



**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: 23**

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

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Inquiry into abortion and reproductive choice in the ACT

I am writing with regard to the above inquiry.

Abortion is the most effective way of terminating a pregnancy in an expectant mother by way of killing the unborn child (or foetus) *in utero*. Many reasons can be put forward for such action but a major one appears to be the welfare of the mother.

While our society places great emphasis of allowing the mother's desire for an abortion, there appears to be no concern given to the rights of the unborn child or foetus. They are deliberately destroyed because killing them is the easiest way to solve the mother's problem.

Abortion is a complex issue but the right of the unborn must be protected. Here governments have the choice of going with the ethos of the community at the time or taking a long and detailed look at why abortions are procured.

I do not know if governments we have had in the ACT have ever done this. To destroy human life is a most serious matter and I am loathe to support the proposed ACT budget of over \$2 million to expand the availability of abortion in the ACT when the status of what or who is being killed is not certain. The precautionary principle, so mooted during the Covid disaster, would argue that that as the status of the unborn child or foetus is not agreed upon, killing them is unacceptable.

With this background and my not knowing how many abortions are performed in the ACT each year and whether any mother or mother to be is ever prevented from having an abortion if they desire it in the ACT I cannot see why the funding of abortion in the ACT is in need of a \$2,000,000 budget hand out. This needs to be clarified.

I know one of the testimonies on the matter (on the ACT Government's website) indicated that Calvary Hospital did not do D&Cs. Is this correct? My very limited understanding is that the D&C is a "routine" procedure for the situation described. It should be verified whether the statement made is correct or not.

It is a fact of life that the Australian health system, although wonderful, has limited resources and in the public system immediate access to a specific operation or technique is not always available, e.g. waiting lists are apparently long for many serious life threatening or disabling issues. However, one would expect that the situation described would have been treated as a true emergency by a hospital.

Similarly, the other submission that is on line is, based on its summary, is a direct demand that Calvary Hospital conduct procedures its founders consider unethical. Is there really is a shortage of abortion facilities in the ACT such that Calvary needs to be forced to do procedures against its ethos and moral code? Or is this another attack on the beliefs of a minority group with the desire to remove Calvary Hospital from its religious foundations?

The ABC news at <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2022-08-04/canberrans-to-have-access-to-free-abortions-from-next-year/101298368> appears to say problems for women seeking abortions have been resolved by the ACT Government's recent actions in this area. Indeed, the news item indicates is that ACT abortion services are to be free to women without Medicare cards or who are suffering financial difficulties. The Government has apparently set aside 4.6 million dollars for these services. If the additional 2 million dollars being proposed is not part of the 4.6 million dollars, this is definitely icing on the cake for the abortion industry.

As Medicare and private health funds already contributes to all abortions, there is a definite need to show that women are currently being prevented from getting abortions in the ACT for monetary reasons and lack of facilities.

I have been told Marie Stopes *International* already gets its premises for a reduced rental from the ACT Government? If it does, this practice should be extended to all private companies and businesses in the ACT.

Item 4 in the terms of reference

*4) access to information to support a variety of possible reproductive choices, including choosing to give birth;*

is minimalist. Action, not more “information” is needed.

Here is an opportunity for the ACT Government to be for life, rather than its depressing current anti-life stance. Support should be provided by the Government to help mothers avoid the necessity for an abortion; this can be under the under the banner of personal rights. Such action would actually be protecting both the mother’s right and the rights of the unborn – something that surely is a good thing.

Item 5 in the terms of reference

*5) any other related matters.*

is very broad and should not be used to allow matters not directly related to the inquiry to be raised.

Thank you

Daryl Murphy

██████████  
██████████████████  
██