

23/08/2018

To the Parliamentary committee for Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention

I am writing to you to make a submission regarding the proposed legislation regarding termination of pregnancy presented by the Palaszczuk Government before the State Government and is now being examined by yourselves. I was so disturbed when I heard that the Queensland Government was planning to put forward legislation drafted up by the Law Reform Commission in October of this year (2018) even after planned changes were soundly defeated in 2016. And now it is being pushed through by the end of August/September.

The recommendations from the Queensland Law Review speak of abortion being made possible up to 22 weeks when any doctor feels it is appropriate. And after 22 weeks for any physical, psychological or economic reasons so long as there is a second opinion (required without consultation). A simple phone call is sufficient. And I must point out that doctors who have received medical training are not social workers nor economists and are rarely trained extensively in psychology!

We hear it bandied around in the medical/paramedical fields, the term, 'Informed Consent', but there is another term that reflects the gravity and weight of the role of those government bodies who draft and formulate legislation for our society – 'Informed Responsibility' and as such, I feel you need to understand fully the results and effects of legislation that you may pass. So, before you decide what recommendations you will make, I implore you to look firstly at what the practice of abortion entails.

The standard procedure used in Australia for any type of abortion is 'Dilation and Curettage with Suction'. Which involves the process at which point, the cranium has grown too large to fit through the cervix, the limbs and appendages are firstly severed and removed individually, then polyp forceps are used to literally crush the cranium after which the remaining fragments are evacuated. Images are too graphic to show, but so you can picture the size of a 22-week-old fetus; it is only slightly longer than a fountain pen and can be cupped in a single hand. Remember this either whenever you wash your hands or sign a letter. I humbly request and boldly challenge you to watch a you-tube movie entitled 'The Silent Scream' which explains, demonstrates and shows an abortion taking place under ultrasound imaging [REDACTED] I include this as part of my submission. This in fact shows that the unborn child in addition to having a heartbeat is fully responsive to external stimuli, confirming yet another characteristic of life. If this legislation is passed, it is tantamount to condoning and supporting murder of unborn life. Which begs the question: 'In what other circumstance is murder ethical? We aren't at war—are we?'

I ask the question: At what point do the 'rights' of a woman outweigh those of the unborn child. I hope you will think long and hard about what is RIGHT, not just rights. I am not talking semantics – I know abortion is necessary in very rare situations – I am talking about on-demand termination simply where it 'may' make life easier or less awkward. In today's society, it has become far too common and frequent, but it should never be regarded as the removal of an unwanted growth. "When you have a fertilized egg, you get one set of genes from the mother, one from the father. All the DNA comes from the mother and the father but it's a different combination to both the mother and the father. It's a unique combination.

Your genes came from your mother and your father but you're different, you have a unique combination... as that cell divides no more information is added. So, at fertilization we have a 100% human being – made in God's image – unique combination of information." Ken Ham (Answers in Genesis)

I plead with you to shelve this change to legislation. I have seen 3-D images from the 20-week scan of our children. These children are FULLY formed and are just growing in size. They have five fingers and five toes on each hand and foot. They have eyelids that are closed over developing eyes. They have a brain that is in the process of formation. The list could go on—they are people. And you are the committee for Family Violence Prevention. I believe that there is no greater violence against a human being than being terminated!

I must ask the question: What then, is abortion? Termination/removal/destruction of that unique combination of information. Or - killing a human being! This should NEVER be taken lightly! I believe that support should be looked *at* more seriously as an alternative first.

For many, the body is just a temporal home, life is in the soul. George MacDonald put it well: "You do not 'have' a soul; you 'are' a soul, and 'have' a body." For the most part, in secular terms NOW is all we have and NOW is the moment. A soul-less existence means that if there is a baby impacting on your 'NOW', then you have the right, to do whatever you feel is needed. This process has become too commonly the way to remove unwanted bodies. A century ago unplanned pregnancies were only whispered about, but now these are much more common and one solution (abortion) is being pushed to become the default response.

What has changed now? How did we get here? As Nietzsche would say, "Is there any up or down left? Who gave us a sponge to wipe away the horizon?" it seems that we are now trying to wipe away and reset that which even pilots use to establish an absolute. These absolutes become moral relativism, and when decisions about life are made with this worldview, there is no transcendent definition of life to be seen. As Chesterton commented (it seems prophetically almost a century ago now), "For under the smooth legal surface of our society there are already moving very lawless things. We are always near the breaking-point when we care only for what is legal and nothing for what is lawful. Unless we have a moral principle about such delicate matters as marriage and murder, the whole world will become a welter of exceptions with no rules. There will be so many hard cases that everything will go soft." I.e. it is often talked about as, "But, it is a woman's right!", This doesn't automatically make it "Right" though.

As shown by both the same-sex legislation last year, and now this proposed legislation in Queensland, that breaking point is now here.

May I respectfully also point out to you the results of an independent market research survey conducted by YouGov Galaxy Research which again I include as part of my submission (I remind you of your obligation to consider material once it has been officially submitted), (methodology and full results available at [REDACTED] which found that 52% of Queenslanders – question 19 – (57% of women) oppose the key provisions of the proposed amendments regarding termination of pregnancy - abortion on demand up to 22 weeks. There was only 29% support for this. Is this a case of 'the tail wagging the dog'?! And likewise, I submit to you that it was

found that more than half of all Queenslanders (54%) say that their vote would be influenced by whether a candidate had voted in favor of the proposed legislation (39% would cost votes, and only 15% would be a vote winner.

There is still a majority of Queenslanders who support the protection of unborn life. And be warned – support this legislation at your own electoral peril.

I communicate to you in plain English that I hope you recognise the impact/reality of this legislation, the feelings of society at large and repeal this proposal which has been pushed for yet a second time before the State Parliament (with window-dressing changes which have actually made proposed legislation even worse than the first time). I would request that even at this late stage, you turn this legislation back!

With sincere fear and horror at what it's being proposed,

Dr Mark Elvery

