

## Neil Parrott (MD-06) Message Backup

*Neil Parrott is radically extreme and will be isolated and utterly ineffective in Congress. Neil Parrott's history of extremist and harmful positions include:*

- *In the state legislature, Parrott co-sponsored a personhood amendment that would deny the right to an abortion even in cases of rape, incest, or life of the mother — making him radically extreme;*
- *Parrott was one of only four to vote for weaker domestic violence laws and was the ONLY vote against combating human trafficking.*
- *Parrott was ranked one of the least effective members of the state legislature and his radical extremism will make him completely ineffective — and worse, harmful to families — in Congress.*

**Parrott Co-Sponsored A Bill That Declared Fetal Personhood In The Constitution.** “Proposing an amendment to the Maryland Declaration of Rights to establish that the right not to be deprived of life is vested in all human beings, irrespective of age, health, function, physical dependency, or method of reproduction, from the beginning of their biological development; making technical changes; and submitting the amendment to the qualified voters of the State for their adoption or rejection.” [H.B. 1040, Maryland General Assembly, [2/11/11](#)]

**Parrott's Bill Established The Right To Life “From The Beginning Of Their Biological Development.** “Proposing an amendment to the Maryland Declaration of Rights to establish that the right not to be deprived of life is vested in all human beings, irrespective of age, health, function, physical dependency, or method of reproduction, from the beginning of their biological development; making technical changes; and submitting the amendment to the qualified voters of the State for their adoption or rejection.” [H.B. 1040, Maryland General Assembly, [2/11/11](#)]

**There Were No Exceptions Listed In Parrott's Fetal Personhood Bill.** [H.B. 1040, Maryland General Assembly, [2/11/11](#)]

*Similar Federal Life At Conception Act Would Ban Abortions With No Exceptions...*

**Gazette Fact Check: Legal Experts Argued The Life At Conception Act, Which "Would Outlaw All Abortions With No Exceptions In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or Risk To The Pregnant Person," Could Result In Criminal Charges Against People Who Help Women Get Abortions, Including Health Care Providers, And It Did Not Explicitly Protect Them From Criminalization.** “With the idea that life begins at conception, personhood laws grant fertilized eggs, zygotes, embryos and fetuses the same status as victims in other scenarios. Because of this, some legal experts — as well as Mathis's campaign — have argued abortion could result in criminal charges, such as homicide. The Life at Conception Act specifically states that nothing within the bill ‘shall be construed to authorize the prosecution of any woman for the death of her unborn child.’ But the bill does not explicitly protect anyone else from criminal charges, such as abortion providers or those who help others obtain an abortion. The freshman representative from Iowa has not publicly stated whether she would support criminal charges in this scenario. [...] The Life at Conception Act, co-sponsored by Hinson, would outlaw all abortions with no exceptions in cases of rape, incest or risk to the pregnant person. The bill in question does eliminate the possibility for criminal charges for individuals who receive an abortion, but it does not provide the same guarantees for others. Hinson has never publicly stated she would support legislation that includes criminal penalties for abortions. But the broad scope of the personhood law does have implications for criminalization of abortion.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, [7/11/22](#)]

**Rewire: The Life At Conception Act “Would Effectively Ban Abortion With No Exception For Rape, Incest, Or To Save The Life Of The Pregnant Person.”** “H.R. 616 would grant equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and ‘preborn’ human person. [...] It would effectively

ban abortion with no exception for rape, incest, or to save the life of the pregnant person. It would also ban birth control pills, IUDs, and emergency contraception. In addition, it would eliminate certain medical choices for women, including some cancer treatments and in vitro fertilization.” [Rewire, [9/28/19](#)]

**2021: Parrott Voted Against (1 of 4) Repealing A Law That Allowed Partners To End Married Status As A Defense Against Charges Of Rape Or Sexual Assault.** Parrott voted against: “Altering the definition of “sexual contact”; and repealing a certain prohibition on prosecuting a person for rape or a certain sexual offense against a victim who was the person's legal spouse at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense.” The bill passed 125-4. [H.B. 147, Maryland General Assembly, [2/12/21](#)]

- **2022: Parrott Voted Against Repealing A Law That Allowed Partners To End Married Status As A Defense Against Charges Of Rape Or Sexual Assault.** Parrott voted against: “Repealing a certain prohibition on prosecuting a person for rape or a certain sexual offense against a victim who was the person's legal spouse at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense.” The bill passed 119-17. [H.B. 153, Maryland General Assembly, [2/17/22](#)]
- **2020: Parrott Voted Against Repealing A Law That Allowed Partners To End Married Status As A Defense Against Charges Of Rape Or Sexual Assault.** Parrott voted against: “Altering the definition of “sexual contact”; and repealing a certain prohibition on prosecuting a person for rape or a certain sexual offense against a victim who was the person's legal spouse at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense.” The bill passed 127-9. [H.B. 590, Maryland General Assembly, [2/27/20](#)]
- **2021: Parrott Voted Against Repealing A Law That Allowed Partners To End Married Status As A Defense Against Charges Of Rape Or Sexual Assault.** Parrott voted against: :Altering the definition of “sexual contact”; and repealing a certain prohibition on prosecuting a person for rape or a certain sexual offense against a victim who was the person's legal spouse at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense.” The bill passed 115-18. [S.B. 250, Maryland General Assembly, [4/6/21](#)]

**2022: Parrott on His Opposition to Repealing the Spousal Rape Exception: “I mean you just pat them in the wrong way, they take it sexually inappropriately.”** Parrott was one of three votes against HB153, which repeals an exemption from prosecution for specified sexual crimes if, at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense, the person was the victim’s legal spouse. In defending his vote, Parrott stated: “In common law, in Maryland, it's already against the law to rape your wife, that's no question about that, it's against the law. But we're talking like fourth-degree offense, **I mean you just pat them in the wrong way, they take it sexually inappropriately.** That's marriage. Those things are protected in marriage and this law gets rid of that. This is ridiculous, and that's why I'm voting no, and I encourage the body to vote no.” [[Maryland General Assembly House Floor Actions](#), 2/17/22, 58:10; [HB153 vote](#)]

**2012: Parrott Was The Only Vote Against Requiring Bus Stations And Truck Stops To Provide Signs To Reach The National Human Trafficking Resource Hotline.** Parrot voted against: “Requiring the business owner of a privately owned bus station or truck stop located in the State to post in restrooms in a specified manner a specified sign that provides National Human Trafficking Resource Center Hotline information; requiring an agency that determines a violation has occurred to provide a notice to the business owner of a bus station or truck stop or the business owner's agent; etc.” The bill passed 136-1. [S.B. 352, Maryland General Assembly, [4/1/12](#)]

**2019: Parrott Named a “Least Successful Lawmaker.”** “A handful of legislators wasn’t successful in passing any legislation, and Republicans — who are in the minority — fared the worst this legislative session. The four least

successful lawmakers this past session were Republicans, led by Del. Neil Parrott (R-Washington), who failed to pass any of the 16 bills he introduced as a primary sponsor. The nine-year lawmaker sought to enact legislation that included recognizing exposure to pornography as a public health crisis, changing the size of safety zones for archery hunting in Washington County and tightening election rules. Each of Parrott's bills either received an unfavorable report or did not receive a vote in its committee. Parrott's office did not respond to a request for comment." [[Maryland Matters](#), 5/20/19]