

From: Christians for Personhood <CP@spiritcom.net>
To:
Date: 2/20/2018 7:10:09 PM
Subject: [The State] Personhood Bill S.217 to outlaw all "abortions" in South Carolina passed favorably by Senate Judiciary Committee, by 12 - 9 vote

ri600Christians for Personhood (CP)

Columbia, South Carolina
February 20, 2018

Personhood Bill **S .217** to outlaw all "abortions" in South Carolina passed favorably
by Senate Judiciary Committee, by 12 - 9 vote

Excerpt:

After the vote, Gov. McMaster praised the [Senate Judiciary] committee's decision.

"I believe that human life begins at conception, and I believe the people of South Carolina deserve
for their laws to reflect the values they hold dear," the Richland Republican said in a
statement.

"I applaud the Senate Judiciary Committee's decision to move this important legislation
forward
and ask that the Senate pass it without delay."

The State (Columbia, SC)
Plan to outlaw all abortions in South Carolina gets OK from Senate panel
<http://www.thestate.com/news/politics-government/article201090564.html>
February 20, 2018

[Pro-"Abortion"] The State (Columbia, SC)
Plan to outlaw all abortions in South Carolina gets OK from Senate panel
<http://www.thestate.com/news/politics-government/article201090564.html>
February 20, 2018 01:30 PM
Updated 31 minutes ago

[CP Note: Emphasis added; comments, additional information in **bold red** added]

A Republican proposal that, effectively, would ban all abortions in South Carolina is headed to the full Senate

for a vote despite concerns it could criminalize fertility treatment [FALSE - S .217 would NOT ban in vitro fertilization; it does affirm right of SC General Assembly to regulate in vitro procedures. Any practice attendant to in vitro fertilization which kills a preborn human being could be banned by further legislation.] and some types of birth control [S .217 does NOT ban contraception. Any "birth control" which causes chemical "abortions" would have to be proven by the State of South Carolina to function in that way] , and ban abortions performed to save the mother's life [FALSE].

A state Senate committee [full Judiciary Committee] OK'd [favorably passed] the proposal Tuesday after two hours of debate, voting 12-9 along party lines to extend legal rights to fertilized eggs [sic - zygotes / embryos / fetuses / all pre-birth human beings] at the moment of conception [same as fertilization].

One Republican on the panel did not vote on the proposal [Senator Sandy Senn (R-Charleston)], saying it was unconstitutional [sic - See LEGAL EXPERTS SUPPORTING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATE-LEVEL PERSONHOOD LEGISLATION IN SC (2001), MISS (2009), ALA (2011), and OK (2012)]. However, advocates see the proposal as a way, possibly, to overturn the 1972 [sic - 1973] Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion [sic - "Abortion" is NOT legal].

The proposal [S .217 Personhood Bill of South Carolina], which must pass the full Senate and House, has been praised by abortion opponents and condemned by [sic - some] medical and [sic - some] women's rights groups.

The "Personhood Act" [S .217] that GOP senators approved Tuesday was sponsored by Lt. Gov. Kevin Bryant – when he still was a state senator – and endorsed by Gov. Henry McMaster. Both are seeking the Republican nomination for governor in June's GOP primary, where the abortion issue is a key one to Republican voters.

continued...

The Personhood Act would outlaw ... [all] ... of the nearly 6,000 abortions performed in South Carolina each year.

Just two other states – Kansas and Missouri – have a personhood law. But in both states, that law is expressly subject to the U.S. Constitution [FALSE - Kansas and Missouri have subjected themselves "to the Constitution of the United States, AND decisional interpretations thereof by the United States Supreme Court ..." (in other

words, to Supreme Court OPINIONS

about what the written text of the US Constitution says, which according to Article VI, Clause 2 of the US Constitution itself, are NOT what comprise "the supreme Law of the Land".] [emphasis added]

Its champion in the Senate, Richard Cash, R-Anderson, says the proposal is intended to spark a court case that could be used to overturn Roe v. Wade, the 1973 U.S. Supreme Court decision that affirmed a woman's right to have an abortion under the 14th Amendment.

[CP Note: By DENYING the PERSONHOOD of pre-birth human beings].

"We are trying to challenge the Supreme Court on their fundamental error that a human being is not a person," Cash said.

"A human being is a person."

[CP Note: Black's Law Dictionary , used by attorneys states: "person" - "A human being."]

Senate Democrats on Tuesday complained the proposal, even after a revision Tuesday, leaves too many questions unanswered.

"I don't think the authors of this bill and the authors of this amendment have considered the consequences," said state Sen.

Thomas McElveen, D-Sumter. "We need to do our job here. Our job is to get out as good of legislation as we can ... before we get it on the floor for debate."

Democrats relayed concerns from fertility specialists who said they don't want to be charged with murder for disposing of any fertilized eggs that aren't used during in-vitro fertilization.

Cash replied the bill explicitly does not outlaw in-vitro fertilization. But, the Anderson Republican added, fertilization clinics "should not be allowed to destroy the eggs."

Opponents also worry the Personhood Act could target doctors who perform abortions in medical emergencies that threaten the mother's life.

An amendment to Cash's bill states that a doctor cannot be charged for the accidental or unintentional death of an unborn child if that doctor is making "reasonable medical efforts" to save both the mother and child during a medical emergency.

Democrats also weren't happy that the bill makes no exception for abortion in cases of rape or incest.

Cash didn't back down after state Sen. Margie Bright Matthews, D-Colleton, offered a hypothetical situation involving a 11-year-old girl.

"If a child is raped, yes, that is a horrible act," Cash said. "Two wrongs don't make a right. You cannot erase the rape by killing the child. The child is an innocent person."

"Have you ever been raped?" [state Sen. Mia McLeod, D-Richland](#), asked, starting a line of questioning that Cash refused to answer.

"Have you ever been pregnant?"

Cash said the bill is not intended to outlaw birth control but said the bill doesn't expressly state that intention because "birth control pills, the way that they are formulated, have and could change over time."

The bill faces heavy opposition from Senate Democrats, who can use the chamber's rules to hold it up. An earlier [version of the bill died on the Senate floor in 2016](#).

[State Sen. Sandy Senn, R-Charleston](#), abstained from voting, saying she thinks the bill is unconstitutional but didn't want to vote against a pro-life proposal.

After the vote, Gov. McMaster praised the [[Senate Judiciary](#)] committee's decision.

"I believe that human life begins at conception, and I believe the people of South Carolina deserve for their laws to reflect the values they hold dear," the Richland Republican said in a statement. "I applaud the Senate Judiciary Committee's decision to move this important legislation forward and ask that the Senate pass it without delay."

The State

Additional information provide by Christians for Personhood :

LEGAL EXPERTS SUPPORTING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATE-LEVEL PERSONHOOD LEGISLATION

IN SC (2001), MISS (2009), ALA (2011), and OK (2012):

- Herb Titus is an attorney, constitutional scholar, author, the founding Dean of College of Law/Gov't at Regent University

- Mathew Staver is former Dean of the School of Law at Liberty University; and [Liberty Counsel](#) founder and chair

- Judge Roy Moore , Chief Justice of the [Alabama Supreme Court](#) , is President Emeritus of [Foundation for Moral Law](#)

April 5, 2016

<http://christianlifeandliberty.net/2016-04-05-Legal-experts-supporting-constitutionality-of-State-level-Personhood-legislation-SC-MISS-ALA-OK-edited-Jan-27-2017.pdf>

"PERSONHOOD" is the key to ENDING child-murder-by-'abortion' . A plain reading of the [5th](#) and [14th](#) Amendments of the [U.S. Constitution](#) , and analogous due process and equal protection language in the State Constitutions [for example, Article I., Section 3. of the [South Carolina Constitution](#)], indicates that legal status and therefore protection of constitutional rights, is granted to 'PERSONS' in these provisions. The issue of personhood for the 'fetus' as being the preeminently critical issue was specifically addressed by a US Supreme Court Justice during the October 11, 1972 [Roe v. Wade](#) Oral Reargument. [Go to these internet links to both a [transcript](#) and the actual [audio](#) of the October 11, 1972 [Roe v. Wade](#) Oral Reargument.]

THE 1973 ROE V. WADE OPINION REVEALS THAT ESTABLISHING [PERSONHOOD](#) FOR THE PREBORN AT FERTILIZATION, WITH NO 'EXCEPTIONS' , IS THE KEY TO [ENDING](#) CHILD-MURDER BY 'ABORTION'.

[However, Roe v. Wade itself is a fraud, denying preborn personhood, and making a 'strawman' argument with the 14th Amdt.]

[Roe v. Wade](#) , [410 U.S. 113](#) (1973) (Opinion published January 22, 1973) [Findlaw.com](#)

"The appellee and certain amici argue that the fetus is a "person" within the language and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In support of this, they outline at length and in detail the well-known facts of fetal development. If this suggestion of personhood

is established , the appellant's [pro-abortion] case, of course , collapses , [410 U.S. 113, 157] for the fetus' right to life

would then be guaranteed specifically by the Amendment . The appellant [pro-abortion side] conceded as much on reargument. ... "

[emphasis added]

THE KEY, CRITICAL , FIRST , CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE IN ROE V. WADE (1973) WAS WHETHER OR NOT THE 'FETUS' (PRE-BIRTH HUMAN BEING), WOULD BE RECOGNIZED IN LAW AS A

LEGAL 'PERSON':

[Note: American Constitutional Law even recognizes Corporations as legal 'Persons', but not preborn Human Beings !!!]

Excerpt from [transcript](#) (edited) of Reargument (October 11, 1972) of Roe v. Wade before the US Supreme Court:

US Supreme Court Justice:

"And the basic constitutional question, initially, is whether or not an unborn fetus is a person, isn't it ?" [[p. 827](#)]

Mr. Robert Flowers (Assistant Attorney General, State of Texas):

"Yes, sir, and entitled to the constitutional protection." [[p. 827](#)]

US Supreme Court Justice: "And that's critical to this case, is it not?" [[p. 828](#)]

Mr. Robert Flowers (Assistant Attorney General, State of Texas): "Yes, sir, it is. ... (continued)."
[[p. 828](#)]

To unsubscribe, send "Unsubscribe" to:
Christians for Personhood