

*Criminal Code*

but there are still many things to be said, and certain statements, I think, deserve to be taken up.

The members of the house must make a decision heavy with consequences because, by broadening the legislation on abortion, people will be allowed to play with lives which do not belong to them.

The broadening of the legislation on abortion is construed by the public, at least by some people, in very different ways. Many people send us comments, letters, petitions or newspaper clippings to express their opposition to this abortion law. Some people through the party in office, have spread the word, that the government law on abortion would allow abortions on request.

This is why I think that we must act, as legislators, with all possible care, in order to avoid all the mistakes that could be made in relation to the legislation on abortion.

We believe that every human being has the right to live, unless he loses it through his behaviour, but I do not feel the foetus is an aggressor. It is possible to plead self-defence at times, but in the case of the foetus, this does not apply; to my mind, there is no question of the foetus, on his own, attacking the life of the one who carries it.

Others have proved before me, in spite of the faulty interpretation given in the Criminal Code, that life starts at the time of conception.

According to the evidence given, both before the committee of justice and legal affairs and the committee on health, welfare and social affairs, highly qualified doctors have proved, beyond doubt, that life starts upon conception.

God has willed that two human beings unite to perpetuate creation, and whether or not there will be life is decided at the time of this union. As Pope John XXIII said, and I quote:

—that human life is sacred...from its very start, it directly involves the creative action of God.

Life is sacred and must be respected from the start, from conception on.

Dr. Houdré states, and I quote:

—man and woman create the child; one and the other provide, at the start, a very small mass of protoplasm that contains the potential of a being perpetuating the species and is endowed with the particular characteristics inherited from the father and mother.

This is further proof that life starts upon conception, that from that moment on, it must be respected.

Clause 18 of Bill C-150, wants to add to the act "...endanger her life or health"; abortion would then be permitted. That is the vexing point, for the "health" of an unmarried or married mother can be construed in a very broad manner, and this could lead to all sort of abuses. Should we kill a living being, even if it is still in the womb of his mother, when very often it would only meet the whims of a woman for whom pleasure is the sole rule of conduct?

In the report of the debate of the committee of health and welfare page 867, No. 24, we can find the evidence of the President of the society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Man; Mrs. Sally-Ann Kerman. We know that unfortunately, all too often, in the case of mothers who are asking for abortion, the child is unwanted. This is what Mrs. Sally-Ann Kerman had to say in that connection:

As for the unwanted children of women who feel they must have the "right" to their body—

—as was saying, a few months ago, Lise Payette, on C.B.C., as she claimed a right to the free use of her body, we must understand however that another being has some rights too.

To come back to the quotation:

—I can only say that precious few of us here today did not become conceived because of planned parenthood. We all sort of "grew" on our parents as the first nine months of our development took place and by the time we arrived, everyone was adjusted to our existence. As a woman, I resent the use of the "right" when describing my body. I have the right to be my body unless I wish to destroy it, or tell someone how to dispose of it before or after death, or sell it for material gain. Now unless you propose to legalize suicide, euthanasia, or prostitution, do not tell me legalized abortion will give a woman the "right" to her body. I do not have to have unwanted children because in the affluent society I live in, birth control is my answer. I pay for my birth control methods, but the welfare recipients do not, and so even the non-affluent in our society do not have to have unwanted children.

Should birth control fail—and it is now 98 per cent effective—I do not think that legalizing abortion for the failures is enough reason to liberally destroy many humans, some of whom will benefit society. I do not want to go into the discussion of some of the world's famous "bastards" or people who have come up from the most impossible environments. We all know they exist, just as we all know there are hundreds that do not do anything but remain a blight to our society. Unless we are willing to murder the ones we have already established as "unnecessary" or "criminal", why pick on innocent unborn ones. I don't think we would have much use for social workers if we could solve all the world's problems with legalized abortion.