



Who are the real 'radicals'?

October 11, 2012

By Claire Hoy

Also published in the *Orangeville Citizen*

My Concise Oxford Dictionary – yes, in this electronic age, dictionaries still exist – defines the word “radical” as a person “holding extreme political views; revolutionary.”

Unfortunately, the term is regularly misapplied – and deliberately so – by those who truly are “radicals,” with a big assist from their legions of fellow travelers in the mainstream media.

Which brings us, as you may have suspected, to the latest round in the Great- Canadian- Debate-that-Dare-Not-Utter-Its -Name – or, dare we say it, abortion?

Those of us – and polls show it’s a clear and continuing majority – who think that, like the rest of the civilized world, there should be at least some restrictions on abortion (there is, obviously, a wide range of opinion within this cohort) are routinely dissed as the “radicals.”

While those zealots on the other side who not only think that abortion at any time in the process – and for any reason whatsoever, including gender selection – must remain an absolute right, and who further think that the topic can not even be debated, are routinely pictured in the media as the reasonable ones.

There is something dreadfully wrong with this picture, don’t you think?

You likely know that another private member’s motion in Ottawa – this one from Tory Mark Warawa – is asking the Commons to condemn the practice of sexselective abortion - which, in practice, virtually always means abortion girl babies in favor of boy babies.

Andrea Mrozek, a researcher with the Institute of Marriage and Family Canada and founder of the blog ProWomanProLife, told The Globe and Mail last week that “Some people think you should never call into question any reason for an abortion. I think that doesn’t jibe with mainstream public opinion.”

But Julie Lalonde, a board member for the Abortion Rights Coalition of Canada, responded that a woman’s right to choose is absolute. “People have the right to be appalled by sex-selective abortion. But we don’t believe for a second that this is a genuine attempt at opposing sex selection in Canada. It is anti-choice MPs and antichoice organizations that seem to be fixated on sex-selective abortions because it is a seemingly touchy subject, so it gets people who are on the fence about abortion to sympathize with their viewpoint.”

So, which person is the “radical” here: the one who thinks the subject is worth pursuing, or the one who says it’s over and done, case closed, and it can’t even be discussed?

Well, it seems that even Prime Minister Stephen Harper belongs to the second group, i.e. those who think that despite the fact Canada is the only democratic country in the world without an abortion law is a topic which is beyond the reach of the House of Commons.

They can debate anything else, but not abortion. Heavens no, it’s simply untouchable, or, as Harper’s spokespersons keep saying, “The Prime Minister has been clear that we do not intend to reopen the debate on abortion.”

They forget – or intentionally ignore – that even the pro-abortionist hero Bertha Wilson, the late Supreme Court judge who helped throw out the old abortion law – instructed Parliament to come up with a new law which meets the criteria. Even she didn’t believe that the subject was taboo.

Yet here in Canada – our politicians cowed by decades of vitriolic attacks against anyone who dares believe that unfettered abortion is a good thing – the majority of our elected representatives are too afraid to even debate the matter.

Contrast that to a current debate in the British Parliament – as reported by the National Post’s Chris Selley last week – and you’ll find that their women’s minister, Maria Miller, is attempting to reduce the legal abortion limit from the current 24 weeks of gestation to 20 weeks.

You’ll recall that when our women’s minister, Rona Ambrose, dared support another private member’s bill seeking to simply set up a committee to discuss when life begins – hardly a moot point given the advances of science and the number of in utero surgeries – she was viciously attacked by the pro-abortion forces, and much of the media, and accused of betraying women.

Apparently, in the world of the radical feminists, if you don’t agree with everything they say on abortion, you’re not a woman, your physical characteristics notwithstanding. Yet it was Ambrose, not her maligners, who was seen as the “radical.” Go figure.

In the mean time, we keep killing close to 100,000 unborn babies a year, and, like frightened ostriches, our politicians continue to bury their collective heads in the sand.