

HB 1430 -- RIGHTS OF MEDICAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

SPONSOR: Jones (110)

COMMITTEE ACTION: Voted "Do Pass" by the Committee on Health Care Policy by a vote of 9 to 3.

This bill specifies that any medical professional or health care institution that provides medical services has the right not to participate in and cannot be required to participate in any phase of patient medical care, treatment, or procedure that violates his or her conscience including his or her religious, moral, or ethical principles that are adherent to a sincere and meaningful belief in God or in relation to a supreme being.

No medical professional or health care institution can be civilly, criminally, or administratively liable for declining to participate, provide, or perform any specified medical procedure or research that violates his or her conscience.

No medical professional or health care institution can be discriminated or retaliated against for declining to participate, provide, or perform any specified medical procedure or research that violates his or her conscience. Reassignment to a position that does not require participation in a specific medical procedure or research and that does not result in a demotion or reduction in pay or benefits is not a retaliatory action.

Reasonable notice must be provided by a medical professional asserting a right not to participate in a specific medical procedure or research.

It will be unlawful for any person, the state, a political subdivision, a public or private institution, or a public official to discriminate against any medical institution or any person, association, corporation, or other entity attempting to establish a new or operating an existing health care institution in any manner because it declines to participate, provide, or perform any specified medical procedure or research that violates the institution's conscience.

It will be unlawful for any public official, agency, institution, or entity to deny any form of aid, assistance, grants, or benefits or in any other manner to coerce, disqualify, or discriminate against a person or entity attempting to establish a new or operating an existing health care institution because it declines to participate, provide, or perform any specified medical procedure or research contrary to its conscience.

The provisions of the bill do not authorize a health care professional or institution to withhold lifesaving emergency medical treatment or services or relieve a medical professional from the duty to inform a patient of his or her health condition, risks, prognosis, and available options and resources; however, a medical professional cannot be forced to participate in, refer for, or promote specified procedures or research. A cause of action for damages, injunctive relief, or both, may be brought for a violation of these provisions. It cannot be a defense to any claim that the violation was necessary to prevent additional burden or expense on any other medical professional, health care institution, individual, or patient.

A cause of action for damages or injunctive relief, or both, can be a discriminatory violation of a medical professional's or health care institution's conscience rights. A defense to any discrimination claim that the violation was necessary to prevent additional burden or expense on any other medical professional, health care institution, individual, or patient is prohibited. The aggrieved party must be entitled to recover threefold the actual damages, including pain and suffering; the costs of the action; and reasonable attorney fees. Recovery cannot be less than \$5,000 for each violation in addition to the costs of the action and reasonable attorney fees. If participation in the specified medical procedure or research was so integral to the duties of the medical professional's position or obligations of the employment contract and to the central purpose of the business or enterprise that a reasonable person would understand that participation in the specified medical procedure or research at issue was a requirement of the medical professional's position or employment contract.

The General Assembly may, by concurrent resolution, appoint one or more of its members who sponsored or co-sponsored this legislation in his or her official capacity to intervene as a matter of right in any case in which the constitutionality of the law is challenged.

The bill contains a severability clause for Sections 191.1150 to 191.1168, RSMo, and if any provision is found to be unconstitutional, the remaining provisions of the sections will remain in force and effect with specified exceptions.

**PROPONENTS:** Supporters say that the bill prevents a person from being placed in a situation that violates his or her religious beliefs and morals. The bill is a shield not a sword and does not apply in emergency situations. Missouri has not updated the laws regarding health care conscience since 1986 and much has changed in the medical field during this time. The bill protects institutions by requiring proper notice of an objection and prohibiting

reassignment from being considered an adverse employment action.

Testifying for the bill were Representative Jones(110); Missouri Family Policy Council; Missouri Right to Life; Missouri Catholic Conference; Missouri Family Network; Missouri Baptist Convention, Christian Life Commission; Campaign Life Missouri; Missouri Association of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons; and Concerned Women for American of Missouri.

OPPONENTS: Opponents say that the bill doesn't properly draw a distinction between private and public entities and religious and non-religious entities. It is in direct conflict with current case law and a state deliberative body cannot overturn the Supreme Court of the United States. The bill doesn't sufficiently define terms, which would be a human resources nightmare. Physicians are meant to put the care and needs of a patient before their personal needs. Just because a patient is doing something a physician disagrees with does not mean the physician can simply stop treating the patient.

Testifying against the bill were NARAL Pro-Choice Missouri; Missouri Hospital Association; Dr. Ed Weisbart; Planned Parenthood Advocates in Missouri; and ACLU of Eastern Missouri.