

2021.SB423.pdf

Uploaded by: Arlinghaus, Francis

Position: FAV

SB0423

Dr. Frank Arlinghaus

Favorable

Please issue a favorable opinion on Senate Bill 423.

The amount of money spent by the state is considerable, as laid out in the fiscal note. Many of us in the state are opposed to the state paying for something that we consider immoral, especially when those funds could go toward many other more appropriate programs.

However, funding for abortions is unpopular even among those who support abortion, much less popular than abortion itself. A January Marist poll shows that Americans oppose using tax dollars to pay for abortion by a margin of 58% to 38%. This includes 34% of those identifying as pro-choice, 31% of those identifying as Democratic voters, and 65% of those identifying as independent voters.

For these brief reasons, I ask that you return a favorable report on SB0423.

Testimony SB 423- Limit abortion funding - support

Uploaded by: Ennis, Ella

Position: FAV

The Honorable Delores Kelley, Chair
And Members of the Finance Committee
Senate of Maryland
Annapolis, Maryland

Re: SB 423 – Prohibit State Paying for abortions with exceptions – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Kelley and Committee Members,

I strongly support SB 423 – to prohibit using State or Federal funds to pay for abortions except to save a woman's life or in cases of life-threatening physical illness or in cases of rape or incest.

Each human life is precious and we should do all we can to protect it. Instead of using taxpayers' money to pay for elective abortions we should allocate funds to help women in difficult health or financial situations to bring their babies to term and save those lives. The exceptions provided in SB 423 will ensure that a woman's health or life is not jeopardized. These new lives are our State and Country's future. Please don't waste them.

Please vote for a Favorable Report for SB 423.

Sincerely,
Ella Ennis
P.O. Box 437
Port Republic, MD 20676
E-mail: eee437@comcast.net

Ltr to Committee sb423-hb834.pdf

Uploaded by: salling, johnny

Position: FAV

JOHNNY RAY SALLING
Legislative District 6
Baltimore County

Budget and Taxation Committee

Public Safety, Transportation,
and Environment Subcommittee



James Senate Office Building
11 Bladen Street, Room 321
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
410-841-3587 • 301-858-3587
800-492-7122 Ext. 3587
JohnnyRay.Salling@senate.state.md.us

THE SENATE OF MARYLAND
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

March 8, 2021

Senate Finance Committee

Re: SB 423/HB 834 Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions –
Prohibition and Exceptions

Position: Favorable

Dear Chair, Vice Chair, and Committee Members,

Thank you for accepting this letter of support for SB 423. This bill would address specific concerns regarding the funding of abortions which is such a contentious issue in our society.

Abortion ends life. It is as simple as that. I do not think our state should be involved in the process of funding operations whereby allowing one life to have the ability to end another life without even taking into consideration the rights of that soon to be extinguished life. Babies across our state and nation are being killed every day because of federal and state funding for these operations.

While this bill will not outlaw the taking of innocent life, it will provide what I believe is a path that both sides of the issue should be able to agree on. On such a contentious issue, it is only fair that our state should not be funding abortion procedures. For these reasons, I urge a favorable report on SB 423.

Sincerely,
Senator Johnny Ray Salling

Maryland Catholic Conference_FAV_SB423.pdf

Uploaded by: Sheahan, Molly

Position: FAV



ARCHDIOCESE OF BALTIMORE † ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON † DIOCESE OF WILMINGTON

March 10, 2021

Senate Bill 423

Public Health - Federal and State Funding for Abortions - Prohibition and Exceptions

Senate Finance Committee

Position: SUPPORT

The Maryland Catholic Conference offers this testimony in SUPPORT of Senate Bill 423. The Catholic Conference represents the public policy interests of the three (arch)dioceses serving Maryland: the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington and the Diocese of Wilmington, which together encompass over one million Marylanders.

Senate Bill 423 prohibits federal and state funds from paying for abortion procedures, or paying for health insurance coverage that includes abortions, except in the instance of rape, or to protect the life of the mother.

The Conference supports SB 423 because it prevents taxpayer dollars from being used for the objectionable practice of abortion which ends the life of an unborn human being. The Catholic Church firmly believes in the dignity of human life from natural conception to natural death, including that of all unborn children. This bill would be a step in the right direction to protecting unborn children and their mothers from the violence of abortion.

This bill also reflects the desires of the vast majority of Americans. A Marist Poll from January of this year shows that only 38% of Americans support using tax dollars to pay for abortion. Furthermore, there is no legal requirement to publicly fund abortion, as the US Supreme Court has ruled, "The Government has no constitutional duty to subsidize an activity merely because it is constitutionally protected and may validly choose to fund childbirth over abortion." (*Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, 492 U. S. 490, 492 U. S. 510.)

Pope John Paul II writes that "a society lacks solid foundations when, on the one hand, it asserts values such as the dignity of the person, justice and peace, but then, on the other hand, radically acts to the contrary by allowing or tolerating a variety of ways in which human life is devalued and violated, especially where it is weak or marginalized¹."

The Maryland Catholic Conference works to foster a culture of life by advocating for laws that uphold the dignity of the human person and that assist pregnant women in need, while working to ensure the State sets and enforces safe standards for women's health care. It is for these reasons that the Maryland Catholic Conference respectfully urges a favorable report for **SB423**. Thank you for your consideration.

¹ Encyclical Letter *Evangelium Vitae* (25 March 1995), 101: AAS 87 (1995), 516-518.

SB423.FAVORABLEwithAMENDMENTS.MDRTL.L.Bogley.pdf

Uploaded by: Bogley, Laura

Position: FWA



Favorable with Amendment

SB423 - Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibition and Exceptions

Laura Bogley, JD - Director of Legislation, Maryland Right to Life

On behalf of our members across the state, we support Senate Bill 423 *with amendment*. SB423 is common sense legislation that prioritizes the state's interest in the value of human life and restores to the people, the natural and Constitutional rights to life, liberty, freedom of speech and religion.

There is bi-partisan unity on prohibiting the use of taxpayer funding for abortion. State funding for abortion on demand is in direct conflict with the will of the people. In fact, 58% percent of those surveyed say they oppose taxpayer funding of abortion, including 31% of Democrats, 83% of Republicans, and 65% of independents. 80% of Americans polled favor laws that protect both the lives of women and unborn children.

Pregnancy is not a Disease - Abortion is not healthcare. It is violence and brutality that systemically targets the poor and vulnerable and ends the lives of unborn children through suction, dismemberment or chemical poisoning. The fact that 85% of OB-GYNs in a representative national survey do not commit abortions is glaring evidence that abortion is not an essential part of women's healthcare.

Abortion is *never medically necessary* to save the life of a woman - In the rare case of severe pregnancy complications, hospitals, not abortion clinics, may decide to separate the mother and child and make best efforts to *sustain the lives of both*. This is different from an abortion, which involves the *purposeful termination of fetal human life*. Prior to the Supreme Court's imposition of their decision in *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, the Maryland legislature had enacted a ban on abortion and only would allow exception for the physical life of the mother, if two physicians agreed that termination of the pregnancy was necessary to avoid the imminent death of the mother. Science has advanced beyond this point to support that *both lives can be saved*.

Love them both - 80% of Americans polled favor laws that protect both the lives of women and unborn children. We believe each human being is created EQUAL and the circumstances of conception do not diminish the worth of a human child. While rape and incest are despicable crimes that must be prosecuted, in no other crime do we transfer blame and punishment to an innocent third party. Children should not be condemned to death for the crimes of others. Public funds instead should be prioritized to fund health and family planning services which have the objective of saving the lives of both mothers and children, including programs for improving maternal health and birth and delivery outcomes, well baby care, parenting classes, foster care reform and affordable adoption programs.

Funding restrictions are constitutional - The Supreme Court has held that the alleged constitutional "right" to an abortion "*implies no limitation on the authority of a State to make a value judgment favoring childbirth over abortion, and to implement that judgment by the allocation of public funds.*" When a challenge to the constitutionality of the Hyde Amendment reached the Supreme Court in 1980 in the case of *Harris v. McRae*, the Court 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* had created a limitation on government, not a government funding entitlement.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to vote in favor of SB423 with the attached amendment. We thank you for your consideration for the equal value of each human being, born and preborn.

PART V. FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING.

20-217.

~~(A) EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN SUBSECTION (B) OF THIS SECTION, NO FEDERAL OR STATE FUNDS MAY BE USED TO PAY FOR AN ABORTION PROCEDURE OR HEALTH BENEFITS COVERAGE THAT INCLUDES COVERAGE OF ABORTION PROCEDURES.~~

~~(B) THE PROHIBITION IN SUBSECTION (A) OF THIS SECTION DOES NOT APPLY IF: (1) THE WOMAN'S PREGNANCY IS THE RESULT OF AN ACT OF RAPE OR INCEST; OR (2) THE WOMAN HAS A LIFE-ENDANGERING PHYSICAL CONDITION CAUSED BY OR ARISING FROM THE PREGNANCY ITSELF THAT WOULD, AS CERTIFIED BY A PHYSICIAN, PLACE THE WOMAN IN DANGER OF DEATH UNLESS AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.~~

SB 0423.pdf

Uploaded by: Reichert-Price, Sarah

Position: FWA

The Honorable Delores G. Kelly, Chair
and Members of the Finance Committee
Maryland Senate
Annapolis, Maryland

RE: SB 0423- Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibition and Exceptions- SUPPORT

Dear Chair Kelly and Members of the Committee,

SB 0423 preserves the already struggling economy.

In essence, state funding is resident funding. If the cost of abortions is paid with state funding, more than likely, Maryland State Tax will increase for residents in order to meet the financial need required to do so. Marylanders are struggling financially. An increase in taxes would add to the detriment of our families and decrease our already diminishing quality of life.

Payment for the termination of a pregnancy that complies with the guidelines outlined in SB 0423 should be the responsibility of an individual's health insurance.

Should SB 0423 receive a favorable report, thus, entered into MD law, there must be a strict process in place for the determination of instances of rape, incest, and the existence of a medically, life-threatening condition in order to prevent abuse of the "system" , and/or fraudulent claims.

Please vote for a Favorable Report for SB 0423 with consideration of the financial responsibility being a function of one's medical insurance.

Sincerely,
Sarah Reichert-Price
221 Miller Street
Westernport, MD 21562

2021 PPM SB 423 Senate Side.pdf

Uploaded by: Elliott, Robyn

Position: UNF

Planned Parenthood of Maryland

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Committee: | Senate Finance Committee |
| Bill Number: | Senate Bill 423 – Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibition and Exceptions |
| Hearing Date: | March 10, 2021 |
| Position: | Oppose |

Planned Parenthood of Maryland opposes *Senate Bill 423 – Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibitions and Exceptions*. The bill prohibits federal or State funds from being used to cover abortion services or abortion coverage.

Planned Parenthood of Maryland supports ensuring that all individuals have access to the full range of pregnancy-related services, including abortion services. Insurance coverage is an important factor in supporting access to any health care service, including abortion services. We oppose SB 423 because it would limit access to abortion services for Marylanders who have insurance coverage or direct receive health care services through the following programs:

- Maryland State Employee and Retiree Health Benefits Plan;
- Maryland Medical Assistance Program;
- Maryland Health Benefit Exchange (qualified health plans); or
- Any State or local correctional services facility.

Planned Parenthood of Maryland asks for an unfavorable report on Senate Bill 423. We believe that reproductive health care services, including abortion care, are health care services.

SB0423_SMD.pdf

Uploaded by: Goldstein, Mathew

Position: UNF



Secular Maryland

<http://www.secularmaryland.us>

smd@secularmaryland.us

March 10, 2021

The Honorable Delores G. Kelley
Finance Committee
Miller Senate Office Building, 3 East
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Re: OPPOSE SB0423 (HB0834) Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions
– Prohibition and Exceptions

Chairwoman and Members of the Committee:

Secular Maryland agrees with the existing policy of legal abortions during the first and second trimesters of pregnancy. The end of the second trimester is approximately when the life of a baby usually becomes sustainable outside of the womb. In our view it takes some more time after conception before a new human life is realized. We disagree with those who claim that abortion is murder because human life begins at conception. Restrictions on government funding legal abortions imposes a particular disputable religious or moral viewpoint on those women who rely on government-funded health care. Government funding places the personal decision about how to treat a pregnancy in the hands of the women who live with the consequences of that decision. A July 2018 NBC/Wall Street Journal survey showed that 71 percent of Americans believed the high court's *Roe v. Wade* decision should not be overturned.

Under this bill, only if a woman would otherwise die, or if her pregnancy results from rape or incest, is an abortion covered. Sometimes a woman needs an abortion for her health. Some women will use money they need for food, rent, clothing, or other necessities to pay for an abortion. Women will delay their abortions, increasing their medical risks, while they scrape funds together. Therefore such a restriction on abortion funding would jeopardize women's health. Providing funding for abortion does not compel women to have abortions, but denying funding will compel impoverished women to carry their pregnancies to term. The costs associated with childbirth,



Secular Maryland

<http://www.secularmaryland.us>

smd@secularmaryland.us

neonatal and pediatric care exceed the costs of abortion. Public funding for abortion
neither costs the taxpayer money nor drains resources from other services

SB0423 MD NARAL OPPOSE.pdf

Uploaded by: Philip, Diana

Position: UNF



**SB0423 - Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions –
Prohibition and Exceptions**

Presented to the Hon. Delores Kelley and Members of the Senate Finance Committee
March 10, 2021 1:00 p.m.

POSITION: OPPOSE

NARAL Pro-Choice Maryland urges the Members of the Senate Finance Committee to issue **an unfavorable report on SB0423 Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibition and Exception**, sponsored by Senator Salling.

Our organization is an advocate for reproductive health, rights, and justice. As part of our efforts to protect reproductive freedom for all Marylanders, we work to ensure every individual has the right to decide if, when, and how to form their families, and to parent in good health, in safety, and with dignity. We recognize that all people, regardless of income, deserve meaningful access to abortion care – not just the theoretical “right.”

Low-income people make up a disproportionate number of abortion patients, and are disproportionately impacted by the cost of abortion care in comparison to their middle- and high-income counterparts. Approximately [three-quarters of abortion patients](#) qualify as low-income, and more than half of patients are [already parents](#).¹ An average first-trimester abortion costs [\\$470](#).² Based on this figure, and estimates of average income for Medicaid recipients, paying out-of-pocket for abortion care can consume more than [25%](#) of a Medicaid recipient’s monthly income.³ This directly translates to an individual’s ability to pay rent, put food on the table, and support their existing family. Medicaid is charged with covering necessary health care for low-income people, and abortion care should be no exception. All pregnancy-related healthcare is necessary healthcare.

Research shows that women are [more likely to experience delays](#) in obtaining an abortion if they live in a state where Medicaid does not cover abortion care, or if they struggle to get insurance to cover the care.⁴ Individuals who are forced to delay care as they fundraise for a procedure often get stuck in an impossible positive feedback loop: struggling to raise more money as the care gets more expensive each week. Ultimately, they may be forced to carry the pregnancy to term, or end up accessing abortion care much later than they intended. Data from the [Turnaway Study](#) found that women who were unable to access the abortion care they wanted were more likely to experience economic insecurity; more likely to stay in an abusive relationship; and, more likely to experience complications while continuing their pregnancy.⁵

Looking beyond forced pregnancy and birth as a reason our state should continue to cover abortion care, Medicaid’s coverage of abortion care makes great economic sense. A Medicaid recipient who cannot access the

¹ . Jerman J, Jones R, Onda T. Characteristics of U.S. Abortion Patients in 2014 and Changes Since 2008. Guttmacher Institute; 2016:1-28

² Dennis A, Manski R, Blanchard K. Does Medicaid Coverage Matter?: A Qualitative Multi-State Study of Abortion Affordability for Low-income Women. Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved. 25(4):1571-1585. 2016.

³ *Ibid*

⁴ *Ibid*

⁵ Introduction to the Turnaway Study (annotated bibliography). Accessed at

<https://www.ansirh.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/turnawaystudyannotatedbibliography.pdf>

abortion care she needs will likely go on to give birth. On average, Medicaid would be responsible for paying [\\$12,599](#) for the labor and delivery of a pregnant person – more than 25 times the cost of a first trimester abortion. Not having enough money to care for a child or support another child is the [most common reason](#) women give for wanting to terminate an unintended pregnancy.⁶ A 2015 report from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) puts the current average cost of raising a child through the age of 17 at [\\$233,610](#).⁷ We should respect people's desires to become or remain economically secure by not adding a child they do not want and cannot afford to have.

For these reasons, NARAL Pro-Choice Maryland **urges an unfavorable committee report on SB0423 - Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibition and Exceptions**. Thank you for your time and consideration.

⁶ Biggs, M., et al. (2013). "Understanding why women seek abortions in the US." BMC Women's Health 13(1): 29.

⁷ Lino M, Kuczynski K, Rodriguez N, Schap T. Expenditures on Children by Families, 2015. United States Department of Agriculture; 2017:30.

Ramaswamy_unfavorable_SB423.pdf

Uploaded by: Ramaswamy, Meghna

Position: UNF

To the members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony in opposition to SB423, cross-filed with HB834. I would first state that I am submitting this testimony as an individual and do not represent any larger organization or institution.

I am a medical student and I plan on specializing in Obstetrics and Gynecology. Given my patient experiences thus far, I know abortion is integral to comprehensive healthcare and a healthy society. This bill, which prohibits federal and state funding for abortion, is a step in the wrong direction for Maryland patients, families and our society.

In this testimony, I want to highlight patient interactions that speak to the need for abortion services and legislative support. I also hope to bring your attention to our collective larger goal of a civilized society in which every member is deemed equal and important. I have seen members of this committee and the general assembly at large speak passionately about equity and take actions to achieve the same. I urge you to bring that same passion to look at the reproductive equity rights at stake with this bill, and to vote this bill down.

During my time as a medical student, I care for women in a family planning clinic and encountered several individuals who needed abortions for a variety of reasons, not covered by the proposed bill. I would like to highlight some of them for this committee.

Several women who came in for abortion services are mothers of at least one child in stable homes. In fact, we know that more than half of patients seeking abortions are already mothers. Patient

“M” had an unintended pregnancy and came to our clinic because she knew a new pregnancy would put her family in a tough financial situation in the middle of the pandemic. She knew that having another child would greatly decrease the quality of life for existing children.

Patient “S” was seeking an abortion because she recently became pregnant and was not ready to have another child in such short of an interval. Patient “S” had to leave her 3-month child at home with her family in order to make multiple appointments at the office so she could have her much needed abortion. She wanted to ensure that she could devote her time and energy to her current child and knew she could not support another child at this time.

My conversations with the women were emotional, and they were facing internalized stigma of the word “abortion”, perpetuated by larger social norms, and they were scared about all the obstacles they already faced to seek the care they needed. These same women are more likely to have faced healthcare inequities and systemic racism and bias that made contraception difficult to obtain or who, if they continue their pregnancies, are likely to be at high risk for poor maternal and neonatal outcomes. From a fiscal perspective, the costs of high-risk pregnancies far outweigh the cost of abortions and family planning in our patient populations.

This bill would make it impossible for federal employees and patients covered by state Medicaid to receive financial support for essential abortion care other than in cases of rape, incest, or life endangerment. With this bill we are saying that the patients I have seen and will see in the future do not have dire enough circumstances to receive support for essential healthcare.

For all the reasons I have listed above, I hope you vote down SB423.

Meghna Ramaswamy
Medical Student in Baltimore, MD

SB 423 - Public Health - Federal and State Funding

Uploaded by: Siri, Michelle

Position: UNF

BILL NO: Senate Bill 423
TITLE: Public Health – Federal and State Funding for Abortions – Prohibition and Exceptions
COMMITTEE: Finance
HEARING DATE: March 10, 2021
POSITION: **OPPOSE**

The Women's Law Center of Maryland is a statewide, non-profit law firm that provides direct legal representation to survivors of domestic violence and advocates legislatively on issues related to the physical safety, economic security, and bodily autonomy of women in Maryland. Part of that advocacy includes supporting women in their reproductive choices so that they are able to build their families how and when they want and ensuring that women's reproductive health care is treated equitably and fairly as a medical issue and not a political one. We strongly oppose Senate Bill 423.

Under current law, federal funds are prohibited from being used for abortion except in cases of life endangerment, rape, or incest. State funds may be used to pay for abortions in certain circumstances in addition to those already permitted under federal law, including if a physician determines the continuation of the pregnancy is necessary to prevent serious or adverse effects on the woman's present or future physical or mental health. Senate Bill 423 would remove the State's ability to use state funds for any circumstances other than when 1) the pregnancy is a result of rape or incest or 2) the woman has a life-endangering physical condition resulting from the pregnancy that would place her in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.

The Women's Law Center opposes SB 423 because it imposes undue burdens on a woman's right to access abortion, disregarding the bodily and intellectual autonomy of women. It places limitations on women who lack the financial means to access the medical care they deserve, thereby widening the already enormous gap of health care disparities based on economic status. Decisions such as when and how to obtain an abortion should not be governed by politics or purse strings. Furthermore, this legislation gives little consideration to individual patients' medical circumstances. Just because a medical condition does not rise to the level of impending death does not mean that a woman should have no options available to her, yet this legislation ignores the myriad of mental and health conditions that she may be facing. Again, these are decisions best left between a patient and their physician, not the legislature.

The Women's Law Center strongly believes that reproductive choice is essential for the health and well-being of women in Maryland. For these reasons, the Women's Law Center urges an unfavorable report on Senate Bill 423.

The Women's Law Center of Maryland is a private, non-profit, membership organization that serves as a leading voice for justice and fairness for women. It advocates for the rights of women through legal assistance to individuals and strategic initiatives to achieve systemic change. The Women's Law Center operates two hotlines, Protection Order Advocacy and Representation Projects in Baltimore City, Baltimore County and Carroll County, the Collateral Legal Assistance for Survivors project, and the Multi-Ethnic Domestic Violence Project.