



SC Senate Medical Affairs Subcommittee
Gressette Building, Columbia, SC
S.988 “Equal Protection for Unborn Babies Act” [sic]
January 26, 2022

Good morning, I’m Steve Lefemine with Christians for Personhood. Our purpose is to glorify God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, Who is God the Son, in the power of God the Holy Spirit, by seeking to Establish Justice for pre-birth human beings, in law, at fertilization, and that without exception, because God’s Word says: “Thou shalt not kill (murder),” Exodus 20:13, KJV.

I oppose S.988, the so-called “Equal Protection for Unborn Babies Act” because it does not establish equal protection for ALL unborn babies.

First, under Section 44-139-10., the bill explicitly excludes treatment of ectopic pregnancy from the definition of “Abortion”. Sections 44-139-20 and -30 criminalize “abortion”, but since treatment of an ectopic pregnancy is not included, there is no criminal penalty for administering the abortifacient methotrexate to a woman with an ectopic pregnancy, and committing a methotrexate “abortion”, killing the child. Instead, “watchful waiting” is the proper standard of care, in the hope of natural miscarriage, or migration of the embryo and reattachment in the uterus. If these do not occur, then surgery by minimally invasive laparoscopy may be necessary. However, killing the baby by a methotrexate “abortion” is not equal protection.

Second, S.988 provides no clear, explicit protection or criminal penalty for violations of the equal protection of these other unborn children either:

- a) Certain unborn children during various in-vitro fertilization procedures, where embryos are discarded in pre-implantation screening, or “excess” embryos are used for “scientific research”; in both cases, ending in their destruction; and,**
- b) The large number of unborn children “aborted” chemically by abortifacients such as “birth control” pills and IUD’s. S.988 does criminalize surgical and RU-486 “abortions”; however reliable estimates are the number of chemical “abortions” by abortifacient “birth control” is multiple times more than the number of surgical and RU-486 “abortions”. S.988 does not establish a clear legal foundation for the legal personhood of ALL unborn children which would protect ALL of them.**

Now, if I may ask a question about certain language in the bill, as to the author’s intent ?

In Section 44-139-10(1)(a)(ii), the bill says “Abortion” means “*an omission of a statutorily required act, that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in the death of the unborn baby of a woman known or suspected to be pregnant.*”

That seems cryptic and perhaps unconstitutionally vague. My question is this: Is that language intended by the bill’s sponsor to address either the case of in-vitro fertilization, and/or of chemical abortifacients; and is the phrase “*statutorily required act*” referring to some future potential legislation ?

Please amend S.988 with S.381.
