

talk about so-called rights to terminate a pregnancy, as the euphemism has it, I believe, should cease.

It is worth relating that the question of when human life begins was answered once and for all during the Borowski trial in Regina in May 1983. Arguing the case for the defence of the unborn, Morris Schumiatcher called nine expert witnesses to answer the question of whether the unborn are human beings or not.

Sir William Liley—the professor I mentioned earlier, who was knighted for his pioneering work in amniocentesis—was called as a main witness. He pointed out that the unborn child is not part of his mother's body, but a separate person who dictates his own growth and when he is to be born. Long before the time when an abortion would be performed his heart begins beating and brain activity can be recorded.

Dr. Jerome Lejeune, professor of fundamental genetics at the University of Paris, testified that:

At the moment of fertilization the whole symphony of life is ready to be played out.

He noted that he had never heard any discussion of when a cat's or a cow's life begins. On purely scientific grounds, he could not understand why there should be any controversy over this question with regard to human beings. Dr. Lejeune reiterated that human life begins when an egg is fertilized, the time when all the genetic information necessary and sufficient to build each and every one of us is transformed.

Under cross-examination, Mr. Schumiatcher's witnesses were repeatedly pressed to say that the unborn constitute only potential life. They all refused to agree to that. Sir William Liley said that the term is meaningless in biology. There is either life or there is not, and, if it is the offspring of human parents, it belongs to the human species and no other.

Much has been made recently of difficult cases. It is often suggested by people of good will that abortion must be available to victims of rape or incest. We must be realistic about the magnitude of this problem.

Pregnancy caused by rape, however, is a rare occurrence. A number of factors are said to contribute to this: The short period each month during which a woman is fertile; the use of contraceptives such as a birth control pill; the physical and psychological condition of rapists, which results in many such attacks being incompleting; and the fact that a woman's physiology is such that intense stress caused by fear interferes with ovulation and can make pregnancy impossible. So rare is pregnancy caused by rape that in a scientific survey of 3,500 consecutive rapes treated in hospitals in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area no cases of pregnancy occurred. That study took place over a ten-year period.

● (1500)

Be that as it may, we must take account of the fact that some pregnancies do arise under horrible circumstances. Rape and incest do result in some pregnancies. What is our reaction, as a caring society, to any woman who finds herself in that position? We are challenged to provide a solution which is compassionate and loving, a solution which is in keeping with

the dignity of human life. We recognize that such a woman has been through a brutal experience. We must then offer her every assistance and support that we can.

By legalizing abortion for such women, however, we would simply be adding to their trauma. We would be telling them that our solution to their problem is to give them the opportunity to kill their own child. That is no help at all. Killing one's own child brutalizes a woman, regardless of who the father of the child is. Abortion cannot undo the trauma of rape or incest. It can only add another trauma. One act of violence cannot undo another act of violence.

Instead, we should and must commit ourselves as a society to creating and financing social programs which will help these women. This will be a mark of our concern and true compassion.

In the name of justice we do not impose the death penalty on those guilty of incest or sexual assault. If that is fair and just, how can we turn around and suggest that the death penalty should be imposed on an unborn child—on the innocent child whose life was created by the criminal act?

The value of a human life is not determined by the circumstances of one's conception. We do not place greater value on a person because the parents planned the pregnancy. No, we must value and protect all human life as equal, regardless of age, of parentage or social status.

Yet the proponents of abortion suggest that we should treat some human beings as having more rights than other human beings. The advocates of abortion suggest that the law should allow for the killing of a child in the womb if that child is handicapped. Bill S-16 rejects any such approach, as any just and humane law must.

The handicapped are as fully human as you or I, and their lives deserve the full protection of the law. To reject this is to endorse the principle that one's right to life varies according to one's abilities and talents. Such a philosophy is characteristic of the most brutal and inhumane regimes that our civilization has ever seen. It would allow for the killing of an untold number of people, for where would we draw the line? Who would decide what abilities and characteristics are needed to be deemed worthy of protection?

Do honourable senators think that one of the world's greatest pianists, who was born in Poland, Arthur Rubinstein, should have been born? Let us listen to what he said, as printed in *Time* magazine of February 25, 1966:

My mother did not want to have a seventh child so she decided to get rid of me before I was born. Then a marvellous thing happened. My aunt dissuaded her, and so I was permitted to be born. Think of it! It was a miracle!

That, I believe, is a profound and stunning testimonial for us to remember from Arthur Rubinstein.

In the February 23, 1988, issue of the *Medical Post*, published in Canada, Mr. Colin Muncie, a Toronto journalist, wrote the following: