

*Right of Life*

phenomenon of what I call a new evil: the development of chemical abortifacients. I quote:

It is speculated that with the use of an oral abortifacient, the woman undergoing the killing of a new person within her uterus will not experience the guilt attendant upon the majority of surgical abortions. This is true insofar as she "will not be sure" if she has conceived, at what gestation age the baby was, nor exactly when she aborts the baby.

Such an abortion inducing drug may be marketed in France within a year. Will it be as easy now for a mother to abort a child as it is to cure a headache with an aspirin?

If we, together, can build a reasonable case for the belief that a child is human from conception; if we can bolster it with scientific evidence; if we can, over time, secure the attention of the medical profession, the courts, and certainly the politicians, and the people, I believe our argument will then prevail.

We must argue that this child—this foetus—is not the same person as the mother, that it is not part of the mother. He or she is a genetically unique being, totally dependent on the mother for a while, but possessed of the potential to become as strong and healthy and prosperous as any of us here today.

Let me make one last important point. We who support this position have a duty to put an end to the unwholesome practices of a society which condemns the unwed mother. This is the attitude that I believe led to the proliferation of illegal abortion which caused our law to be changed in the first place. I believe that any pregnant woman who has the courage to take her child to term deserves our full support as politicians, whether she keeps it or gives it up to the thousands of adoptive parents whose homes are warm and waiting. The child merits the concern and protection of society, regardless of the circumstances of conception and birth.

When life is granted and when life is produced, it is then that pro lifers must be at their most active, to replace rhetoric with dollars and helping hands to ensure that this life can be lived in conditions of decency and love, with basic needs satisfied. Otherwise, we receive the label of being hypocrites and do-gooders.

I believe there is a tremendous role for the church to play today. What an opportunity to reach out to bewildered, hurting people. It is not enough for the church to condemn and criticize, we need to offer a positive alternative to aborting babies. The church family can reach out today in love and sympathy to unwed pregnant women, assisting in every way possible.

If we can provide homes and ensure profitable lives for the infants who today are being aborted, then we can assure Canadians that every child born in this country can indeed be a wanted child.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Parry:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry) on a point of order.

**Mr. Parry:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the obvious discrepancy between the two bills, the one in English and the one in French as printed in the Projected Order of Business. I should like to know whether the amendment is in order when it is only presented in English. It is obvious, when referring to the French text, that the substance of the amendment is already included in the motion which means that there are two texts for the same motion under consideration, one in English and one in French which are different.

● (1750)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Chair does realize that the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry) has a very valid point, and I will reserve on it for the time being, the amendment having been presented in the way it has. I think all Hon. Members can at this point continue with the debate and the next time the Bill comes up for debate, the Chair, with the help which has been given by all Hon. Members, will be able to rule on the discrepancy between the French version and the English version of the main motion.

**Mr. Althouse:** I wonder if you could indicate to the House what your position will be with regard to the Speaker's list. You have indicated we are now speaking on the amendment. In the event it is determined that the amendment was not in fact a necessity, that it was simply a printing error, will those Hon. Members have an opportunity to speak to the main motion, if they have already spoken to the amendment—even though the amendment was improperly put?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Chair does not see this as a printing error at all. Therefore, anyone who has spoken on the main motion can speak again. There is no problem. We will reserve on that point, but anyone who wants to speak again has the possibility to do so.

**Mr. John Gormley (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Madam Speaker, I want to address a few words on the amendment and on the motion by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges), as well. I think it will come as no surprise to Hon. Members of the House that I agree in both principle and in practice with the motion which has been proposed. I extend my congratulations to the Hon. Member for his courage and perseverance in moving the motion.

The particular amendment suggested is, in my opinion, strictly a technical amendment which will introduce the word "human" to clarify that the motion does indeed deal with "human beings", and in so doing comply with the French version.

It is more significant than simply an amendment that the word "human" is dealt with because of the general thrust of the motion that the Government should consider the advisability of protecting the human foetus along with the human being