

body and thus a violation of security of the person". Chief Justice Dickson was not talking about meeting the state's health criteria to have an abortion. He did not say the woman should have to be measured against some standard that largely male politicians here will set up in order to have an abortion.

Madam Justice Bertha Wilson said that liberty in a free and democratic society does not require the state to approve the personal decisions made by its citizens. It does, however, require the state to respect them. The question then becomes whether the decision of a woman to terminate her pregnancy falls within this class of protected decisions. I have no doubt that it does. This decision is one that will have profound psychological, economic and social consequences for the pregnant woman. The circumstances giving rise to it can be complex and varied and there may be, and usually are, powerful considerations militating in opposite directions. It is a decision that deeply reflects the way the woman thinks about herself and her relationship to others and to society at large. It is not just a medical decision. It is a profound social and ethical one as well. The response to it will be the response of the whole person.

I would have hoped that in drafting this bill the conservative cabinet would have given more serious consideration to these words of wisdom. I believe if they had there would be no such bills in front of us today.

How far is this government going to take legislating state controls over a woman's body and personal decisions? What other aspects of women's personal lives are going to be left up to the state, the courts, and the medical profession to decide?

Canadians have varying moral, philosophical and religious beliefs about abortion. There is no reason for the state to impose what is, in fact, a minority moral belief about the equal status of the embryo or foetus upon all Canadian women. It is their own moral decision to make.

The church and the state are separate entities in modern Canadian society. They must remain separate. In Ireland and Brazil abortion is illegal, yet these two countries have a much higher abortion rate than we do here in Canada where abortion, prior to the passing of this bill, is still legal. The Minister of Justice said that this bill was not designed to reduce abortions. I do not understand this government. I do not understand why

any government would put a health service in the Criminal Code.

• (1530)

This bill does not reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies. It does not improve access for women across Canada. What is this bill meant to accomplish? What is it meant to do? There seems to be only one answer to that question. It seems that it is meant to quell the call for federal action on abortion. This government will now be able to say that it has dealt with the difficult issue of abortion.

What we should all be working for is to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies in Canada. Bringing in restrictive legislation does not do this. Many people imagine that every sexually active person is completely knowledgeable about various methods of contraception, their effectiveness and the risks. Nothing could be further from the truth.

A 1987 Gallup poll showed that only 46 per cent of Canadians felt that they had adequate access to family planning information services. There was a great regional disparity in these findings, with only one-third of Atlantic Canadians reporting sufficient access to these services and to this information. Young people are at great risk of having misinformation about effective birth control and the risks of pregnancy. One 1986 Canadian study of teenagers has shown that only about one-half of sexually active teenagers always use contraception. The 1986 research discusses how one in six women in Ontario will become pregnant before she reaches the age of 20.

Only half the schools in Canada offered sex education in 1984. A 1982 study showed that only 57 per cent of medical doctors were prepared to provide teenagers with birth control resources. Planned Parenthood states that many parents do not feel prepared to provide thorough sexuality education for their children. Research indicates that the provision of reproductive health services and sex education reduce the number of teenage pregnancies.

According to a 1984 Gallup poll, 83 per cent of Canadians do support sex education in our schools, and half say the current level of school sex education is not adequate. Teenage women are not physically or emotionally prepared for pregnancy. Teenage mothers and their children experience a higher rate of mortality and of morbidity. It is cruel to deal with unwanted pregnancies simply by wrenching new born babies away from these