

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to the proposed 'Termination of Pregnancy Bill'
Date: Wednesday, 5 September 2018 11:25:24 AM

To the Queensland Government Health Committee,

I am writing in response to the proposed 'Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018'. This bill must not be passed in parliament, as it is a majorly flawed document which will be detrimental to Queensland families and individuals.

Firstly, the most morally perverse notion contained within the bill, is that abortion up until birth for any stated reason will be allowed. That is to say that the mother of the child will be the sole deciding authority of whether the baby lives or dies. This despicable bill suggests that a mother's rights to convenience, supersedes the rights of an unborn child.

A common argument as to why a mother has the right to murder her baby, is that a foetus, when not fully formed, does not qualify as a human being – suffice to say that the point at which a foetus becomes a 'human', it has rights and thus aborting it would be considered murder, and a criminal act. The notion that somebody has the right to murder another human being based on their own personal convenience issues is immoral, disgusting, and scientifically criminal. An unborn child is not a pile of cells, nor a lump of tissue, but the beginnings of a sentient human life; therefore, by suggesting that abortion up until birth will be allowed with no criminal consequences and no consideration of circumstances, the bill qualifies that unborn children are not considered human.

Allow me to pose the question: At what point is an unborn child considered a human being? Is a baby considered not a human up to the first heartbeat, and should abortion be allowed up to this point (5 weeks of pregnancy)? I ask again: Does that also mean that grown adults who rely on pacemakers to live, should be killed?

Does sentience determine humanity? I ask again: Is it moral to kill people who are in comas, knowing that they have the potential to awake?

In all cases, killing a person in a coma, killing a person that relies on mechanical support to live etc. is considered a criminal act. Furthermore, should a person murder a woman who happens to be pregnant, in Australia they are prosecuted for the murder of TWO people – regardless of the babies' developmental stage. I again ask: What gives the mother of an unborn child the right to murder it in cold blood, based on their personal convenience? What gives them the right to take the life of a fully formed, sentient human being, just because of their sex, hair colour and the like?

Nobody has the RIGHT to kill a baby just because it is convenient to them. The baby is an individual human being; thus if the baby were outside the womb, and a person stabbed it through the chest, they would be charged with 1st degree murder. However, as soon as the baby is inside the womb, it suddenly becomes the human right of the mother to choose whether the child lives. The proposed bill determines that the human inside a woman has no rights; this despicable bill decides that the child's rights are less important than a mothers rights to convenience.

Yet this bill proposes that society should treat the murder of these human beings as a matter of choice and convenience. It is a scientific and biological fact that unborn children are human beings, not balls of tissue or isolated cells – therefore aborting an unborn child based on personal convenience is comparable to a legal murder, and must not be allowed.

Kind Regards,
Sonia Nikolic
[REDACTED]