

Concerns the proposed amendments to HB 1572 address

The amendments proposed by the bishops would remedy several concerns raised about HB 1572. Specifically, they:

- Do not commit the state solely to a "personhood" challenge to *Roe v. Wade*. Many pro-life legal experts consider this strategy flawed and it has not been endorsed by other bishops.
- Make the bill more a statement of legislative intent to guide legal interpretation rather than a mandate to revise application of existing laws.
- Make sure that HB 1572 does not negatively affect HB 1445 or any other statute where "individual," "human being," or "person" has a unique definition.
- Make sure that the bill is not used to create penalties for women, whom are often the "second victims" of abortion.
- Limit the bill's effect to those statutes concerning the protection of innocent human life, rather statutes concerning apportionment, taxes, government programs, and other laws not concerning life and health.
- Designate where the new law would be placed in the Century Code, helping to limit unintended consequences.
- Use a more commonly used and less ambiguous definition of human being.
- Remove the problematic language concerning interpretation of the state constitution. The state legislature cannot dictate how the state constitution is interpreted.

The proposed amendments are similar to a Missouri statute considered by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, 492 U.S. 490 (1989). The Court found that the language alone did not present constitutional problems.