



To the Minnesota Senate Judiciary and Public Safety Committee
February 3, 2023

SF 70 would appallingly repeal existing law which protects the life of an infant born alive after an attempted abortion, requiring that, when a baby is born alive following an abortion, providers must exercise the same degree of professional skill and care that would be offered to any other child born alive at the same gestational age.

This legal protection underscores a fundamental premise: if a baby is born alive, even after an attempted abortion, he or she is a full member of the human community who deserves our compassion and our care just like any other living human being. Our current law recognizes that once that baby is delivered alive, even after an attempted abortion, there are TWO patients in the room, two distinct and separate human beings.

Minnesota led the nation in passing this law, with many states following suit when the truth of "live-birth abortions" became national news. These abortions resulted in second- and third-trimester babies being delivered alive and then intentionally set aside and left to die a slow, painful, lonely death, often lingering for several hours.

Lest the lie be spread that this never or rarely happens, Minnesota's abortion facilities themselves reported to the Minnesota Department of Health that in 2021 five babies were born alive after attempted abortions. Tragically, SF 70 will also repeal Minnesota's Abortion Reporting Requirements, thereby allowing abortion facilities to hide the existence of these born-alive babies that they will now be allowed to set aside and leave to die. If this bill is passed, we will never know how many babies survived an attempted abortion in 2022, 2023, or any other year.

Minnesota has had abortion reporting requirements since 1998. These reporting requirements were not found unconstitutional by the Ramsey court case this past summer. They are presumably currently enforced law by our state's Attorney General and Department of Health. SF70 is not "simply cleaning up" statutes; it is actively repealing current, enforced law that has specifically not been ruled "unconstitutional."

There are many reasons that Minnesotans should continue to have the right to this public information, which is not private information on private individuals, but aggregate information on what the abortion industry wants to call healthcare. Because Minnesota taxpayers are now required to pay for public assistance abortions, it seems fitting we know how many such abortions we are paying for and what percentage of our annual budget this represents. It also seems fitting we should know the number and severity of abortion complications, as these likely increase taxpayer dollars needed for public assistance health care. Removing the requirement to report complications also impedes medical professionals and policymakers from having access to statewide data that might help reduce and avoid these complications.

Chemical abortions present additional reasons to report complications. Britain and Sweden recently changed their medical standards for chemical abortions simply to protect women's health from very high complication rates. A Finnish study showed 20% of women receiving chemical abortions suffered complications, four times the surgical complication rate.

Minnesota taxpayers have the right to know how their tax dollars are being used. The Abortion Reporting Requirements in Minnesota law provide this transparency, something the abortionists in Minnesota do not want but taxpayers do.

Complications increase from medical abortions in Finland and in Sweden:

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19888037>

<https://bmcmwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-018-0645-6>

Increased health risks of chemical abortion drugs.

<https://www.sba-list.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Deaths-and-Severe-Adverse-Events-after-the-use-of-Mifepristone-as-an-Abortifacient-from-September-2000-to-February-2019-copy5.pdf>