of all charts has proved far more effective than the previous system in preventing surgery of questionable necessity or morality.

There are three Catholic Physicians' Guilds in Canada but currently only the one in Manitoba is affiliated with the National Federation. However, I believe all members subscribe to The Linacre Quarterly. Several years ago the Manitoba Guild staffed a booth at the national C.M.A. convention and recently the Guild in British Columbia held as part of the official C.M.A. program a panel discussion on medical practice in a Catholic hospital. Excellent cooperation was obtained from the executives of the C.M.A. and this may help establish a precedent for the inclusion in future scientific programs topics pertinent to religion, ethics and medicine.

In non-Catholic hospitals tubal ligation is a frequent procedure, requiring only the written consent of the parties involved and of two consultants. It is nearly a routine procedure at third caesarean. So-called "therapeutic" abortion is becoming less frequent as the consultants seem to be finding less reason to be able to justify it; however, press releases from our official medical organizations would give the impression that the medical and legal profession was 100% in favour of blocking abortion and sterilization legal procedures.

The absence of a religious moral code in helping to regulate people's lives is reflected by the stances of some doctors. Their suggestions to the current epidemic of illegitimacy and the rising venereal disease rate are the provisions of sex education by the schools and birth control information in the schools. Pregnancy is presented as the problem, not morality.

It is in a background such as this that our Guilds have had the largest role to play—not to enter into a newspaper debate with those suggesting but to develop leaders of thought in all fields and to educate the public by cooperating with people of all faiths, advocating moral solutions to all problems.

This is our problem in Canada and I am sure it is not ours alone, nor for long. By further communication I am sure we can help each other meet local problems and provide leadership to overcome the decline of morality throughout the world.

J. Bernard Costello, M.D.
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

La sterilisation directe, perpétuelle ou temporaire, de l’homme comme de la femme, est illicite en vertu de la loi naturelle.

Par sterilisation directe, Nous entendons désigner l’action de qui se propose, comme but ou moyen, de rendre impossible la procréation, non seulement en la rendant impossible de fait, mais en rendant impossible la possibilité de provoquer une action, qui rend impossible en fait la procréation. L’homme, en effet, n’a jamais pu l’intention de faire une aussi grande action, et, de même, il n’a pas pu l’intention de rendre impossible la procréation.

Thus for example, the removal of diseased ovaries would have as a necessary consequence to render impossible procreation, but this impossibility can only be achieved as a secondary effect of the disease itself. We have repeated in detail the same explanations in Our Allocution of October 8, 1953 (A.A.S., 45, 673) to the Congress of Urologists. The same principles — permit the solution to a question much discussed
La mise à profit de la stérilité temporaire naturelle, dans la méthode Ogino-Knaus, ne viole pas l'ordre naturel, comme la pratique décrite plus haut [l'utilisation des préservatifs], puisque les relations conjugales répondent à la volonté du Créateur. Quand cette méthode est utilisée pour des motifs sérieux proportionnés (et les indications de l'eugénique peuvent avoir un caractère grave), elle se justifie morallement. Déjà Nous en avons parlé dans Notre Allocution du 29 octobre 1951, non pour exposer le point de vue biologique ou médical, mais pour mettre fin aux inquiétudes de conscience de beaucoup de chrétiens, qui l'utilisaient dans leur vie conjugale. D'ailleurs dans son encyclique du 31 décembre 1930, Pie XI today by medical doctors and moral theologians. It is licit to prevent ovulation by means of pills utilized as remedies for the exaggerations of the uterus or of the organism, even though it is licit to prevent ovulation also renders impossible fecundation. It is licit to the married woman who, desiring this temporary sterility in order to have relations with her husband, may decide to take such medicine, not with the view to prevent conception, but solely on the advice of the medical director, as a remedy necessary because of a malady of the uterus or of the organism, brings about an indirect sterilization which remains permissible according to the general principle of actions with a double effect. But one brings about a direct and therefore licit sterilization, when one arrests ovulation to preserve the uterus and the organism from the consequences of a pregnancy which it cannot tolerate.

The taking advantage of natural temporary sterility, in the Ogino-Knaus method, does not violate the natural order, as does the practice described above [the use of contraceptives], since the conjugal relations correspond to the will of the Creator. When this method is utilized for proportionately serious motives (and eugenic indications can have a grave character), it is morally justified. Already We spoke of this in Our Allocution of October 29, 1951, not to put forward the biological or medical viewpoint, but to put an end to the anxieties of conscience of many Christians, who utilized it in their conjugal life. Furthermore in his Encyclical of December 31, 1930 ("Casti Conubii"), Pius XI had already formulated the principle: "Neither are those spouses to be said to act against the natural order, who use their right, correctly according to natural reason, even though a new life cannot spring from because of natural causes either of time or of whatever defect."