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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 individuals: 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. The 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 mental disorders 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
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 for the 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 the fetus 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
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
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 the 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 do 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
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
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
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
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 do not need acquaint 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
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