

Dr. Abraham told the Institute for Jewish Medical Ethics that fetuses are human beings, and the abortion of the fetus, who is not a threat to the life of its mother, is murder. He also said:

Murder of one human being would never justify the means to healing, or relieving the suffering of another human being.

Canada's heritage is a fabric of great religions, rich traditions, and noble tongues. This multicultural treasure is a legacy of our Aboriginal peoples, the French and English settlers and immigrants and their descendants. They have a high regard for the same principles of the family and the sanctity of human life. It is for the common good to pass these principles on to all our children and to future generations. Furthermore, medicine has always understood that life begins at conception. From that point on no further humanity is added to any of us; only food, water, and air.

**Hon. C. William Doody (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, I wonder if we could agree not to see the clock and continue on.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Is it agreed, honourable senators?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

**Senator Haidasz:** To continue, honourable senators, for proof of this, in 1986 the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan accepted from world-renowned experts in fetology and human genetics, such as Sir William Liley and Dr. Jerome LeJeune, uncontested evidence that a human being's life begins at conception. The uncontroverted evidence was before the Supreme Court of Canada when it heard the *Borowski* challenge in 1988 and 1989. That court did not deny the evidence as fact.

In case there is any doubt, the present Minister of Employment and Immigration, speaking in the House of Commons on this subject on July 27, 1988, acknowledged during a debate on abortion that we are speaking about killing an unborn child. I quote:

Let us not be afraid of the vocabulary.

This can be found in the *House of Commons Debates* at page 18080.

Furthermore, it is now settled that the debate in Canada as to whether the life in the womb is a human being is not over. We know that for sure now. The debate now is whether anyone has an overriding interest or right to kill that innocent life directly and with intent. All of the Judeo-Christian heritage and other cultural influences resoundingly say no. Our 1987 debate over capital punishment concluded with a definitive no for the killing of the most hardened criminals. We reaffirmed the fact that we must always regard life as sacred. In that debate the Prime Minister reiterated the precept that human life is sacred. He said on the occasion of that debate, and I quote:

It is wrong to take life, and I can think of no circumstance excepting self defence to justify it.

He went on to say, on June 22, 1987, which can also be found in *Hansard*:

[Senator Haidasz.]

But before all else, we uphold one simple principle: the inherent dignity of a human being, the inherent worth of a human life. I will resist with all of my strength, all of my life, any action that would diminish that reality and would lessen that value.

Yet, honourable senators, on that day when he fought for the right to life for murderers, did he think of what he might do today? Today, in presenting and promoting Bill C-43, the Prime Minister refused to accord the right to life in the womb to the preborn sons and daughters of Canada. I ask you, honourable senators, how can he reconcile that?

Furthermore, Statistics Canada revealed that 72,693 abortions were reported in 1988-89. That was only what was reported. In 1987 Statistics Canada told us that of the reported abortions, 13,271 women were repeating abortion, some for the fourth time—all of this at taxpayers' expense, and mostly for reasons of convenience.

The birth rate in Canada—not the conception rate—is well below replacement level today. Some 2.2 children per couple are needed to replace our population. The birth rate in Ontario is only about 1.6 children, lower in Quebec at 1.3, and lowest in Newfoundland at 1.28. Demographers find that the Canadian population will decrease to 18 million by the year 2086 if immigration and the birth rate do not increase. Therefore, we must realize that abortion contributes the greatest measurable influence in this rapid national depopulation, with a lot of help from sterilization procedures, drug abuse, sexually-transmitted diseases, marriage breakdown, poverty, homosexuality, and the other social ills of our society.

As I mentioned earlier, on January 28, 1988, upon hearing the *Morgentaler* appeal, the Supreme Court of Canada found that the state had a valid, pressing and substantial interest in the life of the preborn child, and that the preborn child may be one of those included in the term "everyone" in section 7 of the Charter if the legislators provide that understanding in a statute.

● (1750)

Honourable senators, we as legislators must exert a greater authority in the fundamental understanding of law and its function. We must employ a broader vision than the narrow constraints of expediency. The Supreme Court of Canada, hearing the *Daigle* case last year, avowed just that. The court invited us in Parliament to defend the interests of the fetus, stating that the decisions based on broad social, political, moral, and economic issues are more appropriately left to the legislature.

We in this chamber must therefore lead the way for the courts to know that the term "everyone" includes human beings before birth. Through just law we can assert that preborn human beings certainly are among the term "everyone". But Bill C-43 does not do that, nor is there any supportive legislation on the order paper today assisting especially poor and single mothers to want their babies.

Honourable senators, Bill C-43 is fatally flawed. That was the testimony given before the House of Commons legislative