PS for 11/9/89

Are These Abortion Cures Really “Stringent”?

“Stringent curbs on abortion pass in Pennsylvania” screamed the front-page headline in the *New York Times*. Was that headline just factual reporting of all the news that’s fit to print, or was it typical pro-abortion bias of the liberal media establishment?

What’s stringent about requiring a 24-hour waiting period before a woman has an abortion? Most surgery is scheduled at least a week in advance except for emergency surgery, and almost no abortions involve an emergency that couldn’t wait one day.

The abortionists always say that abortion is such a difficult decision for a woman. Accordingly, she needs a day to reflect on what it is that makes the abortion decision so difficult (namely, the fact that medical procedure involves the termination of human life rather than the saving or prolonging of human life).

What’s stringent about banning abortions, except to save the life of the mother, after the unborn baby is 24 weeks old? At six months, it is obvious that the baby is fully formed, has all its body parts and limbs, and can live outside of the mother’s womb.

About 120,000 late-term abortions take place every year, and about 300 of those are born alive. The proper word for these abortions is infanticide, and there is nothing stringent about banning them.

What’s stringent about requiring the mother, except in special circumstances or a medical emergency to notify her husband who is the father of the child? The legislation does not permit him to veto the abortion; it only requires, out of a decent respect for the marital bond, that the guy be notified his unborn baby is about to be deliberately liquidated.

What’s stringent about banning sex selection abortions? Killing an unborn female baby because the mother wants a boy, not a girl, is simply unacceptable in a civilized society.

The real objection to this provision is that it clarifies the awful truth that the 1973 Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade* legalized abortion throughout nine months of pregnancy for any reason whatsoever.

What's stringent about requiring the abortionist first to make a determination of the probable gestational age of the unborn child about to be aborted? That would seem elementary to any physical examination of the pregnant woman prior to surgery.

What's stringent about requiring the abortionist to tell the woman about the risks of abortion and of childbirth, the alternatives to abortion, and the gestational age of her unborn baby? What's stringent about requiring the abortionist to tell her that medical assistance benefits are available to her for prenatal care, childbirth and neonatal care, and that the father of the unborn child is liable to assist in the support of the child?

What's stringent about requiring the abortionist to inform the woman about the development of the unborn child? All these requirements simply give the uneducated woman access to the same knowledge that educated women already have.

What's stringent about restricting fetal experimentation and banning the sale of fetal parts? Once the fetal parts industry gets in full swing, it will become commercially profitable for women to get pregnant in order to abort and sell the fetal parts; and the older the unborn baby, the higher the price the fetal parts will bring.

What's stringent about requiring the same health and safety regulations for abortion centers as the state requires for the other non-hospital medical facilities? Don't we want pregnant women to be treated in clean, safe, places where preparations are in place for emergency treatment when necessary?

The *Miami Herald* reported last month on a busy Miami abortion center where four women have died, many have had ruptured uteruses, perforated colons and emergency hysterectomies, where one abortionist is a convicted sex offender and another was reprimanded by the state licensing board for "gross malpractice," and who have paid out hundreds of thousands of dollars for malpractice damages. But the center is still performing abortions.

What’s stringent about saying the taxpayers will not pay for abortions, directly or indirectly? Or about banning abortions at public hospitals except for rape, incest and the life of the mother?

The pro-abortionists who claim they are so eager to keep the government out of a woman’s bedroom are at the same time demanding that the government actively get into the abortion business by subsidizing it with our tax dollars. The taxpayers should not be forced to aid or finance this shameful, profitable industry.

This new post-Webster legislation is not stringent but eminently reasonable. The newspaper stories should have reported the news like this: Reasonable curbs may prohibit one percent of abortions and persuade some women to make healthier choices.