrectly says that these people do not reject the teaching authority of the Church. Father Prieur sets loose rules for the reception of Holy Communion by contracepting parties, without Confession (p.112).

It is divine law that requires sorrow, confession, and purpose of amendment. Compare the advice of this text with that of Pope Paul VI: “*They (the spouses) should use the Sacraments in sorrow for their lapses and renew their wavering resolutions to obey*” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, Dec.21, 1971).

*Married in the Lord* bears an *Imprimatur*. In 1976 it was recommended by the Ontario Bishops. After John Cattana of

Toronto made several valid criticisms of it in *The Catholic Register* (June 5, 1976), the Toronto Senate of Priests rebuked *The Register* for 'sniping' at Father Prieur's book after it had been approved by the bishops of Ontario.

The September 1976 issue of the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* carried an excellent article entitled "A Book Reviewed." In all charity it pointed out the major deficiencies in Father Prieur's manual.

Of Fr. Prieur's book an Archbishop said in a letter to me (June 10, 1976): "*It has been weakened mainly because it relies on the CCC statement on HV of 1968.... I fail to understand how the Imprimatur could have been given to it in so important a matter, without sound doctrine.*"

The Archbishop referred to in the paragraph above is Archbishop Routhier of Grouard-McLennan, with whom I had a long correspondence on the WS and the Canadian Catechism. He was one of those who voiced his disapproval of the WS at Winnipeg in 1968.

### **Bishop Emmett Carter**

In the fall of 1976, I wrote to Bishop Carter of London (later Cardinal Emmett Carter of Toronto) expressing concern over the grave errors in *Married in the Lord*. In his reply he did not answer my objections, but said he had full confidence in Father Prieur and that he had helped him "over the rough spots" in the writing of the manual.

It is important to note that on February 7, 1967, Bishop Carter told his London priests that they "should be confused about the use of the Pill." He ordered them to absolve those who contracepted "in good faith." He had forgotten or ignored that Pope Pius XII had condemned the contraceptive use of the Pill on September 12, 1958, and that Pope Paul VI had reaffirmed the teaching of the Church in 1964 and 1966, calling it a time of study and not of doubt. When HV was published in 1968 Bishop Carter and some other bishops considered the encyclical not a solution, but "a problem."

In fairness it must be added that in a private letter dated June

15,1995, Cardinal Carter wrote: “I am not prepared to defend paragraph 26 (of the WS) totally. The phraseology was misleading and could give the impression that the bishops were saying that one could dissent at will from the Pope’s teaching.”

### **What to do in the future?\_**

3. Here Father Prieur presents his recommendations for the future. He would launch a more intensive presentation on Pope John Paul II’s *Theology of the Body*. That is good. The Holy Father gave us the superb “Reflections on *Humanae vitae*” in his audiences from July 11, 1984 to November 28, 1984.

It would be good also to launch a more intense study of *Familiaris Consortio*, the Apostolic Exhortation following the Synod on the Family, of 1980. Also helpful would be a study of *Letter to Families* from Pope John II, February 2, 1994. All of these endorse and explain the intrinsic evil of contraception and the spiritual means needed to avoid it.

4. In this final paragraph Father Prieur says many Catholics suffer from both vincible and invincible ignorance regarding contraception.

**Foy:** In fact many Catholics in Canada and elsewhere suffer from erroneous consciences because of false teaching such as that of the WS and that of Father Prieur. Natural Family Planning (NFP) is not a panacea. Here a caution is necessary. NFP is usually taught without moral evaluation. Serious reasons are required for its practice (HV 16). Pope John Paul II teaches that married couples who have recourse to the natural regulation of fertility might do so without valid reasons (General Audience, August 8, 1984). A marriage might even be invalid when the right to have children is excluded by NFP.

### **Conclusion**

Some years ago I met Bishop Bruskewitz of Lincoln, Nebraska, at the *Call to Holiness Convention* in Detroit. He knew there was a serious problem in Canada over the WS and I asked his advice. He thought it would be helpful if even a small number

of Canadian Bishops were to ask the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for an evaluation of the WS. Twice I tried to bring this about, writing to bishops I thought were pro-life. Not one Latin rite bishop would agree to this procedure.

What can be done? As mentioned, some groups and many individuals are working and praying for the recall of the WS. Much more needs to be done and so we must persevere and pray and do penance. May the Holy Spirit guide all those engaged in this noble effort and give them the grace of perseverance.

At present the Church in Canada is stricken and deeply wounded by the contraceptive mentality. It is practising the "Art of Self-Extinction," with a suicidal birth rate. The majority of Catholic couples of child-bearing age are contracepting and, if still going to Mass, receiving Holy Communion in objective sin. In the area of life issues, most so-called Catholic hospitals are ethical wastelands.

Children in Grade 8 of Catholic schools are taught all the means of contraception in the child-abusing course *Fully Alive*, another fruit of the WS. The prenuptial questionnaire, intended to prevent couples from entering illicit or invalid marriages, no longer in most dioceses asks the question, as it did formerly, "*Do you intend to abide by the teaching of the Church in the matter of birth-control?*"

In general, across the country there is a deafening silence on the part of our spiritual leaders about the great charter of love and life called HV. Thirty-seven years after HV, a seminary professor continues to propagate the love-killing, death-dealing WS.

It is enough to make the angels weep.

## Chapter VII

# *Humanae vitae*

ENCYCLICAL OF POPE PAUL VI

*ON THE REGULATION OF BIRTH*

(July 25, 1968)

**T**O His Venerable Brothers the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops and other Local Ordinaries in Peace and Communion with the Apostolic See, to the Clergy and Faithful of the Whole Catholic World, and to All Men of Good Will.

Honoured Brothers and Dear Sons, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

The transmission of human life is a most serious role in which married people collaborate freely and responsibly with God the Creator. It has always been a source of great joy to them, even though it sometimes entails many difficulties and hardships.

The fulfillment of this duty has always posed problems to the conscience of married people, but the recent course of human society and the concomitant changes have provoked new questions. The Church cannot ignore these questions, for they concern matters intimately connected with the life and happiness of human beings.

### **I. PROBLEM AND COMPETENCY OF THE MAGISTERIUM**

2. The changes that have taken place are of considerable importance and varied in nature. In the first place there is the rapid increase in population which has made many fear that world population is going to grow faster than available resources,

with the consequence that many families and developing countries would be faced with greater hardships.

This can easily induce public authorities to be tempted to take even harsher measures to avert this danger. There is also the fact that not only working and housing conditions but the greater demands made both in the economic and educational field pose a living situation in which it is frequently difficult these days to provide properly for a large family.

Also noteworthy is a new understanding of the dignity of woman and her place in society, of the value of conjugal love in marriage and the relationship of conjugal acts to this love. But the most remarkable development of all is to be seen in man's stupendous progress in the domination and rational organization of the forces of nature to the point that he is endeavoring to extend this control over every aspect of his own life—over his body, over his mind and emotions, over his social life, and even over the laws that regulate the transmission of life.

### **New questions**

3. This new state of things gives rise to new questions. Granted the conditions of life today and taking into account the relevance of married love to the harmony and mutual fidelity of husband and wife, would it not be right to review the moral norms in force till now, especially when it is felt that these can be observed only with the gravest difficulty, sometimes only by heroic effort?

Moreover, if one were to apply here the so called principle of totality, could it not be accepted that the intention to have a less prolific but more rationally planned family might transform an action which renders natural processes infertile into a licit and provident control of birth?

Could it not be admitted, in other words, that procreative finality applies to the totality of married life rather than to each single act? A further question is whether, because people are more conscious today of their responsibilities, the time has not come when the transmission of life should be regulated by their intelligence and will rather than through the specific rhythms of their own bodies.

### **Interpreting the moral law**

4. This kind of question requires from the teaching authority of the Church a new and deeper reflection on the principles of the moral teaching on marriage—a teaching which is based on the natural law as illuminated and enriched by divine revelation. No member of the faithful could possibly deny that the Church is competent in her Magisterium to interpret the natural moral law. It is in fact indisputable, as Our predecessors have many times declared, (1) that Jesus Christ, when He communicated His divine power to Peter and the other Apostles and sent them to teach all nations His commandments, (2) constituted them as the authentic guardians and interpreters of the whole moral law, not only, that is, of the law of the Gospel but also of the natural law. For the natural law, too, declares the will of God, and its faithful observance is necessary for men's eternal salvation. (3) In carrying out this mandate, the Church has always issued appropriate documents on the nature of marriage, the correct use of conjugal rights, and the duties of spouses. These documents have been more copious in recent times. (4)

### **Special Studies**

5. The consciousness of the same responsibility induced Us to confirm and expand the commission set up by Our predecessor Pope John XXIII, of happy memory, in March, 1963. This commission included married couples as well as many experts in the various fields pertinent to these questions. Its task was to examine views and opinions concerning married life, and especially on the correct regulation of births; and it was also to provide the teaching authority of the Church with such evidence as would enable it to give an apt reply in this matter, which not only the faithful but also the rest of the world were waiting for. (5) When the evidence of the experts had been received, as well as the opinions and advice of a considerable number of Our brethren in the episcopate—some of whom sent their views spontaneously, while others were requested by Us to do so—We were in a position to weigh with more precision all the aspects of this complex

subject. Hence We are deeply grateful to all those concerned.

### **The Magisterium's reply**

6. However, the conclusions arrived at by the commission could not be considered by Us as definitive and absolutely certain, dispensing Us from the duty of examining personally this serious question. This was all the more necessary because, within the commission itself, there was not complete agreement concerning the moral norms to be proposed, and especially because certain approaches and criteria for a solution to this question had emerged which were at variance with the moral doctrine on marriage constantly taught by the Magisterium of the Church. Consequently, now that We have sifted carefully the evidence sent to Us and intently studied the whole matter, as well as prayed constantly to God, We, by virtue of the mandate entrusted to Us by Christ, intend to give Our reply to this series of grave questions.

## **II. DOCTRINAL PRINCIPLES**

7. The question of human procreation, like every other question which touches human life, involves more than the limited aspects specific to such disciplines as biology, psychology, demography or sociology. It is the whole man and the whole mission to which he is called that must be considered: both its natural, earthly aspects and its supernatural, eternal aspects. And since in the attempt to justify artificial methods of birth control many appeal to the demands of married love or of responsible parenthood, these two important realities of married life must be accurately defined and analyzed. This is what We mean to do, with special reference to what the Second Vatican Council taught with the highest authority in its *Pastoral constitution on the Church in the world* of today.

### **God's loving design**

8. Married love particularly reveals its true nature and nobility when we realize that it takes its origin from God, who "is

love,” (6) the Father “from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.” (7) Marriage, then, is far from being the effect of chance or the result of the blind evolution of natural forces. It is in reality the wise and provident institution of God the Creator, whose purpose was to effect in man His loving design. As a consequence, husband and wife, through that mutual gift of themselves, which is specific and exclusive to them alone, develop that union of two persons in which they perfect one another, cooperating with God in the generation and rearing of new lives. The marriage of those who have been baptized is, in addition, invested with the dignity of a sacramental sign of grace, for it represents the union of Christ and His Church.

### **Married love**

9. In the light of these facts the characteristic features and exigencies of married love are clearly indicated, and it is of the highest importance to evaluate them exactly. This love is above all fully human, a compound of sense and spirit. It is not, then, merely a question of natural instinct or emotional drive. It is also, and above all, an act of the free will, whose trust is such that it is meant not only to survive the joys and sorrows of daily life, but also to grow, so that husband and wife become in a way one heart and one soul, and together attain their human fulfillment.

It is a love which is total—that very special form of personal friendship in which husband and wife generously share everything, allowing no unreasonable exceptions and not thinking solely of their own convenience. Whoever really loves his partner loves not only for what he receives, but loves that partner for the partner’s own sake, content to be able to enrich the other with the gift of himself. Married love is also faithful and exclusive of all other, and this until death. This is how husband and wife understood it on the day on which, fully aware of what they were doing, they freely vowed themselves to one another in marriage. Though this fidelity of husband and wife sometimes presents difficulties, no one has the right to assert that it is impossible; it is, on the contrary, always honourable and meritorious.

The example of countless married couples proves not only

that fidelity is in accord with the nature of marriage, but also that it is the source of profound and enduring happiness. Finally, this love is fecund. It is not confined wholly to the loving interchange of husband and wife; it also contrives to go beyond this to bring new life into being. "Marriage and conjugal love are by their nature ordained toward the procreation and education of children. Children are really the supreme gift of marriage and contribute in the highest degree to their parents' welfare."(8)

### **Responsible parenthood**

10. Married love, therefore, requires of husband and wife the full awareness of their obligations in the matter of responsible parenthood, which today, rightly enough, is much insisted upon, but which at the same time should be rightly understood. Thus, we do well to consider responsible parenthood in the light of its varied legitimate and interrelated aspects.

With regard to the biological processes, responsible parenthood means an awareness of, and respect for, their proper functions. In the procreative faculty the human mind discerns biological laws that apply to the human person. (9) With regard to man's innate drives and emotions, responsible parenthood means that man's reason and will must exert control over them. With regard to physical, economic, psychological and social conditions, responsible parenthood is exercised by those who prudently and generously decide to have more children; and by those who, for serious reasons and with due respect to moral precepts, decide not to have additional children for either a certain or an indefinite period of time.

Responsible parenthood, as we use the term here, has one further essential aspect of paramount importance. It concerns the objective moral order which was established by God, and of which a right conscience is the true interpreter. In a word, the exercise of responsible parenthood requires that husband and wife, keeping a right order of priorities, recognize their own duties toward God, themselves, their families and human society. From this it follows that they are not free to act as they choose in the service of transmitting life, as if it were wholly up to them to

decide what is the right course to follow. On the contrary, they are bound to ensure that what they do corresponds to the will of God the Creator. The very nature of marriage and its use makes His will clear, while the constant teaching of the Church spells it out. (10)

### **Observing the natural law**

11. The sexual activity, in which husband and wife are intimately and chastely united with one another, through which human life is transmitted, is, as the recent Council recalled, “noble and worthy.” (11) It does not, moreover, cease to be legitimate even when, for reasons independent of their will, it is foreseen to be infertile. For its natural adaptation to the expression and strengthening of the union of husband and wife is not thereby suppressed. The fact is, as experience shows, that new life is not the result of each and every act of sexual intercourse. God has wisely ordered laws of nature and the incidence of fertility in such a way that successive births are already naturally spaced through the inherent operation of these laws. The Church, nevertheless, in urging men to the observance of the precepts of the natural law, which it interprets by its constant doctrine, teaches that each and every marital act must of necessity retain its intrinsic relationship to the procreation of human life. (12)

### **Union and procreation**

12. This particular doctrine, often expounded by the Magisterium of the Church, is based on the inseparable connection, established by God, which man on his own initiative may not break, between the unitive significance and the procreative significance which are both inherent to the marriage act. The reason is that the fundamental nature of the marriage act, while uniting husband and wife in the closest intimacy, also renders them capable of generating new life—and this as a result of laws written into the actual nature of man and of woman. And if each of these essential qualities, the unitive and the procreative, is preserved, the use of marriage fully retains its sense of true mutu-

al love and its ordination to the supreme responsibility of parenthood to which man is called. We believe that our contemporaries are particularly capable of seeing that this teaching is in harmony with human reason.

### **Faithfulness to God's design**

13. Men rightly observe that a conjugal act imposed on one's partner without regard to his or her condition or personal and reasonable wishes in the matter, is no true act of love, and therefore offends the moral order in its particular application to the intimate relationship of husband and wife. If they further reflect, they must also recognize that an act of mutual love which impairs the capacity to transmit life which God the Creator, through specific laws, has built into it, frustrates His design which constitutes the norm of marriage, and contradicts the will of the Author of life. Hence to use this divine gift while depriving it, even if only partially, of its meaning and purpose, is equally repugnant to the nature of man and of woman, and is consequently in opposition to the plan of God and His holy will.

But to experience the gift of married love while respecting the laws of conception is to acknowledge that one is not the master of the sources of life but rather the minister of the design established by the Creator. Just as man does not have unlimited dominion over his body in general, so also, and with more particular reason, he has no such dominion over his specifically sexual faculties, for these are concerned by their very nature with the generation of life, of which God is the source. "Human life is sacred—all men must recognize that fact," Our predecessor Pope John XXIII recalled. "From its very inception it reveals the creating hand of God." (13)

### **Unlawful birth control methods**

14. Therefore We base Our words on the first principles of a human and Christian doctrine of marriage when We are obliged once more to declare that the direct interruption of the generative process already begun and, above all, all direct abortion, even for therapeutic reasons, are to be absolutely excluded as lawful

means of regulating the number of children. (14) Equally to be condemned, as the Magisterium of the Church has affirmed on many occasions, is direct sterilization, whether of the man or of the woman, whether permanent or temporary. (15) Similarly excluded is any action which either before, at the moment of, or after sexual intercourse, is specifically intended to prevent procreation—whether as an end or as a means. (16) Neither is it valid to argue, as a justification for sexual intercourse which is deliberately contraceptive, that a lesser evil is to be preferred to a greater one, or that such intercourse would merge with procreative acts of past and future to form a single entity, and so be qualified by exactly the same moral goodness as these.

Though it is true that sometimes it is lawful to tolerate a lesser moral evil in order to avoid a greater evil or in order to promote a greater good, (17) it is never lawful, even for the gravest reasons, to do evil that good may come of it (18)—in other words, to intend directly something which of its very nature contradicts the moral order, and which must therefore be judged unworthy of man, even though the intention is to protect or promote the welfare of an individual, of a family or of society in general. Consequently, it is a serious error to think that a whole married life of otherwise normal relations can justify sexual intercourse which is deliberately contraceptive and so intrinsically wrong.

### **Lawful therapeutic means**

15. On the other hand, the Church does not consider at all illicit the use of those therapeutic means necessary to cure bodily diseases, even if a foreseeable impediment to procreation should result there from—provided such impediment is not directly intended for any motive whatsoever. (19)

### **Recourse to infertile periods**

16. Now as We noted earlier (no. 3), some people today raise the objection against this particular doctrine of the Church concerning the moral laws governing marriage, that human intelligence has both the right and responsibility to control those

forces of irrational nature which come within its ambit and to direct them toward ends beneficial to man. Others ask on the same point whether it is not reasonable in so many cases to use artificial birth control if by so doing the harmony and peace of a family are better served and more suitable conditions are provided for the education of children already born. To this question We must give a clear reply.

The Church is the first to praise and commend the application of human intelligence to an activity in which a rational creature such as man is so closely associated with his Creator. But she affirms that this must be done within the limits of the order of reality established by God. If therefore there are well-grounded reasons for spacing births, arising from the physical or psychological condition of husband or wife, or from external circumstances, the Church teaches that married people may then take advantage of the natural cycles immanent in the reproductive system and engage in marital intercourse only during those times that are infertile, thus controlling birth in a way which does not in the least offend the moral principles which We have just explained. (20)

Neither the Church nor her doctrine is inconsistent when she considers it lawful for married people to take advantage of the infertile period but condemns as always unlawful the use of means which directly prevent conception, even when the reasons given for the later practice may appear to be upright and serious. In reality, these two cases are completely different. In the former the married couple rightly use a faculty provided them by nature. In the latter they obstruct the natural development of the generative process.

It cannot be denied that in each case the married couple, for acceptable reasons, are both perfectly clear in their intention to avoid children and wish to make sure that none will result. But it is equally true that it is exclusively in the former case that husband and wife are ready to abstain from intercourse during the fertile period as often as for reasonable motives the birth of another child is not desirable. And when the infertile period recurs, they use their married intimacy to express their mutual love and safeguard their fidelity toward one another. In doing this they certainly give proof of a true and authentic love.

### **Consequences of artificial methods**

17. Responsible men can become more deeply convinced of the truth of the doctrine laid down by the Church on this issue if they reflect on the consequences of methods and plans for artificial birth control. Let them first consider how easily this course of action could open wide the way for marital infidelity and a general lowering of moral standards. Not much experience is needed to be fully aware of human weakness and to understand that human beings—and especially the young, who are so exposed to temptation—need incentives to keep the moral law, and it is an evil thing to make it easy for them to break that law.

Another effect that gives cause for alarm is that a man who grows accustomed to the use of contraceptive methods may forget the reverence due to a woman, and, disregarding her physical and emotional equilibrium, reduce her to being a mere instrument for the satisfaction of his own desires, no longer considering her as his partner whom he should surround with care and affection.

Finally, careful consideration should be given to the danger of this power passing into the hands of those public authorities who care little for the precepts of the moral law. Who will blame a government which in its attempt to resolve the problems affecting an entire country resorts to the same measures as are regarded as lawful by married people in the solution of a particular family difficulty? Who will prevent public authorities from favoring those contraceptive methods which they consider more effective? Should they regard this as necessary, they may even impose their use on everyone. It could well happen, therefore, that when people, either individually or in family or social life, experience the inherent difficulties of the divine law and are determined to avoid them, they may give into the hands of public authorities the power to intervene in the most personal and intimate responsibility of husband and wife.

### **Limits to man's power**

Consequently, unless we are willing that the responsibility of procreating life should be left to the arbitrary decision of men, we must accept that there are certain limits, beyond which it is wrong

to go, to the power of man over his own body and its natural functions—limits, let it be said, which no one, whether as a private individual or as a public authority, can lawfully exceed. These limits are expressly imposed because of the reverence due to the whole human organism and its natural functions, in the light of the principles We stated earlier, and in accordance with a correct understanding of the “principle of totality” enunciated by Our predecessor Pope Pius XII. (21)

### **Concern of the Church**

18. It is to be anticipated that perhaps not everyone will easily accept this particular teaching. There is too much clamorous outcry against the voice of the Church, and this is intensified by modern means of communication. But it comes as no surprise to the Church that she, no less than her divine Founder, is destined to be a “sign of contradiction.” (22) She does not, because of this, evade the duty imposed on her of proclaiming humbly but firmly the entire moral law, both natural and evangelical.

Since the Church did not make either of these laws, she cannot be their arbiter—only their guardian and interpreter. It could never be right for her to declare lawful what is in fact unlawful, since that, by its very nature, is always opposed to the true good of man. In preserving intact the whole moral law of marriage, the Church is convinced that she is contributing to the creation of a truly human civilization. She urges man not to betray his personal responsibilities by putting all his faith in technical expedients. In this way she defends the dignity of husband and wife. This course of action shows that the Church, loyal to the example and teaching of the divine Saviour, is sincere and unselfish in her regard for men whom she strives to help even now during this earthly pilgrimage “to share God’s life as sons of the living God, the Father of all men.” (23)

### **III. PASTORAL DIRECTIVES**

19. Our words would not be an adequate expression of the thought and solicitude of the Church, Mother and Teacher of all

peoples, if, after having recalled men to the observance and respect of the divine law regarding matrimony, they did not also support mankind in the honest regulation of birth amid the difficult conditions which today afflict families and peoples. The Church, in fact, cannot act differently toward men than did the Redeemer. She knows their weaknesses, she has compassion on the multitude, she welcomes sinners. But at the same time she cannot do otherwise than teach the law. For it is in fact the law of human life restored to its native truth and guided by the Spirit of God. (24)

### **Observing the divine law.**

20. The teaching of the Church regarding the proper regulation of birth is a promulgation of the law of God Himself. And yet there is no doubt that to many it will appear not merely difficult but even impossible to observe. Now it is true that like all good things which are outstanding for their nobility and for the benefits which they confer on men, so this law demands from individual men and women, from families and from human society, a resolute purpose and great endurance. Indeed it cannot be observed unless God comes to their help with the grace by which the goodwill of men is sustained and strengthened. But to those who consider this matter diligently it will indeed be evident that this endurance enhances man's dignity and confers benefits on human society.

### **Value of self-discipline**

21. The right and lawful ordering of birth demands, first of all, that spouses fully recognize and value the true blessings of family life and that they acquire complete mastery over themselves and their emotions. For if with the aid of reason and of free will they are to control their natural drives, there can be no doubt at all of the need for self-denial. Only then will the expression of love, essential to married life, conform to right order. This is especially clear in the practice of periodic continence. Self-discipline of this kind is a shining witness to the chastity of husband and wife and, far from being a hindrance to their love of one another,

transforms it by giving it a more truly human character. And if this self-discipline does demand that they persevere in their purpose and efforts, it has at the same time the salutary effect of enabling husband and wife to develop to their personalities and to be enriched with spiritual blessings. For it brings to family life abundant fruits of tranquility and peace. It helps in solving difficulties of other kinds. It fosters in husband and wife thoughtfulness and loving consideration for one another. It helps them to repel inordinate self-love, which is the opposite of charity. It arouses in them a consciousness of their responsibilities. And finally, it confers upon parents a deeper and more effective influence in the education of their children. As their children grow up, they develop a right sense of values and achieve a serene and harmonious use of their mental and physical powers.

### **Promotion of chastity**

22. We take this opportunity to address those who are engaged in education and all those whose right and duty it is to provide for the common good of human society. We would call their attention to the need to create an atmosphere favorable to the growth of chastity so that true liberty may prevail over license and the norms of the moral law may be fully safeguarded. Everything therefore in the modern means of social communication which arouses men's baser passions and encourages low moral standards, as well as every obscenity in the written word and every form of indecency on the stage and screen, should be condemned publicly and unanimously by all those who have at heart the advance of civilization and the safeguarding of the outstanding values of the human spirit. It is quite absurd to defend this kind of depravity in the name of art or culture (25) or by pleading the liberty which may be allowed in this field by the public authorities.

### **Appeal to public authorities**

23. And now We wish to speak to rulers of nations. To you most of all is committed the responsibility of safeguarding the common good. You can contribute so much to the preservation of

morals. We beg of you, never allow the morals of your peoples to be undermined. The family is the primary unit in the state; do not tolerate any legislation which would introduce into the family those practices which are opposed to the natural law of God. For there are other ways by which a government can and should solve the population problem—that is to say by enacting laws which will assist families and by educating the people wisely so that the moral law and the freedom of the citizens are both safeguarded.

### **Seeking true solutions**

We are fully aware of the difficulties confronting the public authorities in this matter, especially in the developing countries. In fact, We had in mind the justifiable anxieties which weigh upon them when We published Our encyclical letter *Populorum Progressio*. But now We join Our voice to that of Our predecessor John XXIII of venerable memory, and We make Our own his words: “No statement of the problem and no solution to it is acceptable which does violence to man’s essential dignity; those who propose such solutions base them on an utterly materialistic conception of man himself and his life. The only possible solution to this question is one which envisages the social and economic progress both of individuals and of the whole of human society, and which respects and promotes true human values.” (26)

No one can, without being grossly unfair, make divine Providence responsible for what clearly seems to be the result of misguided governmental policies, of an insufficient sense of social justice, of a selfish accumulation of material goods, and finally of a culpable failure to undertake those initiatives and responsibilities which would raise the standard of living of peoples and their children. (27) If only all governments which were able would do what some are already doing so nobly, and bestir themselves to renew their efforts and their undertakings! There must be no relaxation in the programs of mutual aid between all the branches of the great human family. Here We believe an almost limitless field lies open for the activities of the great international institutions.

### **To scientists**

24. Our next appeal is to men of science. These can “considerably advance the welfare of marriage and the family and also peace of conscience, if by pooling their efforts they strive to elucidate more thoroughly the conditions favorable to a proper regulation of births.” (28) It is supremely desirable, and this was also the mind of Pius XII, that medical science should by the study of natural rhythms succeed in determining a sufficiently secure basis for the chaste limitation of offspring. (29) In this way scientists, especially those who are Catholics, will by their research establish the truth of the Church’s claim that “there can be no contradiction between two divine laws—that which governs the transmitting of life and that which governs the fostering of married love.” (30)

### **To Christian couples**

25. And now We turn in a special way to Our own sons and daughters, to those most of all whom God calls to serve Him in the state of marriage. While the Church does indeed hand on to her children the inviolable conditions laid down by God’s law, she is also the herald of salvation and through the sacraments she flings wide open the channels of grace through which man is made a new creature responding in charity and true freedom to the design of his Creator and Savior, experiencing too the sweetness of the yoke of Christ. (31)

In humble obedience then to her voice, let Christian husbands and wives be mindful of their vocation to the Christian life, a vocation which, deriving from their Baptism, has been confirmed anew and made more explicit by the Sacrament of Matrimony. For by this sacrament they are strengthened and, one might almost say, consecrated to the faithful fulfillment of their duties. Thus will they realize to the full their calling and bear witness as becomes them, to Christ before the world. (32) For the Lord has entrusted to them the task of making visible to men and women the holiness and joy of the law which united inseparably their love for one another and the cooperation they give to God’s love, God who is the Author of human life.

We have no wish at all to pass over in silence the difficulties, at times very great, which beset the lives of Christian married couples. For them, as indeed for every one of us, “the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life.” (33) Nevertheless it is precisely the hope of that life which, like a brightly burning torch, lights up their journey, as, strong in spirit, they strive to live “sober, upright and godly lives in this world,” (34) knowing for sure that “the form of this world is passing away.” (35)

### **Recourse to God**

For this reason husbands and wives should take up the burden appointed to them, willingly, in the strength of faith and of that hope which “does not disappoint us, because God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us. (36) Then let them implore the help of God with unremitting prayer and, most of all, let them draw grace and charity from that unfailing fount which is the Eucharist. If, however, sin still exercises its hold over them, they are not to lose heart. Rather must they, humble and persevering, have recourse to the mercy of God, abundantly bestowed in the Sacrament of Penance. In this way, for sure, they will be able to reach that perfection of married life which the Apostle sets out in these words: “Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the Church. Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. For no man ever hates his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, as Christ does the Church. . . This is a great mystery, and I mean in reference to Christ and the Church; however, let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband.” (37)

### **Family apostolate**

26. Among the fruits that ripen if the law of God be resolutely obeyed, the most precious is certainly this, that married couples themselves will often desire to communicate their own experience to others. Thus it comes about that in the fullness of the lay vocation will be included a novel and outstanding form of the apostolate by which, like ministering to like, married couples

themselves by the leadership they offer will become apostles to other married couples. And surely among all the forms of the Christian apostolate it is hard to think of one more opportune for the present time. (38)

### **To doctors and nurses**

27. Likewise we hold in the highest esteem those doctors and members of the nursing profession who, in the exercise of their calling, endeavor to fulfill the demands of their Christian vocation before any merely human interest. Let them therefore continue constant in their resolution always to support those lines of action which accord with faith and with right reason. And let them strive to win agreement and support for these policies among their professional colleagues. Moreover, they should regard it as an essential part of their skill to make themselves fully proficient in this difficult field of medical knowledge. For then, when married couples ask for their advice, they may be in a position to give them right counsel and to point them in the proper direction. Married couples have a right to expect this much from them.

### **To priests**

28. And now, beloved sons, you who are priests, you who in virtue of your sacred office act as counsellors and spiritual leaders both of individual men and women and of families—We turn to you filled with great confidence. For it is your principal duty—We are speaking especially to you who teach moral theology—to spell out clearly and completely the Church's teaching on marriage. In the performance of your ministry you must be the first to give an example of that sincere obedience, inward as well as outward, which is due to the Magisterium of the Church.

For, as you know, the pastors of the Church enjoy a special light of the Holy Spirit in teaching the truth. (39) And this, rather than the arguments they put forward, is why you are bound to such obedience. Nor will it escape you that if men's peace of soul and the unity of the Christian people are to be preserved, then it is of the utmost importance that in moral as well as in dogmatic

theology all should obey the Magisterium of the Church and should speak as with one voice. Therefore We make Our own the anxious words of the great Apostle Paul and with all Our heart We renew Our appeal to you: “I appeal to you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree and that there be no dissensions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same judgment.” (40)

### **Christian compassion**

29. Now it is an outstanding manifestation of charity toward souls to omit nothing from the saving doctrine of Christ; but this must always be joined with tolerance and charity, as Christ Himself showed in His conversations and dealings with men. For when He came, not to judge, but to save the world, (41) was He not bitterly severe toward sin, but patient and abounding in mercy toward sinners?

Husbands and wives, therefore, when deeply distressed by reason of the difficulties of their life, must find stamped in the heart and voice of their priest the likeness of the voice and the love of our Redeemer. So speak with full confidence, beloved sons, convinced that while the Holy Spirit of God is present to the Magisterium proclaiming sound doctrine, He also illumines from within the hearts of the faithful and invites their assent. Teach married couples the necessary way of prayer and prepare them to approach more often with great faith the Sacraments of the Eucharist and of Penance. Let them never lose heart because of their weakness.

### **To bishops**

30. And now as We come to the end of this encyclical letter, We turn Our mind to you, reverently and lovingly, beloved and venerable brothers in the episcopate, with whom We share more closely the care of the spiritual good of the People of God. For We invite all of you, We implore you, to give a lead to your priests who assist you in the sacred ministry, and to the faithful of your dioceses, and to devote yourselves with all zeal and without delay to safeguarding the holiness of marriage, in order to guide

married life to its full human and Christian perfection. Consider this mission as one of your most urgent responsibilities at the present time. As you well know, it calls for concerted pastoral action in every field of human diligence, economic, cultural and social. If simultaneous progress is made in these various fields, then the intimate life of parents and children in the family will be rendered not only more tolerable, but easier and more joyful. And life together in human society will be enriched with fraternal charity and made more stable with true peace when God's design which He conceived for the world is faithfully followed.

### **A great work**

31. Venerable brothers, beloved sons, all men of good will, great indeed is the work of education, of progress and of charity to which We now summon all of you. And this We do relying on the unshakable teaching of the Church, which teaching Peter's successor together with his brothers in the Catholic episcopate faithfully guards and interprets. And We are convinced that this truly great work will bring blessings both on the world and on the Church. For man cannot attain that true happiness for which he yearns with all the strength of his spirit, unless he keeps the laws which the Most High God has engraved in his very nature. These laws must be wisely and lovingly observed. On this great work, on all of you and especially on married couples, We implore from the God of all holiness and pity an abundance of heavenly grace as a pledge of which We gladly bestow Our apostolic blessing. Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 25th day of July, the feast of St. James the Apostle, in the year 1968, the sixth of Our pontificate.

### **NOTES**

LATIN TEXT: *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 60 (1968), 481-503.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION: *The Pope Speaks*, 13 (Fall 1969), 329-46.

### **REFERENCES:**

- (1) See Pius IX, encyc. letter *Oui pluribus*; Pii IX P.M. *Acta*, 1, pp. 9-10; St. Pius X encyc. letter *Singulari quadam*: *AAS* 4 (1912), 658; Pius XI, encyc. letter *Casti cornubii*: *AAS* 22 (1930), 579-581; Pius XII, address *Magnificate Dominum* to the episcopate of the Catholic World: *AAS* 46 (1954), 671-672; John XXIII, encyc. letter *Mater et Magistra*:

- AAS 53 (1961), 457.  
 (2) See Mt 28. 18-19.  
 (3) See Mt 7. 21.  
 (4) See Council of Trent Roman Catechism, Part II, ch. 8; Leo XIII, encyc. letter *Arcanum: Acta Leonis XIII*, 2 (1880), 26-29; Pius XI, encyc. letter *Divini illius Magistri*: AAS 22 (1930), 58-61; encyc. letter *Casti connubii*: AAS 22 (1930), 545-546; Pius XII, Address to Italian Medico-Biological Union of St. Luke: *Discorsi e radiomessaggi di Pio XII*, VI, 191-192; to Italian Association of Catholic Midwives: AAS 43 (1951), 835-854; to the association known as the Family Campaign, and other family associations: AAS 43 (1951), 857-859; to 7<sup>th</sup> congress of International Society of Hematology: AAS 50 (1958), 734-735 [TPS VI, 394-395]; John XXIII, encyc. letter *Mater et Magistra*: AAS 53 (1961), 446-447 [TPS VII, 330-331]; Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, nos. 47-52: AAS 58 (1966), 1067-1074 [TPS XI, 289-295]; Code of Canon Law, canons 1067, 1068 §1, canon 1076, §§1-2.  
 (5) See Paul VI, Address to Sacred College of Cardinals: AAS 56 (1964), 588 [TPS IX, 355-356]; to Commission for the Study of Problems of Population, Family and Birth: AAS 57 (1965), 388 [TPS X, 225]; to National Congress of the Italian Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology: AAS 58 (1966), 1168 [TPS XI, 401-403].  
 (6) See 1 Jn 4. 8.  
 (7) Eph 3. 15.  
 (8) Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, no. 50: AAS 58 (1966), 1070-1072 [TPS XI, 292-293].  
 (9) See St. Thomas, *Summa Theologiae*, I-II, q. 94, art. 2.  
 (10) See Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, nos. 50-51: AAS 58 (1966) 1070-1073 [TPS XI, 292-293].  
 (11) See *ibid.*, no. 49: AAS 58 (1966), 1070 [TPS XI, 291-292].  
 (12) See Pius XI, encyc. letter *Casti connubii*: AAS 22 (1930), 560; Pius XII, Address to Midwives: AAS 43 (1951), 843.  
 (13) See encyc. letter *Mater et Magistra*: AAS 53 (1961), 447 [TPS VII, 331].  
 (14) See Council of Trent Roman Catechism, Part II, ch. 8; Pius XI, encyc. letter *Casti connubii*: AAS 22 (1930), 562-564; Pius XII, Address to Medico-Biological Union of St. Luke: *Discorsi e radiomessaggi*, VI, 191-192; Address to Midwives: AAS 43 (1951), 842-843; Address to Family Campaign and other family associations: AAS 43 (1951), 857-859; John XXIII, encyc. letter *Pacem in terris*: AAS 55 (1963), 259-260 [TPS IX, 15-16]; Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, n.51: AAS 58 (1966), 1072 [TPS XI, 293].  
 (15) See Pius XI, encyc. letter *Casti connubii*: AAS 22 (1930), 565; Decree of the Holy Office, Feb. 22, 1940: AAS 32 (1940), 73; Pius XII, Address to Midwives: AAS 43 (1951), 843-844; to the Society of Hematology: AAS 50 (1958), 734-735 [TPS VI, 394-395].  
 (16) See Council of Trent Roman Catechism, Part II, ch. 8; Pius XI, encyc. letter *Casti connubii*: AAS 22 (1930), 559-561; Pius XII, Address to Midwives: AAS 43 (1951), 843; to the Society of Hematology: AAS 50 (1958), 734-735 [TPS VI, 394-395]; John XXIII, encyc. letter *Mater et Magistra*: AAS 53 (1961), 447 [TPS VII, 331].  
 (17) See Pius XII, Address to National Congress of Italian Society of the Union of Catholic Jurists: AAS 45 (1953), 798-799 [TPS I, 67-69].  
 (18) See Rom 3. 8.

- (19) See Pius XII, Address to 26th Congress of Italian Association of Urology: *AAS* 45 (1953), 674-675; to Society of Hematology: *AAS* 50 (1958), 734-735 [TPS VI, 394-395].
- (20) See Pius XII, Address to Midwives: *AAS* 43 (1951), 846.
- (21) See Pius XII, Address to Association of Urology: *AAS* 45 (1953), 674-675; to leaders and members of Italian Association of Cornea Donors and Italian Association for the Blind: *AAS* 48 (1956), 461-462 [TPS III, 200-201].
- (22) *Lk* 2. 34.
- (23) See Paul VI, encyc. letter *Populorum progressio*: *AAS* 59 (1967), 268 [TPS XII, 151].
- (24) See *Rom* 8.
- (25) See Second Vatican Council, *Decree on the Media of Social Communication*, nos. 6-7: *AAS* 56 (1964), 147 [TPS IX, 340-341].
- (26) Encyc. letter *Mater et Magistra*: *AAS* 53 (1961), 447 [TPS VII, 331].
- (27) See encyc. letter *Populorum progressio*, nos. 48-55: *AAS* 59 (1967), 281-284 [TPSXII, 160-162].
- (28) Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, n.52: *AAS* 58 (1966), 1074 [TPS XI, 294].
- (29) Address to Family Campaign and other family associations: *AAS* 43 (1951), 859.
- (30) Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, n.51: *AAS* 58 (1966), 1072 [TPS XI, 293].
- (31) See *Mt* 11. 30.
- (32) See Second Vatican Council, *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, n.48: *AAS* 58 (1966), 1067-1069 [TPS XI, 290-291]; *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, n.35: *AAS* 57 (1965), 40-41 [TPS X, 382-383].
- (33) *Mt* 7. 14; see *Heb* 12. 11.
- (34) See *Ti* 2. 12.
- (35) See *I Cor* 7. 31.
- (36) *Rom* 5. 5.
- (37) *Eph* 5. 25, 28-29, 32-33.
- (38) See Second Vatican Council, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, nos.35, 41: *AAS* 57 (1965), 40-45 [TPS X, 382-383, 386-387]; *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World of Today*, nos. 48-49: *AAS* 58 (1966), 1067-1070 [TPS XI, 290-292]; *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity*, n.11: *AAS* 58 (1966), 847-849 [TPS XI, 128-129].
- (39) See Second Vatican Council, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, n.25: *AAS* 57 (1965), 29-31 [TPS X, 375-376].
- (40) *I Cor* 1. 10.
- (41) See *Jn* 3. 17.

## Index

- Abortifacients, 26  
 Abortion, 25 ff.  
*Ad Tuendam fidem* (1998), 23, 80  
 Anglicans, 51, 66  
 Anscombe, G.E.M., 21  
 Augustine, Saint, 30, 49  
 Baum, Gregory, 10, 13,  
 Bevilacqua, Cardinal Anthony, 81  
*Born of the Spirit*, 10  
 Bourne, Cardinal Francis, 27  
 Bruskewitz, Bishop Fabian, 96  
 Buckley, Hugh, 88-89  
 Burke, Mgrs. Cormac, 14, 21  
 Butler, Bishop B. Christopher, 17,  
 19  
 Caffarra, Carlo, 21  
 Campaign Life Coalition, 33, 49  
 Carlin, David, 55  
 Carter, Bishop Alexander, 68, 89  
 Carter, Cardinal Emmett, 77, 91,  
 94, 95  
 Canadian Conference of Catholic  
 Bishops, 49, 54, 56 ff., 73,  
 86  
*Casti connubii* (1930), 27, 51  
*Catechesi tradendae*, (1979), 10  
*Catechism of the Catholic Church*  
 (1992), 44, 82  
 Catholic Women's League, 49  
 Catholics Against Contraception,  
 32, 39  
 Cattana, John, 94  
 Cauchon, Martin, MP, 42  
 Chaput, Archbishop Charles, 14,  
 81  
*Charter of Rights and Freedoms*,  
 41, 42, 48  
 Cicognani, Cardinal Amleto 10,  
 87  
 Chrétien, Prime Minister Jean, 28,  
 42, 74  
 Clark, Prime Minister Joe, 28  
 Clement of Alexandria, 22  
 Copps, Sheila, MP, 42  
 Culture of death, 25-26, 34  
 Culture of life, 26, 33, 77  
 Collins, Edward and Lorene, 88  
*Come to the Father* (1967), 10  
 Cuomo, Governor Mario, 28  
 Curran, Fr. Charles , 13, 18, 88  
 Danylak, Eparch Roman, 54, 88  
 Davin, Deacon Daniel, 88  
 de Valk, Fr. Alphonse, c.s.b., 28,  
 88  
 De Villers, Paul, MP, 42  
*Didache*, 77  
*Donum vitae* , (1986), 26  
 Dooley, David, 88  
 Duffy, Jim, 88  
 Durocher, Sr. Lucille, 33  
*Dutch Catechism* (1966), 23  
 Excommunication, 28  
 Eves, Premier Ernie, 42  
 Fagan, Fr. Séan, S.M., 13-17, 20,  
 23  
*Familiaris consortio*, (1981), 43,  
 95  
 Finnis, John M., 21  
 Flavin, Bishop Glennon, 86  
*Formation of Conscience* (1973),  
 70, 86  
 Foy, Monsignor Vincent Foy, 8-11,  
 37-38, 53-55, 85-86

- Fully Alive* (1998), 9, 34, 73, 96  
 Galeone, Bishop Victor, 82-84  
 Gibbons, Cardinal James, 27  
 Glover, Janice, 79  
 Goldmann, Fr. Gereon, OFM, 35  
 Graham, Bill, MP, 42,  
 Grant, John Webster, 52  
 Greenan, Fr. Lambert, O.P., 87  
 Grizez, Germain, 80  
 Guitton, Jean, 18  
 Hardon, Fr. John, S.J., 25, 32  
 Harvey, Fr. John, O.S.F.S., 45  
 Hegel, Friedrich, 25  
 Henry, Bishop Fred, 85  
 Homosexuality, 41-49  
 Hubbard, Bede, 54  
 Hughes, Archbishop Alfred, 82  
 Human Life International, 32  
*Humanae vitae* (text), 103-124  
 Huxley, Aldous, 7  
 John XXIII, 8, 15, 51, 105, 110,  
 117  
 John Paul II, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22,  
 23, 38, 43, 54, 67, 80, 89,  
 91, 92, 95  
 Journet, Cardinal Charles, 15, 18  
 Kaufman, Fr. Philip S., O.S.B., 10  
 Kelly, Msgr. George, 18  
 Kennedy, Fr. Leonard, c.s.b., 88  
 Kennedy, Senator Edward, 28  
 Kippley, John F., 21, 39, 88  
 Klein, Premier Ralph, 49  
 Knights of Columbus, 49  
 König, Cardinal, 16  
 Kung, Fr. Hans, 13  
 Lavoie, Doug and Marie, 88  
 Lemelin, Justice Louise, 42  
*Letter to Families* (1994), 95  
 Likoudis, Paul, 81-82  
 Lio, Ermingildo, 21  
 Liuzzo, Tony and Diane, 88  
 Lonergan, Fr. Bernard, S.J., 18  
 Lower, Norman W., 85-86, 88  
 Lowery, Mark, 47  
 Luther, Martin, 31, 39  
 MacKenzie, J.K., 88  
 Mallon, John, 20  
*Married in the Lord*, 69, 92-94  
 Marx, Fr. Paul, O.S.B., 30, 32, 88  
 McGuigan, Mark, MP, 74  
 McQueen, Moira, 79, 81  
 McTeague, Dan, MP, 49  
 Mecozzi, Filippo, 87  
*Medical-Moral Guide* (1970), 72  
 Motiuk, Eparch David, 83  
 Muggerridge, Anne Roche, 91  
 Murphy, Fr. F.X., C.Ss.R., 18  
 Natural Family Planning, 76, 83,  
 84, 87, 95  
 Naud, Fr. André, 73  
 Newman, Cardinal John Henry,  
 22, 89  
 Nineveh solution, 35-36  
 Noonan, John T., 22  
*On the pastoral care of  
 homosexual persons*, (1986), 46,  
 49  
 O'Boyle, Cardinal Patrick, 87  
 O'Shea, Fr. Bill, 77  
 Pacheco, John and Laura, 88  
 Paul VI, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22,  
 34, 38, 51, 54, 56, 61, 74,  
 77, 87, 94  
 Pharmacists for Life, 33  
 Pill, The, 7, 8, 15, 16, 20, 88, 91,  
 94  
 Pitfield, Justice Ian, 43  
 Pius XI, 27, 51  
 Pius XII, 8, 16, 21, 22, 51, 94,  
 114, 118  
 Pocock, Archbishop Philip, 11,  
 87, 91

- Pope, Joseph, 87, 88  
 Popes: *see* John XXIII; John Paul II; Paul VI; Pius XI; Pius XII  
*Populorum progressio* (1967), 117  
 Priests for Life, 49, 86  
 Prieur, Fr. Michael, 85-96  
 Quebec theologians, 54, 71  
 Rahner, Fr. Karl, S.J., 18,  
*Ratione habita* (1967), 23, 68  
 Ratzinger, Cardinal Joseph, 16, 21  
 RealWomen, 49  
 Robinson, Svend, MP, 42  
 Rock, Allan, MP, 28, 42  
 Rock, Dr. John, 8  
 Rosarium, 55, 84-85, 88  
 Routhier, Archbishop Henri, 94  
 St. Joseph's Workers for Life and Family, 33, 49  
 St. Onge, Fr. Charles, 73  
 Same-sex "marriage", 42  
 Schillebeeckx, Fr. Edward, O.P., 18  
 Sex education, 82  
 Shakespeare, 48, 55  
 Shea, John B., M.D., 88  
 Sheahan, Patrick, 37-39, 85  
 Sheriden, Fr. Edward, S.J., 70, 73, 89  
 Shinn, Roger, 45  
 Smaak, Tom, 85  
 Smith, Janet E., 17, 20, 52  
 Society for Catholic Life and Culture, . 54  
*Statement on Family Life and Family Matters* (1969), 73  
 Stone, John, 88  
 Tertullian, 35  
 Thompson, Fr. Joseph, 88  
 Trudeau, Prime Minister Pierre, 74  
 Turner, Prime Minister John, 74  
*Vademecum for confessors* (1997), 84  
 Vandenberg, Linda, 87-88  
*Veritatis splendor* (1993), 21, 54, 71  
 Verrault, Jim, 88-89  
 von Hildebrand, Dietrich and Alice, 18, 21  
 Wappel, Tom, MP, 49  
 Weisgerber, Archbishop James, 54  
 Wilhelm, Anthony, 76  
 Winnipeg Statement, 8, 9, 34, 51-78, 85-96  
 Wojcik, Elizebieta, 21  
 Zakrzewski, Christopher, 86

## Life Ethics Information Centre

104 Bond St. #300 Tor., ON, M5B 1X9 (416) 204-9601

### Books In Print

Collins, Lorene

***Salvation redefined: Catholic parents and religious education in post-Vatican II Canada***

2003, \$19.95 paper, pp.188

1-895599-13-X

Subject(s): 233 Religion/Catechism

De Valk, Alphonse and others (eds.)

***Judicial activism: a threat to democracy and religion***

2003, \$19.95 paper, pp.168

1-895599-14-8

Subject(s): 209 Politics and government – Canada

Kennedy, Leonard A.,c.s.b.

***The Catholic school in an age of dissent***

2002, \$11.95 paper, pp. 112

1-895599-11-3

Subject(s): 231 Religious education

Laurence, Lianne

***Borowski: a Canadian paradox***

2004, \$39.95 cloth, \$24.95 paper, pp. 415

0-9692988-8-9

Subject(s): 496 Biography; Canada; Politics and Government;  
History of pro-life in Canada

Shea, John Bernard, M.D.

***The Safer sex illusion***

2001, \$3.00 paper, pp. 48

1-895599-10-5

Subject(s): 239 sex (also available in French)

Lawrence, James

***Lumen Christi: A guide to a better life through prayer***

2005, \$10.00 (text on cd: \$10.00) spiralbound, pp. 77

0-9734642-0-8

Subject(s): Catholic spirituality

**Shipping costs will be added.**