

the way they do. I do not know what the sexual orientation of my friend is, but if it departs from the conventional norm, he could not expect everybody to be the same.

Here is the New Democratic Party, trying to force its values on everyone! Madam Speaker, I am glad to belong to a Party which allows its members to speak, to understand, to state their views, to discuss and then says: "Good, we are now going to vote to see whose value is most acceptable." If, in the New Democratic Party, they have found the truth and are able to mass produce it, I am very happy for them. However, I have my doubts, and we suspect, considering what is happening in Quebec presently, that their beautiful unanimity is coming to an end.

So, Madam Speaker, here we are, as members of a society, of the highest Chamber in the land. I believe we should look after things which challenge our values rather than try to grade the various categories of punishment for those who commit some crime. I repeat my first sentence, Madam Speaker: Can we be for or against abortion? I think we must be against. But executing somebody for that is another kettle of fish.

● (1750)

[English]

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, this debate goes straight to the fundamental issue of what we believe life to be. I know many Canadians on both sides of the issue. I like and admire them. They are honest, decent, ethical and moral citizens. Indeed, many countries differ on this issue as well. The harshest restrictions on abortion exist in countries such as Ireland, Portugal and the Philippines. In those countries there is no exemption from the absolute prohibition against abortion, not even for the narrow purpose of saving the mother's life. Less restrictive nations permit abortions for medical reasons affecting the mother. However, the restrictions are usually minimal, and countries with those minimal restrictions are Japan, the U.K., the Scandinavian countries, and the countries of eastern Europe. Abortions are legally performed there for such reasons as difficult domestic situations, often too many other children, financial hardship, unmarried status, or ill health. The least restrictive type of abortion law permits abortion upon demand, although that is usually within a limited time. Countries with such laws are the People's Republic of China, Denmark, the German Democratic Republic, Tunisia, the Soviet Union, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the United States. People on both sides of this issue cover all political persuasions in other countries, as they do in ours.

It is obvious that each of us must speak entirely on a personal basis. Having read and thought about this a lot, there is no doubt in my mind, not a shadow of a doubt, that life starts at birth. We are then faced with the question of where we draw the line between the historic right of the mother to make certain choices about herself and her body, and the right

Adjournment Debate

of the child to have the protection of law. Our ancestors decided on the date of natural childbirth as the cut-off. Clearly that is unsustainable in our modern society. At six or seven months we can take a child out of the womb, operate on it, and put it back in the womb again. When the child is out of the womb it has all the legal rights of any person. When it goes back in the womb again it suddenly loses those rights. We have to move the cut-off time forward, the question is how far. I look forward to debating this further so I can present my views to the House.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The hour provided for consideration of Private Member's Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

NARCOTICS—INCREASE IN DRUG ABUSE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bob Horner (Mississauga North): Madam Speaker, on May 20, 1987, I rose in this House to ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) with regard to when the National Drug Strategy would be brought forward and what it would contain. Usually to take part in the Adjournment Debate, according to the Standing Orders, one must be dissatisfied with the response of the Minister. I want to go on record as saying that I am certainly not dissatisfied. As a matter of fact, I am very, very satisfied. I only wish to expand and make some recommendations.

In the Throne Speech of October 1, 1986, one reads:

A national drug strategy and a comprehensive program dealing with impaired drivers will be brought forward to support the prevention of drug and alcohol abuse.

This was one of the commitments of the Government and was applauded by almost everyone as a positive step. An exception was the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) who said on October 3, 1986:

It seems that when Ronald Reagan has a drug problem Canada gets an epidemic.

I think this is a very cynical view which was not shared by most Canadians.

On May 25, 1987, and during the following week a group of Ministers of the Crown made statements. Statements were made by the Minister of State for Youth (Mr. Charest), the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. MacKay), the Secretary