



Bringing
New Zealand
back to Life



Responding to those who want to introduce an extreme abortion law in NZ

Several pro-abortion lobby groups have been agitating for the introduction of a very laissez-faire abortion law in this country. But New Zealanders don't want an extreme abortion law, they want a law that works best for women's health and well-being, and which considers ALL human beings involved in a pregnancy.

- A law that protects informed consent.
- A law that requires honest information about abortion, and abortion-related risks.
- A law that provides women independent pregnancy counselling.
- A law that protects young girls by requiring parental involvement.

So that women can make truly informed decisions from a place of certainty and knowledge

THE ARGUMENT: 'Changing the law is simply ratifying what's already happening'

THE RESPONSE: What is being proposed is NOT simply a case of ratifying current practice at all. Instead it would involve the introduction of a NEW and extreme abortion law in NZ - a law that could result in the introduction of late-term abortion, the loss of freedom of conscience for healthcare providers, and gender-selective abortions, among other things.

THE ARGUMENT: 'Women who have abortions shouldn't be criminals'

THE RESPONSE: Any New Zealand woman who has an abortion under the current legislative guidelines and protections is NOT committing an illegal act, and is therefore NOT considered a criminal by our current laws. This claim is simply false scaremongering aimed at deceiving people into supporting the introduction of an extreme abortion law in New Zealand.

THE ARGUMENT: 'There is no point in keeping abortion in the Crimes Act, it's a health issue'

THE RESPONSE: The current law recognises the scientific fact that there are at least two human beings involved in every pregnancy, and that abortion results in the loss of one of those lives. The current legal framework attempts to strike a balance between the wellbeing of the mother, and the fact that the deliberate taking of any innocent human life is a crime that must be safeguarded against.

And yes, abortion is a health issue - it's a surgical procedure that has some serious risk factors associated with it. A sound law needs to reflect that reality, and not leave women exposed to harms, such as those recently witnessed in the criminal trial of Kermit Gosnell who was able to operate a dangerous legal abortion facility which resulted in female client death and other atrocities thanks to extreme abortion laws.

THE ARGUMENT: 'It's a matter between a woman and her doctor'

THE RESPONSE: In actual fact there are at least two human beings



involved in every pregnancy, and that's why we place such a strong emphasis on campaigns that discourage smoking or drinking during pregnancy in this country. It's also why, if it is needed, we conduct life-saving surgery while a child is in utero. Any responsible doctor knows that they are dealing with at least two patients that need care every time a pregnant woman comes under their supervision, and any responsible law should also do the same.

THE ARGUMENT: 'Stop trying to impose your religious beliefs on the rest of NZ'

THE RESPONSE: The health and well-being of a woman is not a religious issue. The rights of an unborn human being are not a religious issue.

Yes, there are religious people who oppose abortion, but there are also a lot of non-religious people who oppose it too. This is because the fundamental arguments against abortion are grounded in logic and science, not just religion.

THE ARGUMENT: 'Women currently have to jump through hoops to get an abortion'

THE RESPONSE: New Zealand women do not have to 'jump through hoops'. Instead the system puts basic legal safeguards in place. If there truly are issues with these current safeguards then addressing those areas, and not introducing an extreme abortion law, is the correct way to fix any deficiencies.

THE ARGUMENT: 'Women must have control over their own bodies'

THE RESPONSE: New Zealand women need to be informed of the effects that abortion can have on their bodies, and the current law needs to be amended to ensure that such informed consent is a legal requirement.

There are also at least two bodies in every pregnancy, the body of the mother and the body of the unborn human being growing inside her womb. So if we truly do believe that women must have control over their bodies, then surely unborn women also deserve the right to have control over THEIR bodies too?



THE ARGUMENT: 'Children are important. Every child needs to be loved and wanted'

THE RESPONSE: EVERY child is very important, and EVERY child should be loved because they are important, regardless of whether they were planned or not. A so-called 'wanted child' is no more special or valuable than a child that has parents who are too afraid or unsure to 'want' that child right now. True parenting is about giving to your children without counting the cost, and the ultimate act of love is to give life to a child. There is also no shortage of loving Kiwi parents wanting to adopt any so-called 'unwanted children' in this country.

THE ARGUMENT: 'MP's get a conscience vote on abortion. Why don't I?'

THE RESPONSE: Every time a NZ woman is faced with an unplanned or difficult pregnancy she faces a conscience vote on abortion.

THE ARGUMENT: 'NZ women deserve the right to choose'

THE RESPONSE: Surely ALL New Zealand women deserve the right to choose, not just those New Zealand women who have already been born?

Yes, NZ women should have the right to choose - their maternity care provider, their midwife, their doctor, the type of birth they want, etc, but abortion is something completely different altogether.

The question of choice is far more complex than the way it is often used by some in the abortion debate. The law doesn't recognise personal choice as an absolute without limits; instead it always restricts choice when it conflicts with the wellbeing of others. In the case of abortion, those 'others' are the unborn human beings who will be robbed of ALL their choices if they are aborted. A real choice is one that is fully informed; about all the risks, about all the options, about fetal development, and about what the abortion procedure actually entails, etc.

THE ARGUMENT: 'Pro-choice and pro-family. Private decisions like abortion shouldn't be the government's business'

THE RESPONSE: Being pro-family means choosing life for all of your children, and abortion is never simply a private decision when it is being funded by all NZ taxpayers - which makes it government business.

All of us have a stake in what happens to the most vulnerable members of our community and to their mothers, and so we should all care about what shape our laws take when it comes to abortion.

THE ARGUMENT: 'What about cases of pregnancy resulting from rape or incest, or where there are fetal abnormalities?'

THE RESPONSE: When it comes to pregnancies that result from rape and/or incest, extreme violence has been done to those women. They deserve to be treated with the deepest compassion, given enormous support, and special care.

However, the circumstances of the baby's conception change nothing about the baby herself, or the extreme violence of abortion. So often when this issue is raised, people refer to the unborn child as if they are an extension of the rapist, or his vile act, completely forgetting that in actual fact the child is their own unique person despite the tragic circumstances of their conception. That child is just as much an extension of the mother, and adding abortion after rape simply adds violence to violence, creating a second victim of the rapist - the unborn child.

Many women who have kept their children conceived in rape tell a common story of finding a silver lining of love in that child, in an otherwise very dark situation. Women who keep their babies also avoid the serious psychological risks associated with abortion which, according to some experts, could be amplified even further when added to the already horrific trauma caused by the sexual assault.

Aborting a child because of possible abnormality is nothing less than blatant discrimination against people with disabilities. Any answer has to tear aside the veil of prejudice that drives the notion that it is somehow kinder to kill a person with a disability or a disease before she is born than to let her "live in that condition." Shockingly, the types of disabilities included by pro-abortionists in the list of purportedly "good reasons" for an abortion range from the truly severe to relatively minor; the latter part of the list grows lengthier every year. Abortion is becoming a search-and-destroy method for eliminating less-than-"perfect" people.

