

## Legislation Committee

---

**From:** Natasha Anders [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 3 May 2019 6:35 PM  
**To:** Legislation Committee  
**Subject:** Fwd: Reproductive Legislation and Surrogacy Bill

>>> The Legislative Committee,

>>>

>>> Dr Sally Talbot, Nicolas Goiran, Pierre Shuai Yang, Simon O'Brian,

>>> Colin Stephen de Grussa,

>>>

>>> This outlines why this surrogacy bill should not be passed. The Committee must consider this legislation carefully as it effects women and children. We are responsible collectively to give our children the best future possible and make certain they are kept safe with every opportunity to develop to be the best they can be.

>>>>

>>>> It is extremely important given the recent Modern Day Slavery Act that this bill considers laws in other countries regarding surrogacy. Surrogacy is a contact point for human trafficking abuses worldwide. That's why many countries such as Bulgaria, Portugal, Spain and Italy have banned all forms of surrogacy as it is the sale or trading of children. Surrogacy has proven too problematic to legislate or police which is why many nations refuse to legislate it at all, opting to close the door altogether.

>>>

>>>> There are current markets in India, Thailand and Cambodia that have tightened and or stopped commercial surrogacy. However India has a billion dollar black market that does not comply with its surrogacy laws. Women are being human trafficked into lucrative baby making farms /clinics as victims of their own biology due to poverty. And more often than not are controlled by mafia cartels or victims of bond slavery.

>>>> Surrogacy is a dark industry guilty of human rights abuses. Many countries have attempted to change laws and shut this commercial industry down but it is driven by international demand.

>>>> Any laws such as death insurance for the surrogate and their family to pay for funerals in the event the mother dies are often ignored by international customers. There is no enforcement or work place laws to protect the workers /surrogate mothers who are paid a pittance to risk their lives. Our responsibility for surrogacy and the markets it creates must be considered within this legislation. Altruistic surrogacy has the same boundaries and opens the door further to fuelling these markets.

>>>

>>>> As a first world nation our responsibility is to elevate the standing, education and opportunities for all women, not reduce them to victims of their own biology. Women and children are being used by cashed up westerners to facilitate their needs. Whether it's prostitution or the manufacture of babies no developed nation should engage in either practices or attempt to legislate under the guise of discrimination to same-sex or single men. Walk Free Foundation and many international companies are committed to eradicating human trafficking. The Modern Slavery Act asks us to actively engage in this debate. The purposeful procurement, creation and trade of children is human trafficking. People are not commodities to be traded. Whether in a first world or third world context.

>>>> This bill legislates the use of women's bodies by men for their own selfish adult desires. There are parallels with every women engaged in an act of surrogacy.

>>>

>>>> This is clearly an open door to coercion and abuse of women disguised as the discrimination of single and same-sex men. All forms of surrogacy clearly engage the usage of women's bodies as a service with indirect payment and children as product.

>>>

>>>> The Modern Slavery Act which was endorsed as of Jan 2019 calls us as nation to take into account our responsibility to keep our supply chains clean. Ethically we should not be extending surrogacy laws. Whether on an individual level or corporate level - our responsibility is to ensure all people are free - especially children.

>>>> How do we police such processes? Is there going to be a Surrogacy Commission set up to monitor breaches? Check the agreements?

>>>> Is there a process being activated to clamp down on human trafficking markets? All people have a right to know how this legislation will be monitored given it is based on personal contracts and with no protections such as police checks for the same-sex and single men accessing surrogacy.

>>>

>>>> Everyone knows that altruistic surrogacy for single males will result in creating markets in the third world for the trafficking of women and the purchasing of children, when a friend or family member doesn't comply. A child can be bought offshore and then imported to Australia via the law of descent. Who tracks where the child is from and how it was procured? Who tracks the supply chain?

>>>> All altruistic surrogacy opens the door to commercial surrogacy regardless of how the child is procured. Once the child exists they can be brought to Aust. Commercial surrogacy is currently available in Russia and Ukraine. The convicted Queensland same-sex couple bought a surrogate baby from Russia for \$8,000 and then rented it out to a paedophile ring.

>>>> We need to legislate for the worst case scenario - one abuse is too many. Child protection must be the primary consideration.

>>>

>>>> This bill seeks to marginalise impoverished women and children even further in these developing countries by reverting them to commodities being bought and sold. Human beings should not be for sale. In this country the parallels are not as obvious but the same. Vulnerable women may be asked or coerced to engage in altruistic surrogacy - renting their bodies for trade purposes and indirect payments or financial favours.

>>>

>>>> In the case of altruistic surrogacy the risks to the carrying mother and unborn child far outweigh the idea of producing a child that is desired. This is not about love but about money. This legislation will give same-sex couples and single men access to taxpayer funded Medicare for rounds of IVF. It currently costs \$8,000 to up to \$15,000 per IVF round and about \$80,000 - \$120,000 to produce one IVF baby to the taxpayer.

>>> Our medical system is not designed to facilitate an adult's desire to create a child at the taxpayer's expense. Medicare was designed to fund the correction of disability, disease and dysfunction. Same-sex couples and single men are unable to have children biologically. We should not be funding their desires just because technology enables it and should consider the cost to society.

>>> In the UK women are being discriminated against to enable same-sex couples to access rounds of fertility treatment. The NHS has adopted quotas that mean a percentage of treatment must be allocated to same-sex couples. This discriminates against women who are over 40-44, their ability to conceive declined at that age and then they are considered not as cost effective to fund for IVF treatment.

>>> Every heterosexual couple now must be at the mercy of hospital quotas and allocated funding due to demand outweighing treatment. The NHS system is at breaking point to service and fund all the legislated groups in spite of the reason they are accessing treatment. Whether fertility is impaired due to illness and or needing correction or conception is compromised for medical reasons it is irrelevant. They are refused treatment in favour of same-sex couples.

>>>

>>> This proposed legislation does not reference the age of the single or same-sex men that can access children. They have the capacity to produce sperm till they die. No requirement is taken into account for their age or ability to care for the children. Can they procure and care for a child if they are 70 years of age? This also is discriminatory against women whose biology does not allow the production of children indefinitely. Providing sperm requires low/minimal investment in comparison to the surrogate mother that risks her life potentially to carry and produce a child. Who pays for the ongoing treatment of a disabled child? Who pays the taxpayer. Who pays for on-going treatment for a woman who develops complications and dysfunction as a result of carrying the child? Gestational diabetes affects the mother for life and has life threatening implications that can lead to death. 1 in 7 pregnancies are affected. Not to mention the endless list of disabilities that can occur in-utero and can't be tested for. Who pays for the child in a process of agreement breakdown if one party changes their mind or circumstances change?

>>> The taxpayer.

>>> If a single man has to give up work to look after a disabled or sick child who pays? This legislation is not about fairness or love it's about money namely access to welfare and Medicare subsidies for IVF as commercial surrogacy is very expensive. The cost to our health and welfare system is too high. The cost to women and children is too high. The cost to communities is too high. The cost to society when it breaks down or goes wrong is far too high.

>>>

>>> As there are no protection laws for the children with this legislation. Convicted sex offenders, paedophiles and criminals can ultimately access surrogacy if this is passed. When these sorts of crimes occur we collectively bear a

huge burden in the playground, as parents, teachers, mentors and child protectors. Every Australian would bear these crimes collectively if this legislation is passed as will this Legislative Committee personally.

>>> Again the cost to the taxpayer who will have to foot the bill to see

>>> such crimes go through the courts like the outrageous Baby Gammy case. A convicted sex offender that procureres and then left an unwanted disabled child with the mother in extreme property. She had no provision to provide for the sick baby, another mouth to feed without food or medical care. Abandoned in extreme neglect with no commitment or redress with the commissioning couple. Not to mention being unaware what might lie ahead for the baby adopted by the criminal sex offender. A fate worse than death for any mother to contemplate.

>>> As with the case of the two lesbian mothers wanting to remove their IVF child to another country and stop access of the donor father. We foot the bill to sort out all the far reaching ethical problems not considered by unethical legislation.

>>>

>>> This legislation fails to protect women and children and asks men to take responsibility for nothing.

>>> It is legislation that is misleading, veiled as discrimination to single men and same-sex couples. In actual fact it asks women to pay a price too high risking personal health and reducing women to an act of biology for service.

>>> There are issues of insurance relating to cover for death, disability, injury specific to surrogacy.

>>> This is deceptive as no single women are accessing it therefore who is being discriminated against?

>>> This legislation allows access for women to rent out their wombs for "indirect" payment, taxpayer funded medicare assisted IVF treatment and associated costs to the detriment of children as commodity. Surely all legislation should seek to protect the most vulnerable in society namely children. The lack of protections is astounding. Given the abuses that have occurred in this county already.

>>>

>>> Men are not being discriminated against as I repeat no single women

>>> have accessed surrogacy to date. The cost to women has far greater ramifications with health, disability risks than a man seeking to satisfy his adult desires. The cost to children is well documented with many studies outlining the mental health problems they suffer when forceably being removed from maternal/parternal bonds. This is effectively what this legislation does on purpose.

>>>

>>> Every man does not deserve a child. Perhaps in a same-sex or single choice they should defer to the capacity and limitations of their biology. The rights of the child in a first world nation should be paramount and at the centre of this debate.

>>> A child is a human being and should not be legislated as an item to be bought, sold, traded or manufactured in any way. Children are not products to be manufactured with the purposeful removal of their legal right to connection to their biological parents by legislation without their consent.

>>>

>>> Children are not to be bought and sold or traded under any agreement. It's a human rights abuse and ethically unsound.

>>>

>>> I urge you to seek your conscience when considering the proposed changes. Changes that have far reaching ramifications for us all as a community.

>>>

>>> Grateful for your time.

>>>>

>>>> Yours faithfully,

>>>>

>>>> Natasha Martin.

>>>>

>>>>