

## **Statement in support of H.F. 2180: Licensing of abortion facilities** *Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life*

H.F. 2180, the MCCL-supported bill to require abortion facilities to be licensed and inspected by the state, is more crucial to the health and safety of women than ever before.

The goal of the legislation remains the same: to protect Minnesota women by requiring appropriate licensing and inspection of abortion facilities in Minnesota. But the language in this bill is different from the language of some previous versions, which should allow it to receive broader bipartisan support. Previously, abortion facilities were to be licensed very similar to outpatient surgical centers. The revised language merely requires them to be accredited or accepted as member providers by their own industry. This language reflects the hard work of the legislature in previous years.

Planned Parenthood has created its own set of clinical guidelines, and requires affiliates to follow them in order to be accredited affiliates. Similarly, the [National Abortion Federation](#) (NAF) has created its own [clinical standards](#) and accepts as provider members those facilities who abide by the guidelines. Both Planned Parenthood and NAF also require on-site inspections prior to accreditation/membership. Such accreditation or membership would be required for abortion facilities to be licensed in Minnesota.

In 2010, an abortion facility in Pennsylvania was finally shut down after its extremely dangerous and [horrifying conditions](#) came to light. The doctor who had run the facility, Kermit Gosnell, had applied to be a NAF provider member. Following the site visit, he was refused membership, but was able to continue operating. In Minnesota, with passage of this legislation, a facility like Gosnell's would have been shut down immediately.

This bill's language is specific in an attempt to boost support for the legislation, including an effort to gain the Governor's signature. The language has been worked through bipartisan committees in previous years to ease concerns on both sides of this issue. Each one of the concerns has been addressed with this specific language:

- Will the bill lead to clinic closures? The abortion industry has made it clear that Minnesota's abortion facilities already abide by industry standards. This bill would only guard against the emergence of dangerous facilities like those that have sometimes been uncovered in other states.
- Does the bill impose inappropriate requirements? The requirement for licensing is adherence to evidence-based clinical standards for abortion, created within the industry itself.
- Does the bill violate patients' privacy? The bill's language is very specific to ensure patient privacy is protected.
- Is the legislation unconstitutional? While there is no precedent for this legislation, there is no reason to believe that requiring the abortion industry to follow its own standards constitutes any kind of "undue burden" (according to U.S. Supreme Court decisions such as *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*).

- over -

There are 23 states across the country that already require licensing for abortion facilities. Great efforts have been made to ensure that this legislation meets its goal of protecting women, while alleviating any concerns that have been brought up. We believe that there is absolutely no reason, outside of purely political motives, for anyone to oppose this legislation.

*Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life is Minnesota's largest pro-life organization. MCCL works through education, legislation, and political action to secure protection for innocent human life from conception until natural death.*