in protecting potential human life exists throughout the pregnancy"; in other words, from conception to birth.

To anyone who affords the Supreme Court judgment on the Morgentaler case a careful reading, the following facts are self-evident. First, there is no constitutional right to an abortion. Second, as Judge Dickson indicated, it is Parliament's prerogative and responsibility to summon together all available evidence and then decide the state's interest in the foetus. Third, Parliament's interest need not necessarily require a gestational or pro-choice position. Fourth, as Judges Beetz and Estey stated, Parliament's interest need not exclude a life and health standard approach which includes the confirmation of a second, independent medical opinion. Fifth, Parliament's interest need not disallow a life and health standard which is very restrictive, even to the point of excluding first trimester abortions.

Clearly, it is both Parliament's privilege and responsibility to decide as to the rights of the foetus from conception on. I can only agree with Judge Dickson that Parliament should reach its decision on this matter after informing itself by means of all evidence at hand.

As I have argued throughout, all biological and physiological data available leads one to one conclusion only, that the foetus is an autonomous life in development. As such, the only reasonable legislative option is that which serves to protect the rights of the foetus throughout its development.

Furthermore, this right can only be abrogated, on the grounds of self-defence, in those rare instances where the mother's life is in demonstrable danger and where there is no other acceptable medical procedure to obviate that danger.

Of course, there must always be concern for the well-being of the mother, but her best interests are served only when the utmost respect is afforded all human life; that of the mother, her unborn child and, indeed, society itself.

This, therefore, is the pro-life position. I shall support any amendment before this House which gives a strong pro-life direction to the Government, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Unfortunately, the abortion debate has been construed as one of competing interests, the right of the mother to be free to choose versus the right of the unborn to live. However, surely it defies all that we hold dear about humanity to speak of a mother and her unborn child as being in competition against one another. Only a pathetically distorted sense of what is right and what is freedom could render mother and child as antagonists.

Every reasonable Canadian knows that there are necessary and legitimate limits to rights and freedoms, especially where human life is concerned. Otherwise, we are left vulnerable to the tyranny of anarchy.

As the esteemed American Judge Learned Hand has said: "A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few . . . (but the true) spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs (the interest of others) alongside its own without bias".

Consequently, as the philosopher Francis Schaeffer has noted, abortion is not solely a feminist issue any more than slavery was only a slave owner's issue; rather, "the fate of the unborn is a question of the fate of the human race. We are one human family. If the rights of one part of that family are denied, it is of concern to each of us. What is at stake is no less than the essence of what freedom and rights are all about".

Given all that I have said, I would like to take advantage of the unanimous agreement of the three Parties and table the following amendment. "That all of the words in the motion after the "to protect the unborn; and" be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "Such legislation should prohibit the performance of an abortion except when: —two independent qualified medical practitioners have, in good faith and on reasonable grounds, in writing, stated that in their opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would be likely to, endanger the life of the pregnant woman or seriously and substantially endanger her health and there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; but the grounds for such an opinion are not to include (I) the effects of stress or anxiety which may accompany an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy, or (II) social or economic considerations."

That motion is seconded by the Hon. Member for Surrey—White Rock—North Delta (Mr. Friesen). It is crucial to note that this amendment specifically defines the parameters of the term "health", which was a requirement in the Supreme Court judgment, that is, the threat to a woman's health must be, first, serious and substantial; second, such that there is no other commonly accepted medical procedure for effectively treating the health risk; and third, other than the anxiety and stress which normally accompanies an unexpected or unwanted pregnancy. Additionally, socio-economic factors may not be grounds for an abortion.

• (1720)

It is also important to realize that the distinction between this amendment and the amendment just put by the Hon. Member for Grey—Simcoe (Mr. Mitges) is a very fine one. This view is in accordance with the interpretation of pro-life medical and legal experts. For example, in my own Kitchener constituency, Dr. John Sehl, obstetrician and gynaecologist, views this amendment as extremely restrictive and has urged me to support it. He is convinced that if the medical community were to act in accordance with the wording of this amendment it would effectively allow it to perform abortions in life threatening circumstances only. The validity of this position has received widespread recognition throughout a broad cross-section of those concerned about Canada's unborn.