

NMFAM Legislative Guide for SB30

Reporting of Induced Abortions

Included:

- **Simplified Breakdown of the Billpg. 2**
 - *A plain-language explanation of what the bill does, section by section, written to quickly clarify intent, scope, and real-world impact without legal jargon.*
- **Messaging & Fact Tool (*Helpful to Legislators*).....pg. 5**
 - *Key talking points paired with supporting facts and data to help legislators clearly and confidently explain their position in committee, on the floor, or with constituents.*
- **Likely Opposition Arguments—& How to Respond (*for Legislators*).....pg. 9**
 - *A brief overview of the most common arguments in opposition of the bill, along with concise, factual rebuttals legislators can use in debate or media interviews.*
- **Messaging for Action Items & Socials.....pg. 13**
 - *Ready-to-use language for action alerts, social media, and constituent outreach that clearly communicates the issue and drives timely engagement.*

SB 30—Simplified Breakdown:

Reporting of Induced Abortions

What Does SB30 Do?

SB30 **repeals Section 24-14-18 entirely** — meaning:

- **There will no longer be a statutory requirement to report abortions to the state.**

The bill does nothing else.

It does not replace the section.

It does not add alternative safeguards.

It simply removes the law.

What is Section 24-14-18 NMSA 1978?

Section **24-14-18** sits in New Mexico's **Vital Statistics Act** and specifically governs **abortion reporting requirements**.

In simple terms, it currently requires:

1. Mandatory Reporting of Abortions

Health care providers or facilities that perform abortions must report each abortion to the **Department of Health**.

This includes:

- When an abortion occurred
- Where it occurred
- Medical and demographic information (non-identifying)

2. State Collection & Oversight

The Department of Health is required to:

- Collect abortion data
- Maintain records
- Use the data for **public health monitoring**

3. Public Accountability (Without Naming Individuals)

While individual patient identities are protected, the law ensures:

- The state can track **how many abortions occur**
- The state can monitor **trends, safety, and public health impacts**
- Policymakers and the public have access to **aggregate data**

This is **not** about shaming or exposure — it is about **basic public health transparency**, the same standard used for births, deaths, and communicable diseases.

How Does Repealing this Section Affect Abortion Accountability?

1. Eliminates Mandatory Abortion Reporting

Once repealed:

- Providers are no longer legally required to report abortions
- The Department of Health loses authority to require that data

2. Removes State Oversight

Without reporting:

- The state cannot verify how many abortions are occurring
- There is no consistent data on gestational age, complications, or trends
- Policymakers lose insight needed for informed decision-making

3. Creates a Transparency Black Hole

New Mexico would:

- Still track **births**
- Still track **deaths**
- Still track **fetal deaths in other contexts**
- **But not abortions**

This creates a **deliberate data gap**, not a privacy safeguard.

Why This Matters for Families & Taxpayers

Even setting aside moral views on abortion, this repeal raises serious governance concerns:

Public Health Integrity

Abortion is a medical procedure. Removing reporting:

- Undermines standard public health practices
- Prevents safety trend analysis
- Makes it harder to detect complications or systemic issues

Fiscal & Policy Accountability

When abortion services intersect with:

- Medicaid funding
- Public health programs
- Interstate abortion access

The public has **no way to evaluate impact or scale**.

Unequal Standards

No other medical procedure of this scale is exempt from **any** reporting requirements.

Bottom Line (Plain Language)

SB30 removes the only law that requires abortion reporting in New Mexico.

If passed:

- The state will no longer track abortion data
- Lawmakers and the public lose visibility
- Oversight is replaced with intentional opacity

This is not about protecting women's privacy — that already exists.

This is about **removing accountability entirely**.

SB 30—Messaging & Fact Tool

Oppose SB30: Protect Accountability, Public Health & Women

Position: NMFAM OPPOSES SB30

Category: State Accountability & Public Health Transparency

1. SB30 Eliminates Basic Government Accountability

Message:

SB30 repeals New Mexico’s only statutory requirement for abortion reporting, removing the state’s ability to track and evaluate a significant medical procedure.

Facts to Support:

- Section 24-14-18 NMSA 1978 requires abortion providers to report procedures to the Department of Health
 - SB30 repeals this section in its entirety with no replacement safeguards
 - No alternative reporting mechanism is created
-

2. Public Health Decisions Require Data — SB30 Removes It

Message:

Good public health policy depends on accurate, aggregate data. SB30 creates a deliberate information gap that undermines responsible governance.

Facts to Support:

- New Mexico collects data on births, deaths, fetal deaths, and communicable diseases
 - Abortion is a medical procedure with known risks and complications
 - Without reporting, the state cannot monitor trends, safety outcomes, or system-wide impacts
-

3. Lack of Reporting Harms Women — Not Protects Them

Message:

Removing abortion reporting does not protect women — it prevents the state from understanding health outcomes and addressing risks.

Facts to Support:

- Reporting does not include patient-identifying information
 - Aggregate data helps identify:
 - Complication patterns
 - Access disparities
 - Systemic safety concerns
 - Without data, women experiencing harm are statistically invisible
-

4. SB30 Removes Oversight Without Justification**Message:**

No other medical procedure of this magnitude is exempt from reporting. SB30 creates an unjustified exception.

Facts to Support:

- Reporting requirements exist for:
 - Birth outcomes
 - Maternal mortality
 - Fetal deaths in other contexts
 - Abortion reporting has historically been treated as a public health standard, not a moral judgment
-

5. Transparency Is a Core Function of Government**Message:**

When the state removes transparency, trust erodes. SB30 weakens confidence in New Mexico's health and governance systems.

Facts to Support:

- Taxpayers fund public health infrastructure
 - Policymakers rely on data to evaluate policy impacts
 - Removing reporting eliminates evidence-based oversight
-

6. This Bill Creates a Policy Blind Spot with Long-Term Consequences

Message:

SB30 prevents lawmakers from assessing how abortion policy affects women, families, and communities over time.

Facts to Support:

- No data means no evaluation
 - No evaluation means no improvement
 - No improvement means increased risk to women and families
-

7. Moral Concern: Accountability Matters Because Life Matters

Message:

NMFAM believes abortion raises serious moral and ethical concerns. At minimum, the state has a responsibility to acknowledge its impact through transparent reporting.

Facts to Support:

- Abortion involves the deliberate ending of a developing human life
 - Removing reporting treats abortion as unworthy of scrutiny
 - Accountability is the lowest standard a government should uphold when life is involved
-

8. Privacy Is Already Protected — SB30 Goes Far Beyond That

Message:

Patient privacy protections already exist. SB30 is not about privacy — it is about eliminating oversight.

Facts to Support:

- Abortion reporting laws prohibit identifying information
 - Aggregate reporting has never required public disclosure of personal data
 - The repeal removes the system entirely instead of refining it
-

Bottom Line Message

SB30 weakens public health oversight, eliminates transparency, and removes accountability from a serious medical and moral issue.

New Mexico can protect privacy *without* abandoning responsibility.

Vote NO on SB30.

SB30 — Likely Opposition Arguments & How to Respond

Oppose SB30

Opposition Argument 1:

“Abortion reporting violates women’s privacy.”

Response:

Abortion reporting laws do **not** include personally identifying information. They rely on **aggregate, non-identifiable data**, the same standard used for births, deaths, and other medical procedures.

Key Point:

Protecting privacy does not require eliminating accountability.

Supporting Facts:

- Existing reporting laws prohibit disclosure of patient identity
 - Aggregate public health data is a standard government function
 - SB30 removes the entire reporting system instead of refining privacy protections
-

Opposition Argument 2:

“Reporting requirements stigmatize women and providers.”

Response:

Reporting is a neutral public health practice, not a moral judgment. Eliminating data does not reduce stigma — it reduces oversight.

Key Point:

Medical transparency exists to improve safety, not assign blame.

Supporting Facts:

- Reporting is required for numerous sensitive health issues
- Data is collected at the systems level, not the individual level
- Stigma concerns can be addressed through policy safeguards, not repeal

Opposition Argument 3:

“Abortion is safe, so reporting is unnecessary.”

Response:

If a procedure is safe, transparent data should confirm that. Removing reporting prevents verification and continuous improvement.

Key Point:

Safety claims should be supported by data, not protected from scrutiny.

Supporting Facts:

- All medical procedures carry risk
- Reporting helps identify trends, complications, and access gaps
- Lack of data makes informed public health decisions impossible

Opposition Argument 4:

“Abortion is legal, so the state has no reason to track it.”

Response:

Legality does not eliminate the state’s responsibility to monitor public health outcomes.

Key Point:

Many legal activities are still tracked when they impact health, safety, or public funding.

Supporting Facts:

- Legal procedures such as childbirth and surgery are reported
- Public health oversight exists regardless of legality
- Abortion intersects with Medicaid and state health programs

Opposition Argument 5:

“This bill aligns New Mexico with reproductive freedom.”

Response:

Reproductive freedom and accountability are not opposites. Transparency strengthens trust and protects women.

Key Point:

Freedom without oversight undermines responsible governance.

Supporting Facts:

- Public health data improves policy outcomes
 - Reporting does not restrict access
 - Eliminating oversight creates long-term risks for women
-

Opposition Argument 6:

“Reporting requirements are outdated or unnecessary.”

Response:

Public health data is more important now than ever, especially as New Mexico becomes a regional hub for abortion services.

Key Point:

Outdated systems should be improved — not erased.

Supporting Facts:

- New Mexico’s abortion access has expanded significantly
 - Increased volume increases the need for data
 - SB30 removes all data instead of modernizing reporting
-

Opposition Argument 7:

“This bill protects providers from harassment or political misuse.”

Response:

Providers can be protected without eliminating public accountability.

Key Point:

Safeguards and transparency can coexist.

Supporting Facts:

- Aggregate reporting does not expose individual providers
 - Other medical fields manage reporting without harassment
 - Policy solutions exist short of full repeal
-

Opposition Argument 8:

“This is a small technical change.”

Response:

Repealing the only abortion reporting statute is not technical — it is a significant policy shift.

Key Point:

Removing oversight has real and lasting consequences.

Supporting Facts:

- SB30 repeals an entire section of statute
 - No replacement language is provided
 - Accountability is permanently lost
-

Closing Reframe for Legislators

This debate is not about ideology — it is about whether New Mexico believes in transparency, public health oversight, and responsible governance.

Eliminating abortion reporting:

- Does not protect women
- Does not improve healthcare
- Does undermine accountability

Vote NO on SB30.

Messaging for Action Items & Socials

SB30 —Call to Action

OPPOSE SB30

Primary Action Center Copy (Reworked)

Headline:

SB30 Eliminates Abortion Reporting — Vote NO

Body Copy:

SB30 repeals New Mexico’s only law requiring abortion reporting to the Department of Health. This bill removes basic transparency, eliminates public health oversight, and prevents lawmakers and families from understanding how abortion policy is impacting women and communities.

Protecting privacy does not require eliminating accountability.

Government should not operate without data, oversight, or public transparency — especially when serious medical procedures and the taking of life are involved.

 **Contact your legislator today and urge them to vote NO on SB30.**

Alternate CTA Versions

CTA Option A — Transparency Focus

SB30 removes abortion reporting and replaces transparency with silence.

Tell lawmakers accountability matters.

 **Vote NO on SB30.**

CTA Option B — Governance Focus

New Mexico should not exempt any medical procedure from basic oversight.

SB30 eliminates accountability and public trust.

 **Vote NO on SB30.**

CTA Option C — Moral + Accountability

When life is involved, accountability should be the minimum standard.

SB30 removes that standard.

 **Oppose SB30.**

Short Button / Click Text

- **Tell Legislators: Keep Accountability. Vote NO.**
 - **Transparency Matters — Oppose SB30**
 - **No Oversight Is Not Good Governance**
-

Optional Closing Line (If Space Allows)

This is not about expanding or restricting abortion — it is about whether New Mexico believes in transparency, accountability, and responsible governance.