



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

---

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND COMMUNITY WELLBEING  
Mr Johnathan Davis (Chair), Mr James Milligan MLA (Deputy Chair),  
Mr Michael Petterson MLA

## Submission Cover Sheet

Inquiry into Abortion and reproductive choice in the ACT

**Submission Number: 22**

**Date Authorised for Publication: 6 September 2022**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [LA Committee - HCW](#)  
**Subject:** Abortion Inquiry  
**Date:** Sunday, 14 August 2022 11:13:22 PM

---

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. [Learn why this is important](#)

Here is my submission to the Abortion Inquiry:

In Para 1 of the TOR you already give the game away, in so far as this is not an impartial Inquiry. You refer to “barriers” for accessibility. These are supposed to apply to the disadvantaged groups that are listed.

In Para 2 of the TOR you give a further example of your bias by referring to “affordability of abortion and reproductive choice”.

In Para 3 you give a further example of bias by referring to “legal protections for abortion rights”.

Para 4 contains the only example of an attempt at non-bias by referring to a “variety of possible reproductive choices” .

I wish I had the time to compare your terms of reference with those of other Inquiries, to show that it is one of the most biased terms of reference in the history of legislative Inquiries.

I don't always agree with Elon Musk but his recent Twitter comment (8 July - <https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/1545046146548019201>) deserves a comment and study viz “A collapsing birth rate is the biggest danger civilization faces by far.”

What is contributing mightily to this collapse? Abortion, of course. Where can one discuss this in your biased Terms of Reference?

Cheers

Denis Strangman AM  
[REDACTED]