

To The Senate Finance and Public Administration Committees ,
Submission in relation to **“Health Insurance Amendment (Medicare Funding for Certain Types of Abortion) Bill 2013”**.

1. The unacceptability to Australians of the use of Medicare funding for the purpose of gender selection abortions;

It is wrong that Medicare funding be used to “terminate the life” of a growing unborn baby in the womb simply because of the baby’s gender. I would prefer the term “killing the unborn baby” as I believe the unborn baby is a person but this bill is not about abortion but about discrimination using abortion. At the very least funding should not be provided by the tax payer for this form of choice. There is no medical or even socially desirable reason why a female unborn baby should be destroyed simply because she is female and to use tax payers’ money for this is to provide support for this totally unnecessary form discrimination. Feminists and anyone who cares about human rights would be against taxes being used to aid in this process of discrimination. This is not about the rights and wrongs of abortion but its application to a group of people simply based on their gender.it is a human rights issue of great importance.

2. The prevalence of gender selection - with preference for a male child - amongst some ethnic groups present in Australia and the recourse to Medicare funded abortions to terminate female children; The practice of aborting unborn babies on the basis of sex has long been considered a problem in areas of India and China, where boys are sometimes considered favourable for cultural or economic reasons. , Geeta Pandey in May 23, 2011, "India’s unwanted girls” on the BBC News said that eight million female unborn babies may have been aborted between 2001 and 2011.Even if only one unborn baby was aborted for being female it would be a very terrible injustice. Such a large number reported means that there must be at the very least a large number systematically destroyed due to their gender. It is fairly obvious that there must be some unborn babies in Australia that are being destroyed due to their gender. There has to be some sort of protection and disincentive in our laws to prevent this injustice in Australia whether large numbers or not.

3. The use of Medicare funded gender-selection abortions for the purpose of 'family-balancing'

While it is often something families would like. A family balanced with equal number of girls to boys is something that is a matter of personal choice and has nothing to do with abortion ethically. This need for gender balance would never be a just cause for aborting an unborn baby .The means for such an outcome would be cruel and unjust. The right to life of the unborn is a far greater right than the right to the freedom to decide the balance of one’s family as desirable as this may be in itself. As a result of this it would be wrong to use Medicare funds to abort an unborn baby simply because the parents wanted a better balance of boys and girls in their family. This is because the unborn baby is a person. Why is the unborn baby a person with rights?

1. Lets work back from birth. It is wrong to kill a born baby because he or she is a person.
2. 2 minutes before birth it is still wrong they are the same person.
3. 3 days before birth it is still wrong they are the same person.
4. 2 months before birth it is still wrong they are the same person.
5. This is where some people have a problem. They say that somewhere along the continuum the unborn baby loses its personhood but they cannot say exactly when so they talk in terms of vague trimesters as if the baby is a real person after the second or third trimester.. In reality there is no loss of personhood going right back to conception (the point at which the unborn have everything they need for being a human being) because the unborn baby is simply growing from one stage to another through the various stages of the continuum of maturation to birth and beyond. Law can never be based on vagueness. Even if a person believed that personhood came to an unborn baby at some point during the pregnancy and not at conception, they really would have to be accurate in their timing as to the exact moment when the baby received personhood before allowing abortion at any time during the pregnancy as they risk killing a person. The law should never allow such risk. The unborn baby is not simply a human being with the potential to become a person with rights. They are that person. We all started life as a human person at conception. We are the same person today as we were then. We didn't start our personhood at some magical point due to gaining of some physical or mental ability or in this case a particular gender. (and here is the connection of all this with this bill) In fact to make personhood contingent on such a criteria is the greatest form of injustice, exclusion and discrimination. Actually this Bill concerning abortion based on gender shows the true colours of abortion. Abortion is always about discrimination based on defect. In this case it is the gender of a person that is seen as a defect.
4. Support for campaigns by United Nations agencies to end the discriminatory practice of gender-selection through implementing disincentives for gender-selection abortions';
I fully support providing this support because of the reasons already given that this is about protecting the rights of female unborn babies and their freedom to be born as opposed to the discriminatory practice of gender selection as well as for all unborn babies to be free from unfair discrimination called family balancing selection. This is a matter of human rights across the entire world and best organisation to provide that is the United Nations.

Sabina Prinzen-Wood