

*Right to Life*

of the motion—and I am one of those—believe, to put it bluntly, that abortion is murder.

That is a strong statement, and why do I make it, Madam Speaker? I believe that a human being with untold potential is present from the moment of conception. I believe that every human being has the right to life. I believe that no one and no Government has the right to take an innocent life—and I emphasize the word innocent—or to kill an innocent human being. A human being is present from the moment of conception. This is a fact affirmed by modern science. It is a fact that can be proved genetically and was accepted as fact by the World Council on Abortion held in Washington in 1967.

From the moment of conception onward, there is human life. The first cell is a being. It is alive. It is an individual and it is human. It is not a carrot or a vegetable. It is not a cat. It is not an animal. What is conceived from human is human. The foetus is a human being with potential. It has all the genetic information and the developmental dynamism needed to become a fully developed human adult. Even a newborn baby is still mostly potential. It is important to remember that every human being is and remains a human being with potential. We all continue to grow and mature. Only death ends the process of growth which begins at conception.

Let me examine briefly some of the arguments used by pro-abortionists who support easy access to abortion. It is argued that a woman has control over her body and it is her choice alone whether to abort that pregnancy or to carry the child through to birth. There is undoubtedly truth in the statement that we all have or should have control over our own bodies. But even here there are caveats.

No society has condoned self-mutilation and no society has condoned suicide as a universal good. The fact remains that we are stewards, not owners of our bodies and our life. As stewards we have a duty to promote and preserve life and health. We are not the cause of our own existence and must not be the direct cause of the cessation of that existence, be it our own or someone else's.

The issue, of course, is whether the unborn child is a part of the mother, a part of her body such as, for instance, a wart. Or is it a separate human being distinct from the mother altogether, although of course depending upon her? If it is only a bunch of tissue, everyone would agree that the mother could remove that tissue at will for reasons of health. However, I submit that the evidence is clear that the foetus and unborn child is a separate being. Biological evidence shows that from the moment of conception onward, the embryo or foetus is a unique and distinct individual, a living human being having its own distinct genetic make-up different from that of the mother and the father.

● (1750)

The embryo has its own organs, its own growth dynamism, its own circulatory system and its own functions. Even the placenta is not part of the mother. It is an organ of the baby,

and while the blood of the mother and baby meet, they do not mix but are kept separate by the placental membrane.

No one has the right to kill that human being which is in the foetus any more than a criminal has the right to kill innocent people. For the state to forbid abortion is no more an invasion of a woman's privacy than it would be an invasion of privacy to prevent a criminal from killing innocent human beings.

Again, it has been argued that abortion should be allowed because it is not reasonable to force a woman who has been raped or becomes pregnant incestuously to bear the child for the full term and subsequently give birth to the child. My reply is that I do not understand how killing the innocent child solves the problems of rape or incest.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Mailly:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily), on a point of order.

**Mrs. Maily:** Madam Speaker, it is really too bad we will not have enough time for a complete debate on this motion. Actually, I have some doubts as to the relevance of the comments that were made. There has been no mention of the Constitution. I thought that the purpose of the motion was to include the word "foetus" in the Constitution. This has nothing to do with the life of a child or whatever... I don't think we are being relevant here, Madam Speaker. We have not been addressing the subject, and I would ask for more time so that we can do so.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Under the Standing Order I have no choice but to interrupt the debate at this time.

[Translation]

It being 5:51 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 36(2), the time allowed for the consideration of this motion has now expired. Therefore, the question is as follows:

[English]

The question is on the amendment of the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** All those in favour please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.