



Written Testimony of Danielle Pimentel, J.D.
Policy Counsel, Americans United for Life
In Opposition to Senate Joint Resolution No. 4
Submitted to the Government Administration and Elections Committee
March 18, 2024

Dear Co-Chair Flexer, Co-Chair Blumenthal, Vice-Chair Slap, Vice-Chair Morrin Bello, Ranking Member Sampson, Ranking Member Mastrofrancesco and Members of the Committee:

My Name is Danielle Pimentel, and I serve as Policy Counsel at Americans United for Life (“AUL”). Established in 1971, AUL is a national law and policy nonprofit organization with a specialization in abortion, end-of-life issues, and bioethics law. AUL publishes pro-life model legislation and policy guides,¹ tracks state bioethics legislation,² and regularly testifies on pro-life legislation in Congress and the states. Our vision at AUL is to strive for a world where everyone is welcomed in life and protected in law. As Policy Counsel, I specialize in life-related legislation, constitutional law, and abortion jurisprudence.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 (“Resolution”).³ If the Resolution is passed, there would be devastating consequences for preborn children, women, and girls in the state of Connecticut. The Resolution authorizes abortion-on-demand throughout all nine months of pregnancy, endangers women’s welfare, threatens the existence of Connecticut’s current pro-life laws, impedes the state from enacting future commonsense protections for women and preborn children, and furthers the false and harmful narrative that abortion is necessary for women’s equality in America. For these reasons, the Committee should reject Resolution No. 4.

¹ *Pro-Life Model Legislation and Guides*, AMS. UNITED FOR LIFE, <https://aul.org/law-and-policy/> (last visited Mar. 15, 2024). AUL is the original drafter of many of the hundreds of pro-life bills enacted in the States in recent years. See Olga Khazan, *Planning the End of Abortion*, ATLANTIC (July 16, 2020), www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/07/what-pro-life-activists-really-want/398297/ (“State legislatures have enacted a slew of abortion restrictions in recent years. Americans United for Life wrote most of them.”); see also Anne Ryman & Matt Wynn, *For Anti-Abortion Activists, Success of ‘Heartbeat’ Bills was 10 Years in the Making*, CTR. FOR PUB. INTEGRITY (Jun. 20, 2019), <https://publicintegrity.org/politics/state-politics/copy-paste-legislate/for-anti-abortion-activists-success-of-heartbeat-bills-was-10-years-in-the-making/> (“The USA TODAY/Arizona Republic analysis found Americans United for Life was behind the bulk of the more than 400 copycat [anti-]abortion bills introduced in 41 states.”).

² *Defending Life: State Legislation Tracker*, AMS. UNITED FOR LIFE, <https://aul.org/law-and-policy/state-legislation-tracker/> (last visited Mar. 15, 2024).

³ AUL’s opposition is limited to the Resolution’s implications regarding abortion.

I. The Resolution is Radical and Protects Abortion-On-Demand Up Until the Baby's Birth Date.

The Resolution deceptively contrives constitutional protection for an unfettered “right” to “terminating a pregnancy” *i.e.*, abortion. The Resolution states that “[n]o person shall be denied the equal protection of the law nor be subjected to segregation or discrimination in the exercise or enjoyment of his or her *civil or political rights* because of . . . sex.” The Resolution defines “discrimination in the exercise or enjoyment of civil or political rights because of sex” to include “terminating a pregnancy.” Consequently, the Resolution implicitly enshrines a “right” to abortion in the state constitution. In doing so, the Resolution would ensure that abortions are allowed for any reason throughout all nine months of pregnancy. This goes well beyond the overruled decisions in *Roe v. Wade*⁴ and *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*,⁵ which only licensed abortion through viability.

As a result, the Resolution will increase the number of late term abortions in the state. Despite the common narrative that late-term abortions are only performed in rare circumstances for medically necessary reasons, “most abortions are done for social reasons.”⁶ In fact, as study on late-term abortion notes, “[t]he Guttmacher Institute has provided a number of reports over 2 decades which have identified the reasons why women choose abortion, and they have consistently reported that childbearing would interfere with their education, work, and ability to care for existing dependents; would be a financial burden; and would disrupt partner relationships.”⁷ Thus, the overwhelming majority of abortions occur for elective reasons of the mother, not because of either the baby’s or the mother’s medical condition.⁸

The Guttmacher Institute further estimates that abortionists perform around 10,000 abortions at 21 weeks’ gestation or later *each year*.⁹ However, the number of late term abortions is likely significantly higher given that states voluntarily report abortion data and abortion destination states, such as California and Maryland refuse to provide any abortion data to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.¹⁰ If Connecticut passes the

⁴ 410 U.S. 113 (1973), *overruled by* *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Org.*, 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022)

⁵ 505 U.S. 833, *overruled by* *Dobbs*, 142 S. Ct. 2228.

⁶ AM. ASSOC. OF PRO-LIFE OBSTETRICIANS & GYNECOLOGISTS, STATE RESTRICTIONS ON ABORTION: EVIDENCE-BASED GUIDANCE FOR POLICYMAKERS, Comm. Op. 10, at 10 (updated Sept. 2022).

⁷ James Studnicki, *Late-Term Abortion and Medical Necessity: A Failure of Science*, HEALTH SERVS. RSCH. & MANAGERIAL EPIDEMIOLOGY, Apr. 9, 2019, at 1, 1.

⁸ *See, e.g., The Assault on Reproductive Rights in a Post-Dobbs America: Hearing before the S. Comm. on the Jud.*, 118th Cong. 15 (2023) (written testimony of Monique Chireau Wubbenhorst, MD, MPH) (stating that “95 percent of abortions are for elective or unspecified reasons.”).

⁹ Guttmacher Institute, *Induced Abortion in the United States*, GUTTMACHER (2019), <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/induced-abortion-united-states>. This number is likely to be significantly higher given that states voluntarily report abortion data and abortion destination states, such as California and Maryland refuse to provide any abortion data to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

¹⁰ *See Questions and Answers on Late-Term Abortion*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. (May 16, 2022), <https://lozierinstitute.org/questions-and-answers-on-late-term-abortion/>.

Resolution, the number of late term abortions in the state will likely increase, which will subject more women to dangerous abortion procedures that threaten their welfare and subject preborn children to barbaric and gruesome deaths.

A. There are Numerous Health and Safety Risks to Late-Term Abortions

If Connecticut amends its constitution to enshrine a “right” to abortion, more women will be put at risk of suffering severe and life-threatening complications from late-term abortions. Abortion already poses inherent dangers to women’s health and safety; however, abortions carry even higher risks when done later in pregnancy.¹¹

Gestational age is the strongest risk factor for abortion-related mortality, and the incidence of major complications is significantly higher after 20 weeks’ gestation.¹² For example, compared to an abortion at 8 weeks’ gestation, the relative risk of mortality increases exponentially (by 38 percent for each additional week) at higher gestational ages.¹³ Further, researchers have concluded that it may not be possible to reduce the risk of death in later-term abortions because of the “inherently greater technical complexity of later abortions.”¹⁴ This is because later-term abortions need to dilate the cervix to a greater degree, and the increased blood flow predisposes women to hemorrhage, and the myometrium relaxes and is more subject to perforation.¹⁵

Some immediate complications from abortion include blood clots, hemorrhaging, incomplete abortions, infection, and injury to the cervix and other organs.¹⁶ Immediate complications from abortions overall affect approximately 10% of women undergoing abortion, and approximately one-fifth of these complications are life-threatening.¹⁷ If the Resolution is passed and Connecticut authorizes abortion-on-demand, more women will experience life-threatening complications from late-term abortions.

B. Abortion Negatively Affects Women’s Mental Wellbeing

Amending Connecticut’s constitution to enshrine an unfettered “right” to abortion will further the psychological harms women suffer after having an abortion. Numerous studies demonstrate the psychological trauma women experience from abortion. “[P]regnancy loss (natural or induced) is associated with an increased risk of mental health

¹¹ See Planned Parenthood, *How Safe Is an In-Clinic Abortion?*, <https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/abortion/in-clinic-abortion-procedures/how-safe-is-an-in-clinic-abortion> (last visited Mar. 17, 2024) (“The chances of problems get higher the later you get the abortion, and if you have sedation or general anesthesia.”)

¹² Linda A. Bartlett et al., *Risk Factors for Legal Induced Abortion-Related Mortality in the United States*, 103 *OBSTETRICS & GYNECOLOGY* 729, 731 (2004).

¹³ *Id.* at 731; PRO. ETHICS COMM. OF AM. ASSOC. OF PRO-LIFE OBSTETRICIANS & GYNECOLOGISTS, *Induced Abortion & the Increased Risk of Maternal Mortality*, Comm. Op. 6 (Aug. 13, 2019).

¹⁴ Bartlett, *supra* note 12, at 735.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ See Planned Parenthood, *supra* note 11.

¹⁷ REPORT OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA TASK FORCE TO STUDY ABORTION 48 (2005).

problems.”¹⁸ “Research on mental health subsequent to early pregnancy loss as a result of elective induced abortions has historically been polarized, but recent research indicates an increased correlation to the genesis or exacerbation of substance abuse and affective disorders including suicidal ideation.”¹⁹

Scholarship shows “that the emotional reaction or grief experience related to miscarriage and abortion can be prolonged, afflict mental health, and/or impact intimate or parental relationships.”²⁰ In fact, a recent 2023 study found that American “women whose first pregnancy ends in induced abortion are significantly more likely than women whose first pregnancy ends in a live birth to experience mental health problems throughout their reproductive years.”²¹ Similarly, “[s]everal recent international studies have demonstrated that repetitive early pregnancy loss, including both miscarriage and induced abortions, is associated with increased levels of distress, depression, anxiety, and reduced quality of life scores in social and mental health categories.”²²

Enshrining a “right” to abortion in Connecticut’s state constitution will increase the number of women and young girls suffering from the psychological harms of having an abortion. By authorizing abortion-on-demand, the rates of mental health issues—such as depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation—will increase and thus diminish women’s overall quality of life.

C. Abortion Subjects Preborn Children and to Painful Abortion Procedures

In addition to harming women’s physical and mental health, abortion also subjects preborn children to fetal pain. The most common abortion procedures performed after 20 weeks gestation are dilation and evacuation procedures, *i.e.*, dismemberment abortions.²³ Another procedure used in later-term abortions is intact dilation and extraction, *i.e.*, partial-birth abortions.²⁴ Both procedures are gruesome and barbaric and involve either dismembering or crushing the preborn child’s body in the womb, which are undoubtedly

¹⁸ David C. Reardon & Christopher Craver, *Effects of Pregnancy Loss on Subsequent Postpartum Mental Health: A Prospective Longitudinal Cohort Study*, 18 INT’L J. ENV’T RSCH. & PUB. HEALTH 1, 1 (2021).

¹⁹ Kathryn R. Grauerholz et al., *Uncovering Prolonged Grief Reactions Subsequent to a Reproductive Loss: Implications for the Primary Care Provider*, 12 FRONTIERS IN PSYCH. 1, 2 (2021).

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ James Studnicki et al., *A Cohort Study of Mental Health Services Utilization Following a First Pregnancy Abortion or Birth*, 15 INT’L J. WOMEN’S HEALTH 955, 959 (2023).

²² Grauerholz, *supra* note 19; *see, e.g.*, Louis Jacob et al., *Association Between Induced Abortion, Spontaneous Abortion, and Infertility Respectively and the Risk of Psychiatric Disorders in 57,770 Women Followed in Gynecological Practices in Germany*, 251 J. AFFECTIVE DISORDERS 107, 111 (2019) (finding “[a] positive relationship between induced abortion . . . and psychiatric disorders”).

²³ Patricia A. Lohr et al., *Surgical Versus Medical Methods for Second Trimester Induced Abortion*, Cochrane Database of Systematic Rev. (Jan. 2008).

²⁴ *See* Elizabeth Johnson, *The Reality of Late-Term Abortion Procedures*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. (Jan. 20, 2015), <https://lozierinstitute.org/the-reality-of-late-term-abortion-procedures/>.

painful for the preborn child.²⁵ As a result, Congress enacted the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban in 2003,²⁶ recognizing the need to protect preborn children from the gruesome procedure.

There is ample research on fetal pain in the 50 years after *Roe*. As one example, in 2019, scientists found evidence of fetal pain as early as 12 weeks' gestation.²⁷ A 2010 study found that “the earlier infants are delivered, the stronger their response to pain”²⁸ because the “neural mechanisms that inhibit pain sensations do not begin to develop until 34–36 weeks[] and are not complete until a significant time after birth.”²⁹ As a result, preborn children display a “hyperresponsiveness” to pain.³⁰ According to one group of fetal surgery experts, “[t]he administration of anesthesia directly to the fetus is critical in open fetal surgery procedures.”³¹ Given the medical advancements in fetal medicine and the evidence of fetal pain early in a pregnancy, it is well within the state’s legitimate interests to enact laws that preserve prenatal life as well as minimize fetal pain as much as possible.³²

If the Resolution passes and voters enshrine a “right” to abortion in the state constitution, the state will be authorizing abortion-on-demand up until the baby’s birth date. In effect, preborn children, who can feel pain, will be subjected to abortion violence. Ultimately, the Resolution disregards the humanity of children in the womb and results in more preborn children intentionally being subject to barbaric and painful abortion procedures, which runs contrary to the state’s legitimate interest to preserve prenatal life and mitigate fetal pain.³³

II. The Resolution May Threaten Existing Life-Affirming Laws and Impede Connecticut from Enacting Future Health and Safety Safeguards for Women

The passage of the Resolution could place Connecticut’s limited pro-life protections at risk of being challenged in court or being removed by the legislature, similar to what has occurred in Michigan in 2023. In the same vein, Connecticut may face difficulty enacting any future protections for women, girls, and preborn children if it enshrines a right to abortion in its state constitution.

The proposed amendment implicitly makes “terminating a pregnancy” a “civil . . . right.” Accordingly, if a pro-life law is challenged in court, even though the Supreme Court found that states have a legitimate interest in protecting maternal health and safety and

²⁵ *See id.*

²⁶ 18 U.S.C. § 1531.

²⁷ Stuart W.G. Derbyshire & John C. Bockmann, *Reconsidering Fetal Pain*, 46 J. MED. ETHICS 3 (2020)

²⁸ Lina K. Badr et al., *Determinants of Premature Infant Pain Responses to Heel Sticks*, 36 PEDIATRIC NURSING 129 (2010).

²⁹ *Fact Sheet: Science of Fetal Pain*, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INST. (Sept. 2022), https://lozierinstitute.org/fact-sheets-science-of-fetal-pain/#_ednref14.

³⁰ Christine Greco & Soorena Khojasteh, *Pediatric, Infant, and Fetal Pain*, CASE STUDIES PAIN MGMT. 379 (2014).

³¹ Maria J. Mayorga-Buiza et al., *Management of Fetal Pain During Invasive Fetal Procedures. Lessons Learned from a Sentinel Event*, 31 EUROPEAN J. ANAESTHESIOLOGY 188 (2014).

³² *See Dobbs*, 142 S. Ct. at 2284.

³³ *See id.*

preserving prenatal life,³⁴ a Connecticut court may nevertheless find that a person's purported "right" to "terminat[e] a pregnancy" under the amendment outweighs such interests and balance the competing interests in favor of abortion.

This extreme abortion "right," even may impact the state from enacting common-sense informed consent and health and safety protections for women and girls considering abortion, which is concerning given the number of women who are forced into having abortions. There are several studies that highlight the prevalence of coerced abortions. A recent peer-reviewed study showed that 43% of post-abortive women described their abortion as "accepted but inconsistent with their values and preferences," while 24% indicated their abortion was "unwanted or coerced."³⁵ Similarly, another study found that 61% of women reported experiencing "high levels of pressure" to abort from "male partners, family members, other persons, financial concerns, and other circumstances."³⁶

This past legislative session, Michigan residents faced a similar challenge as their legislature sought to repeal virtually all pro-life policies in the state only one year after the residents voted to amend their constitution to enshrine a right to abortion. The legislature sought to repeal portions of the state's informed consent process, licensing requirements for abortion clinics, abortion reporting requirements, prohibitions of gruesome partial-birth abortions, a law that required doctors to screen for coercion and provide victims of coercive abuse with helpful resources, *etc.* Michigan's abortion amendment has similar language to Connecticut's Resolution in that it guarantees a "right to reproductive freedom," *i.e.*, abortion.

If Connecticut enshrines a "right" to abortion in its state constitution, the state could face threats to its remaining life-affirming laws, similar to what has occurred in Michigan. These safeguards are crucial to keeping women and preborn children safe from the harms of abortion violence.

III. The Resolution Perpetuates the False Narrative that Women Need Abortion

Abortion is anything but empowering. Abortion not only intentionally destroys preborn human life, but it is also detrimental to women's physical and mental well-being, as mentioned above. However, by seeking to enshrine an unfettered "right" to abortion, the Resolution furthers the narrative that women "need" abortion in order to obtain equality and success in American society. This belief is unfounded and anti-woman.

The Resolution uses vague and broad language that masks the reality of abortion and its harms to women and preborn children. Abortion is not healthcare as the Resolution implies. It is the intentional destruction of innocent preborn human life. The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists ("AAPLOG") define elective abortion as "those drugs or procedures with the primary intent to end the life of the human being in

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ David C. Reardon et al., *The Effects of Abortion Decision Rightness and Decision Type on Women's Satisfaction and Mental Health*, CUREUS, May 11, 2023, at 1.

³⁶ David C. Reardon & Tessa Longbons, *Effects of Pressure to Abort on Women's Emotional Responses and Mental Health*, CUREUS, Jan. 31, 2023, at 1.

the womb.”³⁷ Elective abortions are not medically required, as AAPLOG explains, “[e]lective’ . . . refers to inductions done in the absence of some condition of the mother or the fetus which requires separation of the two in order to protect the life of one or the other (or both).”³⁸ Indeed, “there is no medical indication for elective induced abortion, since it cures no medical disease.”³⁹

Additionally, abortion activists often imply that pregnancy is some sort of illness or disability, rather than a natural physiological process that many women experience. As AAPLOG notes, “[p]regnancy is not a disease, and the killing of human beings in utero is not medical care.”⁴⁰ Further, “[t]o date, the medical literature offers no support for the claim that abortion improves mental health or offers protection to mental health. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary.”⁴¹

Despite these evident truths, abortion activists continue to push forth false narratives about pregnancy and women’s alleged “need” for abortion. However, the evidence abortion activists rely upon, which “claim[s] to show that abortion has facilitated women’s health and equality is feeble and/or scientifically invalid.”⁴² Women are harmed by “the repetition and acceptance of the ‘equality’ argument for favoring legal abortion,” because it “easily communicates that women’s pregnancy and parenting is a disability most females suffer. It explicitly or implicitly assumes that the male body and reproductive model is the norm, to which women should conform in order to achieve ‘agreed’ measures of success...”⁴³

Yet, converse to the cultural narrative, pregnancy is neither an illness nor a disability and to imply that it is such results in discriminatory treatment towards women. “A system that undervalues both mothering and fathering severely disadvantages women as well as men and children, and interferes with children receiving the care they require.”⁴⁴ Additionally, this leads to both a “public and private resistance to accommodating motherhood” in employment, which “leads to additional disadvantages for women.”⁴⁵ “For example, discrimination on the basis of pregnancy and motherhood has succeeded outright discrimination on the basis of sex.”⁴⁶

³⁷ AAPLOG Statement: Clarification of Abortion Restrictions, AM. ASS’N PRO-LIFE OBSTETRICIANS & GYNECOLOGISTS (July 14, 2022), <https://aaplog.org/aaplog-statement-clarification-of-abortion-restrictions/>.

³⁸ Rsch. Comm., Am. Ass’n of Pro-Life Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Concluding Pregnancy Ethically*, Prac. Guideline No. 10, at 5 (Aug. 2022).

³⁹ Pro. Ethics Comm., Am. Ass’n of Pro-Life Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Hippocratic Objection to Killing Human Beings in Medical Practice*, Comm. Op. No. 1, at 8 (May 8, 2017).

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ Rsch. Comm., Am. Ass’n of Pro-Life Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *supra* note 38, at 5.

⁴² Helen M. Alvare, *Nearly 50 Years Post-Roe v. Wade and Nearing its End: What is the Evidence that Abortion Advances Women’s Health and Equality*, 35 REGENT L. R. 165, 216 (Feb 2022).

⁴³ *Id.* at 213.

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 214.

⁴⁶ *Id.* at 216.

Abortion neither resolves nor combats the discrimination pregnant women face. If anything, it only furthers the discriminatory view of pregnancy and motherhood by perpetuating the lie that women cannot be both mothers and thrive in American society. The women of Connecticut deserve better than to have the abortion industry subject them to deceptive language surrounding abortion, which is a life-altering—and at times, life-threatening—decision. The Resolution furthers the abortion industry’s lies and efforts to mask the realities of abortion, which is to the detriment of women’s health, safety, and success and equality in America.

IV. Conclusion

By enabling abortion-on-demand throughout pregnancy, the Resolution threatens the health and safety of some of Connecticut’s most vulnerable citizens. The Resolution seeks to abandon women and preborn children without any health and safety safeguards, which will dramatically increase abortion violence throughout the state. I urge the Committee to reject the Resolution to protect mothers and their preborn children from such harm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Danielle G. Pimentel, J.D.
Policy Counsel
AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE