From:
To: abortionlawreform

Subject: concerns about abortion law reform Date: Tuesday, 28 June 2016 3:08:39 PM

Dear Research Director, Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee:

I recently wrote to the Hon. De Brenni, member for Springwood, about the Abortion Law Reform Bill. Below is a copy of what I said in the original email, the reply I received from Mr De Brenni's office and my further comment back.

I was very disappointed that the essence of my concern was not addressed by Mr De Brenni's office. I am well aware that research shows decriminalisation of abortion does not necessarily mean an increase in the number of women seeking abortion, and that it means that women who would have an abortion regardless of the law can have access to physically safer procedures (the emotional turmoil experienced by women and families affected by abortion is often neglected in these arguments). My argument is not against abortion itself, but against the total decriminalisation and the lack of protection for medical workers who have a conscientious objection to participating in such procedures.

Why should one person's 'right to choose' impinge of this same right of another? It would seem desperately unfair to force medical staff that may be opposed for moral, religious or other reasons to participate in a procedure such as abortion. Why should the 'right of the woman to choose' then impose a lack of 'right to choose' onto others?

I am also very concerned that abortion may be legal at any time during gestation. A friend recently shared a frightening statistic of the number of babies in Australia that are aborted in later stages of pregnancy and actually born alive, then left to die as they are 'unwanted'. I have not varified this statistic but the idea is very disturbing.

I have also heard of the 'partial birth abortion' where the baby is physically forced from being birthed, held back in the birth canal until it suffocates – I struggle to see how this can be justified under the 'right to choose' argument! There is definitely oppression of the rights of the unborn when abortion is left to this late stage when there is no question that the baby is fully formed, and alive!

As a Christian, I value human life and human freedom – the freedom of one person should never be used to oppress the freedom of another. Freedom as a principle, works when it is exercised responsibly and with maturity, when the rights of the individual are not given priority over the rights of the community. Freedom needs to serve the common good.

I urge you to address the flaws in this amendment – protect babies in the later stages of gestation (many, many families on Qld's adoption register would be very willing to

provide loving homes for these babies), and protect medical staff from being forced to participate in procedures contradictory to their personal morals, values and beliefs.

In appreciation for the freedom to express these concerns, and with kind regards, Cassie Love

Communication with Hon. M De Brenni's office:

I am writing to express my concern over the recent Abortion Law Reform amendment bill proposed by Mr Pyne.

Firstly, the argument for abortion is often put forward as a 'women's right to make decisions about their own body'. As a woman, I am well aware of the consequences of sexual activity, that may include pregnancy. Engaging in sexual activity where pregnancy is a possible natural consequence IS a decision I make with my mind AND my body. To use this argument in relation to abortion is to evade the responsibility of the initial choice to participate in sexual activity where pregnancy is a possible natural consequence. Further to this, abortion involves more than one 'body' - the life of the unborn is also at stake, and the life of the 'father' is also directly implicated by the decision of abortion.

Secondly, this amendment does not specify a period of gestation whereby the procedure would be allowed. I am greatly disturbed that abortion can be carried out up to term, the full 9 months of gestation, in some states in Australia. How can this be deemed as different to 'killing a child' when one can be charged under section 313, Killing an unborn child? Section 313 makes it a crime to prevent a child being born alive by any act or omission of such a nature that if the child had been born alive and had then died, the person would have been deemed to have then unlawfully killed the child. This demonstrates the value the State placed on the life of the unborn - if a child has a chance of being born alive no one should have the 'choice' to end that life; either through assault on the life of the pregnant mother or assault on the life of the unborn child through the practice of abortion.

I am particularly concerned that the amendment to the bill does not include a conscientious objection clause to protect medical staff who may oppose the procedure due to personal or religious values and beliefs. This is significant. Should medical staff who morally disagree with the procedure be forced to comply with the amended bill they may feel compelled to resign or suffer mental anguish. Why should one person's decision have the effect of forcing another to lose their job or suffer mentally?

I agree that there are grey areas in this debate, particularly when there are serious medical implications should a pregnancy proceed or if the expectant mother is the victim of rape. However, to decriminalise ALL abortion is not the answer. Perhaps the

government could explore ways to support those women who find themselves in the unfortunate situation of an 'unwanted' pregnancy, to carry the child to birth so that the many families in our state desiring to provide a loving home to children through adoption would have the opportunity to do so.

I urge you not to support the amendment to the bill as proposed. Please make a stand to value and protect the lives of the unborn.

