

**Submission re Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018**

(1) The very title of the Bill, Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018, is highly problematic.

Yes, what this Bill will legalise is the terminating of a pregnancy but what is necessarily concomitant with that, is the terminating of an unborn child's life.

The Bill itself gives indirect recognition to the fact that what is being terminated is a child's life at 6 (3) where it refers to "the life of an unborn child".

It would be far more honest to call this Bill, Termination of Pregnancy/Termination of an Unborn Child's Life Bill 2018.

Except for that one "slip-up" at 6 (3), the Bill though does everything possible to try to avoid acknowledging that what is being legalised is the deliberate ending of human lives. This is simply cowardice and obfuscation.

If a woman's "right to choose" is going to be made legal, then as a matter of integrity it should be admitted that this "right to choose" is nothing more than an alleged "right to end her own child's life".

(2) Regarding the "safe access zones", these are supposed to "protect the safety and well-being, and respect the privacy and dignity, of— (a) persons accessing services [i.e. – having their child's life ended] provided at termination services premises; and (b) persons who are employed to provide services [ i.e. carrying out the ending of children's lives]. . ."

No evidence has been presented to show that anyone's safety has been put at risk by those offering assistance, or by those praying, or by those protesting outside abortion clinics. Besides if that should happen there already are laws in place to deal with such behaviour.

These "safe access zones" around abortion clinics are an example of how those who seek to have abortion decriminalised/legalised want to have it both ways.

On the one hand they want to say that abortion is no big deal – it doesn't destroy a human life, it is just the removal of a clump of cells. At the same time they also want to say that it is a big deal - the most difficult decision a woman will ever make, etc, and therefore no one critical of abortion should be allowed to be anywhere near the places where they are done.

So which is it? If abortion is no big deal - something morally equivalent to having an ingrown toenail removed, then what possible harm is there if someone is on the footpath with a sign and offering help? Such people can be ignored or laughed at.

But if abortion is a big deal – so big that it uniquely requires all who disagree with it to be kept a long way off - why is it such a big deal? Is it because we all know that it actually does involve the taking of a human life? Is that why any contrary viewpoints must be kept away so as to try and shield people's consciences?

In neither case is there justification for suppressing freedom of expression.

There is no justification whatsoever for there to be such special laws for these places.

Graham Preston