

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Termination of Pregnancy Bill
Date: Wednesday, 5 September 2018 10:49:14 AM
Attachments: [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern – The purpose of this email is to register my opposition to the abortion bill presently before the Parliament, presented to the House by the Attorney General and championed by Ms Trad. The present State Government has no mandate to introduce this Bill. I have read the report of the Law Reform Commission. I remain unpersuaded that there is any need to change the present law – under which abortion remains readily available to a woman whose physical or mental health is imperilled by the pregnancy. The importance of the abortion law being regulated by a criminal statute is that it recognises the significance of the termination – which is not just a medical procedure – but the deliberate taking of a human life. Plainly such a step should only be taken in the most limited of circumstances. The proposition that the foetus is not a human life ignores all the medical knowledge amassed over the past 50 years as to the development of the foetus – and – especially its capacity to feel pain and its viability outside the womb from 22 weeks. There is a logical discontinuity between the proposition that a person may be charged with murder for an assault which precipitates the death of an unborn child and that the State will facilitate the termination of a pregnancy – up until birth – because the mother seeks it for societal reasons. The proposition that 2 doctors – one of whom need not even meet the woman – might be in a position to assess her “societal” justification for an abortion is risible – doctors are not qualified to make such an assessment, let alone a doctor to whom the patient is unknown. A “societal” justification for a termination is, rather, another way of saying that what is “convenient” is permissible. Questions of convenience should not determine whether a human life may be taken. The Bill seeks to fix a problem which does not exist and, if it is passed by this Parliament – whose members have avoided engaging with their constituents to explain why this Bill is necessary – largely because most of them are incapable of mounting and sustaining a coherent argument – it will only serve to entrench a utilitarian view of existence to the effect that the value of each life is relative and that the convenience of a woman outweighs her unborn child’s right to live. Finally, on a personal basis, I must record that, as the father of an adopted son – my boy is from China – I am aware of the difficulties surrounding the conception of a healthy child and I am grateful every day to the Chinese mother of my son who chose not to terminate her inconvenient pregnancy but, instead, gave her son up for adoption. Her pain at that parting has given my son a beautiful life in Australia. The option of adoption is one which is sadly little utilised in this country. Whilst I do not presume to measure whether the mother’s grief on termination is less than her grief on giving her child for adoption, the one unarguable fact is that the latter option produces a living child. Yours faithfully
Brett Heath . . .

