

In opposition to SB23-188 – Concerning Protections for Accessing Reproductive Health Care

My name is Tom Perille. I am a physician and President of Democrats for Life of Colorado. I am speaking in opposition to SB23-188.

SB23-188 is based on a false understanding of what constitutes reproductive health care. Induced abortion entails the purposeful killing of a human being and should never be considered a sanctioned health care activity. Just because a medical professional is performing the abortion and the abortion involves medical procedures or medications, it is not health care. It's analogous to calling the injection of a lethal overdose into a person convicted of a capital offense, health care, because it is performed by a medical professional and involves medications. I repeat – the intentional killing of another human being is never health care.

Should physicians who perform late second and third trimester abortions escape malpractice culpability, increased insurance premiums, and Medical Board discipline simply because they perform abortions? Should the inability to find “peers” to testify against them immunize them from professional consequences? Of course not!

Should the bill interfere with the customs and laws of other states? Of course not. A physician should not be able to prescribe mifepristone/misoprostol via telehealth to a woman residing in another state who ingests the medications in another state violating that state’s prohibition against the medication abortion. If a Wisconsin physician was actively performing “conversion therapy” and prescribing medications via telehealth to a Colorado resident, should Colorado have no recourse to enforce our laws against conversion therapy? Of course not!

Should Colorado legislators be able to deprive Catholic hospitals or medical centers of their first amendment religious freedoms to restrict abortion in their facilities and enforce the ethical and religious directives which all practitioners at Catholic facilities agree to as a condition of their employment? Of course not. What about the ability of employers and health insurers with sincerely held religious/moral objections to abortion to exclude abortion coverage? Of course not.