

28th June, 2016

Submission to:

**Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic
and Family Violence Prevention Committee**

Abortion Law Reform (Women's Right To Choose) Amendment Bill 2016

Ben Everingham

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Dear Committee members,

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in regards to the Abortion Law Reform Amendment Bill 2016. I wish to convey my strongest opposition to this Bill, and I will seek to outline my objections from 4 perspectives:

1. The Committee's portfolio responsibilities.

2. The Bill's proposed intentions.

3. The unborn child's rights.

4. Consequences of the Bill if adopted.

1. The Committee's portfolio responsibilities.

The Committee has been elected to have a multi-faceted responsibility in ensuring that legislation that is introduced promotes the health and safety of the constituents that the government represents. I draw specific attention to your role in ensuring care for Communities, Women, Youth and Child Safety. It seems somewhat contradictory to have a committee established to ensure 'Child Safety', yet at the same time given the task of seeing whether or not the killing of an unborn child should be legalised! However, given your portfolio and its ensuing responsibilities, I am hopeful that your thorough investigation will reveal what this Bill actually proposes, and that its outcomes (whether outlined or not) will be against the committees desired objectives, and consequently result in your recommendation that this Bill be rejected in its entirety.

Health

There are many catch-cries that supporters of abortion use, and one in particular is that abortion is necessary to ensure women's 'health'. However there is much opposing research which shows that abortion does not promote woman's health, but rather leads to increasing rates of depression, drug abuse, suicide, and there is ever increasing research that is gaining credibility that is linking abortion to breast cancer. Also the 'health' of a mother should not be considered in isolation to the life of her child.

Communities

Families are the very fabric and backbone of a vibrant community. The make-up of a healthy community is the ability for everyone to respect other people, regardless of who they are, where they've come from, or how old they are. Yes, age does bring different responsibilities and rights (ie. voting, driving, etc.) however never should the right to life be taken away from anyone. Babies, whether pre or post born, are every much a part of the family unit as all the other members are. No one can deny that every single person who has ever walked on planet earth has at one time been a 'foetus', this fact proves that this Bill endorses the taking of life from real human beings.

Disability Services

It is deeply saddening to see that many supporters of abortion see those with disabilities not just as second-class citizens, but as not even worth living. It's a common occurrence that if a child is found to have a 'defect' during an ultrasound, then that baby is aborted. It is routine practice now that tests for Down Syndrome are offered to a mother when she goes in for her 12 or 20 weeks scan. If the test comes back positive, they are offered different alternatives, one being an abortion to 'fix' the so-called problem.

It's interesting that the same ideology that was expressed and actually implemented by Adolf Hitler during World War 2 is being used by the 'pro-choice' people. In the end, life is not based or valued depending on whether or not a baby is a live human being, but on whether or not they deem that the baby should have the same rights as them. Babies are currently being abort because of their sex, perhaps because the parents have one or multiples of that particular sex and would prefer one of the opposite sex. Babies with a physical abnormality are being aborted, and these are not life-threatening issues, but perhaps things like a cleft palate, missing limb, etc. Or perhaps a baby has been diagnosed with a disease like spina bifada, and they feel it is far easier to kill the child before it is born, rather than having to take on the heavy responsibility of care, physio, etc. However I have also seen children who were diagnosed by doctors to have a disease or disability, and the doctors recommended an abortion, but the mother chose to keep the child and it was born with no abnormality. Or perhaps it's simply because there are twins, and the parents only want one child, so a perfectly healthy child is killed so as not to 'inconvenience' the parents.

Family Violence Prevention

It is well worth mentioning that a family unit is not simply limited to a father and mother and their born children. As many a household will show, the picture or card showing the birth due date alerting everyone to the news that you are 'expecting' a baby, the ultrasound pictures on the fridge of the unborn child, the pictures of the pregnant mother, etc. etc., all show that most Australians deem the unborn to be as much a part of the family as every other member is. I urge you to consider, could there be any greater violence than a person killing someone's child, but going even further than that is to have the very parent/s as the ones responsible? Surely if you are endeavouring to prevent or stop family violence in any of its forms, then abortion would have to be the number one issue that you are against?

2. The Bill's proposed intentions

I will seek to address some of the comments made in the *Explanatory Notes* which purportedly support the Bill.

Policy Objective

"The current law in Queensland is causing great hardship and personal suffering." Few would argue that an unplanned pregnancy can at times cause great distress and anxiety, faced with the prospect of caring for a newborn child. I want to emphasize that I am in no way belittling someone's hardship when faced

with a pregnancy that is unexpected, or avoiding the reality of what an unplanned pregnancy can sometimes do someone in emotional, physical, and financial terms. However, even in all of these instances, never does a hardship that one may have to face legitimize the deliberate killing of an innocent child! Too often I hear similar comments made by Mr. Pyne that women should have “control” over their own bodies, rather than speaking out about the dangers and consequences of living promiscuously. Yes, not all unplanned pregnancies are the result of promiscuous behaviour, however irrespectively the reality is that a mother should want to care for instead of ‘controlling’ (ie. aborting) her baby. Normally, one of the most basic motherly instincts, seen even amongst the animal kingdom, is to provide care and protection for her offspring, and so I find it so hard to believe how a mother can wilfully and deliberately put her child in harm’s way.

Why is it that women who find themselves in these situations are not offered a multitude of support services, who offer care, love, and support for both the mother/father and their child, but instead they are being funnelled down a path where often the so-called ‘counsellors’ are paid employees of the abortion clinics. Many a story has been told where women have gone into an abortion clinic to receive help and advice, as they are told by the pro-choice supporters, but instead all they receive is one-sided advice and are strongly coerced into having an abortion. Some testify that they have been almost forced into the abortion, with some even literally having to run out the door for fear of what was about to happen.

“Children by Choice manager Amanda Bradley told the Brisbane Times: “We get reports of self-abortion, some women we speak to say if I can’t get an abortion I will do it myself.” Children by Choice received 118 contacts relating to self-abortion or threats of self-abortion in the past year. This Bill would not only help those women, but Queensland doctors. Dr. Carolyn De Costa told the Cairns Post that Queensland doctors continue providing abortions despite risking prosecution under existing ambiguous laws. She said, “It’s done knowing that there is case law to protect you, if you are charged — but also knowing that it’s unlawful. This is the only health procedure that is dealt with like this in criminal legislation. It’s way, way out of date and belongs in the 19th century. We’re practising medicine in the 21st century.”

Some disturbing facts are raised by these frequently used arguments: First, just because people are acting outside of the law doesn’t mean that the law should then be changed to accommodate their illegal behaviour! It would be ludicrous to say that people who steal are being unfairly targeted for stealing so the law should be changed to allow their practice, just as it’s ludicrous to say that because women are saying they’ll have an abortion whether it’s legal or not, justifies having the law changed to legalize what they’re doing. The same tactic was used during the Victoria Abortion Law Reform 2008 where it was the intention of the Victorian Government to change the abortions law to suit “current clinical practice”. In other words, it was a known fact that abortions were being performed illegally right across Victoria, and so the law was simply changed to now make them legal.

Sadly, as is the case in the current debate, there is little discussion by the instigators about the actual morality and ethics of what is being proposed, but rather what needs to happen so that those operating outside of the law can do so without fear of prosecution or criminal record. It seems even with the current laws in place, that little has been done to oversight them with the Children by Choice website even stating that ***“In 2009, approximately 15000 abortions occurred in Queensland, according to Medicare item rebates.”***

Secondly, it's suggested that this Bill is designed to help those who would otherwise procure an abortion illegally (ie. *Children by Choice received 118 contacts relating to self-abortion or threats of self-abortion in the past year. This Bill would not only help those women*) however it's a fact that abortions across the spectrum will increase once legislated as it will be far easier to access an abortion if legislation is passed.

Thirdly, the deceptive and misleading language used by abortion supporters such as Dr. Carolyn De Costa only misleads the public away from the true facts. She states that *"This is the only health procedure that is dealt with like this in criminal legislation. It's way, way out of date and belongs in the 19th century. We're practising medicine in the 21st century."*

I find it almost beyond belief that murdering a child could be classified by a "Dr." as a "health procedure". Also, if this Bill is passed, an abortion won't be conditional upon the mother's 'health', but can be based upon a number of factors, and in fact, because of the wording in the proposed Bill, it is virtually allowing abortions at any stage for any reason, as it would be nearly impossible to incriminate anyone acting outside of the Bill because the interpretation of the Bill is so ambiguous.

"It's way, way out of date and belongs in the 19th century. We're practising medicine in the 21st century." Time or medicine doesn't change the truth. It was discovered over 150 years ago that germs cause disease and can kill, but that doesn't mean that because we are now much more advanced in medicine and its related techniques that the truth and reality of what was discovered has changed. The clear facts are, abortion is the deliberate taking of innocent human life, or more simply put, murder, and neither time nor progression in medicine will ever change that fact. In fact, what technology and science has done is proven the existence of life before the child is born (ie. with 3D ultrasounds, etc.) so that those who continue to push for the acceptance of abortion merely have a higher degree of accountability before God and others.

Benefits of Bill

"The Bill will repeal outdated laws." Again, Mr Pyne uses the same argument as many others do to try and convince people that somehow, over time the morality and ethics about the value of all human life has changed, and therefore they want the laws changed. Is he suggesting that we should redefine our Constitution since it must be out of date? Is he suggesting that all those people elected to government who initially compiled our current laws and enacted them, were/are out of date, and didn't know what they were doing? The reality is, time does not alter truth. If something was wrong 1,000 years ago, it will be wrong today, and it will still be wrong in another 1,000 years from now. I would suggest that his views which he would label as 'progressive' do nothing to progress society or the common good for mankind, but rather they are degenerative and detrimental not only to individuals but also to a healthy society.

"Outdated laws that can criminalise women and doctors for a basic human right and a medical procedure." What could be a more "basic human right" than to have the protection for those who cannot protect themselves? In fact, in the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child, preambular paragraphs 2 and 3 state, *"Whereas the United Nations has, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, proclaimed that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth therein, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."*

“Whereas the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, INCLUDING APPROPRIATE LEGAL PROTECTION, BEFORE AS WELL AS AFTER BIRTH.” (Emphasis mine)

The UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child also includes the following principles:

Principle 1 *“The child shall enjoy all the rights set forth in this Declaration. Every child, without any exception whatsoever, shall be entitled to these rights, without distinction or discrimination on account of race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, whether of himself or of his family.”*

Principle 2 *“The child shall enjoy special protection, and shall be given opportunities and facilities, by law and by other means, to enable him to develop physically, mentally, morally, spiritually and socially in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration.”*

Principle 4 *“The child shall enjoy the benefits of social security. He shall be entitled to grow and develop in health; to this end, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and to his mother, including adequate pre-natal and post-natal care. The child shall have the right to adequate nutrition, housing, recreation and medical services.”¹*

In the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 6(1) states, *“Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life.”*

Article 6(5) *“Sentence of death shall not be imposed for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age and shall not be carried out on pregnant women.”²*

These international human rights show that every human being, whether born or not, has the inherent right to life and is to be protected by law from unlawful destruction. These rights are immutable, and as such do not change over time.

So in lieu of all this, how can Mr. Pyne say that this Bill supports a *“basic human right”* while at the very same time it is taking away another’s basic human right? In response to a question on notice at the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs Human Rights Bill Inquiry, lecturer and human rights advocate Rita Joseph states, *“International human rights protection is not “a patchwork quilt” but rather a fire blanket woven on principles that can be deepened and strengthened over time to give more protection but never ruptured to give less protection to any members of the human family. You can’t cut out human rights protection for the unborn child (as attempted by the ACT Human Rights Act 2004, or cut out conscience rights protections for doctors who refuse to abort children or refer them to be aborted (as the Victorian Bill of Rights has attempted) and patch the holes with a ‘new’ right to abortion for women. To do so is to try to move the whole of modern international human rights law across to a different philosophical basis, utilitarianism or consequentialism, a system in which expediency trumps principles such as indivisibility, inclusion and inherency.”³*

Men and women have fought and died for our freedom, and for the sanctity and value of each and every human life, and yet Mr. Pyne has the audacity to say that it is a 'right' for a mother to be able to choose to end an innocent life should she choose to do so. I think what Mr. Pyne calls a "*medical procedure*" I would more accurately call an execution.

"These archaic laws are dangerous and have no place in a modern, liberal democracy" It defies all logic that Mr. Pyne can argue about laws that are "*dangerous*" yet at the same time be putting forth a Bill which seeks to legalize the killing of babies? Also, I thought the definition of a "*democracy*" is that everyone is treated equal and as such should have the same rights, irrespective of race, sex, or age.

"...modern society where women should always have control over their own bodies" For this statement to be legitimate, then Mr. Pyne should also be advocating and supporting that woman can legally use any type of drug they want to, can self-harm without any intervention being necessary, and they should be supported to commit suicide should they wish to do so, because as he says, "*...women should always have control over their own bodies.*"

"This Bill will protect vulnerable Queensland women and the doctors that are currently risking prosecution to assist them" Again, why is it that there is only one side of the story being told. It is absolutely amazing that he can say that "*This Bill will protect vulnerable Queensland women...*" and yet at the very same time the reality is that this Bill won't protect, but rather endorse the killing of the most vulnerable, the innocent, unborn babies!

3. The unborn child's rights.

Much of what has been said hinges on the fact of when personhood or 'life' begins. Much has been done by the pro-abortion lobby groups to convince people that a child growing inside the womb is not a real baby, but perhaps a blob of cells or just some 'tissue', and so seek to use specific terminology such as 'foetus' to persuade others that what they do is somehow of a lesser evil. Rarely do they refer to it as a 'baby', but as Mr Pyne chooses to do, simply refers to it (that is, the baby) as "*the pregnancy*". What's remarkable is that I have never heard of anyone, anywhere in the world, who has been pregnant but doesn't have a real live baby inside. Sounds ridiculous to say such a thing, but the reality is that to be pregnant is to be carrying a child inside the womb. The facts are irrefutable and irreversible, both medically and scientifically. Yet somehow the argument that is being put forward in support of abortion and this Bill is that somehow being pregnant doesn't necessarily mean that you are carrying a human being? Well, it is absurd and borders on lunacy to say such a thing.

The Victorian Law Reform Commissions report has a direct bearing on the Committees inquiry into the Bill since part of the requirements are that you investigate '*legislative and regulatory arrangements in other Australian jurisdictions including regulating terminations based on gestational periods.*'

In the Victorian Law Reform Commission's report, its definition of 'child destruction' detailed that a child can only be killed if it is living first. For example, you can't 'kill' a stone because the stone has no life in it. So in part they base their definition upon whether or not the child can survive independent of its mother.

1. 7.8 *The common law does not recognise a fetus as a 'person' until it is a 'reasonable creature in being', that is, a being separate and independent of the mother. Before that it was considered 'part of the viscera of the mother'.*
2. 7.9 *Under the common law a child was not considered alive, and therefore capable of being murdered, until 'fully born' and 'independently functioning'. Fully born meant that the entire body of the child had left the body of the mother. The presumption was that a child was born dead, unless there was clear evidence of life independent from the mother.*

Proponents of legalizing abortion therefore state that since a baby in the womb cannot survive without the life-giving support of its mother through the placenta and umbilical cord, etc., therefore it should be the mothers choice about what happens to it, that is, on whether or not they will allow the baby to live, or choose to have it killed. However that same argument could be said for those outside of the womb as well. A baby is totally dependant on its mother (or depending on the particular situation a responsible adult) for care and nourishment for a long time, so it is very, very dangerous indeed to say that one's ability or capacity to live by itself quantifies what 'life' is.

With this ideology, one could also say that the elderly, mentally and/or physically disabled, or those on life-supports machines, anyone who needs adult care and supervision for their survival, are therefore not 'living' human beings and as such shouldn't have the right to live should their carers and/or providers choose to end their life. Most abortionists would prefer I use the terminology 'terminate', however it seems at odds with what they are trying to deceive people into thinking because something can't be terminated (in a medical sense) unless it was first a living thing.

What is interesting however is that there are also pro-abortionists who readily admit and understand exactly what they are doing, and agree that they are indeed killing live human babies. So-called moral philosopher Peter Singer has said that "*killing a newborn baby is never equivalent to killing a person, that is, a being who wants to go on living.*"⁴ He is a known advocate of infanticide, and states that since abortion is so clearly evident the killing of an unborn child, then there should be no difference or dilemma with one having the right to kill their baby once it is born if they possess the right to kill it before it was born. He also states, "*Human babies are not born self-aware, or capable of grasping that they exist over time. They are not persons*"; therefore, "*the life of a newborn is of less value than the life of a pig, a dog, or a chimpanzee.*"⁵

Sadly, he is not alone in his beliefs. Philosopher Michael Tooley declares that a human being "*possess[es] a serious right to life only if it possesses the concept of a self as a continuing subject of experiences and other mental states, and believes that it is itself such a continuing entity.*"⁶ As such, babies/infants do not qualify.

Singer, Tooley, and others may seem to hold views that even pro-choice supporters label as 'extreme', however to their disappointment Singer actually agrees with pro-life advocates that there is so significant difference between the 'fetus' and the 'newborn', apart from the obvious differences of location, development, etc. He states that "*The liberal search for a morally crucial dividing line between the*

newborn baby and the fetus has failed to yield any event or stage of development that can bear the weight of separating those with a right to life from those who lack such a right.”⁷

4. Consequences if this Bill is adopted.

Much has already been said about the damaging effects abortion has on the mother, with ongoing effects also on the father, siblings, family, friends, and consequentially society in general. This is obviously in conjunction with the lethal effects it has on any unwanted babies which this Bill is designed to legally authorise or sanction their killing. However, it would be remiss in all of this to not at least look in part at some of the abortion methods or techniques that are already in practice, and subsequently what this Bill is advocating through its endorsement of abortion at any stage.

Infanticide has already been discussed, but it needs to be made clear that this is not a theory or ideology of certain philosophers, but is actually a reality in Australian hospitals and abortion clinics as a result of failed or botched abortions. There are eyewitness accounts of babies who have been born alive, due to the abortion not going according to plan, however the baby has been left to die on the table, or thrown into a garbage bin, with the death sometimes taking several hours. Doctors and assisting staff do not intervene, because as soon as they do they are admitting that the baby is ‘alive’, and are therefore legally required to assist that baby with medical support.

Also, it is ironic that in some hospitals there are premature babies who are getting round the clock medical care to support their life, but in another ward a baby of the same or even greater gestational age is being killed because the parent/s don’t want it. When talking about preemie babies, it is worth noting that the doctors and medical staff never refer to them as ‘premature foetuses’ but always as ‘premature babies’. However, when someone wants to get rid of their child, it is referred to as a ‘foetus’. So it’s a baby if they are wanted, but a foetus if they are not!

There are many varied abortion techniques used, often dependant on the gestational age of the baby and hence the body mass that needs to be removed from the mother. Abortionists state that the older the baby, the harder it is to break apart its body, and so different methods are used to enable the dismemberment of the body. However there is one technique which overcomes the necessity to remove body parts piece by piece, and it allows the baby to be delivered whole which according to abortionists removes a lot of possible complications with an abortion at that gestational age. This method is known as partial-birth abortion. This would have to be one of the most merciless and barbaric acts committed to a child, and yet it’s all done so that the ‘procedure’ (ie. abortion) can go more smoothly and is somewhat less risky for the mother.

It involves delivering the baby breach (ie. feet first) and delivering the entire body except for the head. The reason they purposefully don’t deliver the head is because if they did, then the baby would have been birthed, and they would have a case of infanticide should they continue on with the abortion. It doesn’t mean that sometimes this doesn’t happen, it’s just that rarely does the outside world find out about it. However, abortionists know full well that it avoids a lot of possible criminal indictments to remove a deceased baby from the mother, rather than a live one, hence why they seek to kill the baby before it is fully delivered.

Martin Haskell M.D. details in his presentation⁸ at the National Abortion Federation Risk Management Seminar what happens in a late term abortion, and his description can leave no doubt as to the brutality of what is done. For your reference, I have also attached a link⁹ to medical drawings of a partial-birth abortion which show the brutality of what happens. Anthony P. Levatino, M.D., J.D., an obstetrician/gynaecologist certifies that the images “accurately depict” the partial-birth method. Watson A. Bowes, Jr., M.D., co-editor-in-chief of the journal *Obstetrical and Gynecological Survey*, also testifies that the images are accurate in depicting both the method used and the size of a baby at 24 weeks gestation. Even though all 3 of the abovementioned practitioners have practiced in the US, the same methods are adopted world-wide and serve as an example to others as to what actually happens.

There are medical drawings¹⁰ of different procedures of abortions, along with a plethora of video evidence on YouTube¹¹ which show what actually happens during and after an abortion. I would hope that in the due process of your investigation of this Bill, and its ramifications for all involved, that you will avail yourself to the evidence that is so readily available.

There are many excuses used to try and justify the legitimacy of abortion, however this Bill would allow abortion at any stage for not only physical or health reasons, but also mental, emotional, social, and even financial reasons. None however, justify what this Bill seeks to legalize.

There are those who may not agree with abortion in general, but believe there are extenuating circumstances where in some cases it should be allowed. For example, what about rape? If someone is raped and faced with an unplanned and unwanted pregnancy, then surely this justifies in killing the child? My argument is that two wrongs don't make a right, and you cannot cover one evil act with another. The reality is that rape is harsh and cruel, and it's disappointing that a Bill is not being introduced to toughen the penalties for such a heinous crime, instead of using abortion as a quick fix. It's been found time and again that even after procuring an abortion after as a result of rape, that the victim still goes through emotional, physical, and hormonal changes, and the loss of the child only heightens their grief and suffering that's already been endured as a result of the rape.

Would you recommend an abortion in this situation? The mother is unmarried and only 17 years old. She is raped and finds herself pregnant....would you abort the baby? If you did, you've just killed 7 times world champion surfer Layne Beachley, who is also an Order of Australia recipient. Thankfully, her mother decided to allow Layne to live and adopted her out once she was born.

What about a woman who has tuberculosis and already has four children. The first child is blind, the second child has died, the third child is deaf, and the fourth child also has tuberculosis. Her husband is unsupportive and regularly drinking, and her grandmother is an alcoholic. Given the Bill's proposal, this would more than suffice for reason to have an abortion. If so, then you have just killed Ludwig van Beethoven, one of the greatest composers who has ever lived.

Hopefully you can see by just 2 examples that by killing off the next generation, who knows how many Prime Minister's, government leaders, sporting stars, medical professors, etc., have been killed before they even had a chance to excel.

Conclusion

Even as you read this, you are only able to do so because your mother chose life instead of death for you. We have the responsibility to make sure that all human beings, regardless of age, have that same right so that one day they too can stand up and speak for those who are unable to speak for themselves.

You now have the responsibility, as well as the ensuing accountability, that relatively few in history have had before. Your recommendations could mean the saving of countless, innocent lives, or alternatively, the deaths of them. I trust you understand the gravity of your decisions, and the impact it will have on generations to come.

May I humbly urge you to investigate thoroughly all of the facts and evidence surrounding abortion, and in due process advise against the proposed Bill due to the harm it will cause to families and others in the community, the mental, emotional, and sometimes even the health of mothers who have undergone an abortion, and most importantly, the blatant murder of thousands of innocent little babies.

As a father of 7 children aged between 2 months and 11 years, I have personally watched through ultrasounds each child develop in the womb, and seen the marvellous stages and growth patterns that they go through. I have witnessed the individual traits that they have carried through into infancy, and the intriguing actions of sucking their fingers, stretching, kicking, etc.

It grieves my heart to know that as I now hold these precious children in my arms and cuddle them, that so many babies will never experience this. Instead, the first and only experience they will have of the outside world is some steel clamps grasping their limbs and tearing them off, or having a salt or urea solution injected into their amniotic fluid sac so that it literally burns their bodies, or being forcibly removed and held as scissors are inserted into their skull and their brains sucked out. It is a medical fact that pre-born babies have a lower threshold for pain, meaning the pain experienced by them during an abortion is at a much greater intensity should a similar thing be done to those in older age groups (ie. newborn, toddler, or adults).

Considering all of these facts, it is almost inconceivable that there are those who would do this to a live human being, let alone a little baby. Yet now that you know the reality of what goes on, and especially of what is proposed should this Bill be accepted, then you must advise that it be rejected in its entirety. Please reject this Bill!!!

Sincerely yours,

Ben Everingham

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. Singer, Peter. [Peter Singer FAQ](#), Princeton University, accessed 8 March 2009.
5. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*, 1st ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 122–23.
6. Jeffrey Reiman, *Critical Moral Liberalism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997), 121.
7. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 142.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]