

September 2, 2018.

To:

Members of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family
Violence Prevention Committee.

Subject:

The Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018

Members,

I wish to pre-empt the following paragraphs by expressing my astonishment that legislators who serve a society that has otherwise enjoyed all the benefits of the post-Enlightenment period would dare to propose a Bill such as The Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. A Bill that apparently completely ignores all the advances made in the fields of foetology and neonatology, and consigns these and the unborn child to a [REDACTED], or, in the case of the latter, the [REDACTED]. In short, disgraceful. It appears to me that in contemporary social discourse, a discourse some members of parliament and the popular press enthusiastically engage in, the welfare and fate of a stalled pig or caged hen or feed-lotted steer, is of more pressing concern than the humanity, dignity, welfare, well-being and rights of an unborn child. This is exemplified not only by this Bill, which is an abomination, but also the report of the Queensland Law Reform Commission, QLRC. In setting out its conditions for facilitation of a medically or surgically induced abortion beyond 22 weeks, there is no mention of the existence of a second party, namely the child, let alone any consideration of her or his potential suffering or welfare. Let me put this into some contemporary context. If I, or anyone, were to apply the same level of breathtaking ignorance and ill-consideration to any other populist contemporary issues, be that anthropogenic climate change or the perceived benefits of renewable energy sources, whatever, one would be pilloried into exile. Yet, the proabortion movement and their proxies, in the place where you sit, remain unchallenged. My expectation has always been that parliament, or any legislature, is the bastion of carefully considered, detailed and balanced debate, and that these elements characterise the legislation that it synthesises. This Bill not only falls well short of that standard, it embodies the complete opposite.

Members, it is within all of you to elevate the level of debate, analysis and equity, and ensure that all those that are affected by such a Bill are considered. That includes the unborn child. This Bill treats that life as an entirely disposable 'commodity'. Whilst that may be convenient in a throw-away social paradigm, at a moment of inconvenience, in terms of its sentiment and intent, it can be described as nothing other than evil. As such, this Bill has no place in a civilised, compassionate society.

I also note, without any great surprise, that on the parliamentary website under the said Committee's listing of this Bill, there is a note, in bold type, that it will not accept images of aborted fetuses or the outcome of medical procedures. I take this to mean the outcome of medically or surgically induced abortions. And, I wonder why? Surely to facilitate a balanced debate some detail of what this abhorrent practice actually involves is entirely appropriate. Are you squeamish? Are you afraid that the reality of seeing the easily recognisable human form of a [REDACTED], that would otherwise be [REDACTED], may challenge many of your preconceived ideas about what this act involves? Indeed, if you have the courage of your convictions, convictions that are based on fact rather than populist, legalistic fiction, you would already have become fully acquainted with the range of procedures that an abortionist utilises to kill the unborn, and the physical remnants of these. I can sympathise, it is harrowing. Even for clinicians such as I. It is, however, also that which compels me to give voice to the voiceless.

Currently in Queensland, it is estimated that between 14000 and 15000 elective abortions are performed each year. A dismal statistic, but the reality is none of these are prosecuted. In effect, abortion is accessible on demand. Overwhelmingly for convenience and lifestyle choices, not, as is frequently, emotively and entirely falsely claimed, as a result of a threat to the mother's life or for pregnancies that have resulted from cases of rape. In fact, were one to limit abortions to cases of rape and where there is a threat to the mother's life, one would reduce the number of abortions by approximately 99%, if not more. Other apparently 'admirable' reasons to abort an unborn child include gender selection, congenital isolated limb deformities and antenatal screening. Denmark and Iceland proudly proclaimed earlier this year that not a single child was born with Trisomy 21 (Down Syndrome). They had all been aborted on the basis of antenatal screening. Antenatal screening that is well known to also generate entirely spurious results. I applauded them! Not since [REDACTED] has a nation achieved such a successful [REDACTED] program. How do you think that makes those so afflicted, or those with congenital malformations feel? What do you think, Member, that does to anyone's self-worth? As a state, as a nation, should that be an aspirational goal? Aren't we trying to cultivate an inclusive society that affords protection to the greatest and the least? Does that Bill cultivate such a spirit? Does allowing abortion to term engender such a society? You see, the aim of this legislation is not only to remove the act from criminal statutes. This Bill, which undoubtedly represents an acquiescence to the dark and sinister pro-abortion lobby, goes well beyond its stated aim. Are you aware that in some centres, notably overseas, infants born at just over 21 weeks have survived and gone on to normal childhoods? Google 'Miracle Stensrud'. She was born at 21 weeks and 4 days. She is now 4 and doing well. Being schooled and no different to her classmates. How does killing an unborn child at 22 weeks or beyond differ from infanticide? It sits very comfortably on the spectrum of child abuse does it not? And yet the striking hypocrisy and inconsistency of parliamentarians that routinely speak out against child abuse and yet advocate this *in utero* butchery. Do you believe the foetus is human? Do you believe it is alive? If not classify it for me. What is this tissue? Let's re-write the embryology and reproductive biology textbooks together! What is the earliest one can make a surface recording of the foetal electrocardiogram? At how many days of gestation does the foetal heart begin to beat? At what gestational age does the foetal nervous system begin to respond to endogenous and exogenous stimuli? Including pain? Are you aware of any of this or do you limit yourself to a threadbare, desolate and spartan legalistic viewpoint? Do you care?

'Safe abortion'. Now there's a singularly banal oxymoron if I've ever heard one. How can any abortion be safe? One of the parties always dies. What is this infantile obsession of bringing this state in line with the codes of other states? If four out of the six states introduced legislation that mandated that anyone with red hair should be shaved and branded with a hot iron on each arse cheek, would you institute that as well? Just to 'be consistent' or 'in line'? Who decides what legislation of any other state deserves such merit? All said and done, the current legislation in Queensland has not limited any woman, that I or my nearest colleagues are aware of, from undergoing an elective abortion. The proposed legislation however goes well beyond this and culminates in not only allowing abortion to term, a profoundly diabolical practice, with the agreement of two abortionists for essentially any reason that they see fit, (the recommendations of the QLRC and the relevant sections of the Bill are so vacuous, non-specific and ambiguous that they could essentially be applied to any criteria), and subjugates the time-honoured rights of every practitioner to conscientiously object to participating in the procurement of an abortion. That is wholly unacceptable. It is a mark of intolerance and discrimination against some of the finest clinicians/obstetricians, that I know, of the Christian, Muslim, Jewish and Buddhist Faiths. Or those that have a true and unshakable sense of social justice and equity for all, including the unborn, in the absence of a particular religious persuasion. That proposition is shameful! In over 20 years of working in the public and private health systems, my drive has been the impartial and non-judgmental service of all, including mothers carrying their unborn, and those injured by elective abortions at the hands of supposedly qualified and 'safe' abortionists working in multinational abortion clinics. The suppression of alternate thoughts, views, values and practices that, in this instance, safeguard the well-being of BOTH mother and child, is the hallmark of a totalitarian society. The freedom to uphold the highest ideals of Hippocrates and the freedom for a physician to care for her or his patient without the undue and overbearing influence of the State, is something to be cherished and protected. It is also a freedom that physicians throughout history, including recent history, be it [REDACTED], [REDACTED] or parts of North Africa and the Middle East, have given their lives to protect. The infringement of this right would not be tolerated by any other profession or group in society. It stifles debate and curtails the practices of some of the finest clinicians and institutions in this country who are known here, and internationally, for providing the best care to BOTH mother and child. Whilst we all accept that elective abortion is a regrettable reality of the world we live in, no clinician or allied health professional should ever be coerced into participating in the destruction of an innocent human life. Abortion is never the best possible outcome for either mother or child. Abortion does not fall into my definition of 'healthcare'. Is elective, voluntary homicide healthcare? It is, in fact, the complete corruption of the holistic philosophy of medicine. For this reason alone, this primitive, narrow-minded, intolerant and amoral Bill should be rejected in its entirety.