

*Criminal Code*

they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. (22) Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. (26) For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: (27) And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.

(28) And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient. (29) Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers; (30) Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents; (31) Without understanding; covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: (32) Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.

So, it is all that. This person, who is following closely the proceedings in parliament, concluded by saying:

I hope that those quotations from the Bible will be for you a new inspiration in the arguments you might bring forward to try to stop this hateful bill which strikes even the child and takes away from him the right to be born.

But in this measure to legalize abortion on health grounds, the government leaves again that term without definition or qualification. This bill which allegedly calls for a minor reform is found to be something else altogether when carefully looked at.

The amendments to the abortion legislation, as they appear in bill C-150, are in my view based on a concept of justice lacking both depth and recognition of the true implications of abortion.

If a human being has any right at all, the most important implied in all the others is certainly the right to live. This right is the very first one and the others depend on it. All the principles brought forward on human rights recognize this implicitly, but the proposed changes in the abortion laws do not.

The universal declaration of human rights states that:

Every one, as a person, has the right to life, freedom and security.

The Canadian Bill of Rights asserts:

The right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property—

These two documents mention also that all men are equal before the law.

Proposed changes to the Criminal Code deny that equality by giving to the medical committees a discretionary life-and-death power over human beings still unborn. They also run counter to that section of the Declaration of human rights, adopted by the United Nations, to the effect that children have a right to be protected before birth as well as after.

The Minister of Justice proposes to ensure a balance between the child's and the mother's rights. However, there is no balance between the life of the child and the health of another person, especially when the word "health" can be interpreted as "happiness".

Our comfort, our security, even our health may be seriously impaired, then given back to us. Moreover, the child deprived of his life, will be for ever deprived of all his other rights.

It seems obvious to us that no bill on abortion has its place in a really just society and that no government really concerned about human rights would force its adoption.

In a remarkable report entitled "Abortion and human rights", prepared by the Alliance for life at the request of its chairman, Mrs. Joan Lusignan, of Hull, one reads:

Those human rights belong to all men, without any exception and, in a civilized society, it should be an obvious truth. However, today, as in the past, in our country as well as in other countries, some human beings are deprived of the most elementary and essential rights. By an irony of fate, it is justice itself which supports that injustice.

One of the ways of depriving man of his rights is simply to declare that some categories of human beings are not after all human beings. Thus, it is asserted in the Criminal Code that a child becomes a human being at the time of his birth only. With such an assertion, one may rationalize abortion, on the ground that it does not destroy a human life.

I gave earlier the example of a 4-year-old child who can detect the presence of life, and we know that life exists three weeks after the conjugal act. If a 4-year-old child realizes that life exists in the womb of his mother, five months pregnant, how is it possible to make hon. members believe that life does really exist only after nine months of pregnancy?

● (12:10 p.m.)

I raise a fundamental question, and yet it is very seldom raised. If parliament wishes to decree that certain human beings are not human, how could a constitution guarantee