## Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016

Submission No. 1147 Received 6 Oct 2016

From: <u>Erin Hutchinson</u>
To: <u>Abortion Bill</u>

Subject: [SPAM ?] Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016

**Date:** Thursday, 6 October 2016 11:25:37 AM

Importance: Low

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to declare my wholehearted opposition to the *Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016*. This bill should be rejected for the same reasons that the Parliamentary Committee rejected the *Abortion Law Reform (Woman's Right to Choose) Amendment Bill 2016*. This newer bill is hardly better than the first as I believe it merely pretends to have restrictions that the first bill did not contain. I call the abortion limit of 24 weeks a pretend restriction as the bill clearly states that 'A failure by a doctor to comply with this section does not constitute an offence but may constitute behaviour for which action may be taken under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (Queensland), Part 8 or the Health Ombudsman Act 2013'. Is it lawful or not? What is the point of placing a restriction in the bill only to place a clause saying that it won't be enforced? Doctors who are already performing abortions this late must be laughing at this obvious loophole.

I would also argue strongly that a 24-week baby is viable and can live outside the womb. In a situation where a pregnant woman's health is at risk because of the pregnancy, which can occur in the later stages, then every effort should be made to help both the mother and her child. Dr Anthony Levatino, an American obstetrician who deals in high-risk pregnancies and who was once an abortionist, makes the case that in his many years assisting women with severe pregnancy complications he saved hundreds of women and not one baby was purposely killed by abortion. If an emergency situation arises then an emergency caesarean is performed. There is no such thing as an emergency abortion. A woman after 24 weeks in a life-threatening situation does not go to an abortion clinic – she needs to deliver her child urgently via caesarean section. Please see this video

where Dr Levatino explains this. It can also be viewed at — the videos at this website have been peer reviewed by medical professionals.

In Division 2, 22 Duty to perform or assist in abortion, I believe that (3) is not relevant for the reasons I have stated above – there is no such thing as an emergency abortion.

In Division 3 the bill allows for protection areas, supposedly to protect patients who are entering/leaving abortion clinics. This is similar to laws that have been passed in Victoria and since then there has been one person arrested and charged recently for praying near an abortion clinic. I wonder how someone can be arrested for their thoughts and their prayers? I believe that I have the right to pray wherever I like – and I do! Does this mean that if I am near an abortion clinic and I say a prayer then I have to look like I'm not praying? Those people who pray peacefully near abortion clinics are good people who care about the women entering these clinics whose children, and lives, are being destroyed. I believe that this section of the bill has been included to solve a problem that doesn't actually exist, and to target good people who want the best for women and their children.

Please reject this bill which is so harmful to women and deadly to to preborn children.

Kind Regards, Erin Hutchinson

