

## **LAW2220; Exam Notes Abstract**

<b>1. Capacity, Consent, &amp; Theory.....</b>	<b>1-3</b>
Role of law & professional codes.....	1
Moral & ethical principles (deontology, consequentialism, autonomy, beneficence etc.).....	1
Self-determination & the law – tort of battery.....	1
Valid decision making – Marions Case.....	1
Relevant cases (Gillick, Re C, Re T, Re MB, Candutti, Dean) .....	1-2
Children – Parens Patriae (Family Law Act).....	2
Courts power – Director Clinical Services v Zisko, H v AC.....	2
Adults; Advanced Health Directive, Mental Health Act, Guardianship Act .....	3
<b>2. Legal Status of the Unborn .....</b>	<b>3-5</b>
Legal Status; AG's Ref 1997.....	3
Cases; St George, Re C, Re T, Re MB. ....	3
Termination of Pregnancy; Roe v Wade, Dobbs v Jacksons.....	4
WA's approach; Criminal code, health act > public health act. ....	4
Liability; R v Martin, Watt, X & Y, Harriton, Lynch, Bowditch, Winnipeg.....	4-5
<b>3. Reproductive Technology.....</b>	<b>5-8</b>
Moral and ethical issues .....	5
Recent stats, history, regulation (National ethical guidelines & accreditation) .....	6
Commonwealth & State legislation; The HRT Act (WA) .....	6-8
Prohibited practices Act.....	6
Mitochondrial replacement & reform (Maeve's Law).....	6-7
Trade in Gametes.....	7
Access to RT (McBain v Victoria & CPA) .....	7-8
Centrality of Consent (HRT) .....	8
Issues with RT & Legal Parentage .....	8
<b>4. Embryo Selection, Research, &amp; Cloning.....</b>	<b>8-11</b>
Reproductive Technology & Embryo Selection.....	8-9
Preimplantation Genetic Testing & Access .....	9
NHMRC Ethical Guidelines; Human Reproductive Technology Act 1991 .....	9-10
Savior babies; Human Tissue & Transplant Act.....	10
Embryo Research & Legislation.....	10
Embryo Cloning, therapeutic cloning & legislation.....	10-11
<b>5. Medical Negligence .....</b>	<b>11-13</b>
Compensation requirements.....	11
Sources of law & duty of care (Rogers v Whitaker).....	11
Breach in treatment cases (civil liability act); Bolam, Sparks, Child and adolescent.....	11-12
Causation in treatment cases; Finch, Tabet.....	12
Information cases (trespass); rogers, Rosenberg, Wallace. ....	12-13
<b>6. Health Research on Humans.....</b>	<b>13-16</b>
Regulation cases (R, HSE, Bial, Havasupai). ....	13
Ethical regulation, National health and medical research council. ....	14
National statement & issues with ethical consent.....	14
Legal regulation, requirements for consent (trespass, tissue removal, human tissue & transplant act). ....	14-15

Protecting participants; drug trials.....	15
Ownership over tissue; Doodeward, Moore, AB v Leeds .....	15-16
Henrietta Lacks.....	16
<b>7. Bodies &amp; Modification .....</b>	<b>16-18</b>
Criminal Code 1913 & genital mutilation .....	16
Regulation; cosmetic, non-medical modifications.....	16-17
The limits of consent; consent & controversy, role of tort, criminal, immateriality of consent .....	17
Tattooing & piercing .....	17
Case studies; gender recognition and reassignment; AB & AH .....	18
<b>8. Mental Health.....</b>	<b>19-23</b>
Treatment decisions; Re C, St Georges Healthcare .....	19
History; County Asylums Act, Lunacy Act.....	19
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.....	19
Mental Health treatment & the law, treatment orders.....	19
Mental Health Act (WA) .....	20-21
Electroconvulsive therapy, psychosurgery, deep sleep therapy.....	21
Mental health & the criminal code; presumption of sanity, insanity, mental impairment .....	21-22
Criminal Law (Mental Impairment) Act; WA V Peterson-Crofts [2021].....	22
Unfitness to stand trial .....	22-23
<b>9. Death 1; Ethics, Terminology, &amp; Case Studies.....</b>	<b>23-25</b>
Euthanasia.....	23
Capacity.....	24
Ethics; Airedale National Health Trust, Sanctity of life .....	24
Acts vs Omissions. ....	24
Killing or letting it die. ....	25
Doctrine of double effect, R v Adams, Re A, R v Latimer.....	25
<b>10. Death 2; Legal Frameworks for Death &amp; Dying .....</b>	<b>25-28</b>
Criminal regulation; criminal code .....	25
Aiding suicide, murder, manslaughter, causing death, by omission, other issues .....	26
Competent patients; Brightwater Care Group v Rossiter.....	26-27
Incompetent patients; advance directives, adults & children.....	27-28
Dance & Battersby v Barts NHS .....	28
<b>11. Death 3; Approaches to Assisted Dying .....</b>	<b>28-31</b>
Frameworks; Netherlands & Belgium. ....	28
Framework: Switzerland.....	29
Framework: Canada.....	29
Frameworks: NT, Vic, WA, NZ .....	30
Ordinary resident criteria.....	31

# LAWS2220; Birth, life, death, & medical law lecture notes.

## Lecture One; Capacity, Consent, & theory

### Law and regulation

**Role of the law;** one way to regulate conduct in society (it ‘draws lines’). Defines & determines enforceable rights and obligations. Forces resolutions for disputes. It allocates responsibility for harms and addresses these through punishment or compensation (consider the roles of criminal law & civil law). Can be; Inflexible, slow, difficult to change, not always representative of societal views.

**Professional codes & the law;** prescribes codes to which health professionals must perform, clarify conduct which is unacceptable in the profession. A breach of these standards is not, in itself, a breach of the law. However, a failure to meet professional or industry standards is evidence that there may be a breach of a legal standard. E.g., the loss of a licence to practise medicine.

### **The law is not the only mechanism by which health & medicine is regulated**

**Ethical regulation;** E.g., *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (NHMRC); *Ethical Guidelines for Organ Transplantation from Deceased Donors* (NHMRC).

**Professional regulation;** E.g., *Good Medical Practice: A Code of Conduct for Doctors* (Medical Board of Australia)

**Hippocratic oath:** “*I make these promises solemnly, freely and upon my honour.*”

### Moral and ethical principles

<i>Theory/principle</i>	<i>Defined</i>	<i>Difficulties</i>
<b>T. Deontology</b>	A deontological approach is to make a generalised, universal statement of what is right or wrong and apply that to the moral question. Historically rooted in religions. E.g., it is wrong to kill; it is right to respect personal autonomy; it is right to keep promises.	Clashes of principle – e.g., euthanasia involves questions of killing and autonomy Where do the statements of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ get their legitimacy?
<b>T. Consequentialism / unilateralism</b>	Focus on the consequences of an act rather than on something intrinsic in the act itself. E.g., utilitarianism: an action is moral or good if it produces the greatest balance of utility for all concerned. So, the focus is maximising happiness and minimising suffering.	What counts as ‘good’, ‘happiness’, ‘suffering’ etc? Whose interests count? Often not possible to measure and predict consequences.
<b>T. Libertarianism</b>	Emphasis on the individual and autonomy. John Stuart Mill, ‘On Liberty’: ‘ <i>the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others</i> ’ (the harm principle). E.g., respecting the autonomy of a person to refuse treatment.	Ignores collective interests and the integrated nature of communities. Arguably leads to under regulation (“small government”). Can permit practices that society finds morally repugnant.
<b>P. Autonomy</b>	Promotes self-determination: the ability to choose what happens to your own body. <i>Should</i> the law permit you to do whatever you want to your body? <i>Should</i> the law permit you to refuse treatment under any circumstance? <i>Should</i> you be able to demand any treatment you like?	
<b>P. Beneficence</b>	Doing and choosing the best for others. <i>Should</i> the law play a role in enforcing the ‘best’ decision?	

### Health care issues

**Self-determination: the law;** The law protects self-determination with the **tort of battery (trespass to the person):** ‘*It is the central thesis of the common law doctrine of trespass of the person that the voluntary choices and decisions of an adult person of sound mind concerning what is or is not done to his or her body must be respected and accepted, irrespective of what others, including doctors, may think is in the best interests of that particular person.*’ **Marion’s Case (1992)**

175 CLR 218 (McHugh J)

**Battery;** Requires – A person + touches (or causes other interference to) + another person + without legal justification. \*Note that battery is actionable ‘per se’ (just because it happened). There is no need to prove actual harm, damage or loss to obtain compensation.

## **VALID DECISIONS: REQUIREMENTS**

### **(1) CAPACITY**

- Age – 18+ (in which case capacity is presumed) or a ‘mature minor’
  - *Gillick v West Norfolk & Wisbech Area Health Auth* [1986] 1 AC 112
- State of mind – But note that mental impairment does not always preclude capacity
  - *Re C (adult: refusal of medical treatment)* [1994] 1 All ER 819 (QBD)
- Consciousness

### **(2) VOLUNTARINESS**

- Eg. *undue influence* [Re T] 1992 4 All ER 649) & *phobias* (Re MB [1997] EWCA Civ 3093)

### **(3) BROAD UNDERSTANDING OF BASIC NATURE OF THE TOUCHING**

- **Low threshold** – Understanding of consequences or risks is not required
  - *Candutti v ACT Health* [2003] ACTSC 95; *Dean v Pheung* [2012] NSWCA 223

### Relevant Cases

<b>Age;</b> <b>Gillick v West Norfolk &amp; Wisbech</b>	Mrs Gillick was a mother of five underage daughters. She sought a declaration that the government could not give her children contraceptives because as minors they should be unable to make treatment decisions for themselves. The Court found: Parents and guardians are the ‘default’ decision makers for children (u 18), but... ‘Mature minors’
--	---