

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Abortion Bill](#)  
**Subject:** Submission re: Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016  
**Date:** Thursday, 6 October 2016 3:57:07 PM

---

Inquiry Secretary  
Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence  
Prevention Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
Brisbane Qld 4000

[abortion.bill@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:abortion.bill@parliament.qld.gov.au)

Submitter's ID:

Merle Avis Ross (Mrs)

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
e-m [REDACTED]

home ph [REDACTED]

mob ph [REDACTED]  
,

06.10.2016

Dear Inquiry Secretary

I submit that the laws as they are, have served the community over the decades; so much so, **that there is no need to change those laws**. There should be no new laws, no amendments, and no movement of the laws.

Further to my previous submission, resubmitted at the end of this new section, I shall address three aspects in the second Pyne Bill: patient protection or 'safe zones'; the health of Australian women, particularly those of Queensland; and permitting an abortion on self.

**Firstly, 'safe zones':**

I present this scenario: Your daughter is running wildly on terrain you are familiar with, but she isn't. You know from the way she is running that she won't see the steep river bank. Do you let her go because she is so intent on running at her fastest, or do you strive to catch her and prevent her going over the edge, potentially to her death, or sustaining injuries rendering her a quadriplegic, or, with luck escaping with a broken limb, scratches and bruises? She will not get off free of consequences.

I believe every woman approaching an abortion centre is that woman. She is already in an emotional state, no-one can deny – or change - that. However, people trained to know the psychological (and sometimes physical) effects of abortion are concerned enough to want to prevent that further damage to her emotional, and, potentially physical, health.

In first and second hand reports, I have never known anyone to approach a woman unkindly or without respect and dignity, and it is an approach by a single person, a trained advocate. Media reports of the Australian scene choose their own words and pictures to create a controversy, but on closer examination we see the pictures of the vocal people are the ones holding placards with derogatory slogans, and chanting “choice” and other slogans, with ‘choice’ being a word we know is meant to preclude the choice of ‘life’ (life for the baby). In a first world country, a democratic country with “free speech”, to deny the pregnant woman a last chance to hear what others can offer smacks of a hidden agenda, while simultaneously being a travesty of justice.

We know there are many commercial abortion facilities where substantial fees are exacted above the Medicare payment. It appears the financial considerations of these businesses is driving them to support a law that seems to serve only to increase their business – even now, the pregnant woman appears compelled to enter as if directed, that is, she appears not to be allowed to converse freely with others before entering the facility, or even to look sideways. Though I have no doubt that the staff in the abortion facility believe they are doing the best for the woman in that instance in her life, the business side of the abortion facility shows itself as closed and calculating. If they were seeking the best interests of the woman they would be pleased that she could learn there are other solutions to her dilemma which she might prefer to take up, and thus perhaps decide not to enter the facility. The advice of the trained advocates is free.

Others will have submitted [Australian] case histories, and Australian publications relating case histories of women who have regretted an abortion. ... For many, perhaps most, on leaving the abortion facility, there is a sense of relief; but for those who have immediate regrets – and they are not a mere few – the advocates are still there to offer help to the women. Their interest is the well-being of the woman; their empathetic care for the woman rebounds to thoughts of the baby she is carrying – or was carrying. Who would **not** want such a caring arm in Society?!

Furthermore there are first and second hand reports of members of the public approaching an advocate outside an abortion facility with an account of personal trauma from an abortion. They had remembered where advocates were and had come to them for help. Again, who would **not** want such a caring arm in Society?!

### **Another issue is the health of women, in this case, particularly Qld women.**

What astounds me is that others are not astounded by the apparent bad health of women in QLD.

Pregnancy is a phenomenon in nature; it is not an illness. It results from sexual intercourse. I haven't heard anyone saying that sexual intercourse was not a natural activity. In nature, one is meant to lead to the other, just ask “the birds and the bees”.

All these are natural events, and we are led to believe that huge numbers of women are too sick in one way or another to continue a natural process? As I mention elsewhere, another person interrupts a natural process to the peril of the first person. I would join the ‘green’ culture to squeal long and hard if the natural process of an animal was deliberately stopped by any human being. Why is it

done to our own species – and wanted to be done at will at any time during a pregnancy?

We pride ourselves on having skills, knowledge and intelligence; they should be aligned to the care of the vulnerable woman, not harnessed such as to be a destructive force on her body to the detriment of her mental, and possibly physical, wellbeing, while having as a deliberate intent the destruction of the human life within her. This life is completely independent of her, not part of her as in a cyst or cancer to be excised. Nature (again) is the base line. The woman's body was created as a haven, a protection and avenue of nourishment of the life within her. Interrupting nature is not going to help the woman in the long run – and the long run is where she has to live her life.

A woman presenting with a physical or mental illness should be referred to the appropriate medical specialists, she should not be told before accessing that relevant medical specialist that destroying her baby will cure her. In Australia with its sophisticated medical knowledge and practice, there are only one or two instances where an abortion would be necessary to save the Mother.

Further, an abortion doesn't bring the female body back to the pre-pregnant state; she has to live with that, yet it could have been avoided. Medical specialists in Australia are world leaders in their fields, and they are the ones to whom women should be referred. Abortion leaves the woman with the emotional and psychological scar; at some point in her life she realises she is the mother of a dead baby.

**Finally, the woman allowing an abortion to be performed on herself, by self or other.**

To allow in law a woman to have or perform an abortion on herself without qualified doctor supervision is an irresponsible move for a government. If a woman is so mentally or physically ill that she thinks an abortion will cure her ills, how rational is she then to correctly assess her health and any underlying problems? how rational is she to correctly monitor the process? how will she extricate herself from any complications? who can guarantee the quality of any support, before or after? ... and so many more, serious questions. Governments should not allow any invasive medical procedures for anything, by which they abandon the patient or client to their own devices.

The law as stands not only protects against such a scenario, it is also a support. With the law as her protection the woman can resist the threats, pressure or other unwanted influence of others to force her to an abortion she does not want.

The law should remain. There have been no prosecutions but that does not mean to remove it; it is the support and security aspect that can be of value to a vulnerable woman.



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I wonder if the Committee – and legislators – even the public – have considered what that means in fact – what that weaker, smaller human is. At the end of my submission is a description of the developing baby, its rapid ‘unfolding’ of all its vital parts showing without any doubt that the ‘bunch of cells’ definitely has life and also both purpose and

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stopped in its

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

Here is the treatise which shows why the unborn baby (which you and I all were) is such a remarkable creature and needs to continue to be protected; but the mother needs help and care, too.

Every human being starts developing well before birth, at the moment of conception.

Unborn children develop and grow at a remarkable speed.

Advances in technology over the last 50 years mean that we now know radically more about life before birth than any previous generation. With modern imaging technology - such as ultrasound scans - becoming increasingly widely used, now we all have the opportunity to gain an insight into the humanity of our younger selves.

Here you will find descriptions of the stages of development of the new human being in his/her mother's womb.

## **What do human embryologists have to say about the beginning of human life?**

"The scientific answer is that the embryo is a human being from the time of fertilization because of its human chromosomal constitution. The zygote is the beginning of a developing human."

*Keith L. Moore, T.V.N. Persaud, Mark G. Torchia, Before We Are Born: Essentials of*

*Embryology, 8th edition. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders, 2013. p.327*