

for an insufficient number of parents—in fact in some localities quite the reverse is true.

I get back to the issue of rubber stamp abortions. It is the responsibility of the provincial governments to investigate fully abortions being carried out. The number of abortions being performed has run rampant. On the question of the original law presented in this parliament, if we had looked down the road two, five or ten years, we would not have been happy about what is happening today. Many times in the past governments have reacted because of pressure. On occasion that may be good. However, I sometimes wonder whether governments sometimes try to fill the gap in too much of a hurry.

Canadians are concerned about the number of abortions being performed in their country. I just wonder if therapeutic abortions had been legal whether there would have been as many 15 or 20 years ago.

I wonder if those who have abortions think of the love they are stealing from an adoptive parent. I do not believe that has been brought to their attention. Many of us know adoptive parents. The reason they are so is not only because they are willing to give of themselves. They want to be part of a family. When they approach a green traffic light, they want to be able to take the hand of their child and help him across. That is a natural instinct. When the rubber stamp is used to approve therapeutic abortions, I wonder whether those people think of that.

In conclusion, the motion certainly is interesting. However, there should be more discussion with the provincial agencies with regard to the concern expressed by the hon. member.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) for introducing this motion. I hope it can be carried even though it is facing the perils of private members' hour.

I also commend the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) on the excellent speech he made in support of this motion, pointing out as he did that our concern should be with the children who are affected. My friend across the way stated the case as it is. In my view the action suggested in this motion should be taken.

Unemployment insurance, by the way, comes entirely under federal responsibility. So it cannot be argued that it should be discussed with the provincial authorities before we act on it.

I want to take a moment or two to refer to one other piece of unfairness that sometimes affects adopted children. In many cases children are adopted, because something has happened to their parents, by their grandparents. I know of cases where that has happened, and where the grandparents are in receipt of old age security and the guaranteed income supplement. However, because of an oversight in the legislation, when such grandparents receive the family allowance for the support of those adopted children, their guaranteed income supplement is cut back.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Surely there was no intention when it was decided that a person's income should affect his right to a guaranteed income supplement to make that apply as well to money received for the upbringing of children. This can be corrected very easily. I have raised the matter with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) and I take this as another opportunity to press the point that it ought to be done. I press it for the same reasons given across the way, namely, that our concern should be for the children.

These are little things that sometimes go wrong simply through oversight or a failure to think the whole issue through. I believe that both of these matters can be corrected. In conclusion, I hope this House will say yes to the motion of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East.

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). I think that can best be done if the members of this House will allow me to go back to the word "honourable" because that gentleman fills that word to its utmost. He is honourable in every respect.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): That is the highest tribute I can pay to him in this House of Commons.

I stand to take part in this debate as one who himself was adopted. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) just raised a problem. He was truly justified in doing that. In my particular case, it was not grandparents but a great aunt who adopted me. She did this knowing I was a premature child. This aspect was raised by the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) as well. The implications of adopting a premature child are serious, particularly in the case of those who have never had children of their own. In these later years of life, I, as an adopted child, owe my adoptive parents a debt of gratitude which I can never pay back, verbally or otherwise, in my lifetime or in all the lifetimes of all the adopted children in the world.

● (1740)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): It is only proper, as hon. members have suggested, to think first of the child and of his reaction to the love and affection heaped on him by his adoptive parents. I commend the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon) and the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. They each have adopted children and I am sure those children are no less in their affections and regard than my three natural children are to me. I honestly believe, though, that some of the suggestions we have heard this afternoon might better be embodied in amendments to the health and welfare legislation.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, once a baby bonus, or whatever you want to call it, reaches the adoptive parents, if those parents have reached an age at which they are receiving benefits under the old age pension,