

From:
To: abortionlawreform
Subject: Submission Re: Abortion Law Reform (Women's Right to Choose) Amendment Bill 2016
Date: Thursday, 30 June 2016 10:11:56 AM

Dear Committee,

I am writing to you in regards to the Abortion Law Reform (Women's Right to Choose) Amendment Bill 2016.

The title of this Bill has been enshrined with "A Women's Right to Choose" and I say enshrined because in our day and age it appears that the term Women's rights have been so elevated that it appears scarcely anyone dares to even question it. I believe women have rights, unalienable rights, based upon their humanity that should not be tampered with. A right to live, to be safe and to be heard. Women should have control of their own bodies, but I assert, a fact that is undeniable according to both science and reason that an unborn child does not indeed form part of a women's body, though it does for a time reside within it. Concerning abortion and women's right I would like to ask: who is considering the rights of the little women whose lives will be cut short because their Mothers are given unrestricted access to abortion services?

There is the argument that the loss sustained during an abortion is a negligible one. I would like to note that thankfully the QLD legislation has not yet succumb to the absurdity or describing the life in question in any other way that what it is: a child, who is just yet to be born. The technology of our day succeeds in highlighting the development of the child within the womb. With ultrasound technology we can see with incredible detail the intricacies of the unborn child and as such it is becoming increasingly more difficult to ignore that reality that abortion is indeed taking the life of a real human child. It is granted that this child's life, for some time, is solely reliant on being inside its mother's body in order to live but surely this vulnerability should make us want to consider legislation regarding their life even more thoughtfully. It should make us pause and reflect on questions like the ones posed by write Kevin DeYoung in the following:

Shall we deny the unborn child's right to life because of where he lives?
Can environment give us value or take it away? Are we worth less inside than outside? Can we be justly killed when we swim under water? Does where we are determine who we are? Does the eight-inch journey down the birth canal make us human? Does this change of scenery turn "its" into persons? Is love a condition of location?

Shall we reserve human dignity only for those humans who are not dependent on others? Do we deserve to live only when we can live on our own? Is the 4-month-old fetus less than human because she needs her mom for life? Is the 4-month-old infant less than human when she still needs her mom for life? What if you depend on dialysis or insulin or a breathing apparatus? Is value a product of fully functioning vitality? Is independence a prerequisite for human identity? Are we worth only what

we can think, accomplish, and do on our own?

Kevin DeYoung, 'What Shall We Call The Unborn?'



We are talking about life. Valuable human life. And no life should be out trumped beyond questioning by the supposed rights of another. In the Bill's explanatory notes Dr. Carolyn De Costa is quoted saying that abortion is "...the only health procedure that is dealt with like this in criminal legislation." This of course may be true, but it would be wrong to not point out abortion is also the only 'health procedure' that results in the death of a human in 100 percent of its cases.

Furthermore I would like question the Committee as to the possibility that this Amendment could open the door for women to abort babies who are right on the verge of being born. How is it that we can value life so radically differently depending on what side of the birth canal it is living on? I draw the Committee's attention the case of Jodie Tarnawskyj who in 2014 gave birth to her son Oliver at 40 weeks and then is accused of murdering him almost immediately. Community uproar was of course heard. Society is outraged that a mother could do such a thing to an innocent child. And yet it has been established that a few short months earlier when she was 6 months pregnant she had an appointment for a 'legal abortion' which she failed to attend. Jodie's internet search history has shown that she also tried to find methods to end her unborn child's life and has been established that a few short months earlier when she was 6 months pregnant she had an appointment for a 'legal abortion' which she failed to attend. Jodie has been charged with the murder of her child at birth and has been refused bail. But what if Jodie had not failed to attend her abortion appointment? Would we all wave our flags for a women's right to choose? Would we miss the connect that the same baby boy that died outside the womb would have died in the womb? If we argue for a women's right to choose just how far in fact should a women's right to choose go if she does not want the life of her child to go on? Should she be able to choose to terminate her child's life but not choose the method in which it is done? If the consequences of this amendment carry through then I feel it would be hypocritical to allow a women to legally terminate at 39 weeks and give birth to a deceased child but then charge another woman with murder who gave birth a week later and with premeditation left her child to die?

Another concern I have is the criteria in which 'legal abortions' are allowed both currently and into the future. Abortion advocates insist that because of legal guidelines which states that the mother's well-being must be at greater risk if the pregnancy was to continue abortions are very rare in our state and only under extreme circumstances. I believe however that taking into account the 'emotional health' of a mother is invalid as there is no conclusive or empirical way that evidence of emotional stress can be graded in proportion to the life of a child and pro-abortion providers can easily use this to their

advantage. I know that even in Qld where abortions are illegal, women are still acquiring abortions all the time for reasons that, in my opinion, would not satisfy the legal test.

I have 3 stories to share from women whom I have personal relationships with. The first was an adult women who had an abortion solely because she was pressured by her boyfriend. The relationship ended and she suffered deep emotional trauma at having ended her child's life. Another was a woman who confided in me the regret and ongoing sadness she dealt with because she had had two abortions when she was a young teen because she was afraid to tell her family that she was pregnant due to her age. The third women told me of how her partner had wanted her to abort their first child and how she had reluctantly agreed and made an appointment to have the procedure done. On the day of her procedure she went to the clinic only to find out there was a miscommunication about the fee and she did not have the right amount of money on her so she rebooked her appointment and went home. In the time before her next appointment arrived she decided that couldn't go through with it. Her son is now in high school and she says without pause that "20 dollars saved his life." In none of these three cases was physical or extreme mental health impacting the women's decision to acquire an abortion and in none of these instances was acquiring an abortion difficult. On the contrary acquiring these abortions produced not only the death of children but also long-term emotional issues for the women concerned. Abortion rights activists insist that abortion does not affect women adversely but my experience has shown otherwise.

Part of the committee's stated job is to ensure that any changes to the law falls in line with current views and expectations of the public. There is always talk about abortion legislation being 'archaic' and ad homily attacks in like manner are made on those who, like myself, are opposed to abortion. However, much to my surprise, when Mr Pyne first introduced this bill to the parliament the overwhelming public reaction I saw through social media was one of anger and disbelief. Could women really be allowed to terminate in the third trimester? Would abortion be legal for babies whose life would be viable outside the womb? People from all walks of life were absolutely shocked with many exclaiming along the lines of "This is ridiculous! This will never pass. I support abortion but this is too far!" Unfortunately, the people who take it for granted that such reforms will never be passed into (or out of) law, are unaware that in states like the ACT abortion is already available on demand and at any stage during pregnancy because it was removed from the criminal code. So my question is: is making abortion on demand at any time at the sole discretion of the woman involved really what the public finds acceptable or is it a matter of the loudest voice drowning out the rest?

Mr Pyne and his Amendment Bill do not speak for me and does not speak for my family. He does not speak for the children that will be killed as a result of his Bill and unbeknownst to them he does not speak for the women who will face the mental, emotional and sometimes physical consequences of their "right to choose". I also have reason to believe that he does not speak for a large portion of reasonably thinking people in our society. Human beings are made in the image of God and have inherent value

whether they be inside the womb, outside the womb, young, old, rich, or poor and I unreservedly stand against any legislation that would allow for the snuffing out of even one human life without just cause.

Sincerely

Tamara Moldovan