



Opposition Statement SB121

More Opportunities for Career-Focused Students Act of 2023

Deborah Brocato, Legislative Consultant

Maryland Right to Life

We Strongly Oppose SB121

On behalf of our 200,000 followers across the state, we respectfully yet strongly object to SB121. The Abortion Care Access Act, passed during the 2022 session, removed the physician requirement for performing abortions and created Abortion Care Clinical Training Programs with a protected \$3.5 million training program fund. This use of taxpayer money for the purpose of abortion training goes against the will of the people. Without a stated prohibition, the apprenticeships and certification programs specified in SB121 could include training programs for abortion services and appropriations for those programs. We oppose the expanded use of taxpayer funds for abortion, abortion services and abortion training that this bill would allow.

Pregnancy is not a Disease

Abortion is not healthcare. It is violence and brutality that 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 perform abortions on their patients is glaring evidence that abortion is not an essential part of women's healthcare. Women have better options for comprehensive health care. There are 14 federally qualifying health care centers for every Planned Parenthood in Maryland. Abortion has a disproportionate impact on Black Americans who have long been targeted by the abortion industry for eugenics purposes. As a result abortion is the leading cause of death of Black Americans, more than gun violence and all other causes combined.

No public funding for abortions

Taxpayers should not be forced to fund elective abortions, which make up the vast majority of abortions committed in Maryland. State funding for abortion on demand with taxpayer funds is in direct conflict with the will of the people. A 2023 Marist poll showed that 60% of Americans, both "pro-life" and "pro-choice" oppose the use of tax dollars to pay for a woman's abortion.

Love them both

This bill stands in conflict with the fact that 81% of Americans polled favor laws that protect both the lives of women and unborn children. Public funds instead should be prioritized to fund health and family planning services which have the objective of saving the lives of both mother 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.



Opposition Statement SB121 , page 2 of 2

More Opportunities for Career-Focused Students Act of 2023

Deborah Brocato, Legislative Consultant

Maryland Right to Life

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.*”

We ask for an unfavorable report given for **SB121**.