

live. Every doctor, in the case of critically ill patients, must at one point or another make a decision along these lines. But we have hitherto believed in our society that life is better than death and that so long as life can be sustained we ought to sustain it. Who among us can assume the role of God and decree from on high that this or that life ought now to end?

• (9:40 p.m.)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McBride:** If we want to appoint such temporary gods or committees of the "final solution", what should their terms of reference be? When should grandfathers or grandmothers lives' end, and how many years should that boy in the coma be kept around when neither can exist without another human being supporting and keeping them alive? Abortion is much the same.

The decision to be born is never made by any of us. No person has ever decided or had a share in the impregnation of his or her mother which resulted in one's own birth. Out of the union of two people a wholly other third person came into being. That third person was just like the boy in the coma, except he was not injured. He was just like the old man on intravenous and oxygen, only he is not aged or decrepit.

The only argument for euthanasia or ending the life of the month-old embryo is that it cannot make it in the big, bold world on its own. It, too, needs a host person. The mother, father or both, or society, want off the hook. They do not want the pregnancy to continue. It was not the child's choice to be created. That was the choice of the parents. Once the child is created, ought it also to be the choice of the parents to destroy the child? I think not.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McBride:** Until society is willing to leave to the next of kin the decision as to whether those who cannot survive by themselves ought to live or die, we can scrape up mighty little logic for free abortion on demand that delivers an unborn child into the panicky and often murderous hands of its reluctant mother. Only a very primitive society of the most backward sort would need abortion in this day and age.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McBride:** To use abortion as a means of birth-control demonstrates a lack of concern for human life, the dimensions of which words are not adequate to describe. There are hundreds and perhaps thousands of abortions each year in our nation. Some are performed by competent doctors, most by amateurs. This is an intolerable situation. Those pregnancies need never have occurred if our homes and institutions in society were providing complete, thorough and adequate training, knowledge and materials for preventing conception, especially to the youth to prevent the tragedy of pregnancies among teenagers.

### *Status of Women Study*

In the final analysis, the sexual life of an individual is one's own decision, a highly personal concern. If a female and a male person decide to have intimacies of any sort, that must obviously be their own decision. Except where individuals are mentally retarded or where rape occurs, an individual's action and the results therefrom are theirs and theirs alone; that is, a couple's actions concern no one else directly up to and until a pregnancy occurs. Then a very different situation arises. It becomes one where an innocent third party is directly involved. While a person may do what he wishes with his own life and body, hopefully short of destroying both, no such freedom can be given any person over the life and body of another individual.

All members of this House and all members of society who support any kind of permissive abortion legislation, certainly free abortion on demand, must do everything in their power to encourage the free availability of birth-control information and material. In this area we are surely a retarded nation. Only a nation in sad circumstances would be forced to consider abortion to make up for its lack of family planning. If we could do that, Mr. Speaker, it would seem wise that we make it a severe social stigma to hurl into the world a child for whom the parent has made no preparation and whose life the parent is not prepared to support with love, affection and respect.

I think I could make a very profound case for having to do a great deal about family planning and education in our culture so we do not fall into the pattern of some countries where abortion becomes a form of family planning and regular abortions are a habit. Rather, we must use some of the means available to us, and there are many. Perhaps the scientists need to work harder to make them better. We must do that.

I want to raise the question, what do we do now? Abortion tends to be considered in at least four differing circumstances. First, in the situation of a single, unmarried girl; second, the married woman who does not want or cannot have more children; third, rape or incest; fourth, where the child is known to be malformed. In every one of these situations there are instances where abortion may be the best alternative. Given the present sad circumstances of family planning, training and knowledge in Canada, abortion may be the best alternative—but it is never a happy or good alternative. It must always be done with extreme reluctance, just as any other form of capital punishment is meted out with reluctance.

Abortion is death. Once a pregnancy occurs that is unwanted, there are no good alternatives open. One has to weight the degree or amount of dying that will occur in the mother's life if the pregnancy is allowed to continue against the death of the child. One must decide where there is the lesser degree of death or where the lesser degree of dying will occur. It is a tough, brutal decision, one which anyone who has not worked with young, pregnant, teenage girls will find it difficult to fully comprehend.