The recent legislation to be debated in NSW Parliament is complex. It is a more recent proposal to that of Mr. Nile which has been abandoned for the present. Both arise from the death of an in-utero child, due to the actions of others, for whom it was found there was no accountability. Zoe’s mother learned that her baby daughter was not a ‘person’ in law, so her daughter’s death had no legal consequence. **Hence this proposed law, which would grant legal personhood to a baby over 20 weeks or 400 grams weight.**

While abortion in NSW is still formally illegal, there is a distinction between the courts’ interpretation of its illegality before and after 20 weeks gestation. Hence the rush to get pre-natal diagnosis done and dusted before 20 weeks gestation. After that age planned killing of these babies requires the involvement of ethics committees etc. in hospitals. This legislation however still leaves unprotected all those babies whose mothers have consented to be killed. The only remaining issue will be whether it was true informed consent. Legal ‘Personhood’, however, has not been assigned to these babies before, and it would re-activate philosophical discussion as well as protecting some lives.

From that perspective, therefore, I support Zoe’s Law, even though a person is a person from the moment of conception.

Legal advice of Catholic lawyers, however, has been obtained. Their legal comment is that the Zoe’s Law NSW Amendment Bill, if passed, will conflict with sections 82, 83 and 84 of the NSW Crimes Act. In that event, pressure will arise to remove these legal contradictions and conflicts. This pressure will seek to remove the existing Crimes Act Provision against Abortion. Removal of sections S82, S83 and S84 of the NSW Crimes Act would be a very bad move. This pressure might arise even if Zoe’s Law fails, from those who foresee this legal space.

Either way, we, CWLA NSWInc., need to be ready for it and anticipate a forthcoming attempt to get rid of the existing Crimes Act provision against Abortion.

When?

Anti life, anti-child legislation usually comes around Christmas, and especially during Christmas holidays when families are enjoying each other’s company and celebrating their family life.

We need to remain alert and ready to avoid a Victoria repeat.
Proposed reduction to Foreign Aid Funding

The Sydney Morning Herald on September 5th discussed Tony Abbott’s proposed reductions in Foreign Aid. The Australian chief executive of UNICEF Norman Gillespie said these cuts ‘would cost children’s lives’. Care Australia expressed concern the Millennium Development Goal number 4 might be affected.

It is important to be familiar with UNICEF’s current focus in reading these remarks. Their 2013 Report ‘Committing to Child Survival’ refers to ‘the destructive population growth’ in the number of children poor persons choose to have and to the ‘destructive environmental pressures’ these people cause. Such language has been found deeply offensive by third world countries in the past.

In 1997 the Vatican withdrew support for UNICEF and gave 5 reasons:
1. Unicef failed to respond to requests that it account for the use of donated funds which were earmarked for child – focussed programmes.
2. UNICEF collaborated with the UN in producing a manual which promoted abortion-causing drugs and devices,
3. UNICEF resources are used to help liberalize abortion laws,
4. UNICEF workers are often busy distributing contraceptives rather than developing children’s programmes.
(ref.: Vatican City Nov 4th 1996 (vis) press release published by the Holy See Permanent Observer to the UN)

At the London summit in 2012 in which Melinda Gates pushed to stop poorer families choosing the size of their families, CARE Australia argued that Australia should give money to inject these mothers with Depot Provera and Implanon and IUCD’s. African countries at the time were upset by this, as was reported in this newsletter at the time. Third World countries consistently state that they prefer money be spent on
- treating Malaria and preventing it;
- treating gastro-enteritis in children and preventing it,
- clean water
- and education, particularly of their women, to give them more opportunities.

The Population Health Research Institute has recently commented (Sept 13th) that both UNICEF and CARE Australia have come to regard the poor as the enemy of the environment simply because they welcome children into the world. Pope Benedict 16th in ‘Charity in Truth’ (28) warned us about some NGO’s (non-government organizations) working actively to promote sterilization in poor countries and to spread abortion, ‘in some cases not even informing the women concerned’
(With acknowledgment to Maria Campos currently working in the Population Research Institute and Director of FLI who supplied the substance of this report)

***

Our lady of The Immaculate Conception Pray for us.
CWLA-NSW Inc, Bioethics Convenor Dr. Deirdre Little