

Summary of the so-called Reproduction Privacy Bill, which has nothing to do with reproduction (quite to the contrary) and nothing private about it, being shouted in the corridors and offices in the State House by organized, pink shirted bullies.

A few talking points from Rhode Island Right to Life:

- Under false pretenses, some local media outlets have joined abortion extremists and unscrupulous politicians to push a New York-style abortion expansion bill here in Rhode Island.
- They falsely claim it is needed to keep abortion legal. But the uncontested fact, admitted even by Planned Parenthood, is that regulation and availability of abortion in Rhode Island does not automatically change even if Roe v Wade is someday overturned.
- They falsely claim it maintains the status quo. But expert legal analysis verifies it goes way beyond and would make Rhode Island a haven for virtually unregulated abortions, even late-term abortions until birth.
- They falsely claim it has broad support. But three separate polls have found the majority of Rhode Islanders do not support their extreme abortion up to the day of birth agenda.

Brief history of the bills over the last few months. Even this long trail is the Cliff Notes version – lots of behind the scenes maneuvering and daily pink shirted protestors and blue shirted, much more reserved and prayerful pro-life advocates on hand for all legislative sessions to show opposition to the bill.

- After long into the night contentious hearings with by far the most compelling testimony against the bill (available on YouTube), it was tabled for further study, usually the end of such bills. Pro-life advocates celebrated.
- Then after weeks of political arm twisting, two previously professed and endorsed “pro-life” legislators, including local Jay Edwards, folded under pressure the bill emerged from the committee. The House passed the bill when the previously declared pro-life Speaker of the House, Nick Mattiello capitulated. Full legal analysis is available.
- The Senate version was subject to a similar, dramatic late night, loud and rancorous hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee. It was eventually defeated because of its extreme nature with a swing vote pro-abortion senator voting it down, even after demonstrators dressed as the fictitious sex slave handmaids picketed the key senator’s home. After it was defeated, the pink shirted thugs coursed through the State House and stormed the Senate President’s office. He had to be escorted out by state house police.
- But there lingered a stealth version. The bill that had passed in the House could still be brought up in the Senate Judiciary Committee for action. Pro-lifers held their breath.
- After delays, it was brought up and amendments offered that did little more than offer some cover for Senators to vote for it. In the eleventh hour a resolute and courageous Senate Minority Whip, Elaine Morgan, vowed to vote ex officio in the committee, which was allowed under senate rules. This would have tied the committee vote and essentially killed the bill.
- The Chairperson of the Judicial Committee (and one of the bill’s sponsors) called a halt to the proceedings after seeing its fate. She then transferred the bill to the Senate Health and Human Services committee, which was stacked in favor of the bill. In doing so, she violated senate rules

which required such transfers to be done only in general sessions of the Senate. When challenged, she replied that she was the chairperson and could do what she wanted.

- Senator Morgan wrote a detailed letter to the head of the Senate Rules Committee and to Senate President Ruggiero asking that the transfer be nullified unless properly submitted. By this time Ruggiero was thoroughly cowed by the pink shirted bullies, and although supposedly always pro-life, answered Senator Morgan with a curt, if not rude, one-line memo that her request was denied.
- After only two days with no hearings and no testimony that the committee members heard, the bill passed in committee and then immediately passed in the full Senate.
- An amended House bill sent back to the House for final ratification is usually referred back to the House Judicial Committee for reconciliation of variances. In this case, that was bypassed and the Speaker rushed the final bill through the House in hours.
- Pro-abortion Governor Gina Raimondo signed it immediately without review and to much pink shirted cheering with many photo ops.
- That Ruggiero, Mattiello and Raimondo are professed as Catholic is remarkable. Both Senate President Ruggiero and House Speaker Mattiello have run many times with pro-life candidates with endorsements. Although both voted against the bills, it was cynical, knowing that the votes were there to pass it, hostage to the implacable ideological pro-abortion agenda of the Democrat party.

A brief synopsis of the amendments added to the House bill that provided the cover for its passage in the Senate:

***Expert legal analysis of the "compromise" bill that will be voted on by the Senate Judiciary Committee today:***

***"The enactment of Substitute B would work a radical change in state law regulating abortion. Although the bill would preserve statutes mandating informed consent (including parental consent ), prohibiting fetal experimentation and guaranteeing rights of conscience, see proposed 12 § 23-4.13-2(c)(1), Substitute B, either expressly or by necessary implication, would repeal a wide range of abortion statutes, including statutes prohibiting partial-birth abortion, regulating abortion clinics, restricting public funding of abortion, as well as those state statutes prohibiting abortion which are not currently enforceable because of the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade (1973), as modified in Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992). Moreover, in the absence of subsequent legislation modifying the scope of the legislation, Substitute B would effectively prevent state agencies from adopting and enforcing meaningful rules regulating the practice of abortion. In no way may Substitute B fairly be described as simply "codifying" existing federal law. Substitute B would repeal, expressly or by implication, statutes and rules that are fully consistent with the federal constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court."***