

In our society there is no person more weak, defenceless or vulnerable than the unborn. It is the function of the law to protect innocent human life. When the mother, who should be the natural protector of her unborn child, becomes its adversary, then it is the function, the duty and the responsibility of the government to intervene to protect that innocent human life.

Governments pass such laws as seatbelt laws to preserve life, yet we stand idly by while the pro-abortionists brainwash our society into believing there is nothing wrong with artificially ending the lives of thousands and thousands of children.

First, if we believe that life begins at conception, we must accept that there is a new being entirely separate from its father and mother because it has a different chromosomal makeup. Second, at conception the unborn is alive because it has the capacity to replace its own dying cells. Third, at conception, the unborn is alive, needing only food and time to grow into an adult human. Fourth, the unborn is just as much alive and human before birth as it is after birth. It is not a different life. Fifth, the body of the unborn child belongs to the child, just as the body of the mother belongs to the mother. The mother is not aborting a part of her anatomy, as suggested by the NDP member for Vancouver East; she is aborting the result of the union of two people placed within her. Sixth, since we have not given the right to a mother to terminate her child's life after birth, why should she have the right to terminate the child's life before birth?

We know that the entire genetic package which determines one's personality and physical characteristics is totally present at conception. It is just like a tape recorder, our total being programmed at that instant.

The tiny humans we once were have developed into the adults we now are; but we were there totally at conception. All we needed to become the adults we are now was nutrition, oxygen and time. A being who has never before existed in the history of time, a being not at the end of the line but at the dawn, a being completely intact and containing within himself or herself the totality of everything that being will ever be, a being moving forward in an orderly process of growth, a being destined to live within the mother for about nine months and for as many as 90 or more years without: this living being is dependent upon his or her mother for shelter and food but in all other respects is a totally new, different, unique and independent creation.

Some people say that by granting an abortion, in many cases we are preventing the creation of candidates for our relief roles, our prison population and our growing list of unwanted and battered children. I am sure we would all agree that every child should be wanted. A world with wanted children only would be a very ideal place in which to live. On the other hand, it would also be a wonderful world if there were no wives unwanted by husbands, no aging parents unwanted by their children and no unwanted Jews, black people, white people, protestants or Catholics. The truth of the matter is that we must remember that people have feet of clay and the unwanted will always be with us.

Abortion

To use being wanted by someone as a measure of whether a human life is allowed to live suggests the frightening concept that the unwanted can be eliminated. Abortion is not just another method of birth control. Contraception prevents the creation of new life; abortion destroys life after it has begun. The question of contraception is a personal decision for a couple to make. Abortion, on the other hand, involves society's responsibility to safeguard the life of another person. A woman has both the right and the ability to determine whether she will or will not conceive. Once she has become pregnant, however, it is no longer a question of her body alone. The life of another human individual is present, one who is distinct and separate from the mother. If we accept that the unborn child is human, it is obvious that the issue is not the right of the mother to control her body but whether she has the right to end the life of another human being who shares her body.

I am sure I could go on citing figures and statistics to support my presentation with regard to the almost 6,000 per cent increase in abortions during the last ten years. I believe the crux of the matter is whether we as parliamentarians wish to do something about the problem or whether we should turn our heads, ignore the situation and hope it goes away.

It will not go away, and it will haunt our society in the years to come. No country can allow such flagrant disregard for human life and not pay a heavy price.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my position to the debate this afternoon. I will indicate first that what I am about to give is my own personal position because my position is not the same as that which was adopted in convention by the New Democratic Party, which I would now like to read into the record. The following was the position of the New Democratic Party recorded at the federal convention in 1967:

Be it resolved that the New Democratic Party favours the legalization of abortion so that abortions could be permitted, under the closest medical and social supervision, depending on the condition of the pregnancy involved, these conditions should include:

- (1) genuine risk of death or physical or mental injury to the mother, or to any existing children of her family;
- (2) substantial risk the child will be handicapped by severe physical or mental abnormalities;
- (3) following rape or incest.

When I was asked to run for the New Democratic Party, the basic philosophy of which I accept as socially a good way to handle our country, I made it very clear before I let my name stand that I was against that particular position.

● (1740)

In my nomination speech I indicated where I stood on the question of human rights. This position was approved by my local constituency and I announced it as one of the main platforms upon which I ran for the House of Commons. My personal position is this: I believe in rights across the board. I believe that human rights were an essential issue in that campaign as they are every day of my life, and rightly so, just