

## **Opposition Statement HB135/SB84**

## Pharmacists - Administration of Self-Administered Medications and **Maintenance Injectable Medications** By Laura Bogley-Knickman, JD

Director of Legislation, Maryland Right to Life

## We Strongly Oppose HB135/SB84

We strongly object to HB135/SB84 as written. While "telehealth" is a worthwhile goal for the state of Maryland, "teledeath" must be expressly excluded from all telehealth policy and public funding.

As written, this bill could be used to kill not to heal. It could force Maryland taxpayers to fund the remote administration of lethal drugs that are intended to end human life, including abortion-inducing drugs like mifepristone (common brand name Mifeprex) and lethal drugs used in Physician Assisted Suicide (PAS).

FDA guidelines maintain that the distribution and use of mifepristone, the drug commonly used in chemical abortions, must be under the supervision of a qualified healthcare provider because of the drug's potential for serious complications including, but not limited to, uterine hemorrhage, viral infections, pelvic inflammatory disease, loss of fertility and death.

But the abortion industry is pressuring the FDA to remove these safety restrictions- leaving women to fend for themselves. They brazenly promote abortion inducing drugs as "DIY abortions." They want to convince women that these abortions are safe, easy, and nearly painless. They want to expand telemedicine to distribute more abortion pills, faster, so providers can dispense these drugs en masse, putting profits before patients. They even abandon women with complications to emergency rooms, refusing to deal with or even monitor the consequences of this dangerous drug.

The Maryland Medical Assistance Program and the Maryland Children's Health Program are two primary programs used for publicly funded reimbursements to abortion providers in Maryland. Taxpayers should not be forced to fund abortions or subsidize the billion dollar private abortion industry. A 2019 Marist poll showed that 54% of Americans, both "pro-life" and "pro-choice" oppose the use of tax dollars to pay for abortion.

## Funding restrictions are constitutional

Furthermore government funding restrictions on abortion are constitutional. The Supreme Court in Harris v. McRae (1980), ruled that the government may distinguish between abortion and other procedures in funding decisions -- noting that "no other procedure involves the purposeful termination of a potential life" -- and affirmed that Roe v. Wade did not create a government funding entitlement.

We respectfully ask for your help in protecting the health and safety of Marylanders by restricting the categories of drugs that pharmacists or other non-physicians may distribute for self-administration to specifically exclude those drugs commonly used to terminate life through Chemical Abortion or Physician Assisted Suicide. We respectfully ask for your amendment or your unfavorable report.