

I wish that the bill would go to committee because I am not against us examining the issue, but I as a person who believes very strongly in the sanctity of life am very concerned with anything that could be done whereby we would start—and I will dare use the words—to play God in any way.

I am concerned with what we see in some European jurisdictions. I am thinking in particular of Holland, a great country but one in which too many decisions, I believe, are taken by members of the medical profession to end human life. That whole subject disturbs me immensely.

We have had debate in the past on other related issues. I am thinking of the debate we had on capital punishment. I said where I stood on that one and that was against capital punishment for the protection of human life. We have had a debate on abortion and again I stood in the same position.

Today I express my concerns with this bill, but I am not one who will block it from going to committee because I do think we have to talk of the issue because it is a very profound one. I nevertheless want to indicate to the House how deeply I feel about the issue. I am sure that other members feel just as strongly as I do, but that should not prevent us from discussing an issue so important as this one.

[*Translation*]

Some might say, Mr. Speaker, that the issue is much more complex because, with the advance of medicine, who can tell at what stage of life a person dies from natural causes versus being artificially prolonged? Besides, what do we mean by “natural”? In the absence of this information, it becomes very difficult to determine what is not. That is why, notwithstanding my deepest convictions, I would like this matter to be referred to a parliamentary committee. I hope that the government will see to it that it will be considered, that the full process is applied so that witnesses can be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish that the witnesses who will testify before the committee not to be biased one way or the other, no more my way than the other way. I want a real debate to take place, where all views on the issue can be expressed, because I believe that everyone must be heard, not only those who support a legislation such as this one. We should also hear from those who are against.

### *Adjournment Debate*

Again, Mr. Speaker, I saw what happened in a previous debate, the abortion debate, and I am not convinced that the whole process was carried out impartially. I detected some degree of bias in that debate and I want none in this one. I would want us to be impartial and all witnesses to be heard.

[*English*]

I do not want to speak any longer because I do not want to prolong this debate. I wish the issue to go to committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to Legislative Committee H.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

PS 2000

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, in June I rose in the House and asked the President of Treasury Board if the minister would tell us just what the government's commitment was to pay equity for federal government employees.

The minister responded:

I would like to reassure the hon. member that pay equity stays there, I mean will be implemented.

In 1984 the Public Service Alliance of Canada filed a complaint with Canada's Human Rights Commission on behalf of 50,000 members of the clerical and regulatory CR group.

It was only after that action that the Treasury Board invited all federal public service unions to participate in a joint equal pay study. The equal pay adjustment which the Treasury Board announced for the CR and ST groups in January 1990 were only one-quarter to one-third of what they were entitled to and owed.