

It is widely recognised by people of good will that even if a person's presence is perhaps annoying, inconvenient, or aesthetically distasteful, that is not a sufficient reason to prevent them from existing.

This bill follows this basic tenet of being good-willed by proposing to ban the funding of the practise of sex-selective termination of the development of unborn children because the child(ren)'s parent(s) find the child's gender unappealing. **I support the banning of Medicare funding for this practise, and I suggest strongly that it should be banned even where there is no government funding in use.**

All human lives have worth and rights – whatever their gender. Whether people are young or old, male or female, physically disabled or bodily fit, silly or smart, Existentialist or Platonist, lying or honest, ugly or handsome, dog-lovers or cat-lovers – all of them, even if we don't like a particular characteristic, are not so overshadowed by what we find unappealing that they should be prevented from existing. For example, although I find men on occasion to be incredibly tedious and annoying companions, they are still worthwhile human beings. They can do very clever things that I as a woman can't do – like carry heavy things and sing bass and grow beards – and I value these things in them, even if the male in question is incredibly unpleasant.

However, some people may say in regard to this: 'We're not talking about stopping annoying people we don't like from existing-- we're talking about people who don't even exist. I mean, the pre-born human thing is not a human. It's an extension of the woman's body or a parasite, and if she doesn't like something about it, such as its gender, it is quite in her rights to be rid of it.'

This is incorrect. Firstly, from conception, the unborn child is not the same as the woman's body-- it's a composite of the egg and the sperm, and the sperm does not come from the woman's body. The new genetic material, the embryo is not identical to the woman; it is not the woman. Is it some strange bacteria or parasite? No, it has human DNA: the same sort of DNA, if not exactly identical, that you find in every cell of the adult human body. **The thing in the woman's uterus is not the woman and not bacteria: it is a unique individual with human DNA.**

Secondly, to inhabit the body of another person for nine months this is an essential part of the nature of the human being. It's not nice, it's not clean, it's not polite or fashionable or comfortable, I understand the fear, I'm a woman and find the prospect alarming-- but it is an essential part of the human being that they spend a particular amount of time in a woman's uterus, and very likely being cared for and fed by her afterwards as well. You would not deny me, as a fully grown, healthy, intelligent woman, of, say, being a ten year old (if you could travel back in time); because if I don't go through the stage of being ten years old, then I will not attain my current age and you will be guilty of having ended me and all my future prospects. Similarly, **to deprive a person of the necessary, if bizarre and uncomfortable, stage within the uterus, is to commit a denial of the rights of the fully grown person, among which is the right to grow up.**

Human rights are complicated, overlapping, and often uncomfortable. But that is how life is: we must figure out compromises if we are to permit the allowances of two people's rights. In this case, the rights clashing are those of the person to be permitted to go through a necessary stage of existence, and the right of the woman to live happily as she wishes. Perhaps some stoicism is called for; perhaps, instead of cowering from a difficult situation, we should be calling for strength, courage and the ability to rise to the occasion and make it an opportunity for becoming a better, happier, wiser person. Feminism has shown us that women are not weaklings, and why, then, should they cower from as gentle a situation as a pregnancy of someone whose gender they don't like? There is always adoption if necessary.

It is necessary to discuss this in order that I may prove that sex-selective abortion does involve unfair selection on a real, human individual with full rights.

Sex-selective abortion is a denial of basic human rights. As such, Medicare should not fund it, and the practise, even when paid for without government assistance, should be combated by the

government and society.

I do have a concern with the bill. It does not say what the actual means of enforcing this Bill is. This problem should be resolved. Otherwise, the sentiments expressed are reasonable.