CHP CANADA

COMMUNIQUÉ

Volume 22, Issue 6 February 10, 2015

Supreme Court Usurps Powers of Parliament and Shakes its Fist at God

Rod Taylor
Leader, CHP Canada

In a trend now all too familiar, the Supreme Court of Canada, on Friday, Feb. 6, 2015, delivered another blow against parliamentary democracy and sought to establish its own opinions over the clear judgments of God, our Ruler Supreme. In a unanimous decision, the SCC threw out the law against killing the elderly, the disabled, and the depressed. If their ruling stands, doctors will be able to kill their patients upon request. They have "given" Parliament a year to write a new law...one which would accommodate the wishes of right-to-die advocates and ignore the pleadings of those who advocate for the defence of all innocent human life.

There is so much wrong with this decision, it's hard to know where to start. First, the reasoning behind it: it claims to be defending the rights of "life, liberty, and security of the person." Ending a life cannot possibly defend it. Security (usually understood as personal safety) cannot be gained by choosing certain death. Liberty to make a bad choice will soon be shown—as it has been in the suicide-friendly European Low Countries—to be nothing more than a matter of convenience for health care professionals, for restless family members of a dying patient, and for those underwriting health care costs in the early years of our Demographic Winter.

The propaganda over recent decades has haunted the aging with visions of themselves—helpless to resist—being kept artificially alive against their wishes, covered with tubes and forced to breathe and eat by cruel machines. This deliberate deception has worked its will on our busy and gullible generation. Few have been told that they already have a right to refuse treatment they don't want. The spectre of a health-care/end-of-life decision being made by a faceless number-crunching bureaucrat has not occurred to them, but that happens all too often in the precedent-setting countries that have taken this path before us. It's well-known among those who have studied the issue that in the Netherlands and Belgium, increasing numbers of "assisted suicide decisions" are made by medical staff, not by the patients nor even by their families. Media and right-to-die enthusiasts have managed to cloak this societal transition with a veneer of compassion for those suffering mentally and physically but the bottom line is an attempt to control rising health care costs.

Now we come to the crux of the matter: a Supreme Court emboldened by its successes of the past and a discernible shift in public opinion on this particular topic. Public opinion has not deterred the SCC in the past when it has ruled on abortion, prostitution, sexual orientation issues, territorial claims by Canada's aboriginal peoples, etc. In all those public battles, the SCC pushed ahead and forced changes that the people and Parliament of Canada were not prepared to choose for themselves. In the most egregious example, the Supreme Court in the 1995 Egan case, simply inserted the words "sexual orientation" into Section 15 of the Charter, thereby writing the law as they would have it, not as Parliament had passed it. From that decision evolved our current same-sex marriage laws, the enabling of gender preoccupation programs in our public schools and the foolish gender-sensitive catering now prevalent in all public institutions. That unwelcome court ruling forced a shift in public opinion, especially because Parliament lacked the courage to resist.

This case is different because the bombardment of propaganda on this issue has already softened up public opinion. In this case the Court can claim to be responding to public opinion, even though the public is still

deeply divided. Whether the tide has shifted or no, the Court has still erred—and dramatically so—by creating, through its own deliberations a "right to die." Of course, all of us will die at a day and an hour known only to God. The length of our days is in His hands—as it should be. The presumption to end a life when we choose—whether of a child in the womb or a senior in a wheelchair—is an affront to our Creator without whom we could not draw one breath or take one step. The presumption to bypass Parliament and write the laws for all Canadians (who for some reason still believe that we elect MPs to do that) shows the depth of self-deception to which frail human beings are subject, even those who sit on the bench of the highest court in the land. We value our institutions of governance: our House, our Senate, our Prime Minister and Cabinet, and our Supreme Court which, collectively, are entrusted with decision-making powers for the good of this nation and the good of all her citizens. The various institutions represented are meant to provide checks and balances against the abuse of power. That is obviously not working today. Our nation has been and is being changed—often against the will of the people—by the high-handed decisions of nine unelected judges. It is time for Parliament to fulfill its duty and exercise its use of the Notwithstanding Clause.

The political challenges are immense and the risks are evident. The majority of this nine-member Supreme Court have themselves been appointed by Mr. Harper. It is an election year and this issue is not one that any of the parties now in the House will want to debate on the campaign trail. However, a year will pass quickly and the dictates of the SCC—if not challenged—will become law by fiat. This is not a time for timid acquiescence; this is a time for the bold defence of the value and sanctity of human life and an unequivocal defence of Parliament's sole prerogative to write Canadian Law. Unless those laws are in accord with the divine law implanted in the human heart by the Supreme Lawgiver, our nation will suffer.

This also underscores the importance of the TWU law school case. Only accredited and approved lawyers will ever become judges in Canada, much less Supreme Court Justices. When Christian law school students are blocked from practicing by those already entrenched (ie. law societies in BC and Ontario) the influence of Christian morality, upon which Canadian law is based, is filtered out, leaving a smaller and less diverse pool of lawyers from which to draw future judges. This narrowing spiral—if not checked—may produce a final end-of-life decision, not only for individuals but for Canada as we have known it.

The Christian Heritage Party calls on Parliament to respond to the SCC ruling by using the Notwithstanding Clause, by invoking the Supremacy of God which is the foundation of our legal system and to re-establish public respect for the sanctity of human life. Let not our great democracy perish by judge-assisted suicide.

You will want to take action to counter this latest assault on the sanctity of human life and on the unique role of Parliament. One easy action item is to sign this petition[1]. The other thing you can do is join CHP Canada[2], if you're not already a member. Help us nominate and support candidates in 2015 who will speak for life and moral values.

Footnotes

[1] www.lifesitenews.com/petitions/stop-assisted-suicide-in-canada

[2] www.chp.ca/get-involved