

In examining the role of doctors in today's debate over the legalisation of euthanasia and assisted suicide, it is prudent to review the historical record. I believe that there are helpful lessons from the events—as early as 1920 when Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche published their misguided theories—that led up to the Jewish Holocaust. A Jewish leader has pointed out that (<http://pjsaunders.blogspot.ca/2015/01/the-nazi-holocaust-lets-not-forget.html>):

“It's now a well-known [cliché] that the Holocaust didn't begin in Auschwitz, it ended in Auschwitz.”

“In terms of principle, it began with the belief that some lives are not worth as much as others, and that is precisely what we are faced with here.”

The article cited goes on to say (with my emphasis added):

What ended in the 1940s in the gas chambers of Auschwitz, Dachau and Treblinka had much more humble beginnings in the 1930s in nursing homes, geriatric hospitals and psychiatric institutions all over Germany.

...

With the advantage of hindsight we are understandably amazed that the German people and especially the German medical profession were fooled into accepting it. The judgement of the War Crimes Tribunal in 1949 as to how they were fooled was as follows.

“Had the profession taken a strong stand against the mass killing of sick Germans before the war, it is conceivable that the entire idea and technique of death factories for genocide would not have materialized...but far from opposing the Nazi state militantly, part of the medical profession co-operated consciously and even willingly, while the remainder acquiesced in silence. Therefore our regretful but inevitable judgement must be that the responsibility for the inhumane perpetrations of Dr Brandt [(pictured left)]...and others, rests in large measure upon the bulk of the medical profession; because the profession without vigorous protest, permitted itself to be ruled by such men.” (War Crimes Tribunal.

'Doctors of Infamy'. 1948)

[Related thought for reflection, pertinent to this message, from the above: This was merely a human court, which pales in comparison to divine judgement (i.e., we will one day be accountable to the One Who can destroy both body and soul)].

History thus suggests that the acquiescence—through silence—of medical doctors of that time was one of the key factors which led to the atrocities of the Nazi regime. I put forward to the medical doctors of our time that this presents a valuable lesson, for:

“Those who do not learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to repeat them.”

~ Attributed to George Santayana (1863-1952) with variations of the wording by Edmund Burke (1729-1797), and Lord Acton (1834-1902).

Nearly a century later, I believe that physicians should reflect on how similar today's circumstances are in the wake of the Supreme Court of Canada February 6, 2015 ruling

in *Carter*. This despotic ruling is attempting to turn our world upside down by setting individual rights and personal autonomy over and above the common good, which has been upheld from tradition. I consider it despotic for a number of reasons; but, primarily, because it sets a deadline of one year for Parliament to enact legislation that the Supreme Court has decreed to be necessary. Is this timeline reasonable when we find ourselves less than one year away from the fixed-date election in 2015 (requiring passage of a bill not only by the House of Commons, but by the Senate as well; moreover, compounded by the complex and controversial nature of the subject matter) [<http://www.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/compilations/ProvinceTerritory/ProvincialFixedElections.aspx>]? The unsoundness of such a decree casts doubt on the reasoning used by the Supreme Court judges in their deliberation of the *Carter* case.

As explained in the quote that follows, three High Court justices in the United Kingdom provide the prudent approach for a democracy. It's a shame our judges didn't follow their example (Tony Nicklinson and Martin cases, 2012; <http://www.christianconcern.com/our-concerns/end-of-life/law-unchanged-by-supreme-court-judgment-on-end-of-life-cases>):

Five of the nine justices concluded that the Supreme Court had the "constitutional authority" to declare that the current law was in breach of Article 8, but only Lady Hale and Lord Kerr were in favour of making a declaration of incompatibility in today's ruling. The remaining three justices had different views on why such a declaration should not be made now, including the view that it was for Parliament - not the courts - to change the law in this area.

As our neighbours to the south of us have pointed out in regard to their Declaration of Independence/Constitution/Bill of Rights, such documents are only as good as the people who oversee their just interpretation. The 19th-century British historian, Lord Acton, made an observation that seems applicable for the Supreme Court of Canada ruling of February 6, 2015:

"Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

This substantiates the rationale for having a democracy in which power is vested by the people in elected representatives. As recently as 2010, our Parliament has clearly indicated (Bill C-384 voting was 228 to 59) that it rejects legalising euthanasia and assisted suicide in order to uphold the common good by protecting vulnerable people from our ever-expanding "culture" of death. When people focus only on the ends of relieving extreme suffering or a serious misery that life presents, a solution of killing the afflicted human beings may appear to be logically appropriate, but that is not the whole picture. Will physicians remain silent and comply with implementing the new world order that the Supreme Court of Canada is attempting to impose as was the case during the totalitarian regime in Nazi Germany?

In a discussion on conscience rights—as the medical profession is deliberating, or about to deliberate, under the described circumstances—it is necessary to reflect on the importance of having a formed conscience. This naturally leads to bringing God into the picture ...doesn't it? It is precisely in Christ that the medical profession can find the solution to the present dilemma.

I have been wondering why the medical profession, as a whole—going back to when the abortion dilemma began—hasn't provided true leadership on the crucial issues related to human life (having been esteemed for their professional ethics—didn't this stem from the consistency provided by swearing allegiance to the Hippocratic Oath?). After all, the human body contains so many signs and wonders that reflect the genius of our Creator (Psalm 139:14, "fearfully and wonderfully made"). Specifically, the miraculous, built-in healing capability of the human body should, in my estimation, lead doctors to an awe and reverence for our Creator (therefore, respecting the sanctity of human life that He commands; in this regard, I invite you to examine the citations in the corresponding file sent as an attachment), and to proclaim the glory of God. Is it being taken for granted? Isn't the medical profession inestimably indebted to God for this?

With the greater knowledge physicians possess, it follows that there should be an associated affinity for showing leadership. Has intellectual pride prevented too many physicians from studying and living out God's instructions that have been revealed in the Holy Bible? Alternatively, has secularised society—which ridicules growing in the knowledge of God and His laws—made inroads into the medical profession (the corresponding file in the attachments speaks on the said topic)? Are these the explanations as to why the medical profession, as a whole, is hesitant to uphold the long-standing principle of "do no harm"? This is obviously the fundamental reason that patients entrust themselves to their doctor. My heart is saddened that I don't see evidence of the medical profession—as a unified body—having the courage to stand by this principle, which has underpinned the integrity of medical doctors all the years since they swore allegiance to the Hippocratic Oath.

Once again personal autonomy appears set to trump the common good—in this instance, in the realm of the medical profession. The Holy Bible makes it clear that God calls us to protect the common good (revealed primarily through the command to love our neighbour, but also inherently from His Triune nature that calls us to live in community). What is your medical opinion here: isn't a healthy society (the medical bodies being an important part of it) one that concerns itself with the common good? This diagnosis calls for standing for truth rather than going along with what is popular. The persons who are susceptible to committing suicide are counting on the medical profession to provide support to overcome their misunderstanding of life that has befallen them; while the persons experiencing intractable pain need the medical profession to develop and apply its knowledge of palliative care.

In the matter of human dignity, which has a wide range of meaning (I'm led to believe that the sublime dignity given to each person by God—which is the basis for respecting the sanctity of human life—takes precedence), I refer you to a Scottish gentleman who appears to have a good grasp of it (<http://www.scotsman.com/news/assisted-suicide-is-an-assault-on-dignity-1-3680550>). While some cases may appear overwhelming, life experiences have taught me to make the extrapolation that if doctors put their trust in the Lord (with the aid of prayer), God's grace can act through their medical skills to adequately resolve the most difficult disorders in health. It takes no skill to speak of to end a life (concurrently, doing this is a complete misunderstanding of what compassion means), but it certainly requires much to bring a living being out of a difficult physical health condition. May you

strive to use your medical knowledge and skills, with God's help, to live up to this challenge.

Sincerely,

[Do not be afraid](#) [Isaiah 41:10,13; 43:1-2]. [Open, I say open wide the doors for Christ.](#)

~ St. (Pope) John Paul II (1920-2005) began his pontificate on October 22, 1978 with these words.

A thought for our time: **Many people have one way communication with God because they don't read** [Acts 17:11; cf. Psalm 1:2, Proverbs 7:1-3, Hosea 4:6, Matthew 22:29, Luke 24:27,45; Acts 2:42 (could the sequential activities differentiated here be in a successive, prerequisite order for effectiveness of individual prayer?—cf. Catechism of the Catholic Church par. no. 2624); 2 Timothy 2:15, 3:16-17], **or study** (with the help of Biblical scholars as per Acts 8:31; cf. 2 Timothy 3:15; 2 Peter 3:16) **the Holy Bible (the Word of God) on a daily basis whereupon He speaks to us** (Matthew 17:5, Mark 9:7, Luke 9:35; cf. John 2:5), **and through which we learn obedience (as the Lord Jesus modelled for us)** [cf. John 8:31, 14:23; 1 John 2:5-6]. *As Saint Augustine puts it: "...When you read the Bible, God speaks to you; when you pray, you speak to God".* [Reference 292, quoted from *Verbum Domini*, the Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation by Pope Benedict XVI issued on September 30th, the Memorial of St. Jerome, in the year of our Lord 2010]. The Church "forcefully and specially exhorts all the Christian faithful...to learn 'the surpassing knowledge of Jesus Christ' (Philippians 3:8)" [cf. Ephesians 3:19] through prayerful reading of divine Scriptures (CCC par. no. 133, 2653; cf. 1792). Notably, misunderstanding of the Holy Bible occurs with the wrong approach, which lacks reverence and humility (cf. CCC par. no. 299).

A commentary on marriage: **God instituted marriage with Adam and Eve** [Genesis 2:20-25; affirmed by the Lord Jesus in Matthew 19:4-6. Interestingly enough, the KJV uses "a help meet (suitable/fit) for him" in Genesis 2:20. An accompanying, slightly facetious interpretation has been suggested, associated with "opposite", in the divergent case of the woman helping her husband by opposing him when he falls prone to acting as if he thinks that he's God], **exceptionally sanctified it with the Blessed Virgin Mary's betrothal to Joseph** (in the culture at the time of our Saviour's birth, betrothal was equivalent to marriage such that infidelity was considered adultery as Matthew 1:19 alludes to with the consideration of issuing a certificate of divorce), **foster father of our Lord Jesus** (Luke 1:26-28 and Matthew 1:18-21); **and underscored its special role in life by having the first miracle take place at the wedding in Cana** (John 2:1-11). **In the broader context, it could be said that the Holy Bible begins (Genesis 1:26-28, 2:7,18-25)[preceding the first sin] and ends (Revelation 21, 22:17) with the subject of marriage. Moreover, the first miracle at Cana initiated the public ministry of the Lord Jesus. Notably, at that wedding, the Mother of God (of the Lord Jesus) gave us the advice of a lifetime** (John 2:5; cf. Deuteronomy 18:18-19, John 1:45, 4:25-26, 6:14; Acts 3:22-23, 7:37): **Do whatever He tells you** [which can be primarily understood through His Word recorded in the Scriptures]. The Catholic Church's teaching on matrimony (which of course is based on the revelation from Sacred Scripture) is provided primarily in par. nos. 1601 to 1666 in the Catechism (of 1994). Nonetheless, in the age of grace that we are living in, it is possible for a single person to live a life of chastity wholly committed to our Lord Jesus Christ (as an alternative to marriage; taking note of 1 Corinthians 7:32-34), through the power of the Holy Spirit dwelling within believers (inspired by the examples of the Lord Jesus and His Blessed Mother). Yet, how many individuals point out the latter possibility to children and young people? I suspect most people—especially parents when speaking to their children—emphasise the former [of course, this could be what God intended in view of His command in Genesis 35:11 (cf. Genesis 1:28, 9:1); although, it may be of relevance to recognise that the command was given to the Israelites]. **Applying the instruction from Deuteronomy 4:9, 6:5-9,20-25; 11:18-20** (cf. Joshua 1:8, Psalm 1:2, 78:3-7; Proverbs 4:20-27, 7:1-3) **to our day intimates that one of the main responsibilities of parents is to teach the Word of God to their children** (with corresponding implications to the parents about their personal knowledge of the Holy Bible from these citations and the directive from **1 Peter 3:15**). Hebrews 13:4 gives a warning to guard oneself from falling prey to fornication and homosexual relationships as our present day secularised society accepts and widely promotes (fornication and homosexuality need to be judged primarily in light of God's revelation on marriage).

SPEAK THE TRUTH IN LOVE WITH CHARITY IN DEED (cf. 1 John 3:18).

In conjunction with presenting the foregoing citations [evolving from the study of the Holy Bible with Biblical scholars since October 2004; primarily from the posthumous Internet broadcasts of recordings made by the late Fr. Al Lauer (1947-2002) aired on Presentation Ministries' website (<http://www.presentationministries.com/dbread/dbread.asp>), and Dr. J. Vernon McGee (1904-1988) on Thru the Bible Radio Network (<http://www.ttb.org>)—the latter requiring setting aside Protestant views which are at odds with the teachings of the Catholic Church], the writer discloses being a Biblical novice without any formal training in the Scriptures; accordingly, no claim to have any exceptional knowledge of Sacred Scripture is being suggested, or implied (consider paragraph numbers 91 to 95 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church). The Biblical viewpoint on the topics herein is brought forth not only to convey its invaluable instruction and relevance (with this light, one has some trepidation for the higher level of responsibility and accountability implied from Mark 4:11), but also to acknowledge the importance of the Holy Bible as a guide in the daily life of every person (which all too often is neglected). The reader is advised to seek the guidance of recognised authorities on Sacred Scripture to implement this effectively. For Catholics, the accurate interpretation of Sacred Scripture, as it evolves in the life of the Church under the guidance of Tradition, ultimately rests with the teaching authority of the Catholic Church as exercised by the Magisterium. For clarification, the writer holds no authorisation to speak on behalf of the Catholic Church.

Biblical Citations Proscribing Euthanasia

The following citations from the Holy Bible are suggested to be speaking—in varying degrees—to the specified topics concerning euthanasia.ⁱ

- 1.1 The sacredness of human life: human beings are created in the image of God [Genesis 1:26-27; cf. **Genesis 9:5-6**, Matthew 10:29-31]. This mystery imbues every human being with a God-given dignity which calls forth a respect for that life in all its stages, circumstances and states.
- 1.2 God is the source and author of life; correspondingly, He deems the length of our earthly sojourn [Exodus 4:11, **1Samuel 2:6**, Psalm 100:3, **139:13-16**; Ecclesiastes 3:1-2, 11:5 (caution is urged with taking the passages of this book out of their context, which centres on life "under the sun": the philosophy of man living life apart from God. Its author, presumably Solomon—when he was out of fellowship with God—tells us that "all is vanity" in such a predicament); Isaiah 44:24, 45:12, **64:8**; Jeremiah 1:5, Ezekiel 18:4,32; **Matthew 10:28**; cf. Ephesians 1:3-4, **2Timothy 1:10**].
- 1.3 Proscription against murder—the obvious implication worthwhile emphasising is that it applies toward *all* human beings in every stage and state of life [**Genesis 9:5-6**, **Exodus 20:1,13**, 21:12-14 (cf. **Numbers 35:9-33**); Leviticus 24:17-21 (cf. Exodus 21:20 regarding the significance of ownership, which is possibly given to enable recognising the sovereignty and sole discretion over life and death held by the Creator—as underscored in Matthew 10:28; cf. Job 12:10. Note also that the Mosaic Law must be viewed in light of the higher standard set with the New Testament commands given by the Lord Jesus.), **Deuteronomy 5:5,17**, **27:25**; **Proverbs 6:16-19**].
- 1.4 Other citations worthwhile examining in regard to the dignity and worth of human beings according to God [Psalm 22:9-11, **27:10**, 71:5-6, **116:15**; **Isaiah 46:3-4**, **2Corinthians 4:7**; cf. 1Corinthians 1:27-29].
- 1.5 **Obedience to God** (as always, *the* best choice) **versus choosing euthanasia** [**Genesis 9:5-7**, Exodus 1:17, 23:7; **Deuteronomy 30:19-20**, Proverbs 12:15 (cf. Proverbs 3:7-8), **24:11-12**; **Isaiah 29:15-16**, **45:9-12**; **Ezekiel 18:32**, Luke 1:38, **Romans 9:20-21**, **1Corinthians 6:19-20** (cf. **1Corinthians 3:16-17**), **Hebrews 4:13**, 1Peter 2:20].
- 1.6 We are urged to persevere [Deuteronomy 31:6,8; **Matthew 11:28-30**, John 16:33 (cf. Philippians 4:7), **Romans 5:3-5**, 1Corinthians 13:4-7, **2Corinthians 4:16-18**, **12:8-10**; Philippians 4:11-13,19; **Hebrews 9:27-28**, **10:36-39**, **12:1-2**; **James 1:2-6**, 5:11 (cf. Job 1:20-21, 2:10)].
- 1.7 God's unfathomable love for human beings (while alluding to the degree of susceptibility to weaknesses or failures that a person can fall prey to) [**Psalm 23:4**, **51:5-10**; **Proverbs 8:35-36** (explains the origin of a "culture of death"; **gives the remedy as well**), Isaiah 49:15-16, 54:9-10; **John 16:33**, **Romans 8:35-39**, **2Corinthians 7:10**, Galatians 1:13-16 (cf. 1Timothy 1:15-17)]. Psalm 103:15-16 helps put things into perspective; yet, the Lord has compassion for us (Psalm 103:11-14,17-18).

- 1.8 The basis to continue with life even in the midst of suffering, rejection or dejection: we are all called to be children of God [John 1:12-13; cf. 1John 5:1-2] through our adoption made possible by the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ [**Romans 8:12-18,22-25**; Galatians 4:4-7, Ephesians 1:5-8].
- 1.9 Healing is possible through prayer in faith (though consideration needs to be given to the response the Lord gave in 2Corinthians 12:8-9a) [**Exodus 15:26, 2Kings 20:5-7** (cf. 2Chronicles 32:24), Psalm 6:1-3, 41:3-4; **Sirach 38:9-15** (cf. 2Chronicles 16:12, Isaiah 38:4-9,21), Matthew 8:10,13,16-17, 9:2-7, 15:28; Mark 16:15-18 (cf. **John 14:12**), **James 5:14-16**]. The Old Testament belief was that sickness and infirmity are the result of sin (e.g., as inferred from Exodus 15:26, Psalm 41:4, and Sirach 38:9-11)—one's own, or that of one's ancestors (Deuteronomy 5:9; cf. v.10) [Mark 2:5-12, John 5:14, 9:2 (cf. Exodus 20:5-6, Ezekiel 18:20); **1Corinthians 11:29-32**, James 5:16a]. However, the Lord Jesus' teachings make it clear that sin does not have sickness or infirmity associated with it as an outcome in every case (**John 9:1-3**; cf. Luke 13:1-5, 1Peter 2:20). God sometimes uses sickness to teach us something, or He may have different purposes for it. In addition, there is the (bewildering) possibility that other consequences can result from sin (instead of sickness, or infirmity).
- 1.10 Standing idly by as fellow human beings—our neighbours—are being put to death through euthanasia [**Leviticus 19:16-18**, Matthew 19:18-19, 22:37-39; Mark 12:30-31; cf. **Luke 10:30-37**; pertinent for persons in positions of authority are 2Samuel 23:3-4, 2Chronicles 19:6-7 and **Proverbs 24:11-12**]. **Proverbs 31:8-9** (cf. 1Timothy 5:20) directs us to speak up on behalf of all human life. The image of a watchman for the people of Israel in the Old Testament (**Ezekiel 3:16-21, 33:1-11**; cf. Leviticus 19:17, Isaiah 58:1, Ezekiel 2:3-5, James 5:19) can be applied to the Christian of today (Matthew 18:15-17, Luke 17:3-4, Galatians 6:1,9; cf. Sirach 19:12-13, 1Corinthians 10:12-13). We're called to protect (Psalm 82:3-4, Ezekiel 34:4, Acts 20:35, 1Thessalonians 5:14) and rebuke when necessary (Luke 17:3, Ephesians 5:11, 2Timothy 4:2, Titus 1:9,13, 2:15; cf. Isaiah 1:15-17); speaking the truth in love (Ephesians 4:15).

In the chance that there remains any doubt in a person's mind for accepting the universal truth of the sacred value of all human life one should pause for further reflection on the compassion God has for both the orphan and the widow, as well as the oppressed, neglected, or helpless of humanity (thus even as sinners, we can all have hope as per **2Peter 3:9**) [Exodus 22:21-23, **Deuteronomy 10:17-18, 15:11** (cf. Matthew 26:11, Mark 14:7, John 12:8); **Psalm 34:18, 72:12-14, 145:8-9, 146:6-9**; Ezekiel 18:7 (versus v. 12),16 (cf. Isaiah 1:17,23; Jeremiah 5:28, Ezekiel 16:49); Luke 4:18, 7:22 (cf. Isaiah 61:1); cf. Matthew 25:44-45, Luke 9:48].

Life is a mixture of joys (Sirach 40:12-27) and miseries (Sirach 40:1-11, 41:1-4), but through it all God values every human being (Matthew 18:12-14; cf. 2Peter 3:9). If the Lord Jesus is concerned about flowers (Matthew 6:28-30) and birds (Luke 12:6-7), how much more does He care about you and I. The “culture of death” preys upon people’s fear of death, but Christians (Acts 11:26) find comfort in the Lord Jesus’ victory over death (Isaiah 28:15, 1Corinthians 15:54-57, Hebrews 2:14-15; cf. Matthew 7:15, 9:36). Apparently, the Holy Bible tells us not to fear 365 times, once for each day of the year. The late Pope John Paul II (1920-2005) not only gave a personal witness to enduring adverse physical conditions (near the end of his life when Parkinson’s disease had significantly impaired carrying out the duties of his papacy), but frequently spoke out against the “culture of death” by telling us: *Do not be afraid*

[Isaiah 41:10,13; 43:1-2 (citations added herein)]. *Open, I say open wide the doors for Christ.* [St. John Paul II (canonised on April 27, 2014) began his pontificate with these words on October 22, 1978].

The caterpillar, through the miracle of metamorphosis, turns into a beautiful butterfly and thus, no doubt, gives a vivid picture of the wondrous transformation of the believer that takes place in passing from death (earthly or bodily death, as opposed to the second death of Revelation 20:14, 21:8; cf. Matthew 5:29-30, Mark 9:43-48) to life eternal in Christ. We need only to turn to the Lord for help in times of need (Matthew 7:8) rather than desperate means like euthanasia or assisted suicide (Psalm 27:1, 145:18; **Proverbs 14:12**; Romans 8:31; cf. Matthew 11:28-30). The Lord Jesus laid down His life for us so that we can become adopted children of God (Romans 8:15-16); as such, we have a sublime dignity that is independent of earthly circumstances. As His children, God calls us to live godly lives obedient to His ways (John 13:34-35; 15:10,12-14,17; Ephesians 1:7-10, 3:4-5,8-12; cf. Proverbs 3:5-6, Isaiah 55:1-9). Thus, we can be confident that in the magnanimous love of God, He has a tender spot for the human being who is suffering through dire circumstances (2Corinthians 1:3-4; cf. Isaiah 49:15, 66:13).

Although we may not realise it at the time, God (cf. 1Samuel 16:7, Proverbs 17:3, Jeremiah 12:3a, 17:10, 20:12a; of course, also noting James 1:13-14) always has a purpose in testing (of our faith) and trials (e.g., through suffering). Consider **Deuteronomy 13:3-4** ("hold fast to him", NIV), Judith 8:25-27, **Jeremiah 17:9-10** (cf. Psalm 51:10, **Ezekiel 36:26-27**) and Hebrews 12:5-11; also, the testing of the Lord Jesus (Matthew 4:1-11, Mark 1:12-13, Luke 4:1-13; Matthew 26:36-46, Mark 14:32-42, Luke 22:39-46) Who modelled the attitude for us to hold towards our Heavenly Father: "not as I will, but as You will." The faith of the Blessed Virgin Mary and St. Joseph was tested (Luke 2:1-7, 2:25-35; Matthew 2:13-23, Luke 2:41-50). Similarly, we will undoubtedly be tested in our lives; accordingly, may we be able to respond afterward in like manner to our Blessed Mother in Christ as described so eloquently by St. Luke (Luke 2:19,51). We need to trust in God rather than rely on our intelligence apart from God (**Psalm 34:8**, 118:8; **Proverbs 3:5-8, 16:20,25**; Isaiah 50:10-11, 53:6); accordingly, we "surrender our intellect to faith" [cf. Ephesians 3:19; 1994 Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) 155 & 157]. Our trouble is never an end in itself. If we accept the suffering that God purposes (albeit, during our earthly sojourn, we may not understand why; cf. Psalm 139:23-24), and strive to endure it, one can even experience joy—not in the suffering itself, but in going through the trial (**James 1:2-4,12**; cf. vv. **13-14**). Suffering can be willingly offered up to God to obtain mercy, and also for the benefit of others as per **Colossians 1:24** (cf. CCC 618); cf. 2Corinthians 1:5, 4:8-11; **Philippians 1:29, 3:10-11**; 2Thessalonians 1:4-12; **1Peter 4** (especially vv. **12-14,19**). One of the most strikingly profound statements (even more so in that it is often cited as the shortest verse in the Holy Bible) related to suffering might be: "Jesus wept." (John 11:35; cf. Luke 19:41, Hebrews 4:15).

ⁱ In conjunction with presenting these citations (emanating from the study of the Holy Bible that has been aided by guidance from Biblical scholars since October 2004), the writer discloses being a Biblical novice without any formal training in the Scriptures; accordingly, no claim to have any exceptional knowledge of Sacred Scripture is being suggested, or implied. The Biblical viewpoint on euthanasia is brought forth to acknowledge the importance of the Holy Bible as a guide in the daily life of every person (Acts 17:11; cf. Psalm 1:2, Proverbs 7:1-3, Hosea 4:6, Matthew 22:29, Luke 24:27,45; Acts 2:42, 2Timothy 2:15, 3:16-17), and particularly those in the sphere of jurisprudence. The reader is advised to seek the guidance of recognised authorities on Sacred Scripture to implement this effectively.

WALKING IN CHRIST DURING THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY (Exposing the BIG LIE of Secularists)

When reflecting on the nation of Canada today, one is struck by how hostile it has become towards people of the Christian faith. Why so when it was Christians who, in living out that faith, founded our nation? Canadian people on the whole have chosen secular values that—on the surface—seem well-suited to a modern, technologically advanced society. Yet, how has this radical turnabout actually occurred?

There is sufficient evidence that the spiritual malaise of our nation has its origin—for the most part—traced to a huge misconception which is related (as one would expect) to the Christian call for applying the truths of faith: not only in one's private life, but in living them out in the broader world as well. To explain this, we need to go back in time to the beginnings of our modern form of government by examining the lives of the then-ruling political leaders and their perspectives.

We can start by looking at the Canadian Parliament buildings. How many citizens of our nation are aware that there are numerous scriptural references engraved onto these buildings and etched into their window panes?¹ What is the reality behind these pieces of factual proofs of faith? It is reasonable to speculate that the Scriptures were commonly and highly valued; not only by the political leaders on the whole, but by the people of the nation whom they represented. To substantiate this conclusion, I urge you to examine for yourself the individual lives of some of these people;² as well as those of our neighbour to the south of us.

At the root of the trend towards secularisation in the political realm; concurrently, the phenomenon of judicial activism in Canada today is the influence of the perspectives from our neighbouring nation concerning matters of faith. The misconception regarding the intention of the authors of the Declaration of Independence/Constitution/Bill of Rights in the United States of America to bring about the separation of Church and State has filtered its way into the perceptions of political leaders and the judiciary in Canada.³ The deceptions repeatedly put forth in regard to this misconception were eventually regarded as being factual.

Reliable reports from the USA point out the flaw in the interpretation that separation was intended to mean the removal of God and expressions of the Christian faith from the public sphere. This type of interpretation seems to have developed as early as the US Supreme Court ruling of 1947 (*Everson v. Board of Education*), but such a notion is unfounded in reality. If the reader is unconvinced of this conclusion, I would urge an examination of the lives of the founding fathers of the United States of America (e.g., via compact disc recordings by David Barton⁴).⁵ The actuality suggested in the reports is that the importance of faith in their lives, and the lives of people of their time, was much more commonly held than today and was likely seen as a given. The founders of the United States of America looked to the Holy Bible as a blueprint for their lives. Thus the idea that they wished to separate their beliefs of faith from their public duties is not compatible with these circumstances.

The more reasonable explanation offered in the reports is that the authors of the USA's constitution sought religious liberty. They wanted to ensure that no one

religion (one specific denomination) would be enshrined in law as the religion of their nation.⁶ An understanding of faith coupled with common sense and reason affirm such a conclusion. Evidence of bearing witness to their faith in their public duties on the part of political leaders of that time is presented which unquestionably substantiates the proposed viewpoint. Their testimony of faith should be examined and looked to as an example for the people of today. Their example urges our leaders not to “check” (i.e., set aside) their consciences at the doors to the House of Commons, the Senate, and the judges’ chambers in Canada.

Our nation’s leaders have lost their way to the extent that our present political system is no longer fulfilling its mandate (largely in regard to upholding the common good). It seems this is the result of two phenomena operating independently (though it is conceivable that one influenced the initiation of the other, and each then fuelled one another’s advancement) that have grown over time to take on a harmfully excessive prominence in the governance of our nation: **over-dominant political partisanship** (which stifles the expression of individual beliefs of conscience and its indispensable guidance—political parties were first legislatively recognised by the *Canada Elections Act* in 1970) and **runaway judicial activism** (that originated with the introduction of the *Charter* in 1982⁷ and has been taken to the extreme by way of the injurious misconception outlined herein).

Is *Intolerant Secularism* (in practise, tolerating everything except the expression of a Christian faith) the new State "religion" in Canada? Isn't this a close cousin of ancient paganism (the Old Testament gives numerous accounts of the idolatry of paganism that can be referred to for comparison); merely couched in deceptive, high-sounding principles of secular humanism (cf. 1Corinthians 3:18-21)? Many politicians and also, by implication, court rulings are perpetrating a BIG LIE⁸ by telling Canadians to keep their faith private—within their homes or churches, and out of the public square. Of course, such a notion is abetted by the media; as well as contributing factors such as an affluent lifestyle, which fosters susceptibility to extreme individualism and independence. These people believe that they are justified in **imposing** their secularised views on society, but how unthinkable it is to even attempt to impose one’s faith on anyone.⁹ If both are an imposition, then wouldn't it be better to impose what leads to the truth (actually though—with Christian conduct—this is proposed, not imposed)? Christians are first of all called to walk by faith and not by what appears to be suitable for contemporary society (cf. 2Corinthians 5:7). Had you lived centuries ago, isn't that exactly what you would have needed to enable crossing the Atlantic Ocean on a sail boat?

~ Analysis by¹⁰

(An initial version of this text was compiled for the Pioneers and Founders Seminar of November 16, 2013)

¹ The existence of these inscriptions did not occur by chance. To substantiate this I shall cite Hansard, which is the official record of the remarks of our members of Parliament during their debates in the House of Commons (begun in 1880 for this House; 1871 for the Senate). Without doing an extensive search, I found many examples of references to, or about the

Scriptures. I have I selected a few samples from the year 1921 because in May and June of that year some questions were raised about the inscriptions (this was around the time that the Parliament buildings were being restored following a major fire). One concern was in regard to the absence of the use of French inscriptions (one of the two official languages in Canada). Another remark—on the face of it—appears possibly connected with a secular attitude. As an aid to conceptualising the Biblical worldview of the Canadian Parliament of 1921 please consider the following remarks.

Mr. W. K. Baldwin (Standstead):

The people honour their King and worship God, and if you can get a people to do that the country is safe. ... I heard the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) say that he was brought up on oatmeal and the Bible. Well, that is a pretty good diet and I want to say that if more people lived on such a diet they would come to a full realization of things and would know a little better what they were created for. It is said that mankind was created to glorify God, but I think that the percentage of those who do so outside the province of Quebec is very small indeed.

~House of Commons Debates, 13th Parliament, 5th Session: Volume 4, Image 203, page 3205 (May 10, 1921)

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (leader of the Opposition):

Let me remind my right hon. friend that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and that there is a passage of Scripture which says, "Judge not, that ye be not judged, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

~House of Commons Debates, 13th Parliament, 5th Session: Volume 4, Image 597, page 3599 (May 19, 1921)

Mr. Fernand Rinfret (St. James):

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, though a sinner, is only a sinner of the eleventh hour, and I do hope that for him the text of scripture does not apply in the reverse form.

~House of Commons Debates, 13th Parliament, 5th Session: Volume 4, Image 650, page 3652 (May 19, 1921)

[Crediting the Library of Parliament (Historical Debates of the Parliament of Canada), <http://parl.canadiana.ca/browse>].

² Some suggested sources:

1. Michael Clarke (Editor), *Canada: Portraits of Faith* [Chilliwack, BC: Reel to Reel Ministries (Canada) Society, 1998].
2. Faytene Kryskow, *Stand On Guard: A Prophetic Call & Research on the Righteous Foundations of Canada* (Vancouver, BC: Credo Publishing, 2005).
3. David Mainse (with David Manuel), *God Keep Our Land: A Salute to Canada*, (Toronto, ON: Mainroads Productions Inc., 1981).

³ Perhaps the most compelling evidence substantiating the influence of the United States of America on Canada in this regard is the reference to our constitution, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, by the judiciary as a "living tree". Clearly this has evolved from the dicta associated with the "living constitution" put forth by the judiciary in the USA. Through my research, I have discovered the following primary sources: John Marshall in *McCulloch v. Maryland* from 1819; and Oliver Wendell Homes Jr. in *Missouri v. Holland* from 1920. David Barton, a noted American historian (<http://wallbuilders.com/SCHbioDB.asp>), pointed out an eye-opening declaration from the Supreme Court of the USA, which has been overlooked by the judiciary of our time. It is found in a case from 1892: *Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based on, and must include the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is impossible for it to be otherwise. We find evidence of this from the discovery of the nation to the present hour.* Mr. Barton attempts to correct the distortions of history perpetrated by the

proponents of secularisation by presenting factual information on the founding fathers of the USA. He outlines historical documents that attest to the profession of their faith: not only privately, but in their public duties as well.

⁴ Two compact disc recordings that I would recommend listening to are:

1. *America: Designed with Godly Intent I-II* (product # B00579D) produced by Focus on the Family (2001, 2008 broadcasts). Hosted by Dr. James Dobson with Mr. David Barton as the featured speaker. This CD recording goes into detail on the letter written by Thomas Jefferson in regard to the First Amendment (of the Bill of Rights) of the Constitution.
2. *The Founding of America I-II* (product # 5008189) produced by Focus on the Family (2004, 2011 broadcasts). Mr. Jim Daly hosts this recording with Mr. David Barton as the featured speaker.

⁵ For a closely related analogy in history, I charge anyone to cite an explorer granted a charter who didn't visibly profess his (I suspect there were no female explorers) faith through some means or manner of behaviour in carrying out the said mandate. In the present era, voyages were taken into space—"the final frontier" (as William Shatner, a.k.a. Captain Kirk, regularly announced to "Trekies" starting in 1966). Having the benefit of hindsight, one can't help but think of how much must have been missed by the spaceship travels (in real life; e.g., Apollo 11 of July 20, 1969) by not openly offering these to the glory of God in the spirit of the explorers of old (not to negate the individual—essentially private—profession of faith that was discernible to the inquisitive observer).

⁶ Consider that the Pilgrims left England because of such circumstances, which did not give them the freedom to practise their faith as they saw fit. The Pilgrims recorded the following statement for future generations to know: "This voyage was undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith." [Paraphrased by Senator Zell Miller during the Focus on the Family (<http://www.focusonthefamily.com/>) broadcast of July 3, 2007 entitled *Let Us Behave Decently*]. Thanksgiving Day in the USA is a testimony of the grateful faith of the Pilgrims. A study of its origins reveals that the celebration carries forth this public profession of faith in a continuum to our time despite the attempts of secularists to remove all traces of religion from the godly heritage of the USA. They have become so brash that they are demanding the removal of references to God in the inscriptions on American currency; as well as, the removal of the posting of the Ten Commandments from government buildings (cf. the failed attempt, circa May and June of 1921, to remove Scriptural references on the Parliament buildings in Canada). How is it that secularists cannot see the mere existence of these evidences of faith as a clear sign that they misunderstand the notion of the separation of Church and State to mean the removal of all religious expression in the domain of the government (rather than to ensure that the Church is protected from having the imposition of a State religion)? This is obviously in opposition to the intent of the founding fathers of the USA that is self-evident from the First Amendment: *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.* Yet, the myopic agenda of secularists has been widely promoted as having a basis in Thomas Jefferson's letter (written while he was the third President of the United States) which mentioned a wall of separation between Church and State. This is a denial of the reality overwhelmingly evident from the historical facts; and, considering the harm done, nothing less than a diabolical lie.

⁷ The Preamble for the *Charter (Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law)* unmistakably affirms the need to recognise the

role of faith in the legislative process and the justice system. This analysis attempts to explain why the Preamble of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* has been ignored by the majority of our legislators and the judiciary from its inception in 1982. It is significant to observe that the wording for this Preamble stems from the one for the *Canadian Bill of Rights* of 1960 (notably leaving out additional, important considerations: *The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions; Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law; And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada.*

⁸ Around the beginning of the third millennium (roughly 2,000 years after the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ)—at the height of “political correctness”—the secularists made concerted efforts to lead people away from recognizing the religious basis for the *holy days* (the root meaning of “holidays”, a word commonly used in their place as society advanced industrially and commercially) associated with Christmas. Some examples: store employees being directed to greet people with “Happy Holidays” instead of the traditional “Merry Christmas”, changing the name of the Christmas tree to a “holiday tree”, and banning nativity scenes from the public square. They have not been as successful with the Easter Season; perhaps because they are not so determined, in this case, to use their euphemistic deception since the words are not overtly Christian.

⁹ The passage of Omnibus Bill C-150 legalised abortion, and decriminalised both sodomy and contraception (the *Divorce Act*, which expanded the basis for sanctioning divorce, was passed one year prior in 1968). Altogether these changes enormously facilitated the imposition of a secular outlook; accordingly, hindsight attests this to have been the major turning point for implementing secularisation in Canada. It was given wide acceptance by Pierre Elliot Trudeau who, as Justice Minister, introduced this bill originally. On December 21, 1967 he made his famous quip (which was apparently coined by a newspaper journalist) that the media highly promoted: “There's no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation.” He went on to say “what's done in private between adults doesn't concern the Criminal Code.” **A statement was then made which has turned out to be very significant, but unheeded to this day (in particular with the passage of the *Civil Marriage Act* in 2005, which legalised homosexual “marriage”): “When it [this thing on homosexuality] becomes public, this is a different matter.”** The press were also told: “It’s bringing the laws of the land up to contemporary society.” He was subsequently elected—with a popularity that many Canadians described to be Trudeaumania—as Prime Minister to oversee the reintroduction and passage of Omnibus Bill C-150 on May 14, 1969.

¹⁰ On April 2, 2014 this analysis was dedicated to the papacy of St. John Paul II (1920-2005) in conjunction with the inaugural observation of “Pope John Paul II Day” (first established in Ontario, http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&Intranet=&BillID=2794). It is an expression of my gratitude for the immeasurable way that his life of faith inspired and assisted me in my Christian walk. May the annual memorials to his legacy provide hope for generations to come. Pope John Paul II was a tireless promoter of the Gospel of life (directing people to respect the sanctity of human life from conception to natural death); showing himself to be a highly credible witness of this through his epistle (2 Corinthians 3:2-

3)—written with his life—during the ending years, especially the last few months, of his earthly sojourn. The present edition commemorates his canonisation of April 27, 2014.