

Government Orders

important as they are for the survival of our country. We have it made, they are not so well off, so should they not do as we do?

If we look at what is going on world-wide in all so-called underdeveloped cultures we realize that respect for life and procreation as well as the assurance of having many offsprings is a major priority in many countries.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, why not set up preventive and educative programs, make available birth control methods, facilitate adoption programs, and assist needy women with alternatives which are less radical than abortion.

Let us listen to our own heart, let compassion and love guide our decision, this love which we feel for other human beings. Let us treat life with the respect it deserves and we will be shown respect.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill C-43 is to amend the Criminal Code. I understand that the area of Federal jurisdiction is rather limited, health care regulation being a Provincial responsibility.

I am aware that Bill C-43 does not legalise abortion. Yet, under Clause 1, an abortion induced by a physician will be deemed legal when the health or life of a female person is threatened. I understand that health means physical, mental and psychological health.

Mr. Speaker, we are not sanctioning abortion on demand, but we are making it a legal medical procedure when performed for health reasons.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, will physicians be called upon to exterminate the poor, the old and the needy on behalf of the state which is shirking its responsibilities by renouncing all ethical and moral rules?

That is not a solution, Mr. Speaker. The legislators' duty is to be the guardians of public morality. To criminalize abortion is not an ideal solution. Entrusting physicians with the responsibility of the state to make social judgments is not an acceptable solution.

With an heavy heart, Mr. Speaker, I must inform my constituents and my colleagues in the House that I just cannot support Bill C-43.

[*English*]

Mr. Ron Fisher (Saskatoon—Dundurn): Mr. Speaker, there is an ad in today's *Globe and Mail* which states:

"Men for Women's Choice.

This Personal Decision is No Crime.

I rise in the House to concur with that sentiment. Underneath the ad is a list of several names, I suppose hundreds, I have not counted them. I am sorry that my name does not appear among them.

I would like to read the ad, because I think it says in all the essence what I stand for personally and which I believe my party's stand tries to say:

No government should be able to force a woman to bear a child against her will. The proposed law would make women criminals for taking a personal decision to seek an abortion. Abortion has no place in the Criminal Code.

Like a growing number of men, we do not think that men should control women. Men ought to have equal say and responsibility in a decision to parent. But ultimately, if there is a dispute, the decision to end a pregnancy must be a woman's choice because it is her body.

No husband, no boyfriend, no judge, no doctor, no politician, should control a woman's body. Ever.

Governments should act to ensure access to abortion in every province and every territory. More and better sex education and birth control information should also be provided.

It goes on to say that: "Now is the time for men to speak out. Show your support for women's choice by letting—" and I will not bother to name the politicians who ask us to let them know—although, of course, it includes the Prime Minister and all the other Members of Parliament—how we feel.

I rise today on this issue in as sincere a plea as I have ever made in my life that this place should not recriminalize abortion. Abortion is a health matter, not a political matter, not a criminal matter. It certainly is an emotional matter. It certainly is a physical matter in every sense of our humanity. The government has said that it is a psychological matter, and it certainly is; that it is a health matter, and it certainly is. I guess there have