

Gagging for Choice

Someday soon, Canadians and their legislators will be put to an excruciating test of their values. Rather, they may have to face the possibility they have none at all. Even hardened pro-abortion types (sweetly described as "pro-choice" by the media) are gagging at the new American procedure called "Dilation and Extraction." This special technique was developed for use with pregnancies as late as 26 weeks; that is - on sizeable, healthy babies weighing four or five pounds.

D & X is apparently not used Canada - yet. But it is so efficient, we can be certain it will be. This clever procedure attempts to solve three problems at once. It ensures that the aborted baby cannot survive the procedure, as occasionally happens. It always kills the baby inside the mother's body, thus ensuring the physician will escape any legal charge of murdering a "born-alive" child. And finally, it allows the harvest of fresh, still-warm brain cells for medical experiments, or treatment of adult diseases.

Here's how it works, as described by American abortionist Martin Haskell, M.D., who in 1992 claimed he had "performed over 700 of these procedures," and prefers it to the classic method of "dismembering the fetus inside the uterus...and removing the pieces." He knows a surgeon who does D & X "up to 32 weeks or more" - that's eight months.

First, the abortionist inserts a forceps into the birth canal and starts pulling the baby out by one leg. Then, with his hands, he delivers "the torso, the shoulders, and the upper extremities," except for the head, which he intentionally leaves inside the mother. At this point, without any anaesthetic, he pushes tips of "a pair of blunt curved Metzenbaum scissors" into the back of the baby's head, and "spreads the scissors to enlarge the opening."

Next, he inserts a suction device into the hole, and "evacuates the skull contents;" that is, he sucks out the baby's brains, collapsing that "skull", and pulls out the dead baby. One of the first nurses to help Haskell do this, called the police. To no avail.

Inevitably, those warm brain cells will be transferred to help even the not-so-sick. An August, 1992 article in the Toronto Star warned that future Olympic athletes may use "baby power" to win Gold Medals by injecting fresh fetal cells from elective abortions into injured muscle tissue. Researcher Phil Embleton said when you are dealing with multi-million dollar salaries, "morals go out the window." He felt the next stage would be for strength-boosting of healthy athletes. Well, now...somehow it's difficult to thrill at the sight of a man setting a new world record in the high jump thanks to the bouncy cells of aborted babies.

But the broader political question must surely be this: How is it possible that in Canada, a "democracy" meant to reflect the will of the people, in which the majority has always

disapproved of most (not all) abortions, we have no law of any kind, against abortion of any kind, even those performed very late, on very large children, even - if this procedure is used - with the entire baby delivered, except the head?

A typical profile of the full range of nuanced public attitudes toward abortion - one that does not differ much between our two nations - was nicely captured in a U.S. Wirthlin Exit Poll, November 5-7, 1992. When asked: "When should abortion be legal?", four per cent said "no opinion." Only 12% said "At any time, for any reason." A substantial 29% said "only in early pregnancy." But fully 55% said "never, or seldom," and gave restrictive conditions, such as only to save the life of the mother, or for incest, or rape.

To its credit, the liberal Boston Globe ran a finely- detailed survey on abortion attitudes in 1989, which reflected this same picture, and showed that when questioned closely, even most liberals do not support abortion on demand - except in rare circumstances. The Globe findings strongly suggested, as another columnist put it, that even the U.S. pro-choice majority "would be ready to outlaw most of the abortions that are actually performed." So who's running these countries, anyway?

Radicals, that's who. For Canadians wondering what's in store for them, Ontario Premier Bob Rae's socialist government has set the trend. Among the many mandates of his "Task Force" on abortion, are those actually forcing reluctant hospitals to perform abortions, and also forcing all physicians, nurses, and social workers (who are refusing in increasing numbers), to make "abortion referrals" regardless of personal conscience!

Alas, we have not yet figured out that the welfare State has a vested financial and managerial interest in the false concept that human beings are only material things, and therefore in the deliberate de-spiritualization of all human life. A \$400 abortion is simply cheaper than five years of social assistance for a pregnant teenager.

Once thus conceived, our cost - and therefore our value - can be determined and weighed by the state, making us increasingly vulnerable to the economic manipulations of social policy experts throughout the life cycle.

Think hard about this if you or your loved one ever suffer a terminal illness in a public Canadian hospital.

Better check the orange juice.

Better yet - ask the nurse to drink a glass first.

© William Gairdner