

Roe vs Whom?

Vicki Gunn

Executive Director, CHP Canada

Perhaps one of the most controversial news items last week was the American leaked document around “Roe vs Wade.” News agencies reported, to a horrified world, that women’s rights were being attacked.¹

It seems unbelievable that it would create the stir it has in Canada when it’s an American law that is under discussion. Why are Canadian pro-aborts worried about an American law? Why does this leaked, judicial decision of “Roe vs Whom” affect any of us here in Canada?

Why, also, does Prime Minister Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, respond by telling Canadians that, “The right to choose is a woman’s right and a woman’s right alone,” when it’s the Supreme Court of the United States that may strike down their almost 50-year old U.S. precedent-setting legal case. This is not under the control of the Supreme Court of Canada or the Canadian government.

Does Mr. Trudeau have a vested interest in American law? Why does this American controversy cause Canadians to hit the streets with pictures of clothes hangers?

P.M. Trudeau assures us that, as Canadians, we will always be allowed to kill our own unborn children. He said, “We need to ensure that there are protections in place so that we never see people backtracking on that right [the “right” to kill the unborn].”

Of course, there never was a legal or moral right to kill your child, and there has never been a law drafted that would allow Canadian women to kill their children, but . . . we wouldn’t want that truth to get in the way of a good bit of drama for our Drama Teacher in Chief.

The pro-abort movement is now shaken because many of them have confused being equal with being the same. Men don’t have to worry about getting pregnant, so it’s not fair (they say) that women are the only ones to have to think about the consequences of sexual encounters . . . biology really is unfair.

When a child’s friend gets the latest toy and your child gets a similar, cheaper toy, we’re all quick to remind kids that “life is NOT always fair.” But, that’s kids stuff. As adults, we often expect equal outcomes rather than equal opportunities.

If I engage in casual sexual encounters then my biology should not get in the way—although it must in that only women have abortions. That’s so unfair!

In rejecting our own God-given biological makeup, we can’t help but find that everything is unfair. To be honest, I would like to be a lot younger. I have considered petitioning the Ontario government to change the date on my birth certificate. I think I’d like to self-identify as a 35 year old. Of course the wrinkles on my face belie that assertion, but it’s not fair that my biological age is more than so many people who are 35 years old. It’s just not fair!

It's also ridiculous to assert that an unborn baby is not a human. What is it? A dog? A cat? Perhaps, a horse? We are biological human beings and our progeny are biological human beings. Canadians expect that those who serve in political office are relatively intelligent, reasoning human beings. Why then does simple biology confuse so many of them? We don't expect a maple tree to create seeds for a pine tree; nor do we expect a hamster to give birth to a horse. We've got that figured out.

The real question is, "If a woman is pregnant with a baby human being, is it okay to eviscerate the baby with the callous consent of their mother because it's inconvenient, for whatever reason, to carry the child full term?"

With the real question in mind, do lawmakers have the right to permit a citizen to murder?

Well, in a society that expects equal outcomes, if it's okay to kill one human being, it's okay to kill another. After all, basing the decision to kill or not to kill on age, is ageist and, therefore, unfair. One should be able to kill anyone . . . except that's not equal outcome for the victim and the perpetrator. One is dead and the other is not.

In the same way, basing the decision on the person being inconvenient endangers our aged parents, as they may become inconvenient to the system. But, to be fair, with equal outcomes, inconvenient is inconvenient—so, we murder regardless of age OR we don't allow murder at any age.

Obviously, it's ridiculous to base the legal definition of murder on whether the victim is inconvenient or not. Yet, Canadians do that. Canadians watch a crowd of pro-aborts, who made the news, waving hangers and clamouring for convenience, which a pregnancy is not; clamouring for equality of outcome of a sexual encounter, which cannot be. (The woman may become pregnant—the man will not, no matter how much hubris is published about "gender equality").

"Wade" in "Roe vs Wade" was the State of Texas. It was not the country of Canada. "Roe vs Wade" has no legal bearing for Canadians. The outrage in Canada is based on the fear that babies will become recognized as human beings. When that happens, Canadians will be forced to look in the face of our murdered children and pretend that we didn't know that it was wrong to slaughter them. When we can't convince ourselves, how do we deal with the collective guilt that goes with this realization?

CHP Canada will be at the March for Life, in Ottawa and Victoria, on May 12 and in Toronto, on May 13. We hope to see you there.

Join the battle for life today; Join CHP Canada.²

Footnotes

¹ www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-womens-rights-are-under-attack-but-that-was-already-the-case-for/

² www.chp.ca/get-involved/