

Human Rights Law Centre Ltd ABN 31 117 719 267

Level 17, 461 Bourke Street Melbourne VIC 3000 Australia

P: + 61 3 8636 4450 F: + 61 3 8636 4455 admin@hrlc.org.au www.hrlc.org.au

Ms Lizzie Blandthorn MP
Chair
Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee
Parliament of Victoria

By email: sarc@parliament.vic.gov.au

5 November 2015

Dear Chair

## Public Health and Wellbeing (Safe Access Zones) Bill 2015

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission concerning the Public Health and Wellbeing (Safe Access Zones) Bill 2015.

The Human Rights Law Centre strongly supports the bill.

## Gap in legal protection of women accessing abortions

For the last five years we have acted for the Fertility Control Clinic in its efforts to stop anti-abortionists harassing and intimidating staff and patients as they attend the clinic. The clinic has experienced daily harassment for over two decades.

In 2014 the clinic brought a Supreme Court action seeking to compel the Melbourne City Council to exercise its powers under the *Public Health and Wellbeing Act* 2008 (Vic) to remedy the nuisance out the front of the clinic. The clinic put expert psychiatric evidence before the court about the daily harassment and intimidation of people attending the clinic and the psychological effects on staff of the anti-abortionists. The evidence was uncontested.

In August 2015 the Fertility Clinic lost its bid in the Supreme Court, despite the court finding that the anti-abortionists' behaviour may well constitute a nuisance. The disappointing court decision highlights the urgent need for law reform to protect the rights of women to safely and privately see their doctor.

## Balancing human rights of patients, staff and anti-abortionists

The Human Rights Law Centre strongly supports the rights to freedom of opinion and expression, including the rights of anti-abortionists to hold and express those views. However those rights are not

2

absolute and must be balanced against the rights of women to safely and privately access health care, and their rights to non-discrimination.

We believe the bill strikes an appropriate balance between the competing sets of rights in the circumstances.

Similar access zones are in place in Canada and the United States. In those jurisdictions courts have found that sensible access zones can be a lawful restriction on free speech and protest rights. I **attach** a table that summarises the findings in the Canadian and US cases.

We also note that Tasmania created access zones in similar terms to the bill when they decriminalised abortion in 2013.

We would be happy to provide the Committee any further information or assistance.

Yours sincerely

cliente

**Emily Howie** 

Director of Advocacy and Research