

### Abortion

For those who are reluctant to characterize abortion as murder or to compare abortion clinics to communist or Nazi extermination camps, let us look at what happens in abortion clinics.

Mr. Speaker, I will refer to two cases which, morally speaking, are typical of all abortions to the extent that in each abortion an unborn child is killed directly. The only unique feature in both cases was the publicity they enjoyed. The first one is the Waddill case. We must refer to a 1977 court decision in California, followed by another decision in 1978, and the proceedings that led to those decisions. Mr. Speaker, in that case the abortionist replaced part of the amniotic fluid with a salt solution, which not only poisons the system and burns the skin of the unborn child, but also causes its premature expulsion from the womb. The baby girl survived the abortionist's attempt at burning and poisoning her, and also her traumatic and premature expulsion from the womb. Did the baby survive the abortion? In fact, during an hour, half suffocated, she cried after escaping the doctor's attempt at taking her life. Then the doctor returned, caught her by the throat and strangled her to death.

An abortion as we now understand it is not complete so long as the child is not put to death. That abortionist could not claim self-defence or the need to protect a victim from an aggressor. Therefore, from an ethical point of view, how can that abortion be characterized?

Mr. Speaker, that was a direct killing of a harmless human being, that is a human being that threatened nobody's life through a positive act. Even if that type of crime is generally called an abortion, or euphemistically a pregnancy termination or removal of the product of conception, the fact remains it is pure murder.

The other case, Mr. Speaker, is the testimony of a nurse in September 1981 to a Vancouver radio station, CJOR, during a program chaired by the former Minister of Health of British Columbia, Rafe Mair. After attending a hysterectomy abortion, the nurse snatched away the living baby on the abortionist's sterile table in order to baptize him, Mr. Speaker. The abortionist turned to the anaesthetist and shouted: "Did you see that? She snatched my specimen away!" The nurse replied: "I just baptized your specimen Paul."

Mr. Speaker, is not using human beings as guinea pigs before killing them what went on in concentration camps? Let us recall that morally, those abortion cases are no different from any other kind of abortion, either by means of abortives such as drugs and intra-uterine instruments, or by an abortionist who pulls a baby to pieces by means of a vacuum tube, carves it out with a blade or removes the uterine wall to prevent the baby from implanting, the so-called expansion and curettage. He ties up the umbilical cord to suffocate the baby or simply throw the aborted baby into a garbage can where it dies after struggling for a period of between 15 minutes and three hours, etc.

Faced with such cases, Mr. Speaker, any refusal on our part to recognize that abortion clinics today are the equivalent of concentration camps is to deny reality.

• (2300)

Two remarks must be made here: First of all, in the Waddill case, if the physician for instance had strangled the same baby, also prematurely, but born in the delivery room across the street from the abortion clinic, he might have been accused of murder instead of being paid for carrying out a medical procedure. Which means that the life of the baby would have protected by the legislation only if someone, perhaps the mother had, wanted it. But to allow any interested person to determine at whim whether or not the baby in question is a human being with the right to live reminds us of Nazi methods.

Mr. Speaker, the Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup riding which I have the honour and privilege to represent in the House is mostly a rural riding. I have made it my duty over the past few years to visit one of the finest counties in Quebec and I have had the opportunity to discuss with groups representing the area, including l'Âge d'or, the AFEAS groups, *Maison des femmes*, Knights of Columbus, *Cercle des fermières*, *Filles d'Isabelle*, and a great many others, and I asked their opinion about such issues as capital punishment and abortion. Mr. Speaker, I often had extraordinary exchanges with fathers and mothers with families of 10, 12, 15 children, sometimes even more, and during a survey I carried out as early as 1985 on the abortion issue, 65 per cent of my constituents were against abortion. Some in all of its forms, others with restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, even more recently, on April 22 last, Mrs. Adrienne Tanguay of Saint-Pascal and Mrs. Gertrude Madore of Kamouraska held a press conference to hand me a petition against abortion signed by 8,016 residents of 18 parishes in the Rivière-du-Loup and Kamouraska regions. They also handed me a similar petition signed by 698 residents of five parishes in the Transcontinental, that is the Pohénégomook region.

These two women, both of whom are mothers and grandmothers, acted spontaneously without the support of an organization, simply because they love life, consider abortion to be a crime and believe that it is their duty to defend innocent and defenceless beings, "choosing to act in silence for those who die in silence".

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the idea that human life must be respected is very important in the long run because of the extremely negative consequences which can occur otherwise. After having been conditioned little by little to accept the idea that the human foetus is nothing more than a sandwich, human beings could very well reach the stage where they seek to destroy themselves more or less unconsciously. Euthanasia would rapidly become, with all its dangerous aspects, another step in this lack of respect for human life. People would then start asking, as in the case of abortion, who must die and when and in the case of which disease and below which IQ or following which emotional reaction.