

BILL

Original drafter Italian lawyer Pietro Guerini 14-12-2015

Rules for the protection of birthright.

Article 1.

The State has a moral duty, coinciding with its function as an instrument for the defense of the individual weak and with its economic interest, to protect the birthright of the conceived and the conceived, as an objectively essential right for the exercise of any other right by any person, provided that the birth is not to the detriment of the mother's life pursuant to the following article.

Article 2

Voluntary abortion is permitted only in the case of serious danger to the life of the woman which leads to terminate your pregnancy or face childbirth, a serious current and not otherwise avoidable danger that must be ascertained and rigorously documented by a commission composed of three doctors, none of as an employee or collaborator of the health facility chosen by the woman for the possible interruption of pregnancy, and excluding from the assessment any analysis relating to a hypothetical suicide of the itself. *[This paragraph complies, among other things, with art. 49 n. 3 of the Zanardelli Code, in force since 1929 in the Vatican City State, so anyone who considers it an anti-Christian paragraph must first of all ask the Supreme Pontiff, who belongs to that State, to abolish the provision cited technically Absolute Sovereign, in a not at all hilarious attempt to fill unlikely gaps doctrinal at least from 1929 to today of his and his predecessors, among whom are Pius XII and Benedict XVI, far from Catholic communists, who have demonstrated, by not intervening, that they are considering obviously a woman is a person and not a reproductive machine that can be scrapped by law.]*

Any other option of voluntary abortion is prohibited.

Anyone, outside the cases provided for by article 326 of the penal code, having become aware of it for reasons of profession or office, reveals the identity - or in any case discloses information capable of revealing it - of whoever has resorted to the intervention provided for in the first paragraph is punished in accordance with article 622 of the penal code.

Even in the case referred to in the first paragraph, the State recognizes the right of all health workers to conscientious objection, except when their intervention is essential to save life of the woman in imminent danger, in line with the provisions of paragraph 5 of the art. 9 of the repealed law 194/78.

Anyone who produces, imports, possesses, distributes or markets any substance they produce abortive effects starting from the very moment of conception he is criminally responsible and is punished per se himself with imprisonment of 3 to 5 years, without prejudice to the further responsibilities provided for by this law.

Article 3

Anyone who voluntarily causes an abortion, whether materially or through facilitation or incitement, he is criminally liable and is punished with imprisonment from 8 to 12 years.

The same penalty applies to anyone who causes the termination of a pregnancy with actions directed at cause injuries to women and is decreased by up to half if these injuries result in the acceleration of the I'm leaving.

If the facts provided for in the first and second paragraphs result in the death of the person as an unintended consequence woman, imprisonment of 14 to 20 years is applied if this results in very serious personal injury imprisonment from 10 to 15 years, the latter penalty being reduced if the personal injury is serious.

The penalties referred to in the first three paragraphs are increased by up to a third for the potential father of the conceived child or if the woman is under the age of 18.

The penalty referred to in the first paragraph also applies to anyone who obtains or agrees to undergo an abortion.

Article 4

Anyone who negligently causes an abortion is criminally liable and is sentenced from 4-months to 3 years of imprisonment.

Anyone who through negligence causes a woman to give birth prematurely is punished with the penalty provided for in the paragraph previous one, decreased by up to half.

The penalties referred to in the first and second paragraphs are increased if the act is committed in violation of the name placed to protect work.

Article 5

The State recognizes each woman with an allowance of € 250 from the third month of pregnancy until the sixth month life of the unborn child, repeatable and therefore to be returned in full in the event of miscarriage or failure cohabitation with the child, also to integrate any existing forms of assistance, e promotes facilitated adoption routes for unwanted unborn children starting from the very moment of birth, without prejudice to the non-punishment of the mother who does not abandon her child but puts him to available to anyone who can assure it to the competent authorities and whoever assures it to the authorities competent.

Article 6

Law 194/78 must be considered repealed as of the entry into force of this law.

**Note to the art. 2 paragraph 1: the only case of admissibility of voluntary abortion was protected even before of the entry into force of law 194/78 as covered by art. 54 c.p. (state of necessity) and art. 32 of the constitution (right to health), protection that can be denied to women only by downgrading her to reproductive machine, the violation of this right being undisputed if it is intended to be forced by law the woman to die due to her pregnancy, in violation among other things of the same dictates of religious background, for example, of Catholic doctrine which, on the one hand, also recognizes the exemptions from the state of necessity and legitimate defense and, on the other, it denies anyone, even the State therefore, the right to dispose of the life of an individual (which the woman must be considered to be) from conception at natural death.*

It is no coincidence that in every country in the world voluntary abortion is permitted in that extreme case, either directly or indirectly through the justification of the state of necessity, if this were not the case the death penalty would be allowed against an innocent person, which is also considered aberrant and even in those nations where the female condition has minimal or no consideration.

The only case of admissibility of voluntary abortion contemplated in my text is, therefore, the serious one danger to the life of the woman who carries the pregnancy to term, where abortion is the only intervention rigorously ascertained as such with which the life of the pregnant woman can be saved, an eventuality however very rare but to be contemplated in a legal text, which must also deal with extreme hypotheses, which is fine other than therapeutic abortion, which allows abortion in very different and additional cases, as therapy for fight an illness, which pregnancy is not.

And that this extreme and only case of admissibility was protected through art. 54 c.p. (state of necessity) even before the entry into force of 194, and therefore cannot be repealed with it, it is undisputed among those who in pro life have at least a law degree, regardless of the carrying out a forensic activity, which as such translates into an activity of practical law and beyond theoretical.

Finally, it should be underlined that, obviously, the woman is free to decide to sacrifice her life to give birth to his son, an act of heroism which, as such, cannot however be imposed for law.

Anyone who intends to assert opposing principles is invited to write to the Supreme Pontiff asking him to introduce them into the legislation of the Vatican City State, a nation of which it is technically Sovereign Absolute and which applies on this point the same substantive legislation in force before 194 and which is to come implemented in this bill, to then start a dissemination crusade in the rest of the world.

**Note to the art. 2 paragraph 4: as well as the jurisprudence (see Cass. Pen., VI section 2-4-2013, n. 14979: "The the right to conscientious objection finds its limit in the protection of women's health, so much so that paragraph 5 of the art. 9 of the cited law excludes any operation of conscientious objection in cases in which the intervention of the objecting doctor is "essential to save the woman's life in imminent danger". As any sensible person can understand, this is a insurmountable limit, established by law and jurisprudence, as such to be considered and not from ignore, regardless of its sharing, just as the driver of a car cannot ignore a curve because he doesn't like it if he doesn't want to end his race off the road. Not a healthcare worker he can let a woman die even if she is an objector, otherwise she will be convicted of murder malicious intent, at least in the form of possible intent (acceptance of the risk of the event).*

**Note to the art. 3 paragraph 1: the minimum penalty (which is higher than that foreseen before 194) is double compared to that set, to a particularly small extent, only for the mother in the case of infanticide from the art. 578 c.p. however, it finds justification in the particular condition in which A woman may find herself abandoned during childbirth or immediately after it.*

**Note to the art. 3 paragraph 3: the sentence from 14 to 20 years in the event that unwanted death results from the abortion of the woman is commensurate keeping in mind that the art. 584 c.p. (net of any abortive event) foresees a sentence of 10 to 18 years for manslaughter.*

**Note to the art. 4 paragraph 1: the sentence from 4 months to 3 years of imprisonment is commensurate taking into account that the art. 589 c.p. provides for a sentence of 6 months to 5 years for manslaughter.*

Lawyer Pietro Guerini