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Life or Death: Who Chooses?

In Roman times, abortion and the destruction of unwanted children was

permissible, but as out civilization has aged, it seems that such acts were

no longer acceptable by rational human beings, so that in 1948, Canada

along with most other nations in the world signed a declaration of the

United Nations promising every human being the right to life. The World

Medical Association meeting in Geneve at the same time, stated that the

utmost respect for human life was to be from the moment of conception. This

declaration was re-affirmed when the World Medical Association met in Oslo

in 1970. Should we go backwards in our concern for the life of an

individual human being?

The unborn human is still a human life and not all the wishful thinking

of those advocating repeal of abortion laws, can alter this. Those of us

who would seek to protect the human who is still to small to cry aloud for

it’s own protection, have been accused of having a 19th Century approach to

life in the last third of the 20th Century. But who in reality is using

arguments of a bygone Century? It is an incontrovertible fact of biological

science – Make no Mistake – that from the moment of conception, a new human

life has been created.

Only those who allow their emotional passion to overide their

knowledge, can deny it: only those who are irrational or ignorant of

science, doubt that when a human sperm fertilizes a human ovum a new human

being is created. A new human being who carries genes in its cells that

make that human being uniquely different from any and other human being and

yet, undeniably a member, as we all are, of the great human family. All the

fetus needs to grow into a babe, a child, an old man, is time, nutrition

and a suitable environment. It is determined at that very moment of

conception whether the baby will be a boy or a girl; which of his parents

he will look like; what blood type he will have. His whole heritage is

forever fixed. Look at a human being 8 weeks after conception and you, yes

every person here who can tell the difference between a man and a women,

will be able to look at the fetus and tell me whether it is a baby boy or a

girl.

No, a fetus is not just another part of a women’s body like an appendix

or appendage. These appendages, these perfectly formed tiny feel belong to

a 10 week developed baby, not to his or her mother.

The fetus is distinct and different and has it’s own heart beat. Do you

know that the fetus’ heart started beating just 18 days after a new life

was created, beating before the mother even knew she was pregnant? By 3

months of pregnancy the developing baby is just small enough to be help in

the palm of a man’s hand but look closely at this 3 month old fetus. All

his organs are formed and all his systems working. He swims, he grasps a

pointer, he moves freely, he excretes urine. If you inject a sweet solution

into the water around him, he will swallaw because he likes the taste.

Inject a bitter solution and he will quit swallowing because he does not

like the taste. By 16 weeks it is obvious to all, except those who have

eyes but deliberately do not see, that this is a young human being.

Who chooses life or death for this little one because abortion is the

taking of a human life? This fact is undeniable; however much of the

members of the Women’s Liberation Movement, the new Feminists, Dr. Henry

Morgentaler or the Canadian Medical Association President feel about it,

does not alter the fact of the matter. An incontrovertible fact that cannot

change as feelings change.

If abortion is undeniably the taking of human life and yet sincere

misguided people feel that it should be just a personal matter between a

women and the doctor, there seems to be 2 choices open to them. (1) That

they would believe that other acts of destruction of human beings such as

infanticide and homicide should be of no concern of society and therefore,

eliminate them from the criminal code. This I cannot believe is the

thinking of the majority, although the tendency for doctors to respect the

selfish desire of parents and not treat the newborn defective with a

necessary lifesaving measure, is becoming increasingly more common. (2) But

for the most part the only conclusion available to us is that those

pressing for repeal of the abortion laws believe that there are different

sorts of human beings and that by some arbitrary standard, they can place

different values on the lives of there human beings. Of course, different

human beings have different values to each of us as indi uals: my mother

means more to me than she does to you. But the right to life of all human

beings is undeniable. I do not think this is negotiable. It is easy to be

concerned with the welfare of those we know and love, while regarding

everybody else as less important and somehow, less real. Most people would

rather have heard of the death of thousands in the Honduras flooding

disaster than of a serious accident involving a close friends or favourite

relatives. That is why some are less disturbed by the slaughter of

thousands of unborn children than by the personal problems of a pregnant

women across the street. To rationalize this double standard, they pretend

to themselves that the unborn child is a less valuable human life because

it has no active social relationships and can therefore, be disposed of by

others who have an arbitrary standard of their own for the value of a human

life.

I agree that the fetus has not developed it’s full potential as a human

being: but neither have any of us. Nor will any of us have reached that

point: that point of perfect humaness, when we die. Because some of us may

be less far along the path than others, does not give them the right to

kill us. But those in favour of abortion, assume that they have that right,

the standard being arbitrary. To say that a 10 week fetus has less value

that a baby, means also that one must consider a baby of less value than a

child, a young adult of less value than an old man. Surely one cannot

believe this and still be civilized and human. A society that does not

protect its individual members is on the lowest scale of civilized society.

One of the measures of a more highly civilized society, is its attitude

towards its weaker members. If the poor, the sick, the handicapped, the

mentally ill, the helpless are not protected, the society is not as

advanced as in a society where they are protected. T more mature the

society is, the more there is respect for the dignity and rights of all

human beings. The function of the laws of the society, is to protect and

provide for all members so that no individual or group of individuals can

be victimized by another individual group. Every member of Canadian society

has a vital stake in what value system is adopted towards its weak, aged,

cripple, it’s helpless intra-uterine members; a vital stake in who chooses

life or death.

As some of you may know, in 1969, the abortion laws were changed in

Canada, so that it became legal for a doctor to perform an abortion if a

committee of 3 other doctors in an eccredited hospital deemed that

continuation of the pregnancy constituted a severe threat to the life and

health, mental or physical of the women. Threat to health was not defined

and so it is variously interpreted to mean very real medical disease to

anything that interferes with even social or economic well being, so that

any unwanted or unplanned pregnancy thus qualifies. What really is the

truth about the lasting effect of an unwanted pregnancy on the psyche of a

womem? Of course there is a difference of opinion among psychiatrists, but

if unbiased, prospective studies are examined certain facts become obvious.

(1) The health of women who are mentally ill before they become pregnant,

is not improved by an abortion. In fact in 1970 an official statement of

the World Health Organization said, “ Serious menta isorders arise more

often in women previous mental problems. Thus the very women for whom legal

abortion is considered justified on psychiatric grounds, are the ones who

have the highest risk of post-abortion psychiatric disorders. (2) Most

women who are mentally healthy before unwanted pregnancy, despite a

temporary emotional upset during the early weeks for the pregnancy, are

mentally healthy after the pregnancy whether they were aborted or carried

through to term.

Do we accept killing a human being because of a temporary, emotional

upset? All obstetricians and gynaecologists know of many cases where the

mother, be her single or married, has spoken of abortion early in the

pregnancy and later on, has confessed her gratitude to those who have not

performed the abortion. On the other hand, we have all seen women what have

been troubled, consumed with guilt and development significant psychiatric

problems following and because of abortion. I quote Ft. John L. Grady,

Medical Examiner for Florida State Attorney’s Office, “ I believe it can be

stated with certainty that abortion causes more deep-seated guilt,

depression and mental illness than it ever cures”.

We used to hear a lot about the risk of suicide among those who

threatened such action if their request for abortion was refused. How real

is that risk – it is not – in fact, the suicide rate among pregnant women

be they happy of unhappy about the pregnancy, is 1/4 of the rate among

non-pregnant women in child-bearing years. An accurate 10 year study was

done in England on unwed mothers who requested abortions and were refused.

It was found that the suicide rate of this group was less than that average

population. In Minnesota in a 15 year period, there were only 14 maternal

suicides. 11 occurred after delivery. None were illegitimately pregnant.

All were psychotic. In contrast, among the first 8 deaths of women aborted

under the liberal law in the United Kingdon, 2 were from suicide directly

following the abortion.

Are there any medical indications for abortion?? Is it valid for a

doctor to co-operate in the choice for abortion? The late Dr. Guttmacher,

one of the world leaders of the pro-abortion movement, has stated: “ Almost

any women can be brought through pregnancy alive unless she suffers from

cancer or leukemia, in which case abortion is unlikely to prolong her life

much less save it.”

As an opponent to abortion, I will readily agree, as will all those who

are against abortion, that pregnancy resulting from rape or incest is a

tragedy. Rape is a detestable crime, but no sane reasoning can place the

slightest blame on the unborn child it might produce. Incest is, if that is

possible, even worse, but for centuries, traditional Jewish law has clearly

stated, that if a father sins against his daughter (incest) that does not

justify a second crime – the abortion of the product of that sin. The act

of rape or incest is the major emotional physical trauma to the young girl

or women. Should we compound the psychic scar already inflicted on the

mother by her having the guilt of destroying a living being which was at

least half her own? Throughout history, pregnant women who for one crime or

another were sentenced to death, were given a stay of execution until after

the delivery of the child: it being the contention of courts that one could

not punish the innocent child fo he crime of the mother. Can we punish it

for a crime against the mother?

If rape occurred the victim should immediately report the incident. If

this is done, early reporting of the crime will provide greater opportunity

for apprehension and conviction of the rapist, for treatment of venereal

disease and prevention of pregnancy. Let is give our children good sex

education; and let us get tough on pornography, clean up the newstands,

literature and “ Adult Movies” and television programmes which encourage

crime, abusive drugs and make mockery of morality and good behaviour and

therefore, contribute to rape.

By some peculiar trick of adult logic, proponents of abortion talk

about fetal indications for act. Whatever abortion may do for the mother,

it so very obviously cannot be therapeutic for the fetus. Death is hardly a

constructive therapy. As Dr. Hellegers of John Hopkins Hospital says,

“ While it is easy to feel that abortion is being performed for the sake of

the fetus, honesty requires us to recognize that we perform it for adults”.

There is no evidence to indicate that an infant with congenital or birth

defect would rather not be born since he cannot be consulted. This evidence

might exist if suicides were common among people with congenital handicaps.

However, to the contrary, these seem to value life, since the incidence of

suicide is less than that of the general population. Can we choose death

for another while life is all we ourselves know? Methods are being

developed to diagnose certain defects in the infants of mothers at risk

before the infant is born. The fluid around th etus can be sampled and

tested in a very complicated fashion. If we kill infants with confidential

defects before they are born, why not after birth, why not any human being

we declare defective? It is no surprise of course for many of us to learn

that in hospitals across North American Continent such decisions affecting

the newborn and the very elderly or those with incurable disease, are being

made. What is a defect, what is a congenital defect? Hitler considered

being 1/4 Jewish was a congenital defect incompatible with the right to

life. Perhaps you have all heard this story :

One doctor saying to another doctor, “ About the termination of a

pregnancy, I want your opinion. The father was syphilitic (venereal

disease). The mother tuberculous (small lumps on skin). Of the four

children born, the first was blind, the second died, the third was deaf and

dumb, the fourth also tuberculous. What would you have done?” “ I would have

ended the pregnancy”. “ Then you would have murdered Beethoven”.

Not content with the Abortion Act of 1969 which allows 40, 000 unborn

children to be killed legally in our country in 1973, many noisy and

emotional people are campaigning for abortion on request. They are aided by

a crusading, misguided press and media which continues to utter as fact,

the fiction of fertile imaginative minds. We have been told by the media

that the majority of Canadians wish to have abortion legalized but the

latest census taken by the Toronto Star in March of 1989 reports that 35%

of those polled thought that abortion was already easy to obtain, 26%

thought it too hard, 19% about right and 21% had no opinion. Men more then

women thought it too hard. Even if the majority did want it, this does not

make it right. Centuries ago, most Americans thought slavery was right. The

elected leaders of this country must have the wisdom and integrity for what

is right, not for what might be politically opportune.

One of the uttered justifications for abortion on demand is that every

women should have the mastership of her own body, but should she? To quote

Dr. Edwin Connow, “ Should she have the right for what is really judicial

execution of new life – not a cat, not a chicken but a human being – not

only potential but actual”. In a society one is not totally free to do what

one will with one’s own body (we don’t have the right to get drunk or high

on drugs and drive down Young Street.) The great concern has been shown for

the innocent victims of highjacking but what is abortion but this? The

highjacking without reprieve, of an innocent passenger out of his mother’s

womb. Should we really leave the right to hijack as a personal decision

only?

Those campaigning for further liberalization of the abortion law, hope

to make abortion available and safe for all who wish it during a pregnancy.

Qualifications have been placed on the abortion on demand routine by other

groups, for example, a time limit for the duration of pregnancy or clause

that the operation be performed in an accredited hospital. Before exploring

the reality of so-called safe abortion, let me tell you a little method of

procuring an abortion. Before 13 weeks of pregnancy, the neck of the womb

is dilated – a comparatively easy procedure in someone who has already had

a child – much more difficult if childbirth has not occurred. The products

of conception in many hospitals are removed but a suction apparatus –

considered safe and better that the curettal scraping method. After 13

weeks pregnancy, the fetus is too big to be removed in this was and either

a dangerous method of injection a solution into the womb is carried out,

this salting out method results in t mother going into what is really a

miniature labour and after a period of time, expelling a very dead often

skinned baby. In some hospitals because of the danger of this procedure to

the mother, an operation like a miniature Caesarean section called a

hysterotomy has to be performed. There area also many other methods.

Let us now look if we can, at consequences of such license to kill an

individual too small to cry for it’s own protection.

Abortion by suction curettage is not just as simple as a pelvic

examination performed in a doctor’s office as Dr. Morgentaler and the

television programe W5 who were doing a great disservice to young women in

Canada would have us believe. In Canada as reported in the Canadian Medical

Association Journal (the Statistics from Statistics Canada), the

complication rate and this being for immediate complications of early

abortion is 4. 5%. According to the Wyn report with statistics from 12

counties, women who have a previous induced abortion have their ability to

bear children in the future permanently impaired. There is a 5-10% increase

in infertility. The chances of these women having a pregnancy in the tube

increases up to 4 times. Premature delivery increases up to 50% and when

one realizes that prematurity is the commonest cause for infants being

mentally or physically defective, having cerebral palsy or other

difficulties, then one realizes that those doctors doing abortions in great

numbers south of the border or across the water, even in Canada may not be

doing the women and her family a service. They will tell you that abortion

has almost no complications. What most of them will not tell you, is that

once the abortion is done they may refuse to see the women again and that

she must take her post-abortal problems elsewhere.

Those seeking repeal of the present abortion law will rapidly point out

that nevertheless, it is safer to have a legal abortion than illegal

abortions, safer for the women that is. This I don not dispute, but here is

the real rub. Liberalized abortion laws do not eliminate illegal, back

street abortions and in some cases, the overall number of illegal abortions

actually rise, usually stays stagnant, and rarely falls. There are still

people who would rather try it themselves or go somewhere they will be

completely anonymous. Another factor enters the total number of people

seeking abortion, legal or illegal rises. The overall pregnancy rate

rockets and people become careless with contraception and a women can have

3 or 4 abortions during the time of one full term pregnancy.

Are doctors really being kind to the girl to allow her to choose life

or death for her unborn child? In aborting a 16 year old this year with

so-called informed consent, we may be preventing her from having even 1 or

2 children 10 years later when happily married. No, repealing the abortion

law does not make it possible for every women to safely eliminate, what is

for her, an unwanted pregnancy.

Would limiting abortions to accredited hospitals make it safer? Yes,

safer for the women, not for the fetus and it would jeopardize the

continued well being of all of the members of the community with the gross

misuse of the medical manpower, hospital facilities and money. With almost

31, 739 abortions performed in Ontario in 1989, the cost to OHIP is about 9

million dollars. Yet to do as has been done in the U. S. A and the United

Kingdom – namely to make legal, abortions is to turn so-called ‘ backstreet

butchers’ into legal operators.

Patients now go into the office through the front door instead of the

rear. I have heard it said that is abortions became available on request,

many less children would be born and we could use the pleasant delivery

suites and postnatal beds for abortions. As I have pointed out, however,

before today, liberalization of abortion does not reduce the birth rate.

There would be little increase in available facilities or indeed doctor’s

time. By the very nature of the operation and because the longer pregnancy

lasts, the more difficult it is, patients for abortions are admitted as

urgent cases or emergencies so that all other members of the community must

wait longer for their hospital bed or the surgery they need.

Who will pay for there abortions? With medicare, of course, it is you

and I. I know one full tern pregnancy costs most than an abortion, but not

much more. And it does not cost more than 3 abortions and that is what

happens when the climate or choice for life or death of the unborn child

changes. Let us use this money for constructive purposes, not destructive.

It has been suggested that abortions on request would enable the poor to

secure abortion as easily as the rich but regrettably, it has been shown

that abortion-minded physicians in great demand will respond to the age-old

commercial rules, as has already happened in the States and in Britain.

Abortion on demand a women’s right to choose not to continue an

unplanned pregnancy would prevent there being unwanted children in this

country, so we are told. This is the final and desperate emotional plea of

people anxious, at whatever price, to escape the responsibility for their

actions. Nobody here or in Canada, wants there to be unwanted children in

this city, and in this country, and also in this world. There is nothing

more pitiable or heat rending that an unwanted fetus becoming an unwanted

babe or an unwanted babe becoming an unwanted child, or an unwanted child

becoming an embittered adult. But few would think it right to kill or have

killed an unwanted baby to prevent it from becoming an unwanted child. Then

how can they think it right to kill an unwanted fetus, even more

defenceless than a newborn babe just because it may grow into an unwanted

child.

Once a women has conceived, she already is a parent, be it willing or

otherwise. The only way she ceases it be a parents is by a natural death or

an act of killing. Killing in any form is not the solution to so-called

unwanted human beings at any age. Hitler thought this was right. Canadians

surely do not. It is a permissive and frightened society that does not

develop the expertise to control population, civil disorder, crime,

poverty, even its own sexuality but yet would mount an uncontrolled, repeat

uncontrolled, destructive attack on the defenceless, very beginnings of

life. Let us marshall all our resources financial, educational, those of

social agencies, but above all, of human concern and passion for our fellow

humans. Let us by all means, make available to all, knowledge of conception

and methods of contraception. Let us offer ourselves as loving humans to

those already in this country who are unwanted by their natural parents.

And incidentally, I am sure I don not need ac int you with some of the

facts about so-called unwanted children. The Children’s Aid Societies in

Toronto and in fact in every major city across our country have many more

potential parents anxious and willing to adopt infants and young children

than they have such children available for adoption. Let us marshall our

technology and humanity in the service of the unfortunate. And in

conclusion, I would like to read to you a letter which a member of

Birthright received.

Dear Birthright:

I heard about your work in Birthright and think you can help us. We’re

in our late 20’s and have been married 7 years. After 3 years of waiting,

we became the happy adoptive parents of a precious baby girl last fall.

This is how you can help us. Please tell every unwed mother who places

her baby for adoption how much we love her. We think each of those girls

are the most generous, charitable, kind devoted and loving mothers on this

earth. We know she must have carried her child out of love or in this day

and age should have found some way to have an abortion. We can never thank

her enough for the 9 months of time and energy she spent for us.

Maybe if she knows that we think she’s the most loving person in this

world we will never know, it will help us both.

As Jenny grows older, we are telling her she has two sets of parents.

We’ll tell her how she came to be our child this way. Her first mommy

didn’t have a home or a daddy to help love and care for her. She loved her

so much that she just couldn’t let her daughter grow up without love of two

parents and all the things that make a happy home. We’ll tell Jenny that

her 1st mommy thinks of her often and wonders how she is. She will always

love her baby.

Maybe our thoughts will someday reach Jenny’s 1st mommy. What she did

was an act of faith in mankind, hope for her daughter’s future and love

toward us. We think the strength of her love enabled her to place her

precious baby with us. We have faith that as Jenny grows up learning she

was placed out of love and not abandoned by her 1st mommy, both Jenny and

she will be at peace.

Thank you.