



Opposition Statement HB1054

Physicians – Licensing – Foreign Practicing Physicians
Deborah Brocato, Legislative Consultant
Maryland Right to Life

We oppose HB1054.

On behalf of our over 200,000 followers across the state, we respectfully but strongly object to HB1054. Maryland Right to Life opposes non-citizens receiving licenses, certificates and registrations for the purpose of providing abortions and abortion services. Maryland Right to Life requests an amendment excluding abortion purposes from this bill.

The Abortion Care Access Act has already lowered the standard of care for women and girls by allowing non-physicians to provide abortion services. Women and girls deserve the expectation of the highest standard of care possible. This bill further erodes standards of medical care by not applying the same licensing standards to foreign physicians as are applied to United States citizen physicians. Poor record-keeping and lack of uniformity among foreign nations makes it impossible to verify or quantify the level of professional standards of care. The bill does not provide details of the examination required for the foreign “physician” and even allows the Board to extend a license to the foreign “physician” for 1 year while preparing for the exam. Will the state force insurance companies to provide medical malpractice insurance for those individuals? How will women and girls be able to seek recovery after injury from abortion services provided by these individuals? This bill does not inspire confidence that the State of Maryland is concerned with the health and well-being of Maryland women and girls. An amendment would prevent this bill from being exploited by the abortion industry to staff their workforce.

In the context of other laws that have lowered the standards of medical care and bills going through the Maryland General Assembly, this bill compounds those lowering of standards. As demonstrated by the Abortion Care Access Act, the abortion industry is simply concerned with simply finding more “qualified providers” to provide abortions, and if those “qualified providers” are permitted to call themselves doctors, it works in their favor.

Maryland is one of only 4 states that forces taxpayer funding of abortion. Maryland taxpayers are forced to subsidize the abortion industry through direct Maryland Medicaid reimbursements to abortion providers, private health insurance, and other various state grants



and contracts, and through pass-through funding in state programs. Programs involved in reproductive health policy include the Maryland State Department of Education, Maryland Department of Health, Maryland Family Planning Program, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, the Children's Cabinet, Maryland Council on School Based Health Centers, Maryland for the Advancement of School Based Health, Community Health Resource Commission, Maryland Children's Health Program (MCHP) and Maryland Stem Cell Research Fund.

Americans oppose taxpayer funding of abortion. Taxpayers should not be forced to fund the licensing of foreign physicians. Marist polls consistently show that 60% of Americans, pro-life and pro-choice, oppose taxpayer funding of abortion. 81% of Americans favor public funds being prioritized for health and family planning services that save the lives of mothers and their children including programs for improving maternal health and birth and delivery outcomes, well baby care and parenting classes.

Funding restrictions are constitutional. The Supreme Court of the United States, in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* (2022), overturned *Roe v. Wade* (1973) and held that there is no right to abortion found in the Constitution of the United States. As early as 1980 the Supreme Court affirmed in *Harris v. McRae*, that *Roe* had created a limitation on government, not a government funding entitlement. 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 held that there is “*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.*”

For these reasons, we ask for an amendment excluding abortion purposes from this bill. Without the amendment, we respectfully ask you to give an unfavorable report on **HB1054**.