

To the CPSC Committee of London regarding its upcoming meeting on February 20th agenda item 4 Items for direction 4.1

Alliance for Life Ontario is the provincial pro-life educational umbrella organization for 50 affiliate member groups active in Ontario. We are extremely concerned with “Item 4. Items for Direction 4.1 -1. 2024-02-20SR Regulation of the Display of Graphic Images” scheduled for discussion on the agenda at the upcoming Community and Protective Services Committee meeting of February 20th 2024.

According to the proposed draft amendment to the Streets By-Law “*Graphic Image*’ – means an image or photograph showing or purporting to show, a fetus or any part of a fetus”

We note that the terminology is rather broad since it does not specify what species of fetus the CPSC, actually means, however given our past history regarding discussions pertaining to the Graphic Image delivery by-law proposals, *graphic image*, we presume, means human? We also wondered about the use of the term *graphic* and therefor conducted research as to the various meanings of the word – please see below;

Britannica Dictionary definition of GRAPHIC. 1. [more graphic; most graphic] : **shown or described in a very clear way** — used especially to refer to things that are unpleasant or shocking

<https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=meaning+of+the+word+Graphic>

“The words **picturesque and vivid** are common synonyms of graphic. While all three words mean "giving a clear visual impression in words," graphic stresses the evoking of a clear lifelike picture.”

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/graphic>

“very clear and powerful”

<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/graphic>

“giving a clear and effective picture”

<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/graphic>

It is our contention, reflecting on the Graphic Image delivery discussion, that those delivering the images were endeavouring to make a “clear and effective picture” (Graphic) to Londoners of what abortion actually did to the preborn child. We would maintain that this would obviously be important information for any individual to have in order to form an opinion on abortion or indeed make an informed decision regarding undergoing induced abortion. It is our understanding that the images which the CPSC is concerned with were the ones defined as *Graphic Image in the Graphic Image By-law-PW- 14*. We submitted our objections to that proposed by-law as well and we still maintain that it offends the Charter of Rights and Freedoms section 2(b), possibly even more rights documents, and we are surprised that the City has not experienced a Charter challenge as yet. It seems incongruous that a by-law from the CPSC would actually prevent citizens from being provided or “*shown or described in a clear way*” the effect of abortion on the child in the womb. Now it appears that the CPSC will consider what we see as a further breach of the Charter, by extending this prohibition to the streets and public spaces of London.

It seems to us that the CPSC has not considered the effect such amendments might have to those businesses and facilities that make a living producing ultrasound images or use

ultrasound images for health reasons. We are wondering about their ability to advertise their product and have noted that there are at least 10 of these facilities operating throughout the City. We also wonder how the by-law, should it be adopted will be applied to women coming out of these facilities and looking at the images they have just received on a public sidewalk.

https://www.yelp.ca/search?cflt=ultrasoundimagingcenters&find_loc=London%2C+ON
Ultrasound Imaging facilities in London

While several cities have adopted graphic image delivery by-laws, which again we believe will be challenged, the extension to prohibition in public spaces is totally undemocratic and, we believe outside the authority of any City to implement without expectation of challenge. We contend that this kind of discrimination against a certain message is unconstitutional and discriminatory. Canadians have a right to impart their opinion and also to receive the opinion of others in any public space and no City has the right to set itself up as gatekeeper of a specific message. Contrary to the opinion of some, this kind of by-law will be challenged by those who wish to maintain the great democracy we have in Canada.

We have quoted extensively from documents which we believe support the right to show these images, however disturbing they may be to some members of society. It is a most important test of our democratic society that if we wish to live as a democracy we must be prepared to allow freedom, even for messages, in whatever form they may take, that some abhor. The purpose of these images is to show or describe in a clear way the effect of induced abortion on the child in the womb. While these images may contain disturbing and explicit imagery, they are used to present the truth regarding induced abortion from the preborn child's perspective. We direct your attention to the immediate quotes below these remarks and encourage you to read the others which I have highlighted for easier focus and reflection. We agree with J.Holmes below that "if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought – not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought we hate."

Sincerely and respectfully submitted,

Mrs Jakki Jeffs
Executive Director
Alliance for Life Ontario