

The Moral Dilemma Freedom of Choice in ABORTION

The decision faced by a woman considering the abortion option is fundamentally distinct from the decisions made by governments that *legislate* on abortion; whereas the woman's choice is a *moral* one, the government's choices are always *political*.

True freedom of choice in abortion, as in all aspects of choice, entails the personal acceptance and legal enforcement of *responsibility* for one's choices. For that reason, we don't believe that it's the government's job to make getting an abortion *easy* any more than we believe it's the government's job to *prohibit* abortions.

Unfortunately, certain lobby groups within society have created a *political* issue of the moral debate, and their conflict has produced a situation where each side in the debate has been compromised into supporting the other. Though neither the prohibition nor subsidization of abortion will ever be able to resolve the issue, Ontarians have been forced to endure *both*.

The prohibition takes the form of regulatory and controlling review boards that have been granted the authority to make a woman's choice for her. And of course, the government has maintained an outright prohibition on the establishment of private abortion clinics, which would compete with its own monopoly on the practice. But here's the real clincher: at the same time the government prohibits and regulates abortions, it forces the taxpayer to pay for them!

We think this contradiction is intolerable. It's time to stop pretending that there's a *political* solution to the abortion dilemma, because there simply isn't. We recognize that for many, this is a difficult conclusion to have to accept, but there's no way of avoiding it. Laws and regulations are created by politicians who represent their *constituents*, voters whose disagreement on

(over)

Freedom Party

the issue is so widespread, extreme, and fundamental that many regard abortion as a form of "legalized murder" while an equally significant number regard it as a "social right."

Thus, with the public as deeply and morally divided on the issue as it is, it should come as no surprise that our democratically representative government has once again attempted to do the impossible: to "balance" the conflicting wishes of its citizens by resorting to regulation, control, and the subsidization of abortion --- a process that inevitably violates *everyone's* rights under the illusionary pretense that a suitable "compromise" has been reached on the issue. In this way, the government has effectively played each side in the debate against the other, with the only winner being the government itself, because *it gets to make the choices it denies to others*.

The result? Those who are morally and ethically opposed to abortion find themselves forced to pay for the abortions of others, while those seeking an abortion are forced to bear the consequences of decisions made by others. Thus, each side in the issue has become even more intensely polarized and as usual, a political solution to a moral dilemma has proven not only futile, but self-defeating as well.

Freedom Party believes that the *purpose* of government is to *protect* your freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.

Freedom Party believes that *choice* in abortion belongs to the individual who must bear the consequences of that choice, whether those consequences are personal, moral, psychological, physical, or economic. Those who opt in favour of abortion must expect to bear these responsibilities while the "public", as such, should not be involved in the personal decisions of individuals and their doctors. Similarly, those who are opposed to abortion should not be expected to pay for the abortions of others through their taxes or O.H.I.P. premiums, or to subsidize the maintenance of the government's current monopoly on the practice.

As long as each side in the debate continues to insist upon the coerced agreement and support of the other (and of the general public), the abortion debate will be a perpetual political battle with losers on every side. The numbers of abortions will unnecessarily increase (since individuals have no incentive to assume responsibility for their own actions), while the public will have to bear a corresponding increase in costs and decrease in personal liberty and choice.

Our solution?

Freedom of choice *with* responsibility!

Think about it. After all, freedom of choice is what we're all about!