



Missouri Supreme Court to Decide Future of Pro-abortion Amendment

The future of the abortion question is up in the air in Missouri, where the ball has effectively fallen into the hands of the state's Supreme Court.

As [Fox News](#) reports, the court on Tuesday heard arguments regarding a proposed amendment to the Missouri Constitution that would create a legal right to abortion. This proposal was introduced in response to the state's banning of most abortions last summer following the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*.

Things became heated this spring after Attorney General Andrew Bailey, a Republican, refused to approve the cost estimate for the amendment provided by Republican Auditor Scott Fitzpatrick. As a result of Bailey's decision, proponents of the amendment have been unable to get started on the process of collecting signatures to put the pro-abortion proposal on the 2024 ballot.

Fox noted:

They sued, and a circuit court judge last month ordered Bailey to approve the cost estimate. He has not, instead appealing to the Supreme Court to validate him.

ACLU attorney Tony Rothert on Tuesday asked judges to force Bailey to act so he no longer can single-handedly "hold hostage and potentially even kill an initiative."

"The attorney general's actions here are the most serious threat to direct democracy that has ever happened in Missouri," Rothert said.

Assistant Attorney General Jason Lewis told Supreme Court judges Tuesday that Fitzpatrick's office used "nonsensical methodologies" to calculate the cost estimate of at least \$51,000 annually in reduced local tax revenues.

Lewis argued that Fitzpatrick "could have and should have done more," asserting that the cost could be as much as \$12.5 billion per year due to lowered tax revenue resulting from the loss of federal Medicaid funding.

Meanwhile, Robert Tillman, an attorney at the auditor's office, fired back at the "legal gymnastics" of the attorney general.



Americasroof/Wikimedia Commons
Missouri Supreme Court



Written by [Luis Miguel](#) on July 20, 2023

The abortion battle extends both to state legislatures and the halls of Congress in Washington, D.C.

On July 14, the House of Representatives narrowly passed the next National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) along an almost party-line tally (four Democrats voted with their Republican colleagues, and four Republicans voted against it). The bill, which the Democrat-controlled Senate is not likely to send to the president's desk, includes several provisions aimed at prohibiting the Pentagon from participating in the normalization of mental illness. If the measure becomes law, it would limit the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to offer abortions, offer medical care for "transgenders," and implement other efforts to bring "diversity" to the military.

Even if Republicans pull off the bill's passage in the Senate, it isn't likely to be signed into law so long as Joe Biden, a Democrat, occupies the Oval Office and Republicans lack the two-thirds majority needed to override a presidential veto.

Nevertheless, the bill sends an important signal — both to their own base and to Democrats — as to how far the GOP is willing to go on the abortion issue federally, and what they could ostensibly achieve if given the Senate and White House in the 2024 election.

The bill in question holds tremendous significance, as it authorizes a robust national defense budget of \$886 billion for fiscal year 2024.

The part of the bill relevant to abortion came in the form of an amendment presented by Rep. Ronny Jackson (R-Texas), which would restrict Pentagon policies that enable the reimbursement of travel expenses for military personnel seeking abortions.

At the state level, since the death of *Roe*, 14 states have now banned abortion under most circumstances.

Missouri was the first state to do so in the post *Roe* political landscape, making it ironic that it may bring abortion back if the constitutional amendment's supporters get their way.

Even as several red states have restricted abortion, it has become easier to access in Democrat-run states.

Lila Rose, founder and president of the pro-life group Live Action, recently recounted in a [Twitter thread](#) how a homosexual couple used the legal system in California to legally kill a baby boy. The two men hired surrogate Brittney Pearson, who during her pregnancy was diagnosed with breast cancer.

Wanting to give the baby a chance at life without forgoing chemotherapy, Pearson decided to deliver the baby early at 25 weeks. But the two men sued to have her "terminate" the baby immediately, not wanting to risk the birth defects that might come with a premature birth. They ordered that life-saving care be withheld after the baby's birth, claiming "ownership" of the boy even after Pearson offered to adopt him.

"From his moment of conception, he was stripped of his fundamental rights & treated as a product that could be discarded at the first sign of defect," Rose lamented.

As harrowing stories about abortion such as this gain greater attention, it is likely that the abortion debate will only become more heated in Washington and state capitals all around the country.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe