

like to support my remarks today with some of his which, I believe, communicate a basic principle that should underlie decisions, like this one that will, without a doubt, dramatically influence social attitudes and practices:

This half of the twentieth century is witness, on a virtually global scale, to a new creed about man—that the life of man is a biological accident—that man was made not for justice, nor for eternity, but for nothing in particular. A creature whose very decisions are, by definition, meaningless. There is a relentless pressure on governments to govern, and physicians to practise on the principles of pure utility. In this view, what is good is not what is just or what is right, but what is useful. Who is strong will survive. Who is wanted will be welcome, but the only really welcome people might be those whose minds and whose bodies will ensure high rating on a computerized cost/efficiency ledger.

When the abortion issue becomes a question of respect for human life, and it always does, that not only refers to the lives of unborn children, it also refers to our own lives. When making our own decisions on this issue, it says something about our own lives, our human dignity and the purpose of our society. Laws that freely allow abortion repudiate any possibility of a higher human purpose.

Everyone will admit to having a basic sense of what is right and wrong, and it is this sense that, I believe, provides everyone with an intuitive bias against abortion. As a Government, we can sometimes be in danger of inadvertently extinguishing any feelings of personal obligation to oneself or to a moral standard. Abortion legislation is a clear example of this. I hope Members will join me in voting against this Bill.

So far I have dwelt mainly on the philosophical objections to abortion. I think they stand by themselves and prevail over the abortionist arguments favouring a woman's right to reproductive choice. It is obvious to me that by the time a woman is pregnant, she has already made her choice. I will stick to that view even though there are those who would prefer to see an unintended pregnancy as an inconvenience that is easily done away with. In any case, I would like to present to the House some figures that will help people to understand the scope of the problem with which we are trying to deal.

The most staggering figure I could cite is the number of abortions performed. In 1982, there were 66,000 therapeutic abortions performed for women resident in Canada. It is obvious that a pregnancy terminated by an abortion is not an exceptional case. It is not extraordinary. It is not unusual. The number of abortions performed has been constantly growing. In 1981, the City of Toronto released figures stating that 8,300 abortions were performed while there were only 7,600 live births. When abortions are more popular than live births, I think things are getting out of control. There are still some people who claim they are denied freedom of choice.

If their freedom of choice continues to lower the birth rate and raise the abortion rate, I think that reflects an abusive freedom, and a repudiation of responsibility. When the abortion rate is as high as it is now, you can be sure that the whole question has become a decision that is taken very lightly, Mr. Speaker. Through the negligence of Parliament, abortion has become acceptable in the sense that a great number of women are making casual decisions about reproductive choice and

Criminal Code

exploiting the latitude provided by the way current laws are enforced.

Why, in 1982, over 11,000 women had an abortion for the second time. Over 2,000 had one for the third or fourth time. When people try to defend the practice of abortion, they always create extreme circumstances surrounding the event. They might say the mother's life was threatened or that it was a pregnancy due to rape or that the person was particularly young and unequipped emotionally. This convinces some people that there might be justifications for abortion.

When over 11,000 women had their second abortion in one year there are going to be among that number a great many people who have been irresponsible and who have made the wrong choice. For this irresponsibility, 60,000 unborn children are killed each year. The tragic thing is that with permissive laws, and they are already too permissive, these decisions are taken out of the moral context. Pro-abortion groups say that if a woman chooses to have an abortion, she must be correct to exercise that right.

I have never heard a group in favour of choice ever say that, in some cases, it is better to go through with the pregnancy. This disturbs me because abortion is in the process of ceasing to be a difficult moral question for those who have had one. I am personally opposed to them on any grounds. Not everyone is, but I would hope that most people would still admit that there is no justification for the majority of abortions.

The private Members' Bill under consideration today makes no recognition of the fact that most Canadians see abortion as something that should be positively avoided, even if they might condone it in some circumstances. I hope that we will never pass a Bill like this that would make abortion a casual personal decision or just another form of birth control.

The issue of abortion has given the medical community a much more uncomfortable time than it has presented to the pro-choice movement, who do not see it as nearly so difficult. That is probably because it is the doctors themselves who are given the ultimate responsibility for performing abortions. Many doctors refuse to perform abortions, and I have a great deal of respect for them for upholding their professional standards. Doctors are dedicated to a code of medical ethics, the point of which is to guide human action so that they will be consistent with social values.

Canadians believe that life is worth protecting. In 1982, they spent \$30 billion or 8.4 per cent of our Gross National Product because they believed that life is the greatest gift we can be given. It seems ironic to me that Canadians take life so seriously, while some people believe killing should be legalized, killing for no reason other than convenience most of the time.

Maybe the Hon. Member for Burnaby believes that you have to be able to fight for your share of that \$30 billion pie. Maybe medical treatment and health protection is not a right at all, but rather something you earn yourself. In this case society might be justified in turning its back on unborn children. Since Canadians spend \$1 out of every \$10 protect-