

STOPP International's

RYAN REPORT

Behold the Lord, Jesus Christ, who tries so hard to get our attention

Volume IX, Number 5

May 2002

Planned Parenthood helps sink Pickering

The day after Judge Charles Pickering's nomination for the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals was defeated in the U.S. Senate's Judiciary Committee on March 14, Planned Parenthood notified the people on its e-mail list that PP played a significant part in the defeat. Calling Pickering "anti-choice," Planned Parenthood bragged that 42,000 messages to the Committee were sent via Planned Parenthood's Action Network. The vote was 10 to 9 along party lines.

Pro-lifers need to redouble their efforts at contacting members of Congress. Several key issues are coming before Congress this session and Planned Parenthood has already begun to mobilize (see page 2). In addition, we can expect PP to mount a very intense campaign against any pro-life nominee for the Supreme Court.

Planned Parenthood has become very adept at using the internet to generate messages to Congress. Pro-lifers have a vast network of supporters, too, particularly within the structure of our churches. We need to mobilize quickly and effectively to counter the increasing power of PP's lobbying efforts. Let's get information about the bills listed

on page 2 into our newsletters, diocesan newspapers, church bulletins and on our web sites. Urge all pro-lifers to contact Congress today.

PP promotes gay and lesbian families

Recently, Planned Parenthood of South Central New York promoted a perverted concept of family that is detrimental to children and that serves to promote intrinsically disordered relationships.

On its web site, PPSCNY said it was "pleased to co-sponsor 'Love Makes a Family,'" an exhibit of photographs of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender families. The exhibit was on display for the month of February at the Broome County Public Library on Court Street in Binghamton, N.Y.

PPSCNY was just formed a few months ago when the affiliate in Broome and Chenango Counties merged with the one from Delaware and Otsego. PPSCNY has lost no time in launching an attack on traditional families and children. It is appalling that a public library would allow an organization such as Planned Parenthood to promote its debasing ideas in a tax-supported building.

The exhibit was designed to promote an accepting environment for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. The PPSCNY web site noted that such people are fighting for "the right to legally marry, the right to lead a Boy Scout troop, the right to

have access to partner health benefits, and the right to be adoptive and foster parents."

Whether it is the promotion of abortion, graphic sex education, or homosexuality, Planned Parenthood has shown, time and again, that it has no regard for children.

Red Cross web site recommends PP for teen health info

On a web page titled "Health & Safety Tips" (www.redcross.org/services/hss/tips/may/answer98.html#Detailed), the American Red Cross gives an answer to a question about HIV/AIDS and then says the following:

"Some resources for more information on teen sexual health issues:

- Red Cross HIV/AIDS Education Programs for Youth
- Advocates for Youth
- National Network for Youth
- Planned Parenthood
- Sex Education & Young People SIECUS"

Some of the names in the above list are also active links to the web page for the organization. STOPP visited the links on March 20, 2002. "Planned Parenthood" links directly to the PP web site. Thus, the American Red

Inside:

Bush Legacy of Family Planning pg. 5

Victory in Upper Michigan pg. 7

continued on page 2

Cross is recommending that people visit Planned Parenthood's web site for information about teen sexuality.

Furthermore, "Advocates for Youth" links to a page that promotes emergency contraception, and "Sex Education and Young People" links to a page promoting comprehensive sex education.

The source code for this American Red Cross page is dated 1998, so it is apparent that the recent PP and Red Cross distribution of condoms at the Olympics (see *Ryan Report* March 2002, p. 1) is not without precedent. Please contact the Red Cross and ask it not to promote Planned Parenthood or the use of condoms.

PP's 2002 legislative agenda

On March 21, 2002, STOPP's national director, Ed Szymkowiak, used an invitation he obtained online from Planned Parenthood to attend PP's Congressional Day of Action on March 21, 2002, in Washington, D.C.

He found that Planned Parenthood is supporting the following legislation:

1) S.104/H.R. 1111—The "Equity in Prescription Insurance and Contraceptive Coverage Act," which would require health plans to cover contraceptive

drugs, devices and services. S.104 has 42 co-sponsors in the Senate.

2) S.1990/H.R. 3887—The "Emergency Contraception Education Act" which would appropriate \$10 million a year for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007 for a public education campaign aimed at increasing the use of emergency contraception.

3) H.R. 3916—The "Saving Women's Lives Act of 2002" which would reappropriate \$34 million in 2002 and appropriate \$50 million in 2003 to the United Nations Population Fund.

4) H.R. 3469—The "Family Life Education Act" which would appropriate \$100 million a year for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2006 for states to support comprehensive sex education that includes information about contraception. (Planned Parenthood is also asking Congress to oppose funding for abstinence-only education.)

5) The "Compassionate Care for Female Sexual Assault Survivors Act" which would require all hospitals (including Catholic hospitals) to offer sometimes-abortionifacient emergency contraception to rape victims.

Planned Parenthood is asking friendly congressmen and senators to request \$325 million for Title X funding in their "wish list" to the Appropriations Committee for next year. This is an

increase from the \$265 million Title X was appropriated for this year.

Planned Parenthood opposes H.R. 3805, the "Schoolchildren's Health Protection Act," which would prohibit federal education funding for elementary or secondary schools that provide access to emergency post-coital contraception.

Planned Parenthood opposes the "Vitter Amendment" to the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations bill. This amendment would disqualify private organizations that provide surgical or chemical abortions from getting Title X family planning funds.

Please write to your members of Congress today regarding the above proposed legislation. Also, please publish this information in newsletters, church bulletins, letters to the editor, etc.



STOPP's national director, Ed Szymkowiak, (right) visited Congressman David Vitter's office to discuss the Title X "Vitter Amendment" with Greg Facchiano, Vitter's senior legislative assistant (left).

STOPP *international*

STOPP INTERNATIONAL'S RYAN REPORT is named for John A. Ryan, T.O.P., who was one of the first to speak out against Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood.

Publisher—Jim Sedlak, President of STOPP International—a division of American Life League

Editor—Ed Szymkowiak, National Director of STOPP International

Address—P.O. Box 1350, Stafford, VA 22555

Phone: 540-659-4171

E-mail: stopp@all.org

Fax: 540-659-2586

Web: www.stoppinternational.org

Annual subscription is U.S. \$25 © 2002 American Life League, Inc. Copies may be made if attribution is given.

Title X Appropriations

On January 10, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and

Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002 (H.R. 3061). It is now referred to as Public Law No. 107-116. It says, in part:

That of the funds made available under this heading, \$265,085,000 shall be for the program under Title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: Provided further, that amounts provided to said projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office.

The \$265,085,000 represents a 4.4 percent increase over the previous year. Now Title X is not the only federal source for family planning funding, but it does seem to be the one most cherished by Planned Parenthood. Other federal programs have family planning components as well. The federal share of the Medicaid program for family planning is between \$400 and \$500 million annually. By statute the federal government pays 90 percent of covered Medicaid family planning services. Planned Parenthood got about \$42 million from Medicaid in FY 2000.

According to a Government Accounting Office report (11/13/01), Planned Parenthood (including the Alan Guttmacher Institute) got its biggest chunk of federal money in FY 2000 from Title X, about \$55 million. That represents about 23 percent of the total Title X appropriations that year. At that rate, Planned Parenthood would get about \$61 million from the Title X appropriations signed into law by Bush on January 10.

**Last five Title X
yearly appropriations**

(in millions of U.S. dollars, source:
Congressional Pro-life Caucus)

1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
202.9	214.9	238.9	253.9	265.1

**International Family
Planning 2002
appropriations**

On January 10, 2002, President George W. Bush signed the Kenneth M. Ludden Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2002 (H.R. 2506). It is now referred to as Public Law No. 107-115. Section 522 states, "That of the funds appropriated under title II of this Act, \$446,500,000 shall be made available for family planning/reproductive health." This represents an increase of about 5 percent over the previous year's \$425 million.

Section 518 contains the following :

None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part, to methods of, or the perform-

ance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated or expended for any country or organization if the President certifies that the use of these funds by any such country or organization would violate any of the above provisions related to abortions and involuntary sterilizations.

Earlier in the law there is a section that goes into even more detail about restrictions on how the money can be spent. In addition to repeating some of the same provisions listed above, this earlier section includes the following passage:

Provided further, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion: Provided further, That in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning project shall meet the following requirements: (1) service providers or referral agents in the project shall not implement or be subject to quotas, or other numerical targets, of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning (this provision shall not be construed to include the use of quantitative estimates or indicators for budgeting and planning purposes); (2) the project shall not include payment of incentives, bribes, gratuities, or financial reward to: (A) an individual in exchange for becoming a family planning acceptor; or (B) program personnel for achieving a numerical target or quota of total number of births, number of family planning

acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning; (3) the project shall not deny any right or benefit, including the right of access to participate in any program of general welfare or the right of access to health care, as a consequence of any individual's decision not to accept family planning services; (4) the project shall provide family planning acceptors comprehensible information on the health benefits and risks of the method chosen, including those conditions that might render the use of the method inadvisable and those adverse side effects known to be consequent to the use of the method; and (5) the project shall ensure that experimental contraceptive drugs and devices and medical procedures are provided only in the context of a scientific study in which participants are advised of potential risks and benefits; and, not less than 60 days after the date on which the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development determines that there has been a violation of the requirements contained in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (5) of this proviso, or a pattern or practice of violations of the requirements contained in paragraph (4) of this proviso, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a report containing a description of such violation and the corrective action taken by the Agency: Provided further, That in awarding grants for natural family planning under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 no applicant shall be discriminated against because of such applicant's religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning; and, additionally, all such applicants shall comply with the requirements of the previous proviso: Provided further, That for purposes of this or any other Act authorizing or appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, the term

'motivate', as it relates to family planning assistance, shall not be construed to prohibit the provision, consistent with local law, of information or counseling about all pregnancy options: Provided further, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

See the next article for the additional restrictions that President Bush put on foreign expenditures for family planning.

U.S. foreign aid for population control

(in millions of U.S. dollars, source: Congressional Pro-life Caucus, does not include UNFPA funds)

1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
385.0	385.0	372.5	425.0	446.5



Mexico City Policy makes exceptions for rape, incest and life-of-mother

As the previous article shows, Congress has prohibited the use of our tax dollars to directly pay for the "performance of abortions as a method of family planning." What exactly does that mean? Are rape, incest, or life-of-the-mother abortions allowed? The following discussion will shed some light on these questions.

President Bush put some additional restrictions on the distribution of foreign

aid. The so-called Mexico City Policy is in the *Federal Register* (Vol. 66, No. 61, pp.17303–17313). Bush signed the policy on March 28, 2001. Here's what he said, in part:

It is my conviction that taxpayer funds appropriated pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act should not be given to foreign nongovernmental organizations that perform abortions or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in other nations.

In other words, no foreign nongovernmental organization can get our tax money if, with its own money, it performs or actively promotes abortion "as a method of family planning." (Planned Parenthood calls this the "Global Gag Rule.") This is the same phrase Congress used. The President, however, makes it very clear what is meant by such language. Here are some other excerpts from his policy:

I. (10) (i) "Abortion is a method of family planning when it is for the purpose of spacing births. This includes, but is not limited to, abortions performed for the physical or mental health of the mother, but does not include abortions performed if the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or abortions performed following rape or incest (since abortion under these circumstances is not a family planning act).

(ii) To perform abortions means to operate a facility where abortions are performed as a method of family planning. Excluded from this definition are clinics or hospitals that do not include abortion in their family planning programs. Also excluded from this definition is the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions, for example, post-abortion care.

(iii) To actively promote abortion means for an organization to commit

resources, financial or other, in a substantial or continuing effort to increase the availability or use of abortion as a method of family planning.

(A) This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

(I) Operating a family planning counseling service that includes, as part of the regular program, providing advice and information regarding the benefits and availability of abortion as a method of family planning;

(II) Providing advice that abortion is an available option in the event other methods of family planning are not used or are not successful or encouraging women to consider abortion (passively responding to a question regarding where a safe, legal abortion may be obtained is not considered active promotion if the question is specifically asked by a woman who is already pregnant, the woman clearly states that she has already decided to have a legal abortion, and the family planning counselor reasonably believes that the ethics of the medical profession in the country requires a response regarding where it may be obtained safely);

(III) Lobbying a foreign government to legalize or make available abortion as a method of family planning or lobbying such a government to continue the legality of abortion as a method of family planning; and

(IV) Conducting a public information campaign in USAID-recipient countries regarding the benefits and/or availability of abortion as a method of family planning.

(B) Excluded from the definition of active promotion of abortion as a method of family planning are referrals for abortion as a result of rape or incest, or if the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term. Also excluded from this definition is the treatment

of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions, for example, post-abortion care."

And later:

(12) Assistance for family planning may be furnished under this award by a recipient, subrecipient or sub-subrecipient to a foreign government event though the government includes abortion in its family planning program, provided that no assistance may be furnished in support of the abortion activity of the government and any funds transferred to the government shall be placed in a segregated account to ensure that such funds may not be used to support the abortion activity of the government.

Thus, the Mexico City Policy does not apply to foreign governments. They can perform or promote abortion with their own money and still get our "family planning" foreign assistance. More disturbing is the fact that the Mexico City Policy enshrines exceptions for rape, incest, and life-of-the-mother abortions into our international policy. Bush has been hailed by some pro-lifers as a big hero because he reinstated the Mexico City Policy. Upon closer scrutiny, however, we see that it contains some serious flaws and begs the question of just how pro-life President George Bush really is. For more on this matter, see the commentary in the next article.

Family Planning— A Bush family legacy



On January 10, 2002, by the stroke of a pen, our so-called pro-life president appropriated over \$711 million dollars for family

planning/reproductive health programs worldwide. Such programs often provide contraceptive drugs and devices that sometimes act to prevent the implantation of an already conceived human being in his or her mother's womb.

President Bush, who has said he is against federal funding for further destruction of human embryos for stem cell research, is actually funding the destruction of human embryos in the foreign and domestic contraceptive programs he approved funding for in January.

Is this man schizophrenic, misguided or just deceptively clever? Who knows? His actions, however, are nothing new for the Bush family. When George W. Bush's father was a congressman from Texas in the late 1960s, he made quite a name for himself as a champion of population control programs. His efforts were largely responsible for the enactment of Title X. STOPP's national director, Ed Szymkowiak, recently visited the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., to research the history of family planning programs. Here's what he found:

Congressman George H. Bush was chairman of the House Earth Resources and Population Control Task Force. On January 27, 1969, he co-sponsored a bill (H.R. 4605) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to remove prohibitions against importing, transporting and mailing articles for preventing conception and advertisements with respect to such articles.

In the Congressional Record (CR) dated May 8, 1969 (p. 11902), Bush claimed the world population would be seven billion by 2000 and said, "The problems that these additional millions and billions of people will create are unimaginable... Now is the time to remove the stigma from the words 'population control' and 'family planning'...we will be

striving to make these topics the subject of household conversation as only out of this kind of awareness can come the action needed.”

On May 21, 1969, Bush cosponsored H.R. 11550, which proposed to appropriate \$89 million to family planning in FY 1971 and create a National Center for Population and Family Planning. That day, Bush said that without family planning information, the “300 million people who will live in the United States in the year 2000 will be forced to live in a world without the benefits of environment and affluence that are enjoyed today. Furthermore, they will not be able to successfully meet the crisis—it will be too late. So it is extremely important that Congress, as well as the administration, act now” (CR pp. 13280–1).

On June 5, 1969, Bush sponsored a bill (H.R. 11902) to expand domestic family planning and population research activities of the federal government by appropriating \$955 million for such purposes over a span of five years.

In CR dated August 13, 1969 (p. 23923), Bush urged every member of the House to read “Population Explosion—An Appalling Threat,” an editorial that he included in the record.

On February 4, 1970, Bush sponsored a bill (H.R. 15691) entitled, “The Family Planning Amendments of 1970.” This bill proposed to appropriate \$865 million over five years to provide special project grants for family planning research, training and technical assistance.

The culmination of George H. Bush's efforts was the passage of the “Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970,” which became Public Law 91-572 on December 24, 1970. This is the law that created the infamous Title X program and appropriated to it \$382 million for its first three years. Title X is the same domestic population control program that Bush's son,

current president George W., is still funding (see the article on page 2).

George H. Bush voted for the House version of the “Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970” (H.R. 19318), on November 16, 1970, saying that same day in the record (CR p. 37370), that “... James H. Scheuer and I began soliciting sponsors for the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act approximately two years ago ... A month or so after the bill was introduced, the House Republican Conference established a task force on earth resources and population, and I was named its chairman ... Over these two years, our task force has held extensive hearings into the interrelated problems of population growth, depleting natural resources and environmental degradation.”

Thus, George H. Bush is largely responsible for Title X, Planned Parenthood's single-largest source of federal funding. In addition, his efforts certainly helped to enshrine a contraceptive mentality into U.S. government policy. Is it any wonder that his son has continued this Bush family legacy by recently approving over \$711 million for a year's worth of so-called family planning/reproductive health programs aimed at population control in the U.S. and abroad?



UK study debunks PP's theory of contraception for teens

A study published in the March 2002 issue of the prestigious *Journal of Health Economics* debunks Planned Parenthood's theory that providing

contraceptives to teens will reduce underage conceptions. Dr. David Paton of Nottingham University Business School in the United Kingdom authored the study, entitled, “The Economics of Family Planning and Underage Conceptions.”

Dr. Paton, senior lecturer in Industrial Economics, investigated the impact of family planning on teenage conceptions and abortions by testing data from 16 UK regions over 14 years.

One of the aims of Dr. Paton's research was to explore the impact of the 1984 “Gillick Ruling,” which severely reduced teenage attendance at family planning clinics in the UK for a time. Dr. Paton explained: “This ruling provided us with a useful natural experiment involving a change in public policy. Contrary to forecasts at the time, the Gillick ruling, which forced health professionals to inform parents before providing contraceptives to under-16s, did not lead to an increase in underage pregnancies. My research casts serious doubt on current government policy. Over the past few years, we have had a massive expansion in family planning services for young people in the UK, yet there is no evidence that this has reduced either underage pregnancy or abortion rates. Although family planning may make sexually active teenagers less likely to get pregnant, it seems that it also encourages others to start having sex. Some of these will get pregnant through contraceptive failure and, if anything, the overall effect of expanding family planning services for under-16s has been to increase pregnancies and abortions” (press release, Nottingham University, 2/27/02).

Here's an excerpt from Dr. Paton's conclusions directly from the paper that he was kind enough to e-mail to STOPP when we contacted him about the study.

A simple model of rational choice suggests that improving access to

family planning can have an ambiguous impact on underage conception and abortion rates. On the one hand, teenagers who will engage in sexual activity in any case face a reduced risk of pregnancy. On the other hand, family planning raises the likelihood of engaging in sexual activity in the first place. The overall effect may be either to increase or decrease underage conceptions. I use regional data from the UK over the period 1984 to 1997 to test these competing hypotheses using two approaches. The first approach uses the 1984 Gillick Ruling which affected family planning provision for under sixteens in England and Wales. Using older teenagers, who were unaffected by the Gillick case, as a control group, I cannot reject the null hypothesis that the Ruling had no impact either on underage conception or abortion rates. The second approach uses instrumental variables to estimate conception and abortion rates for under sixteens as a function of attendance at family planning clinics. Using a range of specifications, I find no evidence that greater access to family planning has reduced underage conceptions or abortions. Indeed, there is some evidence that greater access is associated with an increase in underage conceptions in our sample.

[Editor: The terms "positive" and "negative" in the next section do not mean "good" and "bad." Variables are positively associated when as one goes up, so does the other. Variables are negatively associated when as one goes up, the other goes down.]

The observed non-negative impact of family planning on conception rates is consistent with the predictions of the rational choice model that availability of family planning will have a positive impact on rates of underage sexual activity. As expected, socio-economic factors are found to be important predictors of underage conception

and abortion rates. The proportion of children in statutory care [Editor: removal of children into the care of someone other than the child's natural parents] and the unemployment rate are found to be positively associated with conception rates, whilst the participation rate in post-compulsory education displays a negative association.

Whether these results can be generalised outside the scope of the UK is a question that future work should consider. In addition, issues such as model dynamics and causality might be explored in more detail through the analysis of individual time series. The longest series of data available in the UK (specifically, data are available for England from 1975) is still relatively short, but these issues might usefully be revisited as more data points become available over time.

The results in this paper provide strong support for many of the policy initiatives currently proposed in the UK. Measures which improve educational and work prospects of those groups most at risk seem likely to help achieve the stated aim of reducing underage conceptions. However, the UK experience does not provide evidence that improving access to family planning will, in itself, be successful in reducing the rate of underage conceptions.

Well, Dr. Paton is to be congratulated for providing evidence to back up what STOPP and others have been saying for years: Planned Parenthood is the problem, not the solution, when it comes to teen pregnancy and abortion. By providing contraceptives to kids, Planned Parenthood has helped to fuel teen sexual activity, which leads to teen pregnancy and abortion.

Yet our government has failed to realize this, and continues to fund Planned Parenthood under the misguided notion

that giving kids more sex ed and contraception will somehow decrease teen pregnancy and abortion. This goofy theory defies common sense and, as Dr. Paton shows, it is not supported by his scientific evidence either. Federal, state and local governments gave \$202.7 million to Planned Parenthood during PP's fiscal year ending in June 2001. Dr. Paton's conclusions suggest that this money would be better spent on education and job training. Let your elected representatives know about this important study and ask them to defund PP. This study will also be useful for those parents fighting to keep PP's graphic sex ed and contraceptive pushing programs out of the schools.

Victory in Upper Michigan

By Pastor Keith R. Snyder

Editor: In the November 2001 issue of the Ryan Report (pp 3–5) we told you about the battle against Planned Parenthood going on in the Houghton–Hancock region of upper Michigan. Here's an update from Pastor Keith Snyder, the leader of Copper Country Pro-Life.

"I love the agitation and the investigation and the glory of defending unpopular truth against popular error." Those words were spoken by James A. Garfield, 20th President of the United States, who was also a minister. He served in a generation long past, but the righteous soldier's heart is needed in every age, including ours.

This update from the Houghton–Hancock, Mich., front comes after a great victory. The action against Planned Parenthood has generated copious quantities of both heat and light. The local paper even ranked it the second biggest story of 2001 (behind the local effect of the WTC attack).

In November, a large banner that said "Planned Parenthood Kills Babies" was hung on the Hancock side of the bridge between the two towns. The banner was stolen within just a few hours. A sturdier wooden sign was then erected, but was vandalized with spray paint within one day, and then kicked down later than night. The sign company and property owners decided to leave it alone for a few days as a mute testimony to the character of the opposition.



The newspaper ran a front-page article about the sign situation, including a photo of the sign before it was vandalized and a quote from a local town councilwoman calling protesters "the local Taliban." After a public meeting about the sign, the council decided it was not in violation of any ordinances, although a committee was appointed to consider possible changes.

There has been a small but dedicated Gideon's band in front of the clinic which has caused quite a furor by showing pictures of aborted babies, exposing the true nature of Planned Parenthood. The commotion caused has come from two main sources: pro-aborts who are guilty when the truth is shown, and pro-lifers who are gutless about the truth being shown.

In response to complaints to city hall, the planning commission announced it was considering revisions to the existing sign

ordinance that would have limited signs to three square feet in size, and would have required protesters to hold them at least seven feet above the sidewalk, severely limiting their effectiveness. The street is the main thoroughfare, so vehicular traffic is the target audience for the signs.

The newspaper characterized the revisions as "designed to quiet speech while not looking quite like a muzzle" and counseled that the city "resist the temptation to craft a clever ordinance that would ... all but guarantee this issue winds up in court."

When contacted by a reporter about the proposal, one of the protesters stated that if the city enacted such an ordinance, they would be defending it in court as a blatant attack on First Amendment rights to free expression. A public comment meeting was tentatively scheduled, then delayed, pending further investigation into ordinance possibilities.

The afternoon of the meeting, the protesters were told that the sign issue had been dropped. No reason was offered, but concerns were voiced about the effect of the protest signs on downtown retail traffic and on the general character of the area. A counter-concern was offered by the protesters about the effect of Planned Parenthood on the character of the area.

The pro-life protesters plan to continue their efforts as long as the clinic is open. They hope for an early end to the battle, but as long as the clinic is open, it provides a focus for the efforts of those who desire to call people to repentance for their selfishness, sexual immorality, and willingness to sacrifice the next generation on the altar of convenience.

Editor: Congratulations to Pastor Snyder and all the other members of Copper Country Pro-Life. For more information on this exciting campaign, visit their web site at www.disinformed.org.

This month's action items

- ✓ Publicize the results of Dr. Paton's study (see page 6).
- ✓ Write to your representatives in Congress today. Ask them to oppose the PP agenda.
- ✓ Write to President Bush today. Ask him to stop approving tax dollars for contraceptive programs here and abroad.
- ✓ To schedule a talk in your community by Jim or Ed, call 540-659-4171.
- ✓ Send a tax-deductible donation today to help us keep fighting PP and sex education.
- ✓ Pray that God will lead us in our work and that we will always have the courage to do His will.