



May 1, 2016

Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights
Sixth Floor, 131 Queen Street
House of Commons
Ottawa ON K1A 0A6
Canada
E-mail: JUST@parl.gc.ca
Fax: 613-947-3089

Dear Members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights:

When it comes to justice, there is no greater issue, across generations, across cultures and across international borders than the protection of innocent human life. There is no human rights issue more poignant than the guarantee, that in civilized countries, those who are weaker—physically, mentally, emotionally or financially—shall not have their lives taken by those who are stronger in any way and who hold greater influence and power or who act on behalf of the state.

Bill C-14 has intrinsic flaws which we are counting on you to deal with in your recommendations, in order that justice and human rights may be properly protected and manifested in the laws of this great Canadian nation.

Under Bill C-14:

1. The purpose of law is distorted in that it allows some Canadians to kill other Canadians.
2. Parliament—without proper deliberation, debate or sober second thought—has allowed the Supreme Court to dictate to it a heretofore unthinkable exception to the historical protection of innocent human life. The Bill, as written, has gone even beyond the scope of the SCC judgment.
3. The lessons of world history are ignored. The atrocities of Nazi Germany in WW II began with the presumptuous declaration that there are “lives not worth living” and the first victims were the feeble, the disabled and mentally challenged. These are precisely the categories targeted by C-14. Once such killing is allowed to begin, the categories of “eligible sufferers” will inevitably be expanded, as also happened in Nazi Germany.
4. No safeguards will prevent the abuse of assisted suicide and euthanasia for: the convenience of doctors, the freeing up of hospital beds, the budgetary goals of provincial healthcare officials, the personal benefit of family members and friends or the desire of the patient to avoid becoming a “burden”.

5. The intrinsic value and worth of human life is diminished in the eyes of society. In catering to the dysfunction, disability or hopelessness of certain individuals and using the power of the state to prematurely end their lives, a greater injustice is done to society as a whole. Family survivors are deprived of their close relatives and of the shared value placed on all human life. “If his / her life can be terminated at will, why not mine?”
6. Suicide—considered almost universally as a tragedy in our society—becomes a morally neutral choice. Efforts to reduce suicide among troubled youth seem to lose their validity if suicide is accepted as a normal response to severe challenges, whether physical or mental.
7. The “slippery slope” which has followed the legalization of physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia has resulted in dire unintended consequences in every country where it has been accepted; Canada will be no different. In Belgium, for instance, 32% of patients who die by euthanasia have never given consent. Some doctors who become hardened to the pangs of conscience after repeatedly administering lethal drugs to their patients will lose their moral judgment and begin to make decisions for their patients without their consent and will be subject to family influence, the shortage of hospital beds and budgetary concerns.

As clearly pointed out in the ARPA (Association for Reformed Political Action) brief, Parliament has other legitimate choices besides creating flawed legislation allowing doctors to kill their patients:

- **New legislation should be written to replace C-14. (ARPA has already provided a model). This legislation should clearly state that it remains illegal in Canada to counsel or assist any person to commit suicide and / or to administer a lethal drug or process designed to take the life of any person, regardless of that person’s desire or consent. The purpose of this law is to protect and preserve ALL innocent human life, not only those considered “vulnerable”.**
- **If insufficient time exists to pass such legislation prior to the expiration of the Supreme Court’s extended time-frame, Parliament should exercise the Notwithstanding Clause to gain 5 years’ time for proper deliberation and discussion.**

Thank you for your consideration,



Rod Taylor
National Leader, CHP Canada
(Christian Heritage Party of Canada)
Box 724, Telkwa, BC V0J 2X0
250-846-5432
leader@chp.ca