



"It Removes All Guardrails for Protecting Young Children and Young Women"

"I do think the correct place to address abortion is the legislature. It is not this extreme, anti-parent ballot initiative that is being backed by the ACLU. It removes all guardrails for protecting young children and young women. It allows for, basically, abortion up until full term, life-altering painful surgeries – well it's broad so it's not written correctly right now, Ann – and the other thing that's really troubling about this, is it's anti-parent because it removes consent. And I can tell you, as a new mother, I will never allow intruders to lay a hand on my child without consent. That's just fundamental. We have moved so far in our society today to allow

government and these extreme groups to infiltrate our decisions and this is unacceptable." (Mehek Cooke, WOSU-TV, 4/14/23)

Anti- Parent Amendment is Purposely Broad

"Marc Clauson, professor of history and law at Cedarville University, said the amendment if passed might affect parental consent laws since those laws are statutes. 'The state constitution is supreme over state laws passed by legislatures,' he said. 'But the amendment doesn't specifically mention parental consent laws, so there also might be some ambiguity,' Clauson said. The language of the amendment is broad, so Clauson said it would trump the state laws." (Samantha Wildow, Dayton Daily News, 4/17/23)

Hmmmmmm ... Why Would an "Abortion Amendment" Not Even Mention Women?

"My antennae shot up when I saw that the abortion amendment doesn't mention women. Ahem, who else gets an abortion? The 'pregnant patient,' that's who. Why bother with such silly wordplay? From my reading, it's an unsubtle hint that the amendment isn't wholly intended to *protect a woman's right to choose*. 'Woman,' you see, suggests a binary-biological identity, which discriminates against some folks and the several medical interventions that they might find desirable in achieving their chosen identities. ... This isn't spelled out anywhere, but the Ohio amendment's language could be extrapolated to [protect access](#) to all sorts of medical interventions, including sex-change surgery or sterilization, and not just for adults. Age is never mentioned in the amendment, meaning that children could have unfettered access to surgical procedures, including abortion, without parental interference.



**PROTECT WOMEN OHIO
AD FEATURING LIBBY**



**PROTECT WOMEN OHIO
AD FEATURING LINDA**

What's also clear is that these abortion 'protections' would remove regulations that are now in place, such as requirements that abortion clinics meet hospital standards for patient care. Or that a hospital be nearby. Or that parental consent be required for minors."

(Kathleen Parker, Washington Post, 3/17/23)

ACLU Wrote the Anti-Parent Amendment and has Anti-Parent Record

"PWO claims the ACLU has been taking aim at parental rights for decades, directing Ohioans to [a page on its website](#) that details the organization's opposition to parental notification when a minor chooses to have an abortion. Natoce also pointed to the ACLU's past litigation and legal stances as evidence that they have a 'well-documented track record' of "fighting against parental consent." In 2016, the ACLU [was part of a lawsuit](#) that fought to undo parental notification laws in Alaska and in 2017, [the organization said](#) Indiana parental consent laws created an 'unconstitutional undue burden on emancipated minors who do not have the consent of their parents and who wish to obtain an abortion.' ... Natoce said PWO believes it is important that this amendment stops in Ohio to prevent the ACLU from enacting similar changes in other states. 'What we're seeing here is the ACLU's track record of state by state going in and passing these extreme amendments that are an all out assault on parental rights and the health and safety regulations that are in place to protect women and the unborn,' she said. 'If they can do this in Ohio, which is a pro-life state, they will try to do it in other states across the country.'" **(Kendall Tietz, FoxNews.com, 4/25/23)**

ACLU's Anti-Parent Hostility Clear in the Amendment

"That the proposal's language is unconstrained should be no surprise. Its

drafters want it that way. The coalition promoting it includes groups like [the ACLU](#) that have taken extreme positions not only on abortion, but also on a wide range of culture-war issues. And beneath it all is an overarching hostility to parents who would disagree. Beyond abortion, the [text](#) of the proposed amendment provides more broadly that 'every individual has a right to make and carry out one's own reproductive decisions, including but not limited to' several categories: contraception, fertility treatment, continuing one's own pregnancy, miscarriage care, and abortion.

'Reproductive decisions,' however, is a very broad term. By explicitly defining such decisions as 'not limited to' the enumerated categories, the proposal establishes its scope as sweeping."

(Carrie Severino and Frank Scaturro, National Review, 3/13/23)

"As a mother of three children, I can't imagine being left out of a life-or-death decision"

"If this proposal is added to our constitution, Ohio parents will no longer be required to give consent or even be notified for their minor daughter to have an abortion. As a mother of three children, I can't imagine being left out of a life-or-death decision being made by one of my daughters. How can we protect and guide our children if we don't even know they're about to make a life-changing decision? The laws currently on the books have earned overwhelming support from the General Assembly because of the protections they give women, the unborn, and parents. This dangerous amendment will undo the decades of progress we've made to make Ohio one of the best states in the country to raise a family." **(State Senate Majority Whip Theresa Gavorone, R-Bowling Green, Toledo Blade, 4/29/23)**