

To the Senate Inquiry Committee,

Regarding the Health Insurance Amendment (Medicare Funding for Certain Types of Abortion) Bill. I wish to express my gravest concerns, as to the quick and virtually silent manner in which such legislation is being rushed through parliament. Because what you are examining and voting on will not only be a financial burden upon Australian taxpayers, but is a matter of immense socio-ethical delicacy, if not legal concern. And let us make no mistake, this is not just something that politicians and the civil service who **REPRESENT** the Australian public can decide upon and vote on without giving a chance to the Australian public to examine what is truly being voted on. Nor should we use the usual juvenile argument that this is a matter of “rights” or “freedoms” of individuals and couples to decide on, because the question is a lot deeper than that.

Firstly we need to consider the premise on which abortion is to be conducted within this piece of legislation; public funding for gender discrimination as the basis for terminating the life of an unborn child. The question is not whether the mother or couple are being denied their right to an abortion, however questionable, inhumane or superficial one may assert their premise for abortion is. But that the funding for a personal choice to terminate a life on a point of a whim, a fancy or a perceived notion that they do not need a child of a particular gender, so as to maintain some sort of perceived “balance”. Already, as we can see, the question is not from the perspective of health or safety to which Medicare’s main purpose was established to serve. Therefore to fund abortions on such a pretext, is not necessary healthcare, because there is no inherent risk to the mother in question, hence, is it not sound judgement to publicly fund what is in actual fact, a personal choice or belief, and not a necessity for health.

Yet, as the descendant of genocide survivors I cannot help but reflect on history, recalling to memory the concept of eugenics which inspired Nazi racist policies in performing scientific experiments and the extermination of many different races and groups of peoples during World War II. And then there is the recent phenomenon of “designer babies” as if babies have now become a commodity by which people can trade or dispose of at will; alternatively put, we are creating the setting for “made to order” babies according to this legislation. And then there are the many books and films which warn of such dangers when we trivialise via so-called rights and freedoms (thus invalidating them), matters of such high ethical and social concern; Aldous Huxley’s Brave New World certainly feature prominently within my own mind when looking at this legislation. In simpler terms, you begin to open a Pandora’s box when you give the ok to this type of legislation which not only encourages and endorses the “reasoning” for this type of abortion, but do it at the public expense.

Now I am sure, there are those amongst you who may assert that this is a “progressive” and “enlightened” piece of legislation which ensures “human rights” and “freedom of choice”. But I would like to know what is so “progressive” and “enlightened” by such a piece of ill-conceived legislation, that tacitly endorses abortion purely on the basis of gender discrimination, and at public expense? Furthermore, what are we “progressing” from, and what “darkness” have we been led out of? Yet I would also like to know why such legislation was proposed and being forced through the Houses of Parliament so quickly, before people have a chance to learn anything about it, let alone hear and know that it is under discussion? Why has it not been publicised with much attention, so as the Australian public may know something of it? What is the motivation or agenda behind such legislation? Why is it that submissions by people like myself, have to be made, in order to call to account what is being

done on the quiet; while expecting me to justify my point of view, when the explanation and justification for such legislation being discussed in the first place, is very tenuous?

Furthermore, if the discussion was about a child that had been born, then questions would be raised over its human rights and how it could not be discriminated against. One only needs to consider how many cases our courts of law deal with each year, regarding questions over abuse, harassment and discrimination amongst adults. But the discussion within public policy-making circles, rarely seems to consider the rights of unborn children, but ensures the rights of unborn animals through legislation. Nor is there due consideration given to the impact upon society as a whole, that we grant the ease, and possibly public funding, for abortion on the basis of gender discrimination. How many childless couples struggle through the processes of medically assisted birth (which may never occur), or the processes of adoption? The obscenity here is, why cannot governmental authorities encourage those people who seek to abort, make arrangements with couples who wish to adopt? Why is there so much legislation, placing barriers to this simple arrangement, which could benefit the nation as a whole; when civil authorities complain about falling birth-rates and the need for a workforce, while worrying about migration policies which cause them no end of headaches?

Either way, it reminds me of how Victoria, under the Brumby regime, quickly passed through the abortion amendment act which took away doctor's rights to conscience, failed to inform mothers about the risks or the nastiness of the procedures of late terminations, as well as many other critical and ethical points of concern. The only reason it was passed without much discussion, was due to the virtual silence which created ignorance within the Victorian public, who would certainly have objected to the extreme measures adopted. To my mind, the idea of late terminations is illogical, because if some woman wishes to abort, she would not leave it to a later date where the procedure poses a threat to her own health and survival.

In any case, this proposal is merely a repeat of an ethical disaster like the Victorian amendment, which will also cost the taxpayer money. But irrespective of what I say, or what the public says, you the representatives will still propose legislation and pass it all the same, either in silence or with media spin. But remember this, when a court adjudicates in a dispute between an offender and a victim of discrimination, it is the offender who is placed with the responsibility of compensating a victim or correcting their abuses, it is not a third uninvolved party (or the victim) which pays for damages. This again begs the question, as to what is the real purpose or agenda for even proposing such legislation, and putting it to review with the intention of voting for it as a resolution? Has due consideration really been given, or is this merely an ideological crusade for white elephants?

With sincere respects,

A puzzled Australian