

Please accept my submission opposing Mr Pyne's second abortion Bill. Having already responded to Mr Pyne's first bill I will try not to cover old territory and simply add to what I have previously stated however I will restate my belief that the only instance where the taking of the life of the unborn child can be legitimately considered in a humane and tolerant society is in the case where it is the unintended consequence while trying to save the life of the mother.

I refer to the Bill's explanatory notes.

With regard to Section 20

I disagree with this section. Every Health Practitioner has an obligation to act in the best interests of his patient. In the case of a pregnant woman, the doctor has two lives to consider. The procedure of abortion causes the doctor to discriminate against one of his patients in favour of the other. The doctor must have compelling reasons for acting in this way. In almost every case abortion is an illicit and immoral procedure.

With regard to Section 21

The age of the mother or the child should not be the paramount consideration. The only question to answer should be "Is this procedure necessary to save the mother's life?" There needs to be good and clear justification for a doctor to proceed and doctors need to be held accountable for their actions (like the rest of us) with severe penalties for breaches e.g. lengthy imprisonment where procedure was not warranted or where mother died or sustained serious injury due to doctor's inaction.

With regard to Section 22

For a miniscule amount of women abortion would be life saving, and the public hospital system alone could easily cope with that volume. I doubt whether any Doctor or Nurse would refuse to act in circumstances of genuine necessity. The huge bulk of abortions are largely done in separate clinics, and this Bill is seeking to grant legal protection, to conduct what is in effect an illicit business. In too many cases, abortion is simply a social convenience resulting in the taking of an innocent life. Doctors/ Nurses should be participating in health affirming or life saving procedures if they intend to bring credibility to their profession. Anyone who participates in a procedure to actively end a life needs to be dealt with under the criminal code starting with the doctors involved in Queensland's 16 or so freestanding abortion clinics. This is unquestionably the slaughter of innocent human-beings on a commercial scale.

With regard to Division 3 Section 23

There appears to be a paradox, where on the one hand, we, as a society are geared towards saving lives, yet an abortion clinic is a facility that does the opposite. The desire for some group or individual, to step in and offer assistance to someone entering such a place is not only understandable, it is also just what one would expect from members of a caring society. This proposed legislation will in effect overturn longstanding social convention, that is, the spontaneous compassionate action of one caring individual towards another, such as is highlighted in the parable of "The good samaritan".

(2)

Don't Police already have the power to move people on who are genuinely causing trouble? What is the previous history of police having to exercise such power that the Government is looking at specific legislation? It is generally those who advocate in favour of abortion that do so loudly and with aggression, those who advocate in defence of human life in the main hold non-violence as a core belief. Is there a precedent in medicine where such laws are applied? If not then why here and now?

WHY DO WE HAVE TO HAVE A SEPARATE LAW, SEPARATE EXPECTATION, SEPARATE TREATMENT ETC FOR ABORTION? IF THIS IS SO RIGHT SO GOOD AND SO NORMAL – THEN WHY?

The introduction of the proposed laws would be an admission that abortion is like no other medical procedure.

With regard to section 24 & 25

This proposed legislation seems to strike at the heart of essential rights and freedoms. When someone out of love and compassion seeks to reach out to someone in need, and actually has to break the law to do this, then something is very wrong with society.

So the question needs to be asked, are such laws being proposed to protect the financial interests of the abortion industry? Clearly if this is the reason (and there seems no other plausible reason)

THERE IS NO JUSTIFICATION FOR THEM. More so because there is no formal arrangement around independent pre-abortion counselling regarding the potential risks, consequences and side effects of abortion. This individual who would see the need to offer pro-life literature or assistance of some kind to a woman entering an abortion clinic, may be the only real opportunity that woman would ever have to hear some facts around the "choice" she is about to make.

Re - ELEMENTS OF THIS BILL ARE CONSISTENT WITH LEGISLATION IN VICTORIA AND THE ACT:

To cite other jurisdictions which have failed to protect the unborn child as models for the way forward is, in the very least, unhelpful in the extreme. We need to learn from these errors so as to avoid them, not repeat them. Abortion does not solve any problem for the mother, it only adds to hers. It leaves her unborn child deceased and the abortionist financially rewarded for all this. Progress in medical science creates a two edged sword. It can be used to benefit the entire community (looking at the greater good) or it can be used selectively, for the individual's own advancement (sometimes, such in the case of abortion) at the expense of vulnerable others.

Medical progress has allowed for life-saving treatment to be performed in the womb for the benefit of both the mother and unborn child on the one hand, while on the other, abortions continue to be performed " more safely "using the latest technology, supposedly benefiting the mother, but at the expense of her unborn child. **THE REALITY IS THAT ABORTION IS NEVER SAFE FOR THE UNBORN CHILD AND LEAVES THE MOTHER OPEN TO UNINTENDED NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS.**

(3)

Neither pregnancy nor abortion is a disease. Both are a decision. Both are the result of the choices we make. **The weak and the vulnerable must never be forced to pay the price for the poor judgement of others.**

In summing up I repeat" If Abortion Clinics provide a medical service which is for the betterment of the community, why is there a need to have separate laws to govern them? Surely the Health system and all its standards etc would cover this.

The current law regarding abortion already provides adequate safeguards for both the mother and her unborn child. All that is necessary is for the government of the day to ensure the law is correctly applied. Mandating independent counselling for women seeking abortion has been known to dramatically reduce abortion numbers as evidenced in South Australia.

Why is the matching pool for the adoption of children in Qld filled with prospective parents and virtually no children? Could it be in part due to government inaction, respect for the defenceless, voiceless, and vulnerable unborn has diminished to such an extent, that today the unborn are aborted rather than birthed and relinquished to be placed for adoption? Children are aborted less they be born with some flaw. Children are aborted so that their other family members can further their individual pursuits.



Therefore I urge this Committee recommend to the Government -

- ***to reject Mr Pyne's second Bill***
- ***to uphold the current law (the recent Galaxy poll conducted by Australian Family Association supports this)***
- ***to introduce mandatory independent counselling for women seeking abortion***

William Tento

