

From: [REDACTED]  
 To: [Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee](#)  
 Subject: Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018 - Submission  
 Date: Wednesday, 5 September 2018 11:59:55 AM

---

Here in I make my submission regarding the "Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018" to the "Queensland Parliament - Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee"

Dear members of the committee,

I include my most recent submission regarding abortion below and request that you accept it as part of my response to this current bill. I am waiting for notification regarding a request for an extension of the petition dead line.

This current bill is evil and should be completely rejected. Law is supposed to uphold justice and protect the most vulnerable in our society. Since I now only have one hour to complete my submission I list some points here and request that you consult my submission response below and my submission responses to the Rob Pyne bills also. More details on the brief points I make here are in these previous submissions and the one I include below. I am disgusted with the persistent pressure to decriminalise and endorse this barbaric practice and to make everybody in society complicate in it. This is shameful behaviour and a disgrace to our nation.

1. Doctors are supposed to promote life. This bill demands that they become agents of death and break the code of doing no harm. Doctors must be able to advise against abortion and refuse to refer a patient to somebody who will do an abortion. To do otherwise is to try and make them complicate in this genocide.
2. Abortion is violent and horrific and should only be done as a last resort in the most extreme of circumstance. This bill opens the flood gates for abortion for any reason.
3. There are already in the order of 14000 abortion every year in Queensland. This is a tragic genocide that needs to stop and yet it is clear that some MPs consider that this is not enough carnage and want to extend this barbaric practice to 22 weeks for any reason and even to full term. THIS IS SHAMEFUL.
4. This bill outlaws the expression of love outside abortion facilities. This is SHAMEFUL.
5. This bill outlaws peaceful free speech outside abortion facilities. This is hypocrisy. Only barbaric voices are allowed to be heard near abortion facilities.
6. Considering the title of your comity "Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee" I would ask you to acknowledge the following point and reject this bill:
  1. If you are concerned about "Health Services" you will reject this bill because abortions harm mothers and babies. Mothers and their pre-birth children should be given proper care and support by health services. Abortions cause far more harm than good. Please see my previous submission below.
  2. If you are concerned about "Communities Services" and the community you will reject this bill because abortion are devastating our communities and this bill will increase the carnage. It conceals and promotes numerous community issues including mental health issues for mothers. This bill tries to make everybody complicate in abortion and promotes legal action against those who do not want to participate in this barbaric practice. The result will be a decline in community services because of fear of litigation for doing what is right. SHAME.
  3. If you are concerned about "Disability Services" and the disabled you will oppose this bill because abortions are used to kill the disabled, weak, vulnerable and the healthy. This bill demands the promotion of a form of euthanasia as a "medical treatment" alternative.
  4. If you are opposed to "Domestic and Family Violence" you will oppose this bill because abortion is brutal domestic violence always resulting in death and injury and is used to conceal other forms of domestic violence, such as rape and incest.

Yours Sincerely  
 Stephen Brennan

---

### Submission to the Law Reform Commission February 2018

Dear members of the "Queensland Law Reform Comity" and in particular MP Yvette D'Ath, Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills and any other members of parliament on the comity.

Please accept my submission here in response to the paper titled "Queensland Law Reform Commission, Review of termination of pregnancy laws, Consultation Paper". My answer to the specific questions are provided below. I provide my answers in the context of the following statements.

Under Queensland parliamentary law I claim my right to parliamentary privilege. It is appalling to me that at the

very outset of this "enquiry" the people in charge of providing justice are trying to avoid proper due process by farming out work to third parties and not properly inform the public about this "enquiry". There were two failed bills as indicated in your terms of reference and paper. These bills failed because good citizens objected to what is evil. This is where this should have stopped but evil knows no bounds. Countless submissions regarding these two bills and others are on record and it is time parliamentarians responded to the truth and facts there in, including such as:

- a foetus is a child,
- abortion is killing a child and therefore murder
- killing a child is barbaric, draconian, cruel, evil, traumatic, and painful for the child and is to be avoided at all cost.
- 50% of children in the womb are girls - who would grow up to be women.
- a foetus has a brain and heart at 21 days after conception
- mothers are harmed by abortions:
  - emotionally
  - psychologically
  - medically
  - physically
  - socially (If abortion is legal there is no protection from coercion to "abort" - for example by rapists and people committing incest)
- Fathers are harmed by abortion:
  - emotionally
  - psychologically
  - socially
- and to repeat and emphasise the most serious point the child is harmed

It is appalling that the Queensland government keeps on asking for submissions in regard to abortion. It demonstrates a total disrespect for the public and what they have told them over and over again and a total disrespect for truth, facts, logic, justice and life. It is time to stop playing this childish game. The parliament should not ignore these previously written submissions in favour of a report or "enquiry" by a potentially politically biased hand picked comity. I request that you make it clear that the previous submissions in regard to the two previous bills should be studied and the facts only there in be fully understood and compiled into a thorough and concise document to affirm the justice of the existing laws. "Higher education" and a pretence of sophistication in no way alters the truth and facts which are timeless. A person who contradicts the truth disqualifies themselves regardless of how many letters they have after their name.

There is a constant disgusting attempt to water down the serious nature of abortion. The existing law acknowledges the truth of the situation. The "Queensland Law Reform Comity" has been asked to make recommendations to "reform" or to be more truthful abolished laws regarding abortion. There is no other solution to the problem of abortion but to recognise in law the atrocity of abortion for what it is. It is time those pushing for "freedom" to "abort" (kill children) at will, quit the pretence of rationality. There has been more than sufficient opportunity for rational debate but it is clear that there is no interest in properly engaging the debate or rational thinking.

MP Yvette D'Ath as Minster for Justice (and members of the comity) you are responsible for administration of justice and under your leadership that is what you must do. In the order of 10000 children are killed (aborted) in Queensland every year. What justice are you going to provide for these ongoing tens of thousands of innocent victims? Is this number too small in your eyes to act? Abortion is by far the leading cause of death in Queensland and Australia. Other types of murder, cancer, heart conditions, strokes and other illnesses, road accidents and even wars are no comparison to what many Australian's will do to their own children. We are witnessing a genocide of unprecedented scale and what are you doing about it? Recommending the relaxations or abolition of laws designed to protect these children and their mothers? These laws must remain to provide legal protection for anybody who needs them. Do you have any national pride or patriotism or are you content for Australia to continue to destroy itself?

It is appalling that such a simple matter has been made so complex, but that is to be expected. When arguments do not stack up irrational people like to hide themselves behinds mountains of convoluted verbal nonsense.

I write only short answers here as limited time permits. There are many organisation and individuals who have made submission and I assert my support for like minded submissions such as those from the Australian Christian Lobby, Family Voice, Cherish life and the Australian Family Association.

Responses to questions:

**Who should be permitted to perform or assist in performing terminations\***

**Q-1 Who should be permitted to perform, or assist in performing, lawful terminations of pregnancy?**

The current laws must not change in this regard.

Medical doctors currently have completely reasonable discretion in this in the extremely rare and exceptional circumstance in which abortion may be necessary to save the life of the mother and the ability to operate in accordance with their own conscience.

Lawful termination is an ambiguous term in this context because it depends on the final decision of the parliament. I expect more from a panel of experts.

Lawful terminations should never include more situations than what they currently do.

**Q-2 Should a woman be criminally responsible for the termination of her own pregnancy?**

The current laws must not change in this regard. It should remain a crime to kill your own child or anyone else for that matter.

The use of the term pregnancy instead of child and termination instead of abortion in this question is disingenuous and deceptive.

**Gestational limits and grounds**

**Q-3 Should there be a gestational limit or limits for a lawful termination of pregnancy?**

No! Only one limit! Abortion should be regarded as murder from the point of conception to birth.

If you wanted to have a child and somebody "terminated" the "pregnancy" would you not regard that as evil? The law is simple and straight to the point. Trying to determine some point where the zygote becomes a child for the point of abortion law is simply wrong. The zygote is alive at the point of conception and has two parents at the point of conception. Even if a zygote develops into identical twins the same is true. To say the zygote is not a child is wrong, because no part of what develops from the zygote is anything but child. For example the child's side of the placenta is part of the child and is only disposed of at the appropriate time just as is the case for other cells in the human body like red blood cells.

A child typically has a heart and a brain earlier than 21 days after conception.

Regardless of what ever spurious standard you adopt if you do not know what state the zygote/foetus/child is in then you can not make a determination of whether it is a child or not.

Basing a decision solely on a number of days is inaccurate and a neglect of proper care.

The only way to be sure you are not killing a child is to not "abort".

**Q-4 If yes to Q-3, what should the gestational limit or limits be? For example:**

- (a) an early gestational limit, related to the first trimester of pregnancy;
- (b) a later gestational limit, related to viability;
- (c) another gestational limit or limits?

**Q-5 Should there be a specific ground or grounds for a lawful termination of pregnancy?**

The current law handles this appropriately. Emergency medical intervention only. This situation is virtually a relic of the past in the western world. Medical intervention to save both the life of the mother and the child is practically always possible in the western world.

I have great empathy for victims of rape. It would be dreadfully traumatic and life changing experience however killing any resulting child creates more problems than it solves.

Typically girls and women have great expectations about having their own children, loving, nurturing, protecting and providing for them. It is natural and designed into the nature of a mother. I will also add mothers and father instinctively both have this characteristic. When a mother takes the life of her child regardless of whether it was the result of rape or not she has to deal with this tremendous conflict of her instinctive desire to protect and love her children while she has previously taken the life of one. In the case of the trauma of rape this conflict adds to the trauma. The trauma created by taking the life of your own child is horrendous resulting in mental health issues in the majority of cases. There also can be other serious health outcomes too, such as death, permanent injury and infertility.

There have been cases of rape where the rapist has insisted that the mother must have an abortion and the mother has refused and been very glad that she did.

It is extremely common for rapists to insist their victims have an abortion because they are trying to destroy the evidence of their crime and have no respect or regard for the life of the mother or the child.

To keep the baby should be regarded as a great victory for the mother and celebrated. It demonstrated the triumph of love over evil and is the ultimate payback, that wicked rapists deserve.

It is totally illogical to argue that a rapist should not receive the death penalty while the child should be terminated. Why should the child pay for the crime of a rapist, practically as a scape goat for the rapist? This should be regarded as appalling injustice in anybodies books. If you don't believe in capital punishment why would you kill an innocent child who has not even seen the light of day? It is the rapist

that deserves to die not the child.

**Q-6 If yes to Q-5, what should the specific ground or grounds be?**

See my answer to question 5.

**Q-7 If yes to Q-5, should a different ground or grounds apply at different stages of pregnancy?**

**Consultation by the medical practitioner**

**Q-8 Should a medical practitioner be required to consult with one or more others (such as another medical practitioner or health practitioner), or refer to a committee, before performing a termination of pregnancy?**

Yes! Absolutely! There should be fully traceable, recorded accountability with properly trained and qualified medical professionals. There is practically no situation where abortion is necessary and if a medical professional thinks they have come across one of the exceptions then they are most likely wrong. Anything less than this would be medical negligence and should be grounds for discipline or dismissal.

**If yes to Q-8:**

**Q-9 What should the requirement be?**

As previously stated there is virtually no need for medical abortion in the western world. Nobody who has an interest in taking the lives of individuals is fit to be in medical practice and certainly should not be consulted on such matters. Only medical practitioners who have the knowledge, skills and determination to preserve both the life of the mother and the child should be consulted or a part of any board or panel that makes such determinations.

**Q-10 When should the requirement apply?**

The requirements for consultation must apply in all circumstances without exception.

**Q-11 Should there be provision for conscientious objection?**

This question assumes that the government has the right to demand a particular point of view from its' citizens and that the government has the right to order citizens to take the life of a child (murder).

I am disgusted and appalled that such a suggestion would come from a comity of "legal" experts making recommendations on justice to the Queensland Government.

The answer is absolutely YES. Everybody has the right to conscientious objection and should have this right, but this gives the false illusion that killing children is the norm and people have to choose to abstain if they so wish. The way this question is framed is sick and twisted. The law already has this provision as it should. The alternative should not even have been considered.

The fact that the option of forcing doctors to take the lives of children is even considered is appalling.

What is it you want to do, set up a totalitarian dictatorship? I certainly hope not.

**Q-12 If yes to Q-11:**

**(a) Are there any circumstances in which the provision should not apply, such as an emergency or the absence of another practitioner or termination of pregnancy service within a reasonable geographic proximity?**

No! There are no circumstances where a medical doctor should be forced to take the life of a patient even if it is to save the life of another patient.

**(b) Should a health practitioner who has a conscientious objection be obliged to refer or direct a woman to another practitioner or termination of pregnancy service?**

No! There are no circumstances where a medical doctor should be forced to refer a patient to another doctor against their conscience.

**Counselling**

**Q-13 Should there be any requirements in relation to offering counselling for the woman?**

Counselling should be provided for women seeking abortion as doctors should be promoting good medical outcomes for mother and child. This counselling should be in accordance with this ethos of preserving the life of the mother and the child.

Counselling, in the same manner, should be provided in the other unfortunate circumstances where and abortion has occurred.

**Protection of women and service providers and safe access zones\*****Q-14 Should it be unlawful to harass, intimidate or obstruct:****(a) a woman who is considering, or who has undergone, a termination of pregnancy; or**

No! There should not be any additional laws created to protect these women. The existing laws are entirely sufficient.

The suggestion that there is any need for such additional laws is false and misleading.

This proposed law change is an attempt to prevent members of the community from caring for pregnant women.

**(b) a person who performs or assists, or who has performed or assisted in performing, a lawful termination of pregnancy?**

No! There should not be any additional laws created to protect these individuals. The existing laws are entirely sufficient.

The suggestion that there is any need for such additional laws is false and misleading.

This proposed law change is an attempt to prevent members of the community from caring for pregnant women.

**Q-15****Should there be provision for safe access zones in the area around premises where termination of pregnancy services are provided?**

No! An abortion facility is not a safe place for women so any pretence of being concerned about the protection of these women is disingenuous. The women who turn up to these facilities rarely have opportunity to get counselling that would help them make a properly informed decision about their child. The proposal to create these laws is an attempt to deny these individuals this right and to rush their decision to take their child's life.

There should not be any additional laws created to protect abortion facilities. The existing laws are entirely sufficient.

The suggestion that there is any need for such additional laws is false and misleading.

**If yes to Q-15:****Q-16 Should the provision:****(a) automatically establish an area around the premises as a safe access zone? If so, what should the area be; or****(b) empower the responsible Minister to make a declaration establishing the area of each safe access zone? If so, what criteria should the Minister be required to apply when making the declaration?****Q-17 What behaviours should be prohibited in a safe access zone?**

There should not be a "safe zone" or associated laws as previously stated so this question is irrelevant.

**Q-18 Should the prohibition on behaviours in a safe access zone apply only during a particular time period?**

There should not be a "safe zone" or associated laws as previously stated so this question is irrelevant.

**Q-19 Should it be an offence to make or publish a recording of another person entering or leaving, or trying to enter or leave, premises where termination of pregnancy services are performed, unless the recorded person has given their consent?**

No! This suggested change to the law is an attempt to silence those who care for, pregnant women and their children, and to remove or reduce the ability of these caring individuals to defend themselves in court. It is an attempt to silence peaceful protest.

**Collection of data about terminations of pregnancy****Q-20 Should there be mandatory reporting of anonymised data about terminations of pregnancy in Queensland?**

There should be mandatory reporting of abortions. Abortion is one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th and 21st century and it is of great public concern. To ignore and not record the countless numbers of injuries, deaths and illnesses induced by abortion is negligence. There are some women who have as many as five abortions and many women lose their fertility after one or two abortions. This type of statistical information is very important and should not be concealed. Other important aspects of this recorded data should include associated information such as incidences of incest, rape, domestic violence, slavery and prostitution.

Women should not be treated as objects to be used and disposed of at will. The same is to be said for any member of society. Abortion is largely the outcome of an endemic problem of selfishness and abuse in our society.

The tragedy of abortion must be dealt with promptly and firmly but also with a great deal of love and care.

Yours Sincerely  
Stephen Brennan

