

From: [Conrad](#)
To: [Abortion Bill](#)
Subject: Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016
Date: Sunday, 9 October 2016 10:36:42 PM

To: Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee

Dear Sirs/Madam,

I object to the Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016 and ask that it be opposed in its entirety.

The bill suggest that a woman does not commit an offence by performing, consenting to or assisting in an abortion on herself. The language which is used in the bill are discriminatory and dehumanizing towards persons who are pre-birth. This is highly offensive and unacceptable. Nobody performs an abortion on a woman because here life is not taken from her. The abortion which is the killing of a life is performed on the child, no the mother.

It is the upmost hypocrisy for this bill to propose that only a doctor can kill a pre-birth child and then in the next breath propose that any woman with no education or training may kill her own child pre-birth with impunity.

Killing a child is killing a child and it is of no consequence whether the person who killed the child is a relative or not they are still guilty of the offence and no licence to kill family members should exist.

I would not be surprised if next it was proposed by certain ministers that the state should permit honour killings for certain members of society as a special protected right for them alone. There is little difference to this proposal. Both would propose that a child causing a parent mental suffering is justification for killing the child.

The suggestion that in order to kill a pre-birth child after 24 weeks of gestation would require the concurrence of 2 pro-abortion doctors is a plain farce. Its like asking 2 foxes if they should raid a hen house.

The test of whether to kill the child is also highly offensive and dehumanizing of the child because the consequences to the child are completely ignored from the equation.

If a woman progresses past 24 weeks of pregnancy will the risk of some or any form of physical harm increase, no doubt, but does that risk of harm warrant the killing of an innocent and defenceless baby? Absolutely not.

The proposed conscientious objection protections in the bill are no protection at all. To claim that you do not have to participate unless we say that an injury to the mother is worth taking the life of the child is not a choice at all and denies the very concept of conscientious objection. Just imagine this kind of conscientious objection rights to avoid being in the military. If the army said you don't have to kill people from another country that our government decided we should kill if you believe its wrong, unless the army thinks any of its soldiers might get injured unless you kill those foreigners we want you to. Its not right to object at all and is licence to force people to kill against their will.

The propose exclusion zones around abortion industries is high offensive and discriminatory. To propose that our citizens don't have the right to speak freely in public is horrendous.

This proposal is akin to having a free speak exclusion zone around a Auschwitz concentration camp telling people not to mention the war because it might be offensive to Germans and make them feel intimidated.

Strange that we don't see this government proposing to introduce bills of free speech exclusion zones around work sites where union strikes are happening so that strike buster workers may enter without verbal or physical intimidation. There is plenty of evidence of that form of intimidation happening in society but not real action to protect citizens who in that case are in genuine threat of harm.

In the case of supposed intimidation of abortion seeking women from pro-life advocates there is absolutely no evidence upon which to base this ridiculous and offensive claim. Has even 1 pro-life advocate been charged with any physical assault upon an abortion seeking woman in Qld in recent history. If so in what way did existing legislation fail to bring justice to the situation?

The fact is that all pro-life advocates seek only to give woman the right to hear the other side of the story about abortion. The side of the story which no abortionist is going to tell the woman. Such as the fact the child is alive already and is not a blob of tissue as is the common lie of abortionists, that support is available to deal with having the baby safely, that adoption is a very real and worthwhile option, that baby's born with disabilities are still valuable and do not deserve to die because of their disability, that there is support for parents of children with disabilities, and help mothers with so many other parts of the picture which abortionists do not want to help them with because it would deprive the abortionist of their livelihood.

This is why abortionists want to ban free speech near their operations, why they want the government to give them special protected status that no other business receives, because they don't want their clientele being told that they are not necessary and that a better option is available.

If the abortion industry receives this sort of government protection then what industry is next. Perhaps the sun-tanning clinics can have free speech exclusion zones around them to prevent anyone telling their customers that tanning beds can increase the risk of skin cancer.

Please oppose this horrible bill.

Yours truly,

Conrad Newbery

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]