

*Criminal Code*

human rights? What would prevent our legislators to limit these rights by restricting the meaning of the term "human being"?

Some legal fiction may be useful and acceptable, but a legal fiction which can be used for the very purpose of denying fundamental human rights is dangerous and cannot be condoned. No government, no legislative body, no judicial body can assume the right to redefine the term "human being" so arbitrarily.

There are very few assertions as arbitrary as this false statement, though widespread, that life begins at birth only. Its falseness should be obvious to the future mother who has already felt her child moving in her womb. And yet she may not know that these movements began even before she felt them during the second month of her pregnancy. The heart starts beating about three weeks after conception and it is at that time that the mother knows for sure that she is pregnant.

For centuries, there have been numerous discussions as to the time when life begins in the human foetus. However, as in those days one did not have the tools of modern scientific research, most of those discussions turned into sterile speculations. Modern science proves that life begins with conception.

This is not a theological opinion, but a scientific fact. In fact, contrary to what many people think, no Christian church has ever laid down a dogma in this respect. The findings of science in this respect are set forth in a non-denominational book, entitled "The Canadian mother and her child" published by the government of Canada, in which we read on page 24:

One of those spermatozoa and the ovule meet and unite and a new life begins.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that books, distributed all over Canada, contain certain statements and because we are trying to amend the criminal code to legalize abortion, I shall take the liberty, at this stage, to express the opinion of our leader, the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) with whom I spoke on his return from a trip to Taiwan, and who asked me to summarize the Créditiste viewpoint.

First, as far as abortion is concerned, we are entirely against it; secondly, we are against homosexuality too. As to lotteries, if the bill was split up, we would be able to look fully into the matter. And finally, we are all in favour of breathalyzers but we urge

[Mr. Dumont.]

the government to consider seriously the constructive criticism we have received from the organization I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks.

If our leader takes such a stand, it is precisely because we discussed those matters at length in caucus. I am a faithful exponent of his opinion and, at the same time, I freely express my own. That is why I urge the Prime Minister, if freedom still exists in Canada, to allow a free vote on this question, in order to release the Quebec members who, in addition to being Christians, are like myself practising Catholics. They will vote in favour of this bill which must be passed at all costs.

The Minister of Justice would have preferred to introduce as many bills as the Conservative member proposed in his amendment. He had already mentioned it and I am convinced that were it not for the dictatorship that exists within the Liberal party and the majority government, Quebec members would all vote against that legislation designed to legalize abortion. I therefore ask them, as Christians and as Catholics, to unite and have that section forever removed from the omnibus bill which will be passed casually, but which will really legalize abortion.

On the other hand, we personally doubt that the draftsmen of the proposed legislation realized that in referring to obscenity between consenting adults they were using the same language used by St. Paul in Chapter I of his Epistle to the Romans, in which God abandoned men to a punishment inflicted upon them by themselves, either in a secret and infamous solitude or, what is worse, in a depraved society, by mutual consent.

Today, we abandon God and God has abandoned us. He surrenders us to complete slavery and to the bondage of our own lusts. When man has reached a certain degree of corruption, when he is determined to abandon God and declare Him dead and buried, the only way to cure him, if there is any hope left, is to let him wallow in his excesses and his corruption. No other means are used by God to bring about in man a result that all warnings and previous punishments had been unable to achieve, that is, complete repentance. It is exactly what the father of the prodigal son did, letting his son go his own way. He let this rebellious son go, giving him his share of property, even though that property, in addition to his bad conduct, was to bring upon him a terrible misery of his own making, that is, the excesses of his own lusts. He repented in his conscience and