

*Abortion*

sensitive as abortion, but I fear not having any legislation in place at all. The situation is reaching a crisis level, especially in British Columbia, but still there are those who shout for greater access and say that they have to go across the border to have an abortion.

It is a real tragedy when a woman finds herself with an unwanted pregnancy, whether or not she is married. Where can she turn for guidance, for help, and for the right direction? Are there agencies in place that will help her and tell her the options? It is this that must be addressed as we go into this debate.

In my opinion the motion before us, alone and by itself, is not satisfactory, and I will speak further on it in my address on the amendment that I believe should be put in place to correct the approach of the motion.

The statistics tell the story. Since 1969 the number of abortions authorized under Section 18 of the Criminal Code increased yearly with the exceptions of 1981, 1983, 1985. The abortion rate per 100 live births remained steady at 16.5 deaths in 1985 and 1984, and then dropped to 16.2 in 1985. For the Province of British Columbia, the rate was the highest in Canada. There were 26.1 abortions per live births or a figure of 11,264. For every 100 live births there were 26 abortions in British Columbia. In 1985 from Statistics Canada figures we see that 89 per cent of abortions that were performed were performed before 13 weeks of pregnancy. In 1985 that represented 54,226 abortions of a total of 60,900 for that year. A further 4,685 abortions were performed between the thirteenth and sixteenth week gestation, while 1,831 abortions were performed between the seventeenth and twentieth weeks. Therefore, one can see that the main motion will have little or no effect on these statistics.

● (1920)

I am sorry to say that repeat abortions have risen dramatically over the last 10 years on the national level. In 1975, 8.6 per cent of all the women who had abortions were repeats. In 1985, the figure was 20.3 per cent of all the abortions. In fact, more women were repeaters in 1985 than the total of all the officially recorded abortions in 1970. In British Columbia, 25 per cent of all the abortions performed are repeats. In case you are not sure of what that means, it means that this is the woman's second abortion, or at least the second, and could be the third or fourth.

The word "therapeutic" has been tossed around quite a bit during all of the previous discussion on abortion, and I thought it would be worth while to find its meaning in the dictionary. According to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, it is defined as "the branch of medicine concerned with the treatment of disease and the action of remedial agents in disease or health". With this in mind, pregnancy is not a disease and abortion is not therapeutic. It heals no disease but rather kills a human being.

You may ask, why do I support the protection of the unborn? I believe that if you accept the sanctity of life, it is impossible to avoid the fact that, no matter how a child is conceived or what kind of life he or she will have, that life should be protected.

Is the unborn child a human being with equal rights? I think so and if that is the case, laws should always seek to protect that life. We should be more concerned with the saving of the unborn child's life than with making it easier, safer and cheaper for those who seek to end it.

Those who believe that the woman has the right to do whatever she wants with her own body must also say to themselves that if she has control in this aspect, should she not also have the control of what is required to prevent the pregnancy in the first place, whether that be making sure that she has the proper birth control or whatever? Our society does not allow individuals complete control over their own bodies. Laws prohibit taking drugs, drinking alcohol before a certain age, and prostitution, just to mention some of the things that our laws prevent us from endeavouring to do.

We all value our rights to free choice, our vocation, our religion, our goals in life. Genuine freedom, however, does not give us the right to trample the human rights of others.

You may ask me, are you not trying to impose your morals on others? I really do not think so. It is important to recognize that every basic law which governs our lives is an expression of morality. The point is that many of our laws are based on morality and much of that morality is based on Judaeo-Christian ethics. Those who seek to change abortion laws are legislating morality, but so were those who sought to legalize abortion back in the sixties.

What if the mother's life is endangered by pregnancy? You cannot blame the mother for choosing her life over the child's. This is an act of self-defence, not murder. This goes back to when I talked about therapeutic. I see no inconsistency with saying that the life of the mother must have a pre-emptive role over the life of the unborn but, only in serious, life-threatening situations. These do not happen very often.

The unborn child is not like an arm, a leg or an appendix. Though they are dependent on their mothers, unborn children are complete, separate entities.

Let me give some examples: The baby can be male and the mother is female. The mother and the baby can have two different blood types and these can even be incompatible. The mother can be fair and the baby dark-complexioned. The umbilical cord and placenta belong to the baby. They are not part of the mother's body.

Why do some people believe that the unborn child does not become a human being until it is delivered? Do they not recognize that even at his earliest development this child is just at one special stage in a whole series of steps that will eventually lead to old age? The difference lies in the process of