



*Together in defense of
Life, family, liberty
and sovereignty!*

Warsaw, 1st of December

Memorandum on the European Parliament vote of 2 December 2025 concerning the “My Voice, My Choice” initiative and attempts to impose EU-level financing of abortion services

Introduction

This memorandum addresses the forthcoming public hearing in the European Parliament on 2 December 2025 concerning the “My Voice, My Choice” initiative and parallel parliamentary efforts to introduce EU-level financing mechanisms for access to abortion services. The initiative, framed as supporting “reproductive rights”, in reality aims to pressure Member States into universal acceptance and public funding of abortion, despite the lack of EU competences in this field and in disregard of the existing international legal framework. Given the repeated attempts to reinterpret treaties beyond their original meaning and the growing ideological activism within EU institutions, the Ordo Iuris Institute wishes to present general remarks and highlight the principal legal controversies associated with the proposed measures.

- 1. The “My Voice, My Choice” initiative forms part of a broader ideological campaign seeking to portray abortion as a fundamental human right.** The “My Voice, My Choice” initiative¹ represents a calculated ideological campaign by pro-abortion networks to leverage EU taxpayer funds for expanding abortion access, bypassing national laws that protect unborn life in countries like Poland and Malta. Submitted as a European Citizens' Initiative in September 2025 with 1.124 million verified signatures, after validation by the Commission on October 1, it demands a

¹ “My Voice, My Choice”, <https://www.myvoice-mychoice.org/our-movement>.



*Together in defense of
Life, family, liberty
and sovereignty!*

voluntary financial mechanism in the EU's Multiannual Financial Framework to subsidize cross-border abortion services, including travel, accommodation, and procedures for women denied access domestically. In November, it secured a FEMM Committee endorsement (26-12 vote) and inclusion in the Gender Equality Strategy 2025 (359-200 plenary vote), advancing to a December 2 public hearing and potential plenary decision despite lacking any basis in EU competence or international human rights treaties.

2. Abortion is not recognised as a human right in international law, and states continue to oppose attempts to elevate it to such status.

The Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD²) clearly stipulates that abortion *must not* be promoted as a method of family planning and that states should take steps to reduce the number of abortions (ICPD PoA, para. 8.25). Likewise, there is no binding international treaty establishing “sexual and reproductive rights”, nor any legal act that would require states to introduce or finance abortion services. Attempts to present such “rights” as established international standards are inconsistent with treaty law and entirely unfounded. It is also relevant that numerous states, including EU Member States, have recently reaffirmed their opposition to redefining abortion as a human right by endorsing the Geneva Consensus Declaration³.

3. Abortion, which terminates the life of a developing human being, raises serious concerns about the well-established right to life and protection from inhuman and degrading treatment.

Foundational human rights instruments, including the United Nation’s Convention on the Rights of the Child, which guarantees children the right to life and clearly states in its

² International Conference on Population and Development, Programme of Action, Cairo 1994, para. 8.25, https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/files/documents/2020/Jan/un_1995_programme_of_action_adopted_at_the_international_conference_on_population_and_development_cairo_5-13_sept_1994.pdf.

³ Geneva Consensus Declaration on Promoting Women’s Health and Strengthening the Family, 22 October 2020, <https://docs.un.org/en/A/75/626>.



*Together in defense of
Life, family, liberty
and sovereignty!*

preamble that legal protection is due “both before and after birth⁴”, the European Convention on Human Rights (Art. 2⁵), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Art. 6⁶), protect human life without excluding its prenatal stage. Moreover, abortion often disproportionately targets children with disabilities, those conceived in vulnerable circumstances, and those simply considered “unwanted”, making it one of the most severe forms of discrimination. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, in its Comments on draft general comment No. 36 of the Human Rights Committee on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, pointed out that “laws which explicitly allow for abortion on grounds of impairment violate the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Art. 4,5,8)⁷”.

4. The European Union has no competence to legislate, harmonise, or impose obligations on Member States regarding abortion policy.

According to Articles 6 and 168 TFEU⁸, public health policy falls under Member State competence, with the EU only holding a supporting role. EU institutions cannot impose harmonised standards, mandate access to abortion, or establish funding obligations in this domain. The European Commission has repeatedly confirmed that abortion lies exclusively within the remit of Member States. Efforts within the European Parliament to promote EU-level financing of abortion services therefore constitute an attempt to exert political pressure on national governments, bypassing the limits of EU authority and violating the principle of conferral.

⁴ Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989, Preamble, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child>.

⁵ Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (European Convention on Human Rights), 1950, Article 2, https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG.

⁶ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, Article 6, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>.

⁷ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2006, Articles 4, 5 and 8, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-persons-disabilities>.

⁸ Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), 1957, Articles 6 and 168, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT:en:PDF>.



*Together in defense of
Life, family, liberty
and sovereignty!*

5. Any attempt to designate abortion as an EU-funded service undermines Treaty provisions and infringes upon the sovereign powers of Member States.

The proposed mechanism – using EU financial instruments or cohesion funding to reimburse abortion procedures – is incompatible with EU treaty law. It disregards the lack of legal basis for such expenditure and seeks to influence the ethical and constitutional frameworks of individual Member States. Such measures must be regarded as unauthorised and incompatible with EU competences.

6. The European Court of Human Rights has consistently held that abortion is not a Convention right.

The ECtHR has repeatedly stated (e.g. Case of A, B and C v. Ireland, 16 December 2010⁹) that: i) there is *no* right to abortion under the Convention, ii) there is *no* right to obtain an abortion, and iii) prohibitions or restrictions on abortion do *not* violate the Convention. The Court has never interpreted Article 2 to exclude prenatal life from its scope of protection.

7. The right to conscientious objection remains a fundamental element of freedom of conscience.

Guaranteed by the constitutions of Member States and international human rights instruments, including the ICCPR (Art. 18¹⁰) and the ECHR (Art. 9¹¹), conscientious objection cannot be limited or abolished for political purposes. Proposals linked to the “My Voice, My Choice” initiative to discourage or restrict the exercise of conscience rights by medical professionals are therefore contrary to international standards.

Conclusion and Recommendation

⁹ Case of A, B and C v. Ireland, 16 December 2010, (Application no. 25579/050), [https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre#{%22itemid%22:\[%22001-102332%22\]}](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-102332%22]}).

¹⁰ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, Article 18, <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/ccpr.pdf>.

¹¹ European Convention on Human Rights, Article 9, https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG.



*Together in defense of
Life, family, Liberty
and sovereignty!*

In light of the above, the Ordo Iuris Institute strongly recommends **voting against** the proposed measures linked to the “My Voice, My Choice” initiative and any attempts to introduce EU-level financing for abortion services. These proposals exceed the competences of the European Union, conflict with international law, undermine the protection of human life, and represent an unwarranted intrusion into the sovereign prerogatives of the Member States.