

*Abortion*

The third point I would like to make is taken from the studies done by the West German supreme court in 1975. In a calm, very rational and objective manner, that supreme court called in the best witnesses they had at the time to tell them whether or not the fetus is a human being, and should we therefore protect that human being and give it full and equal protection of the law. In that discussion the German supreme court was deadly serious because they knew that from 1933 to 1945 Germany had called a group of people subhumans. The German word for that is "untermenschen". They simply said that they can be killed any time. That is why they had to be so careful. In carrying out their investigation, they found the following, in answer to the question: "When does the fetus gain the civil right to life?"

Life, in the sense of historical existence of a human individual, exists according to definite biological-physiological knowledge, in any case, from the fourteenth day after conception.

That is even before a woman knows she is pregnant. They said that from then on the physiological evidence was quite clear.

It is my contention that if that is the evidence, then our actions have to follow or we would be simply dishonest. I think we should take the best evidence that is available in Canada, let the experts come to the committee and explain whether or not we are dealing with a human being. We must be very coldly objective and we must look at what we are really talking about. But at the same time we have to be compassionate. I think we have to do two things at once. This is not easy, but we must try.

I think we must be very much like the statue that stands outside the Supreme Court, the statue of the person dispensing justice, wearing a blindfold. The blindfold is there so that she will listen to the evidence and rule accordingly without being swayed by emotion, and so on. In that sense we must be coldly objective. However, as I said, we must also be compassionate. If we are really serious in our desire to reduce the rate of abortions and if we have compassion for women caught in the tragic situation of carrying an unwanted child, we must be willing as a society to put our money, our legislation and our moral suasion on the side of life. These are the other components of a policy that could reverse the direction in which we are going now. I should like to list a few.

First, I think all levels of government must co-operate in improving birth control education throughout Canada. Improved educational programs could result in an attack on ignorance and would be powerful means of reducing the number of these human tragedies. Second, I think improved assistance should be provided to children's aids societies for their important work. Third, society should provide every assistance possible to unwed mothers to help them over this crisis, instead of the harassment and discrimination against them. I think we must support them instead of making their lives more difficult. Last, I think our social assistance program should provide a decent level of assistance to needy families with children because much of the trauma for many families involves having another child when the money is scarce.

[Mr. Reimer.]

I should like to see this bill go to committee. I realize we must watch our time in the private members' hour. I want to put some of my thoughts on the record. I am clearly in support of reducing the number of abortions in Canada and trying to correct the abuses that are there.

I would like to conclude by expressing one thought, and that is that when some people listen to this debate they will say, "Please do not force your morality on others because we have a different moral code." I would like to answer that objection by referring to history. When the German war criminals at the end of the war were on trial at Nuremberg, they sought to defend themselves on the grounds that they were loyal to a different set of values, different orders, and a different legal system. Therefore they could not be judged by someone else. Robert H. Jackson, Chief Counsel for the United States, had to think about that. He came back with the following answer, to which I should like to refer:

● (1640)

It is common to think of our own time as standing at the apex of civilization, from which the deficiencies of preceding ages may patronizingly be viewed in the light of what is assumed to be "progress". The reality is that in the long perspective of history the present century will not hold an admirable position . . . These two-score years in this twentieth century will be recorded in the book of years as one of the most bloody in all annals. Two world wars have left a legacy of dead which number more than all the armies engaged in any war that made ancient or medieval history. No half-century ever witnessed slaughter on such a scale, such cruelties and inhumanities, such wholesale deportations of peoples into slavery, such annihilations of minorities.

He went on to say the following:

Goaded by these facts, we have moved to redress the blight on the record of our era . . . At this stage of the proceedings, I shall rest upon the law of these crimes as laid down in the charter.

He was referring to the Atlantic Charter. He continued:

In interpreting the charter, however, we should not overlook the unique and emergent character of this body as an International Military Tribunal . . . As an International Military Tribunal, it rises above the provincial and transient and seeks guidance not only from International Law but also from the basic principles of jurisprudence which are assumptions of civilization.

In other words, he appealed to a much higher law which respects all individuals, no matter what their colour, creed, or national background. On that basis he could try these criminals at Nuremberg.

I am not trying to force a moral code on someone else. I am trying to be as objective as I possibly can by saying: let us look at the evidence in committee. In that sense I think we could come to the bottom of this issue.

Also we must realize that the basic principles of jurisprudence and the basic assumptions of our civilization are founded upon the Ten Commandments and the Judaeo-Christian ethical code. When we remove these, and when we ignore all the facts which point in one direction, then the very existence of our freedom is at stake. Relativism ultimately will lead to anarchy and then tyranny.

On his recent visit to the United States the Pope told his audiences in very simple terms that if we want to enjoy real freedom, then we must do so in harmony and in obedience to laws of the Ten Commandments and the directions within the