

*Criminal Code*

major characteristic, to the point where generations of those unable to make a free choice have been compelled into unnatural practices.

This, of course, is not what we are legislating. What we are legislating is a kind of well mannered, sedate, controlled Canadian type of vice. Therefore, I am forced to vote against this bill because of the unavoidable conversion feature of this practice and because, while the bill does nothing to promote this aspect of the practice, it does nothing to control it. The bill gives legal recognition to a practice that basically is anti-social. If I voted for the bill, it would mean that I am condoning that which I feel if carried out on an unrestricted basis would destroy the way of life we have painfully built up over the centuries.

● (9:10 p.m.)

Now, I should like to deal briefly with the section dealing with abortion. I say that those who adhere to the sacredness of human life will not require a great deal of convincing on this point. I am sure in recent weeks we have all received a vast amount of material from various church leaders and other groups dealing with the abortion section of this bill.

I was particularly interested in figures I received that were taken from the World Almanac of 1968. These were supplied by the World Health Organization. These figures give the number of suicides per year per 100,000 women. In the age group 25 to 44 in countries where abortion is allowed the figures in respect of suicide are as follows: In Japan 19.7 per cent, in Hungary 13.4 per cent, and in Sweden 13.1 per cent. In the non-abortion countries the suicide figures are these: Belgium, 5.9 per cent, Canada 5.2 per cent and Italy 2.9 per cent. I ask in God's name how any member of this house in all conscience can support this bill and ignore these facts. How can we ignore the fact that countries with permissive abortion laws invariably have a higher rate of suicide for women of child bearing years than non-abortion countries?

About a week or ten days ago a member on the opposite side of the house used the argument that when a girl is raped she should be entitled to have an abortion. In my opinion this is a matter of conscience because the social consequences of applying that philosophy are a matter of public concern. A person who has been raped has suffered a violation of personal rights. But I ask you, sir, and members of this house what are the

rights of the unborn child? Are we to assume that the unborn child possesses no rights because it has been conceived in violation. Once life is present, how can it be argued that because of social convenience or possible embarrassment it is right to destroy it. We must ask ourselves, are only duly conceived and wanted children to have a right to live. If someone wants a child, it can live; if it is not wanted, it must be denied the right to live, it must die. What kind of society would we build on principles of that kind?

I think we must act to remove the stigma from unwanted children conceived out of wedlock. But are we to do it by destroying them? If we accept the position that it is all right to destroy a child before birth, why not after birth? Are we to create a panel of doctors that will take on the appearance of executioners? On what grounds can they refuse an abortion; on what grounds can they grant to an unwanted unborn child the right to be born? I would suggest that once you have stipulated a number of conditions whereby a child can be destroyed before birth you can be sure those conditions will be met when it is a question of avoiding embarrassment or convenience.

I know I will be accused in terms of all the clichés of the new enlightenment because those people seem to think some great new learning entered the world with the flood. However, human experiences through the ages have shown us that when barriers are removed upon certain areas of human conduct and anti-social acts, the result is simply the speedy undermining and destruction of the entire social structure. We are watching this happen today before our very eyes and the government by this very legislation is aiding and abetting it.

I am completely at a loss to understand why this government that has preached a just society and equal rights would refuse to allow this bill to come before the house other than as a package deal. I say, not as a member of any religious denomination but as a father of a reasonably large family, that I am completely at a loss to understand why the government would impose this vote upon the members of their party without giving those members an opportunity to vote as their consciences dictate. My God, we are not mounting a machine; this is not a machine in respect of which you can just press a button and wait for results. This is a government that has been elected by the Canadian people. I have been elected by a substantial majority