

RESOURCE ROUNDUP

Volume 8, Nos. 9-10

The Hippocratic Resource

(A Statewide Organization of Louisiana Physicians, Dentists, Nurses, Therapists and Other Health Professionals)

11620 Rue de Tonti
Baton Rouge, LA 70810

Tel: (225) 769-7496 or (225) 635-6554; FAX: (225) 766-4089 or (225) 635-2173

www.LaDocs4Life.org or www.LaHealthProfs4Life.org

"I will give no deadly medicine to anyone if asked ... I will not give to a woman an instrument to produce an abortion"

Dear Colleague:

Hurricanes Gustav and Ike have come and gone, leaving a lot of disruption in their wakes. While the former did a great deal south of, and to Baton Rouge, as well as points north, reaching all the way up to Ohio, Ike played a Katrina-like reprise on our southwest coastal areas. Our sincere sympathies to all those hurt, in whatever manner and to whatever degree, and our prayers for as speedy a return to normal as possible! With this *Roundup*, and in lieu of waxing forth on everything that we could in regard to narrower Hippocratic issues, we are sending you a little booklet that we came across and that seemed appropriate. Written by a Catholic priest, Msgr. Robert Guste of New Orleans, "Katrina, Rita and God," is not so much a treatment of respect for life (only pp. 26-32 and 34-35 actually touch specifically on this issue), as it is a spiritual/philosophical reflection stimulated by – and for – hurricane "visitations." We hope you enjoy it!

W. "Al" Krotoski, M.D., etc. and Francis Rinaudo, Jr., D.D.S.

Presidential Election – Candidates' Stands

The forthcoming presidential election is perhaps as crucial to a Hippocratic respect for life as any could be for the U.S.A. The two candidates and their running mates have a wide divergence of views on the subject, and whoever is chosen to serve will doubtless nominate one or more Justices to the U.S. Supreme Court during his tenure (several of those currently serving their life terms are frankly getting on in years). These nominations will shape legal attitudes toward life for at least a generation. A comparison of candidates' views, as compiled by the National Right to Life Committee, is on the reverse of this page.

PLEASE BE SURE TO VOTE !

HHS Conscience Regulations

Proposed government regulations to protect the conscience rights of health care professionals and institutions (45 CFR Part 88 RIN 0991-AB48, Proposed Rule) have drawn the enthusiastic support of organizations and individuals supporting the culture of life, and a diametrically opposed condemnation by those who are pro-abortion or pro-abortion-choice. Intended to implement current statutory provisions that "protect the rights of health care entities, both individual and institutions, to refuse to perform health care services to which they may object for religious, moral, ethical or other reasons," these proposed regulations (pp. 33-34) stipulate that:

"Entities to whom this subsection 88.4 (a) applies shall not: (1) subject any institutional or individual health care entity to discrimination for refusing: (A) to undergo training in the performance of abortions, or to require, provide, refer for, or make arrangements for training in the performance of abortions; (B) to perform, refer for, or make other arrangements for, abortions; or (C) to refer for abortions; (2) subject any institutional or individual health care entity to discrimination for attending or having attended a post-graduate physician training program, or any other program of training in the health professions, that does not or did not require attendees to perform induced abortions or require, provide, or refer for training in the performance of induced abortions, or make arrangements for the provision of such training;"

among other provisions. The official comment period ended September 24; final rule publication is pending.

Many thanks to those who were able to respond to our e-mail alert by sending comments!

Roster Change: *[New Material in Italics].* Content removed to maintain promised member privacy.

Please Note: Appearance of following material may take a few seconds. Pages are *not* blank.



Where Do the Candidates Stand on Abortion?



John McCain

Barack Obama

Abortion on Demand

- Voted to oppose *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision that allows abortion for any reason.
- "I have stated time after time after time that *Roe v. Wade* was a bad decision, that I support... the rights of the unborn. I have fought for human rights and human dignity throughout my entire political career. To me it is an issue of human rights and human dignity."

- Co-sponsor of the "Freedom of Choice Act," (S.1173) which would make partial-birth abortion legal again, require taxpayer funding of abortion, and invalidate virtually all state and federal limitations on abortion, such as parental notification laws.
- "I have consistently advocated for reproductive choice and will make preserving women's rights under *Roe v. Wade* a priority as President."

Partial-Birth Abortion Ban

The partial-birth abortion procedure — used from the fifth month on — involves pulling a living baby feet-first out of the womb, except for the head, puncturing the skull and suctioning out the brain. The great majority of partial-birth abortions are performed on healthy babies of healthy mothers.

- Voted for the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act.

- Did not vote for the Illinois Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act when it came before the Illinois State Senate.

Protecting Abortion Survivors

- Voted for legislation that provides care and protection for babies who are born alive after an abortion.

- Voted four times against legislation in the Illinois State Senate that would have provided care and protection for babies who are born alive after an abortion.

Taxpayer Funding of Abortion

- Voted in favor of the Hyde Amendment, which prohibits taxpayer funding of abortion through Medicaid.
- Voted consistently against federal funding of abortion.

- Voted against legislation in the Illinois State Senate that prohibited taxpayer dollars from being used to pay for abortion.
- His campaign has stated that he "does not support" the Hyde Amendment, which prohibits taxpayer funding of abortion through Medicaid.

Parental Notification Law

- Voted to support a bill that would have required an abortionist to notify at least one parent before performing an abortion on a minor girl from another state.

- Voted to block a bill that would have required an abortionist to notify at least one parent before performing an abortion on a minor girl from another state.



Sarah Palin

- Opposes abortion and believes unborn children should be protected. As Governor of Alaska, supported pro-life legislation.
- "...I am pro-life and have never wavered in my belief in the sanctity of every human life."

Joseph Biden

- Voted to endorse *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision that allows abortion for any reason.
- "I strongly support *Roe v. Wade*... That's why I led the fight to defeat Bork. Thank God he is not in the Court or *Roe v. Wade* would be gone by now."





Help stop the "Freedom of Choice Act"
– or "Freedom for Partial-Birth Abortionists Act"!

(From the National Right to Life Committee)

CONTACT YOUR CONGRESSMAN and SENATOR!

WASHINGTON -- In response to the April 18, 2007 U.S. Supreme Court decision (*Gonzales v. Carhart*) upholding the federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, prominent Democratic members of Congress the next day reintroduced the so-called "Freedom of Choice Act" (FOCA), a proposed federal law to nullify virtually all federal and state

In the interests of truth in advertising, the bill should be renamed the "Freedom for Partial-Birth Abortionists Act." The lawmakers proposing the legislation, and groups endorsing it, repeatedly emphasized that the bill would, among other things, completely nullify the national ban on partial-birth abortion that the Supreme Court upheld.

The House bill, H.R. 1964, was introduced by Congressman Jerrold Nadler (D-NY), who in the new Democratic-majority Congress is the chairman of the House Judiciary subcommittee that has jurisdiction over such legislation. The Senate bill, S. 1173, was introduced by Senator Barbara Boxer (D-Ca.).

Congressman Nadler issued a statement harshly attacking the Supreme Court ruling. "Overturning a decision only a few years old, the Court has, for the first time since *Roe v. Wade*, allowed an abortion procedure to be criminalized," Nadler said. The FOCA, he noted, "would bar government – at any level -- from interfering with a woman's fundamental right to choose to bear a child, or to terminate a pregnancy."

The promoters of the FOCA sometimes claim that its purpose is to "codify *Roe v. Wade*," and they hope that journalists will lazily characterize it in that way. But the key binding provisions of the bill would go further than *Roe*, invalidating all of the major types of laws that have been upheld by the Supreme Court in the decades since *Roe*.

The bill flatly invalidates any "statute, ordinance, regulation, administrative order, decision, policy, practice, or other action" of any federal, state, or local government or governmental official (or any person acting under government authority) that would "deny or interfere with a woman's right to choose" abortion, or that would "discriminate against the exercise of the right . . . in the regulation or provision of benefits, facilities, services, or information." This no-restriction policy would establish, in Senator Boxer's words, "the absolute right to choose" prior to fetal "viability."

The no-restriction policy would also apply after "viability" to any abortion sought on grounds of "health." The bill does not define "health," but in past abortion cases the Supreme Court has sometimes used the term to apply to any physical or emotional consideration whatsoever, including "distress." The bill also prohibits enactment of objective criteria for "viability" that would be binding on abortionists.

Among the types of laws that the FOCA would invalidate are:

-- The Hyde Amendment, which prohibits most federal funding of abortion, and the laws of many states that restrict state funding of abortion.

-- Laws in effect in some jurisdictions that bar abortions in government-operated hospitals.

-- Laws requiring parental notification or consent, or judicial authorization, before an abortion can be performed on a minor daughter.

-- Laws requiring that girls and women seeking abortion receive certain information on matters such as fetal development and alternatives to abortion, and then wait a specified period before the abortion is actually performed, usually 24 or 48 hours.

-- "Conscience" laws, allowing doctors, nurses, or other state-licensed professionals, and hospitals or other health-care providers, to decline to provide or pay for abortions.



FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE

ACTION ALERT

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A HUMAN LIFE AMENDMENT, INC.
1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW • Suite 24 • Washington, DC 20005

202.393.0703
FAX: 202.347.1383
NCHLA.ORG

Oppose Freedom of Choice Act

The Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA) is again before Congress (S. 1173, H.R. 1964). FOCA is a radical bill. It creates a “fundamental right” to abortion throughout the nine months of pregnancy. No governmental body at any level would be able to “deny or interfere with” this right, or to “discriminate” against the exercise of this right “in the regulation or provision of benefits, facilities, services, or information.” For the first time, abortion would become an *entitlement* the government must condone and promote.

FOCA would go well beyond the Supreme Court’s *Roe v. Wade* decision in imposing an extreme abortion regimen on our country. No other piece of legislation would have such a destructive impact on society’s ability to limit or regulate abortion. It would eliminate a broad range of laws—informed consent laws; parental involvement laws; laws promoting maternal health; abortion clinic regulations; government programs and facilities that pay for or promote childbirth and other health care without subsidizing abortion; conscience protection laws; laws prohibiting a particular abortion procedure (e.g., partial birth abortion); laws requiring that abortions only be performed by a licensed physician; and so on. For a careful legal analysis of FOCA by the USCCB’s Office of General Counsel, see: www.nchla.org/docdisplay.asp?ID=190. A summary fact sheet for general distribution can be found at: www.nchla.org/docdisplay.asp?ID=194.

In a September 19 letter to Members of Congress, Cardinal Justin Rigali, Chairman of the USCCB Committee on Pro-Life Activities, raised grave concerns about any possible consideration of FOCA. “Despite its deceptive title, FOCA would deprive the American people in all 50 states of the freedom they now have to enact modest restraints and regulations on the abortion industry,” and would “counteract any and all sincere efforts by government to reduce abortions in our country.” The Cardinal declared: “We can’t reduce abortions by promoting abortion.” He urged all Senators and Representatives “to pledge their opposition to FOCA.” For full text of the letter, see: www.usccb.org/prolife/FOCARigaliTr.pdf.

Recommended Actions: Contact your U.S. Representative and two U.S. Senators by FAX letter, e-mail, or phone. Call the U.S. Capitol switchboard at: 202.224.3121; or call Members’ local offices. Full contact info can be found on Members of Congress’s web sites at: www.senate.gov and www.house.gov.

Message to all Members: “Please pledge now to oppose FOCA.” Those Members of Congress who have signed on as cosponsors of FOCA should be asked to remove their names from the bill. To check the list of current cosponsors, see: nchla.org/docdisplay.asp?ID=191.

Other Actions:

1. Arrange a formal meeting with your Representative and two Senators.
2. Communicate with your Representative and two Senators at town meetings.
3. Place an ad opposing FOCA in your local Catholic paper or other publication or insert educational materials in church bulletins. For an ad presentation designed for grassroots use, see: www.usccb.org/prolife/media/docs/foca.pdf. For bulletin inserts in black and white or color, see: www.nchla.org/docdisplay.asp?ID=201.
4. Write letters to the editor or express your views on call in radio talk shows.

Thanks! 9/24/08