

Health (Abortion Law Reform)
Amendment Bill 2016

Submission No. 1152
Received 6/10/2016

From:
To: [HCDSDFVPC](#)
Subject: Submission on Health { abortion Law Reform } Amendment Bill
Date: Thursday, 6 October 2016 11:50:49 AM

To the Secretary – The purpose of this email is to register my objection to the further bill presented to the House by Mr Pyne MP seeking to decriminalise abortion in Queensland and , moreover , to facilitate abortion up to the date of birth . I made a submission opposing the previous iteration of Mr Pyne's bill . I repeat and rely on the objections I made to the previous bill in opposing the latest version of the bill . In so far as the latest bill provides that an abortion may be procured after 24 weeks if the physician who has been retained to assault and kill the unborn child is supported by another physician , the “ *safe guard* “ is meaningless – another physician from the same abortion facility will , inevitably , support the decision of his or her colleague . The “ *safe guard* “ might have some merit if it required the woman seeking the procedure to be referred to independent counselling before seeking to abort her child – however – the intervention of an independent counsellor is clearly antithetical to the interests of the abortion industry . Further , the so called “ *patient protection* “ provisions in s 23 and s 24 are so poorly drafted as to be unworkable . The declaration – by the Minister – of a “ *protection zone* “ will , inevitably , affect the rights of citizens – morally opposed to the taking of a human life – from counselling against such conduct. For example , what if the abortion facility is near a hospital or general practice surgery ? Health workers at such facilities , if they suggest a woman seek counselling , as opposed to aborting her r child , may be prosecuted if they fall within the “ *protection zone* “ As for s 24 { 2 } { b } , how is one to assess what act is “ *intended to stop a person entering the facility or having or performing an abortion* “ Why should referral to counselling be considered to constitute “ *prohibited behaviour* “ Having regard to the ease with which women procure abortions under the present law – which – at least – is grounded on the recognition of the sanctity of all human life , the numbers in which they do so , and the fact that there has been no criminal prosecution of a woman seeking an abortion under the Criminal Code , there is no demonstrated need for either iteration of Mr Pyne's bills . The views in this submission are my own and not , of course , the views of my firm . Any correspondence concerning this submission should be sent to my postal address – . Yours faithfully Brett Heath

