

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Abortion Bill](#)
Subject: Submission for Health Act Amendment
Date: Wednesday, 5 October 2016 8:41:47 PM

Name: Stuart Withrington

Address: [REDACTED]

Postal Address: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

I am writing to express my opinion that the proposed Health Act Amendment should not be implemented.

The proposed Bill is weak in the following ways:

The bill does not stand alone in that it relies on the criminal code bill to remove the restrictions on unlawful termination of pregnancy.

The bill does not clarify for what reasons an abortion may or may not be conducted prior to 24 weeks gestation. For example there is no restrictions of abortion for reasons of gender or race or similar reasons.

The bill does not provide any penalties for the doctor not obtaining the second opinion for an abortion after 24 weeks.

The bill does not require the doctor providing the second opinion to examine the patient or even review their notes! And it does not require the doctors to be independent of each other - they could work for the same practice which will financially benefit from the abortion!

The definition of providing an abortion doesn't include providing the drugs for a medical abortion, so there is no protection of vulnerable women being pushed into procuring the drugs and self-administering them without any appropriate medical or psychological counseling.

The bill does not stipulate any care requirements such as cooling off periods or pre/post abortion counseling or follow up care.

The requirements for a safe zone includes a minimum distance but not a maximum distance other than the vague term "no bigger than necessary to prevent matter described in paragraph b" where paragraph b includes protection of privacy - it could be argued that 1km would be necessary!

The protection of conscientious objection is very weak in that it offers no protection against discrimination against objectors, the question "do you have a conscientious objection to abortions" can be used in a job application and make the objectors career untenable.

In summary, whilst the stated objective of the bill to remove uncertainty seems to be a good objective, the wording is far from adequate and would leave the law far too open if adopted as proposed.

There is no evidence that the 95% of abortions conducted for convenience provide any therapeutic benefits to the mother, and undeniably harm the unborn babies.

In the previous committee hearings, the doctors admitted to lying in their notes as to the reason for the abortion, yet this bill is relying on these doctors to act responsibly in this matter without any legal control.

Some people think they are doing what's right. But in the end it brings death.
The Bible: Proverbs 16:25

Making rules without respecting the life that God has made, may seem right at the time, but in the end will lead to further decay of our society and increasing death and suffering. Those who know Jesus say with the apostle Peter "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life."

I trust this submission is helpful in evaluating the proposed Bill.

Regards
Stuart Withrington m