

Please pass on my request to the Senate President and all Committee Members that I am opposed to SB 490. It's time to quit being barbaric by killing unborn children and live like civil human beings by treasuring and protecting human life from the time of conception.

Ask them to vote NO on SB 490

Thank you.

Wayne Hanson

Leslie Hanson

Lisa Hanson

Theresa Hanson

Daniel Hanson

All are voting members of our household

Please vote NO on SB490.

Thank you.

Steve Dinkowitz

Grants Pass, OR 97526

Dear Senate Committee Members,

I am asking that you would vote NO on senate bill 490. I would like to thank you for reading this e-mail & taking it into consideration as you vote. Thank you for your service to our great state!!

Sincerely,

Andrea Burman

1383 Abby Lane

Grants Pass, OR 97527

Carol [mailto:carolturner10@aol.com]

Vote no SB490

I oppose this bill which targets Oregon's men, women and babies through attacks on pregnancy centers. Pregnancy Centers actually offer the "choice" that so many people want...the ability to look at all alternatives and make a truly informed decision. Pregnancy Centers do NOT tell people what to do, and further, they do not profit in any way from a person's decision to parent, adopt or abort.

Please vote no.

Thank you,

Mary Lefner

Selma

I am asking for a NO vote on this measure which is totally unnecessary.

Sincerely,

Ronald B. Glynn

3930 Lower Wolf Creek Road

Wolf Creek, Oregon 97497

Dear Legislators:

Please stand with me and vote no on SB490. This has no good purpose and could hurt many people.

Thanks,

Pastor Ralph Orton

Church of God 7th Day

1150 NE 9th Street, Grants Pass, OR

Mail Address: P.O. Box 357, Merlin, OR 97532

541-226-7455

Please vote NO on SB 490. We need pregnancy resource centers to continue to operate in our state. Pregnant mothers and their babies rely on loving, honest help when facing an unplanned pregnancy. As the mother of three adopted children, I know the miracle of life. I have volunteered at Pregnancy Resource Centers and met weekly with clients. There are no words for the positive impact these centers provide.

Thank you!

Michelle Whitmire
Eagle Point, OR

Dear Committee Administrator,

Word has come to us that there is interest in hampering or closing down Pregnancy Care Centers in our state. From a mere "support to the community" position alone this would be a bad idea.

Our local pregnancy center does so much good in our own community here in Grants Pass: education, clothing and diapers, medical testing as requested, counseling as requested and it's all FREE. Our community stands behind our Pregnancy Care Center. Please support this important work in any way you can. Keep our Pregnancy Care Centers open and thriving.

Thank you.

Becky and Bob Bonner

To whom it may concern,

I strongly urge you to vote no on SB490. This bill would hinder the great work that Pregnancy Care Centers provide the citizens of Oregon. I have seen first hand how much my local Care Center positively effect my community. Please vote no.

Sincerely,

Kurt Tamashiro PC

John L Scott Real Estate Grants Pass

Owner/Broker

Cell 541-660-3844

Fax 541-479-2747

OPPOSE SB490.

Please vote NO!

Thank you

Cathy Kitchen

Grants Pass, OR 97527

Urging all Senate and Committee members to VOTE NO ON SB490.
Women need Pregnancy Care Centers. Pregnancy Care Centers
Are doing a great job of giving women options for pregnancy care.
I urge you to VOTE NO ON SB490.

Thank you,
Mike & Connie Murphy
Grants Pass OR

To whom it concerns,

I strongly oppose SB490

Stephanie Jones
Pregnancy Care Services

Dear Senate President and Committee Members,

I would like to express my concerns over Senate Bill 490 and the negative impact it will have on our communities if it is passed.

I have volunteered in pregnancy centers, and I have seen first-hand how women are receiving help and encouragement from caring staff and volunteers. Many of the people who come to the centers are going through financial hardships and are experiencing anxiety and stress as they try to survive in tough economic times. Staff and volunteers treat all clients with care and dignity.

Women are able to give themselves a pregnancy test with free EPT kits, which saves them the cost of purchasing a pregnancy test. Men and women are able to sign up for a program where they earn credit to purchase baby items by watching educational DVD's on prenatal development, nutrition, childbirth, parenting, etc. The clients benefit by gaining more knowledge and then receiving free baby items, which again saves them money.

Informational handouts are available for clients on many topics in which they may be interested, such as the harmful effects of smoking, drugs and alcohol, the risks of contracting sexually transmitted diseases, prenatal development, and many others. Centers also provide referrals to community agencies that may assist them with other needs.

Many of the pregnancy centers in Oregon operate with financial donations and gifts of new and used baby items from community members who want to help needy women and children. For many of these centers, they would be forced to close down if a situation arose where they had to pay excessive fines. How tragic for the needy of Oregon's communities to lose this valuable resource, especially in these times of economic hardship.

Senate Bill 490 is requiring that an entity shall provide written notice of whether or not it provides the following: (1) contraceptive drugs or devices that are approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration, (2) on-site consultation with a practitioner, (3) adoption services or referral for adoption services, (4) abortion services or referral for abortion services.

The written notice is required to be conspicuously placed (1) at all entrances to the premises at which the entity provides services, (2) in all areas where individuals wait to receive the services, (3) on any website maintained by the entity that refers to the services, (4) in all advertisements promoting the services.

The requirements in Senate Bill 490 are unreasonable and the fines are excessive, with a very short timeline for entities to correct "violations." What other organizations are required to post in writing in all waiting areas, entrances, and exits, advertisements, and websites the services they do not provide?

Since Senate Bill 490 also states "This 2013 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2013 Act takes effect on its passage, pregnancy centers would have little time to comply with the requirements of this bill.

This bill requires that the Oregon Health Authority would be responsible to serve written notices informing the entity of the violation and that civil penalties would be avoided only if the violation is cured within five days of the service of the notice. If the entity failed to cure the violation within five days, a penalty of at least \$250 and not more than \$1,000 would be imposed. Then after another seven days, an additional penalty of up to \$5,000 would be imposed. After 14 days (after expiration of the

five-day period) penalties of up to \$10,000 for each week thereafter in which violation continues. Therefore, in one month's time, a pregnancy center could look at possibly being fined for a total of approximately \$46,000, if it didn't have all of its advertisements, signage and websites updated, or hasn't provided copies of a file to a client. This would pretty much "break the bank" for some of these centers, which often operate on annual budgets under \$200,000.

Senate Bill 490 requires an entity that collects health information from a patron to allow the patron, upon receipt of a written request, to examine or obtain a copy of the health information. The bill is poorly written, as it does not state whether the entity has a specific timeframe in which to produce the health information, or copy, before the Oregon Health Authority gets involved. It also does not state whether the health information requested could be from the previous year, or seven years. Many times, older client files are placed in archives and may require a certain amount of time to retrieve them. Nothing specific is addressed in this bill. Due to the excessive fines being proposed in this bill, this could create undue hardship on a pregnancy center if a client involved the Oregon Health Authority because the pregnancy center did not have a reasonable amount of time to provide the file information, or a copy.

Senate Bill 490 states "all civil penalties recovered under this section shall be paid into the State treasury and credited to the General fund and are available for general governmental expenses."

It seems to me that this bill is a heavy-handed way to treat organizations that are providing valuable services to Oregon's neediest population. We hear in the news every day how the economy is affecting Oregon's budget. Why is it necessary to pass such a bill that is really not accomplishing much, but requiring certain wording in advertisements and signage, and producing copies to clients of health files? What would a client really need with a copy of a health file from a pregnancy center?

The motives behind this bill are obvious. It is discriminatory and is designed to stop the valuable work of numerous pregnancy centers which provide for those who are struggling the most in this state. They are the people who basically have no voice, because they are not powerful, rich, or influential. They just want help getting some diapers for their babies, getting a pregnancy test kit that they can't afford to buy, finding a listening ear to hear their story, and finding encouragement from those who work at pregnancy centers.

Please do not pass this bill. You were elected to make Oregon a better place, not to take away valuable services to the many suffering people who need help.

Sincerely,

Kathleen LaRose

From: Joy Provolt [<mailto:joyprovolt@hotmail.com>]
Committee members of Oregon,
I urge you to please vote no on Senate Bill 490 !

Dear Committee Members,
Please vote no on SB49.
Thank you,
Cindy Rovig

Please vote no on this bill. It is a bad one that will greatly damage good work being done on behalf of women in crisis pregnancies.

Thank you.

Barb Wattenburger

Hermiston

With all of the serious issues facing Oregon legislators, this should not even make the short list. There is absolutely no reasonable state regulatory purpose in mandating additional statutory requirements that are clearly targeted at pregnancy resource centers (“PRCs”). Who is currently being harmed? What exactly is the harm that this legislation is designed to address? Show me the need for this legislation mandating posting of information. PRCs already protect the privacy of the women and men they serve, as well as provide them with their health information upon request. Look at their websites – they already provide the information being mandated. So who will this legislation benefit? More importantly, who is behind it? You can be sure it must be funded in part by pro-abortion advocacy groups with an agenda/ultimate goal of closing pregnancy resource centers which operate on small, shoe-string budgets and that encourage women to give their unborn babies a chance at life.

I urge you to please oppose senate bill 490. Thank you,

Karen A. Feil, *Attorney*

I am writing to request that you do whatever is in your power to prevent SB 490 from getting any further. This is a blatant waste of tax payer money, and is clearly targeted at Pregnancy Care Centers (PRCs) in the state. This is not the first time I have contacted you regarding a bill such as this, the first time it didn't get this far and now I am very concerned my first amendment rights are being targeted unfairly.

As mentioned the first time, this bill is ridiculous and unfair! Why should an agency have to spend money they do not have to advertise what services they do not offer. Does Planned Parenthood have to advertise they do not support adoption instead of abortion? Does McDonalds have to advertise they do not sell lawnmowers? Does a doctor have to advertise they do not paint houses? I strongly oppose this bill and will be appalled if it gets any more attention than it already has. We are facing times of budget concerns and THIS is how our Senate wants to spend my tax money?

By the language of this bill, PRCs would have to advertise the services they do not offer (i.e. we do not perform abortions) while abortion clinics throughout the state would be exempt? This bill targets nonprofit faith based entities simply because they are doing something Planned Parenthood (PP) does not agree with, and if the true people behind this bill were published I am sure the lobbyists are all being funded by PP. Unlike PP, PRCs take no government funding and SAVE the state significant funds by providing free social services to needy members of their communities. I have been involved with the PRC in Hermiston, OR and they do not walk the streets promoting their services, they do not go to the high schools with anti-abortion messages, they simply exist so that women have an option they may not be aware of, they provide an ear to listen to these women and young girls who often are facing a very difficult time in their lives. Who does that hurt? In fact PRCs don't advertise at all, but now you want to force them to pay for advertising for services not offered?

I am offended that a bill like this even was introduced. I am strongly against murdering innocent children simply because they are unborn and the mother changes her mind. I have a first amendment right to voice that opinion, just as PP has a right to promote the senseless killing of the unborn!

This bill intentionally targets pro-life agencies and is unfair and unconstitutional. Please, I urge you to use your power as Senators to remove this bill from the agenda and let PRCs exist as they have been. A similar law specifically targeting pro-life pregnancy centers was found to be unconstitutional viewpoint discrimination by the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals. Greater Baltimore Center for Pregnancy Concerns, Inc.

v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore, 683 F.3d 539 (4th Cir. 2012). A similar New York ordinance was barred from taking effect because it likely is an unconstitutional infringement of free speech. Evergreen Association, Inc. v. City of New York, 801 F. Supp 2d 197 (S.D. N.Y. 2011).

If Pro-Choice has a voice, then so should Pro-Life, simple as that!

Mike Snyder
Very Concerned Tax Payer

Hello!

I'm writing to express my opposition to senate bill 490. This bill would threaten groups like pregnancy resource centers, which do great good for individuals with crisis pregnancies, or wanting training or help with raising kids. I know of many individuals who have benefitted greatly from such centers.

Please vote NO on SB 490!

Sincerely,

Grant Goins
Associate Pastor
Roseburg Alliance Church
2165 Garden Valley Rd.
Roseburg OR 97471
541-673-5412

I strongly oppose SB490. This bill will effectively hinder and in some cases completely shut down pregnancy care centers in our state. These centers are in high use and are greatly needed. Please vote NO on SB490.

Thank you.

**Sincerely,
Mary Brown**

Please consider very carefully the purpose of this bill. Who is it aimed at punishing as if they were a criminal?

Are Christian run Pregnancy Centers who provide ultrasounds, pregnancy counseling, and follow-up care after childbirth in order to help new moms better care for their newborns; are these folks somehow a threat to life in Oregon and do we really need to label them as criminals and fine them out of business? Who have they damaged? Who are they threatening? What kind of threat do they pose to the born or unborn in our world?

Legislators, I submit to you they are no threat to anyone. Show me how they threaten and deliver harm to our state's mom's and/or kids when compared to the results of non-Christian counseling provided by tax supported organizations like Planned Parenthood and I will join your cause in support making them criminals.

Sincerely,
Dale Sauer

Registered Voter in Jackson County since 1968

From: Karen Jones [<mailto:k.annjones@yahoo.com>]
To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose SB490

Gail Severinsen [mailto:gail_inparkdale@yahoo.com]
please oppose SB 490 (an unfair burden of PRC's)

We support our Pregnancy Care Center, the unborn, our pregnant mothers and their babies. We oppose SB 490 and ask you to defeat this Bill--Vote NO.

Tim and Marcia Evans
Grants Pass OR
541-476-0361

Thank you for encouraging all you members to vote NO on SB 490
Ron & Phyllis Lindner

To all Oregon Committee Members and Senate President,

First of all, I would like to personally thank each of you for your service to the people of this great state. I am thankful to live in Oregon, and I realize the work that you put in as you represent the voice of the people.

I want to do my civil duty in communicating some grave dangers that I see in an upcoming bill. Senate Bill 490 needs to be opposed for the sake of the people of Oregon. The results of this bill will further inhibit liberty of choice in health care. The regulation proposed will result in closing down options that the people currently have. The consumer should be able to have the right to choose a preference in health care. This bill supports big conglomerate health care. Please vote no on this upcoming bill for the sake of the people that you serve! Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeoffery and Alicia Puglisi

Dear Oregon Legislators

I am writing asking you to vote against Oregon Senate Bill 490 . This bill is an attempt by certain groups to harness the power of the state to not only protect their ideas, but to attack a group they disagree with. It is a power play based not on fair play, but on bigotry. It is not enough that abortion is legal, but apparently necessary to harass those who want to help pregnant women choose life - it is anti-choice (and anti first amendment).

Don't be a tool of harassment of any interest group, no matter what your personal views.

I could make further appeals to the moral value of not harassing a group that comes along side pregnant and scared women with comfort, finances, and assistance. I could argue that this is living proof that those who criticize pro-lifers for "attacking abortion but doing nothing else for women or babies" is clearly a lie. I could argue that, even if you are a Democrat, you do not have to be a toady of the extremely hostile, radical, or anti-freedom position of the zealots of abortion (or those who profit from abortion that hate any competition), or the general idea that using the coercive power of the state to attack pregnancy care center is another form of bullying...but, I'm sure any legislator can see that.

No matter what you think of abortion rights, this law goes beyond protecting Roe v Wade to forcing it down the throat of Oregonians - isn't that anti-choice?

Respectfully,

A. Frye

S T [<mailto:sujotaylor@hotmail.com>]

I Oppose SB490, Please Vote No. Pregnancy care centers are a great options for individuals who are pregnant. We live in a land where choices are ultimated. Pregnancy care centers have just as much right to stay open as anyone else. They are bettering peoples lives, not destroying them. Isn't that what America should be about?

Committee Administrator,

We are writing to ask you to oppose the passage of SB490. Please vote no and kill this bill. We have been reading about the SB490 and can't see where it will benefit Oregon. It will add more red tape and cost to our already burdened system.

Why are you trying to fix something that isn't broken when there is so much other out there that is? Our Senator, Jeff Kruse, says it well, "State government should address only legitimate needs of the people of Oregon, in a cost effective manner, so Oregonians can have the freedom and personal resources necessary to run their own lives.". SB490 is not a legitimate need. We should be able to make our own choices and have the opportunity to use a Pregnancy Resource Center without government interference.

Our nonprofits, such as Pregnancy Resource Centers, are doing a tremendous job to serve the women of Oregon and have done it faithfully for several decades. Unlike government, they have to get results on a very tight budget. They are law abiding citizens and most are giving their time and resources so others can have a choice in life.

SB490 would place unnecessary requirements on top of what is already being regulated, when there is little evidence of wrongdoing. This bill is wrong for Oregon and the thousands of women this would effect. It will only benefit Planned Parenthood and it's supporters. We Oregonians need to return to our roots of people working together for the benefit of us all.

We pray you will agree with us and vote NO on SB490.

Sincerely,
Larry L Cooper
Delores I Cooper
3056 NE Hughes
Roseburg OR 97470
541-672-7681

Please note and record that I am against Senate Bill 490. Pregnancy care and resource centers do a great deal of good, and at no cost to taxpayers.

You should focus on stripping Planned Parenthood of all government funding. They do serious harm! Like killing babies and shredding families. Not only do they destroy life (and future taxpayers), women and men who kill their babies end up with heavy grief to bear all their lives.

Wonder why some people have taken guns into public places and wantonly killed people? Because this nation has ceased to publicly revere life. 55 million people have been aborted since Roe v Wade. So folks 40 years old and under have less reason to think we who are older care about them.

Robin Lee
415 Sunrise Av
97504

Dear Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson,

SB490 is wrong for Oregon and I urge you to kill the bill immediately. It is unfair, unnecessary and unconstitutional. This bill is bad for the thousands of women served by PRC's each year. Please kill this bill. I and my friends do not support this bill.

Sincerely,

Sidney M. Lilienthal
Concerned citizen

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am concerned that SB490 will close down our local Pregnancy Care Center. Please do not let this happen. The community care centers provide a very important service. Women are receiving loving care and babies are being born who might otherwise be aborted.

I hear the voices of women who are Pro Choice and want the right to abort their babies. And then I hear their voices when they are wracked with guilt and they regret that choice that they were so adamant to make. I never hear of women who were proud that they had had an abortion or felt that it was a good thing. The mainstream media doesn't let us hear those voices. These pregnancy care centers offer women a choice, too--the choice to bring that beautiful life into the world--to keep and raise, or to adopt out to a couple who has been waiting for a baby to love. I haven't heard of any women who regretted her choice to let her baby live. Please don't take away these centers. The lives of so many unborn babies are at stake.

Thank you,

Marcia D. Evans
2670 Leonard Road
Grants Pass, OR 97527

Please vote no on SB490.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Robin Fuller, Executive Director
Pregnancy Care Center of Grants Pass

I oppose SB 490. This is an infringement on the people's right. Other organizations (whether State or private) are not required to put the services they "do not" offer on their doors. This is unconstitutional infringement upon free speech rights because it compels pregnancy centers to say words they would not otherwise say and regulates speech NOT conduct.

Abraham Lincoln once said, *"Don't interfere with anything in the Constitution. That must be maintained, for it is the only safeguard of our liberties."* The American people are having their liberties stripped away one at a time. It's up to you, as our appointed leader to save our liberties. That's why we voted you into office. I urge you to vote NO on SB 490.

Thank you,

Briawna Mueller

I am a resident of Jackson County Oregon and am emailing to voice my opposition to SB490. I am asking that it be voted down. Please vote NO on this bill.

I think this bill unfairly targs pregnancy centers throughout Oregon and strongly oppose it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Shirley Criswell

Rogue River Oregon

Dear Health Care and Human Services Committee Members-

It has come to my attention that a bill, what I understand to be SB490, may be considered for passage by the Oregon State Legislature.

I write with the utmost respect and admiration for your efforts to serve the best interests of the people of the state of Oregon and appreciate your service! I provide below my perspectives for your consideration.

The nature of this bill is very concerning to me as a business owner and an American citizen, as it seems to introduce the requirement for a segment of social service organizations to post publicly specifically what they don't do, in an apparent attempt to legally dissuade potential customers from seeking services.

In our community we have a Planned Parenthood office and a Pregnancy Care Center, which work rather well together. Some of the PCC's staff have previously worked at PP. The Planned Parenthood clinic will refer patients to the Pregnancy Care Center, as they realize there are some services our PCC can provide in a manner that is more beneficial to the patient than the PP clinic is able to do.

I am concerned that this legislation would introduce a form of apparent discrimination that specifically targets services with a specific philosophical belief, rather than applying broadly to all entities within the sector. As an American Citizen it is very alarming to consider that legal means might be successfully used to discriminate against certain ideologies.

Most Pregnancy Care Centers throughout the state of Oregon are committed to providing a level of care that meets or exceeds Planned Parenthood, and our local PCC has demonstrated this through [AAAHC accreditation](#), which unlike an affiliate or PP self-accreditation process ([PPFA example](#)) demonstrates compliance with nationally recognized healthcare standards as determined by an outside entity serving the Ambulatory Healthcare industry as a whole.

It would seem odd for our government to be concerned with legislating an organization that receives minimal government support, and allow an organization that rely's heavily on government support (PP) to have no similar requirement. As a business owner, I would typically be more concerned about providing oversight and accountability to the entities that benefit financially from me.

As indicated above, I am not in favor of SB490 and believe it will merely discourage women with unplanned pregnancies from seeking the assistance they may desperately need. I also believe this bill was crafted to minimize or eliminate competition, which would seem to put the State of Oregon in the position of promoting a monopolistic business environment.

Thank-you again for your willingness to consider my comments and may you be blessed with the wisdom and guidance to discern what is best for the people of Oregon.

--

Jeremy Nugent

Southern Oregon Managed Networks

106 NW F St. #187 | Grants Pass, OR 97526

Dear Committee members,

I am a mother of five, grandmother of five and lover of life and children.

SB 490 is being heard in committee today. It is an unfair attempt to hamper the beneficial operations of pregnancy centers in Oregon just because they do not perform abortions. This is Planned Parenthood's continued attempt to bully anyone who challenges their agenda and reduces their revenue. I ask you to oppose and kill this bill before it goes any further.

Sincerely,

Arden Sleadd

546 Jaynes Dr

Grants Pass, OR

COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR

WANTING TO LET YOU KNOW WE **OPPOSE BILL 490** AND WOULD LIKE A "**NO VOTE**" ON THIS!

I WOULD LIKE THIS TO BECOME PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD.

THANK YOU,

RONALD AND RUBY FORBES-ROBERTS

Dear Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson and the members of the Health Care & Human Services Committee:

Please vote NO on SB 490. I urge you to kill the bill immediately. It is unconstitutional, unfair and unnecessary. Pregnancy Centers Of Oregon provide millions of dollars in free social services to our communities every year, with no help from state or federal funding. Pregnancy Resource centers have broken no laws, they already must abide by Oregon law just as any other organization or business. Having to advertise services they don't provide is in clear violation of the first amendment.

I have first hand seen the positive impact of a pregnancy Center. This bill will prevent 1000's of families from being served. Please kill this bill, let pregnancy centers continue to do the good work they do in providing services to residents in the sate of Oregon.

Very sincerely,

Shannon Lilienthal
Roseburg, Oregon

I would urge all of you to please consider voting "no" on Oregon Senate Bill 490. The pregnancy centers who operate by providing free ultrasounds for pregnant woman are doing a good service, certainly not a harmful one, especially for women who have no health coverage. I don't understand why Planned Parenthood has such a problem with these centers that are merely trying to give the unborn a chance at life by showing their parents that they are a viable life. Unlike Planned Parenthood and their lucrative abortion industry, they do not make a profit or have any monetary gain from their services. What comes tumbling down this slippery slope next? Eugenics? Please vote "no." Thank you so much for reading this.

Sincerely,

Karen E. Gordon
5828 Shady Brook Drive
Central Point, Oregon

I am urging you to please vote "no" on SB 490. This bill unfairly targets pregnancy centers throughout Oregon to stop education and information about pregnancy and the help that is available to them and their child. Please see the worthwhile effect that these centers have a women who find themselves pregnant and needing the assistance that the pregnancy centers provide. Please educate yourselves thoroughly before you make this vote.

Thank You

Kathi L McGowan
Central Point, OR

You have before you Senate Bill #490. By this email I understand that our comments will become part of the written record.

The undersigned strongly appose this bill and ask respectfully that you vote "no" on this bill.

Thank you,

P. J. Slade

Doris A. Slade

I GREATLY OPPOSE BILL 490.

I pray for each of you in this committee, to do what is right and vote NO on bill 490.
Thank You and may God Bless All.

Sincerely,
Nancy Steffan

WE OPPOSE THIS BILL !!
PLEASE HEAR OUR VOICES AND VOTE NO!!!

Thank You,
Karen Maentz and Anna Maentz

I DEEPLY OPPOSE THIS BILL !!

PLEASE, VOTE NO ON BILL 490 !

Concerned Citizen,
Annette Beliveau

Oregon Senate Bill 490 Legal Analysis

Jeanneane Maxon, J.D.

Kelsey Hazzard, J.D.

Americans United for Life

Oregon Senate Bill 490 (“SB 490”) is the latest in a long string of legislation, promoted by NARAL and like-minded groups, to undermine the work of pro-life pregnancy resource centers. Although SB 490 is not yet in its final form, it appears that Oregon has taken note of some of the constitutional problems that similar legislation has faced (e.g. viewpoint discrimination) and endeavored to avoid them. Ultimately, however, this remains an instance of compelled speech in a non-commercial context, which is prohibited by the First Amendment.

I. Provisions of SB 490

A. Entities to which SB 490 would apply

SB 490 “applies to an entity if the primary purpose of the entity is to provide pregnancy-related services and the entity advertises or solicits patrons with offers to provide prenatal sonography, pregnancy tests or pregnancy options counseling.” SB 490 §1(2)(a). Unlike most anti-pregnancy-center legislation, SB 490 does not expressly condition its application upon the entity’s refusal to perform or refer for abortion.

Entities are exempted from the provisions of SB 490 if “at all of the entity’s sites that are open to the public,” the entity employs a physician, naturopath, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, registered nurse, or nurse midwife who is “on-site whenever medical services or treatment is provided.” SB 490 §1(2)(b). This exception is very narrow and will not exempt most pregnancy centers, *even those which are fully medically licensed*, for three reasons.

First, SB 490 §1(2)(b)(A) uses the word “employs,” which suggests that the medical professional must be paid by the pregnancy center. Many pregnancy centers utilize physicians, nurses, etc. on a volunteer basis only. This allows the pregnancy center to keep costs down and provide care to low-income women and families free of charge. There is no reason to believe that the quality of care provided by a volunteer medical professional is any less than that provided by a paid employee, making this provision entirely irrational.

Second, there must be a medical professional at every site that the entity operates. If a medical pregnancy center has a satellite office or offices that exclusively provides social services (e.g. counseling, parenting classes, baby and maternity products), *all* of the pregnancy center’s locations will be covered, including the medical location, as SB 490 is currently written.

Third, although it sounds reasonable to say that the medical professional must be on site “whenever medical services or treatment is provided,” an earlier section defines “medical services” to include *pregnancy options counseling and pregnancy testing*. SB 490 §1(1)(a). As a practical matter, to be exempt, the center must have a medical professional on site every day. If a center designates one or two days a week as “medical days” when a volunteer physician or

nurse is available, and provides options counseling or pregnancy testing on other days, the center will *not* be exempt from the disclosure requirement.

This is an attack on the idea that pregnancy options counseling can be effectively provided by trained, compassionate, non-medical volunteers. Pregnancy centers provide options counseling based on accurate and current facts and statistics from medically reviewed studies. Such information is already widely available through various vehicles, including internet searches. As this information is educational in nature and not diagnostic, pregnancy options counseling is not a “medical service” requiring the presence of a physician or nurse.

SB 490 could, in theory, apply to a center that provides or refers for abortions. Many abortion clinics rely on traveling abortionists who are only on-site on designated days of the week. If any such clinic provides options counseling or pregnancy testing on a day when no doctor, nurse, etc. is on site, that clinic will expose itself to liability under SB 490. This may be an intended outcome, meant to bolster the state’s case that SB 490 does not constitute viewpoint discrimination, or it may be an unintended outcome.¹ In any event, given Oregon’s strongly pro-choice political climate, pregnancy centers are understandably concerned that the bill will be selectively enforced only against those entities with a pro-life viewpoint.

Finally, it is worth noting that SB 490 makes no distinction between entities which offer services for free and those which propose commercial transactions.

B. The disclosure requirement

Covered entities must provide a written disclosure regarding “whether or not” they provide “(a) contraceptive drugs or devices that are approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration; (b) an on-site consultation with [a physician, naturopath, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, registered nurse, or nurse midwife]; (c) adoption services or referral for adoption services; and (d) abortion services or referral for abortion services.” SB 490 §1(3).

The “whether or not” language and the inclusion of some services that are commonly provided by pregnancy centers (adoption services or referrals and, for some, on-site consultations) are unique to Oregon’s bill. This is likely a response to the pro-life complaint that past disclaimers have focused solely on services that pregnancy centers do *not* provide, while ignoring the positive, helpful services that they *do* provide. Notably absent from the list in SB 490 §1(3), however, are any services which pregnancy centers provide and abortion centers do not,² such as parenting classes and free maternity supplies. The end result is that this bill, like its predecessors in other states, promotes a false perception that abortion centers provide everything that pregnancy centers do and more.

¹ Planned Parenthood has come out in support of the measure and evidently does not think that SB 490 would apply to it. See Christopher David Grey, *Planned Parenthood Wants Pregnancy Centers to Display Their Services*, THE LUND REPORT, Apr. 3, 2013, available at

http://www.thelundreport.org/resource/planned_parenthood_wants_pregnancy_centers_to_display_their_services.

² Although abortion centers rarely if ever provide adoption referrals in practice, they are certainly capable of doing so upon request. Planned Parenthood’s most recent annual report indicates that Planned Parenthood provides one adoption referral for every 145 abortions it performs. http://issuu.com/actionfund/docs/ppfa_ar_2012_121812_vf/5 (showing 333,964 abortion procedures and 2300 adoption referrals in the year 2011).

In addition, the disclosure regarding FDA-approved “drugs and devices” for contraception is unwarranted in that it narrowly focuses women’s minds on particular forms of birth control, regardless of whether or not an FDA-approved drug or device is the best method of family planning for her situation. Pregnancy centers do in fact offer contraception services, in the form of natural family planning and abstinence education; abortion centers typically do not offer these methods, preferring to prescribe drugs and devices. A truly balanced bill would simply require all entities to disclose the methods of contraception that they offer. The narrow focus of SB 490 suggests that fully informing women is not the genuine legislative motive.

The disclosures must be “conspicuously” posted at every pregnancy center entrance, in every waiting area, on the center’s website, and on all advertisements. SB 490 §1(4)(a). This will result in clients seeing the disclaimer far more times than is reasonably necessary to convey the information.

In addition, the disclosures must be “written and provided in a manner that a reasonable person is likely to read and understand before accepting the services described in subsection (2)(a) of this section”—namely, prenatal sonography, pregnancy tests, and pregnancy options counseling. SB 490 §1(4)(b). This provision is troubling for two reasons.

First, as will be discussed more fully in the “Constitutional Issues” section of this memo, SB 490 §1(4)(b) is unclear to the point of being unconstitutionally vague. What is a reasonable person likely to read? The notices at the entrance, waiting room, etc. required by SB §1(4)(a) are probably things that a reasonable person would be likely to read and understand (and if not, why require them?), but would they also satisfy the mandate of §1(4)(b)? Given the use of the word “and” between SB 490 §1(4)(a) and (b), the answer would seem to be no—Oregon wants yet another notice. But what shall this additional written notice be? Perhaps a form signed by the client? (Is a reasonable person *likely to read* the details of every form she signs?)

Second, §1(4)(b) seems to suggest that the additional notice must come immediately before a client accepts a service (although this too is unclear). That would lead to some bizarre outcomes, such as the center being required to notify a pregnant client that it does not offer FDA-approved contraceptive drugs and devices before she can obtain her sonogram.

Perhaps the committee already recognizes the potential for confusion, because SB 490 §3 does direct the Oregon Health Authority to “adopt rules to carry out the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this 2013 Act.” Unfortunately, there is no way to know in advance what these rules would be.

C. Procedure and penalties

If a pregnancy center’s disclosures are not sufficiently “conspicuous” in the opinion of the Oregon Health Authority, the pregnancy center will receive a written notice and will have five days to cure the violation without a penalty. SB 490 §2(1). If the Oregon Health Authority remains unsatisfied after five days, the pregnancy center will be fined between \$250 and \$1000. SB 490 §2(2). A week after that, the fine increases to up to \$5000, SB 490 §2(3), and a week after that, the fine increases to up to \$10,000 per week, SB 490 §2(4).

Pregnancy resource centers are non-profit, low-budget, and largely volunteer-run entities. A fine of \$1000, \$5000, or \$10,000 could wreak havoc on a center's finances, compromising the availability of services to low-income Oregon women.

D. Effective date and declaration of emergency

When it comes to the effective date of the measure, SB 490 contradicts itself. SB 490 §4(1) states that sections 1 and 2 (the substantive provisions of the bill) shall “become operative on October 1, 2013.” But SB 490 §5 says differently: “This 2013 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2013 Act takes effect on its passage.”

Setting aside the ridiculousness of declaring an emergency over an imaginary threat to the “public peace, health, and safety” from charities that help pregnant women who choose life, the conflicting effective dates create a serious problem for pregnancy centers. Between the enactment date and October 1, 2013, it will be unclear whether or not a pregnancy center must comply with the act's disclosure requirements. A pregnancy center that guesses wrong could be subjected to crippling fines, as discussed above.

II. Constitutional Issues

A. SB 490 raises First Amendment concerns

As discussed above, the authors of SB 490 have attempted to avoid offending the First Amendment prohibition on viewpoint discrimination by making this bill equally applicable to entities that are pro-life and those that are pro-choice. However, viewpoint discrimination is only one of two First Amendment arguments that have been advanced against pregnancy center speech regulations. The other is that governments cannot compel speech where no commercial transaction is being proposed, unless the compelled speech is the least restrictive means available to achieve a compelling government interest. SB 490 cannot meet this test and is therefore unconstitutional.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals recently struck down a Baltimore ordinance requiring disclosures from pro-life pregnancy centers. *Greater Balt. Ctr. for Pregnancy Concerns v. Mayor & City Council*, 683 F.3d 539 (4th Cir. 2012) (affirming District Court judgment that law compelling speech by pregnancy centers that do not provide or refer for abortions is unconstitutional). Although that ordinance was also viewpoint-discriminatory, the Fourth Circuit primarily relied on the non-commercial speech rationale to apply strict scrutiny and find the legislation unconstitutional:

[T]he City asserts that although many pregnancy centers operate as non profits, they effectively engage in commerce by offering pregnancy testing, sonograms, and options counseling, “all of which have commercial value, garnering payments and fees in the marketplace.” The City's formulation of the commercial speech doctrine, however, is not supported by the law. ...

Rather than regulating traditional commercial advertising, Ordinance 09-252 targets speech regarding the provision of “free services.” While this fact alone might not be dispositive, it becomes so in this case because there is no indication that the Pregnancy Center is motivated by any economic interest or that it is proposing any commercial transaction. The Pregnancy Center seeks to provide free information about pregnancy, abortion, and birth control as informed by a religious and political belief. This kind of ideologically driven speech has routinely been afforded the highest levels of First Amendment protection, even when accompanied by offers of commercially valuable services.

The City's argument does not address what commercial transaction is proposed by the Pregnancy Center's speech or what economic interest motivates the Pregnancy Center's speech. Instead, the City would define commercial speech to include any speech that offers services “which have commercial value, garnering payments and fees in the marketplace” generally. Adopting this definition of commercial speech would effect an unprecedented expansion of the commercial speech doctrine and is unsupported by citation to any applicable Supreme Court precedent. As the district court explained, the City's position would mean that “any house of worship offering their congregants sacramental wine, communion wafers, prayer beads, or other objects with commercial value, would find their accompanying speech subject to diminished constitutional protection.” Indeed, it is difficult to imagine any charitable organization whose speech would not be considered “commercial” under the City's proposed broad definition.

In short, we agree with the district court that the pregnancy centers are not engaged in commercial speech and that their speech cannot be denied the full protection of strict scrutiny on that basis.

Id. at 553-54 (internal citations and parentheticals omitted).

SB 490 applies even when the entity offers all services free of charge. Accordingly, the speech that SB 490 compels will be analyzed under the strict scrutiny standard. “It is well-established that a regulation compelling noncommercial speech is subject to strict scrutiny and must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest.” *Greater Baltimore*, 683 F.3d at 552 (citing *United States v. Playboy Entm't Group, Inc.*, 529 U.S. 803, 813, 120 S. Ct. 1878, 146 L. Ed. 2d 865 (2000), and *Riley v. National Federation of Blind, Inc.*, 487 U.S. 781, 796, 108 S. Ct. 2667, 101 L. Ed. 2d 669 (1988)). In order for a statute to be narrowly tailored, it must be the least restrictive means among available alternatives. In this case, the burden would be on the State to show that there is (1) a compelling government interest and (2) that it is narrowly tailored. In this instance, the State has neither produced nor received any evidence that the Bill is needed to serve a compelling state interest.

Furthermore, SB 490 is not the least restrictive means among available alternatives. If a problem does exist, Oregon “always retains the option of prosecuting violations of its criminal and civil

laws that proscribe deceptive advertising and deceptive statements made by pregnancy centers,” rather than compelling speech. *Greater Baltimore*, 683 F.3d at 558.

Additionally, the provisions of SB 490 are themselves overly burdensome. SB 490 does not merely prohibit deceptive behavior; it requires pregnancy centers to provide affirmative disclosures, and to do so multiple times: in their advertising, on their websites, at their entrances, in their waiting rooms, and once more before a client can receive certain services. This means that every client who visits the center will receive the disclaimer at least three times, and quite likely four or five times! Given this excess, a court would likely find that SB 490 is not narrowly tailored, and is therefore unconstitutional.

B. SB 490 Raises Due Process Concerns

SB 490 presents serious due process concerns. The language of the proposed legislation is vague and ambiguous. In order to be constitutional, statutes challenged as vague must give a person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited and provide explicit standards for those who apply the statute in order to avoid arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement. *See Upton v. S.E.C.*, 75 F.3d 92, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶99011 (2d Cir. 1996); *U.S. v. Wunsch*, 84 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 1996); *Smith v. Avino*, 91 F.3d 105 (11th Cir. 1996).

SB 490 does not come close to meeting this standard. Several key terms are undefined and open to considerable interpretation, most notably: what it means for a posting to be sufficiently “conspicuous” under SB 490 §1(4)(a); the nature of the additional written notice that a reasonable person must be likely not only to understand, but also to likely to *read* (§1(4)(b)); and even, as mentioned previously, when the legislation goes into effect!

C. Misuse of a Government Actor

Pro-abortion advocacy organizations, principally NARAL, have been the primary proponents of legislation imposing regulations on pregnancy centers. The abortion debate is better suited for the public square, without abortion advocates enlisting a government actor to needlessly harass pro-life charities. This is a misuse of the Oregon Senate and is outside its jurisdiction and proper functions. Neither pro-abortion proponents nor the state of Oregon has demonstrated a need for this bill. Rather, SB 490 is designed to emphasize an ideological complaint that pro-abortion advocates have with regard to pregnancy centers.

III. Conclusion

SB 490 violates the First Amendment and is unconstitutionally vague, exposing Oregon to the likelihood of a costly legal challenge. Pursuing such legislation is a waste of Oregon’s time and resources.

SB 490 unnecessarily regulates pregnancy centers which already voluntarily operate under high standards of professionalism. The overwhelming majority of pregnancy centers are part of an affiliation organization such as Care Net, National Institute for Family and Life Advocates (NIFLA), and Heartbeat International. Each of these affiliation organizations maintains a legal

department and provides centers with legal education and other services, such as legal manuals, policy and procedure manuals, legal updates, and other materials reviewed and approved by legal and medical professionals. The array of services offered by these groups is designed to ensure that centers are operating in compliance with state and federal laws and providing only truthful and accurate information.

Pregnancy centers are credible institutions held to high standards set by professionals in the industry. Centers comply with laws and offer a tremendous service to their communities—services that sometimes cannot be found in any other institution. SB 490 seeks only to unfairly discredit these worthy organizations, and it does so in a way that is demonstrably unconstitutional.

For these reasons, **we urge you to oppose Senate Bill 490.**

Dear Committee Administrator,

Please advise your committee to recommend a vote of “No” on SB490.

This bill is an unfair burden on Pregnancy Care Centers who are only trying to help women make the right decision about abortion.

What is needed is a Bill that would put an end to this Holocaust of our unborn. Who are we to make the decision of who lives or dies? In fact, look at what the doctor’s Original Hippocratic Oath says about that decision.

“...**I (the doctor) will** prescribe regimens **for the good of my patients** according to my ability and my judgment and **never do harm** to anyone...I will **not give a lethal drug to anyone if I am asked, nor will I advise such a plan**; and similarly **I will not give a woman a pessary** to cause an **abortion**” (From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia-emphasis added).”

May we return to that integrity again.

Sincerely,
Stewart Whittemore
Grants Pass, OR

Good Day

Please put oppose SB 490 Pregnancy Resource Centers in Oregon are supported by all volunteers, and Provide wonderful and safe services with much compassion to women, men and their children

Sincerely,

Karen Suess
The Dalles, OR

Please note that I am strongly opposed to SB 490

Jan Reitz

Voter in Umatilla County

I oppose SB 490, please vote NO!

I understand the concern for women to receive comprehensive prenatal healthcare. Yes, sufficient prenatal care is of upmost importance, however, I have never heard of comprehensive “prenatal” clinics giving free ultrasounds to pregnant women shortly after they receive a positive pregnancy test. It seems of upmost importance for a woman to make an informed decision regarding the life of her unborn child. This is life we are talking about. Options Pregnancy Resource Center in Albany does just that, offers ultrasounds so that a woman understands that a tiny living baby is within her womb.

My question is why are the opponents so afraid of clinics like Options? Why are they so fearful for a woman to possibly change her mind and choose life for her baby and not death? As you may well know, over 4,000 abortions are performed every year in Oregon. Options Pregnancy Resource Center in Albany and clinics like Options are offering good service and not even putting a dent in the number of abortions that are being carried out every year here in Oregon. Not only does Options offer ultrasounds, they also give referrals for prenatal care and other community resources. In addition, these clinics are not a drain on taxpayer's money.

This bill is a waste of our government's time and money. Please, give a no vote to SB490; stop the unfair regulations and let clinics like Options continue to perform caring services for the women in our community.

Concerned Citizen,

Susan Allen

Albany, Oregon

We oppose bill SB 490

Have a Great Day,

Darlene

Please oppose SB 490.

I sincerely thank you,

Ruth Ann Compton

From: Ron Wilmot

I oppose senate bill 490. Please vote NO. Thank you!

Please oppose SB 490.

Thank you

Elaine Simpson

My name is Deborah Tilden, Thank you for your time today.

Please accept my personal testimony today. Some of what I share today is part of my shared testimony at the HCR 6 hearing on April 1st in Hearing room D.

For the record, I have personally experienced an abortion here in Oregon - at the Lovejoy Clinic in Portland, at the young, scared and vulnerable age of 18. I am also a spokeswoman for countless women who have also experienced the soul wound and trauma of abortion as a Regional Coordinator for the Silent No More Awareness Campaign and an affiliate caregiver for ARIN (Abortion Recovery InterNational) as a post-abortion healing and recovery mentor.

Since going through my own personal healing & recovery process in 2003, after suffering in silence for 23 years, I was astounded by how many other women were experiencing, or had experienced the same things after their abortions.

Things such as:

- Alcohol & drug abuse that had not been a part of my life prior - it became a way to numb the pain in my heart and thoughts that ran away with me.
- Recurrent nightmares (2 of them, for more than 23 years for me!)
- Intense relationship and marriage issues - for many I worked with, repeat divorces
- Bouts of depression, deep sadness and confusion on the anniversary dates/seasons of my abortion and the time period of when our child would have been born, which happened to be around Mother's Day.
- Mother's Day brought such mixed emotions - later as my other 3 children came along, the mixed emotions grew stronger. Little did I know at the time that there was a name for this called "disenfranchised grief." Noted Ph.D.s Theresa Burke and David Reardon in Forbidden Grief - The Hidden Pain of Abortion. A must read for all of you who want to optimally serve, care for, protect and

defend women and better understand reproductive grief and loss, including abortion impact's on our lives.

- Eating disorders - for me binge eating (again, things I never experienced before my abortion, EVER!)

2003 was a life change year for me. The Pregnancy Resource Center in Sacramento, CA became of haven of safety and compassion. A place where I could heal from my abortion from 23 years prior. I truly do not know where I would be today. My husband and I finally came to terms with the choice we had made all those years prior of ending the life of our first child at the same time we were planning our wedding. What a way to start a life together?! We were on the edge of destruction when that help came from the PRC. My husband was able to resolve some issues that had plagued and haunted him since our abortion as well. We were given permission to heal from what society and the abortion industry said was “no big deal”. Abortion, ending the innocent life within the womb, is a VERY BIG DEAL. Leaving a very, very deep soul wound. The womb has become a tomb. I am grateful that I was able to go on in later years to have 3 children, however, my 2nd born was not without birth difficult and long term disability issues.

Over the last ten years I have tried to understand the bigger picture. Quite honestly, it has become very disheartening that women are not better informed of all the risk factors of abortion, which we “sell” as “no big deal”. Women deserve better, because it's a very big deal. The worldwide evidence is growing. I have a volume of research articles in my office, and it continues to grow.

Let me list a few, please let me know if you would like the full abstract report or article. I'd be happy to send any or all to you. I have provided them all the the House Committee from the HCR 6 hearing.

- The Breast Cancer Epidemic: Modeling and Forecasts Based on Abortion and Other Risk Factors - Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, Vol. 12, Number 3, Fall 2007
- Finland's epidemiological study, published in the European Journal of Public Health in 2005. Conducted by Finland's National Research and Development Center for Welfare and Health (STAKES). The researchers looked at data between 1987 and 2000 on all deaths among women of reproductive age (15 to 49). The suicide rate among women who had abortions was six times higher than that of women who had given birth in the prior year and double that of women who had miscarriages. (We can't ignore this if we are truly going to help women)
- Britain's Royal College of Psychiatrists issued a statement in the Sunday Times on March 16, 2008, "Royal college warns abortions can lead to mental illness". "They urged the government to undertake a full review of the linkages between abortion and women's mental health. The statement reflected a growing body of evidence, including a long-term study out of New Zealand published in 2006, that abortion is in fact linked with elevated levels of mental distress, including depression, substance abuse and suicide, in young women.
- A New York Times article titled Russia Enacts Law Opposing Abortion - requiring abortion providers to devote 10 percent of any advertising to describing the dangers of abortion to a woman's health, AND they make it illegal to describe abortion as a safe medical procedure.

- The British Journal of Psychiatry (2011) 199, 180-186. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.110.077230 - Abortion and mental health: quantitative synthesis and analysis of research published 1995-2009
- Obstetrical and Gynecological Survey - Volume 58, Number 1 - 2002 - CME Review Article - "Long-Term Physical and Psychological Health Consequences of Induced Abortion: Review of the Evidence

- (Upon Request) A 16 Page Research and Key Facts Report - Abortion's Harm to Women Published Studies - Significant Risk of Injury and Death from Abortion

Like I said earlier, I am astounded why women are not given all the risk factors. My question to you all is why aren't we here affirming a woman's right to know the truth of all the risk factors of abortion, reproductive grief and loss? Risk factors that could profoundly impact her life and health, relationships, marriage and family.

Why aren't we here asking ourselves why we are not pursuing more unbiased peer-reviewed double blind studies like other countries have?

Abortion is a heart issue. Abortion trauma is a wounding to the soul that cuts to the core of a woman's being - to end the life of your own child growing inside in profoundly impacting! Don't our precious sisters of humanity deserve better than this?

EVERY woman I have personally met and/or worked with over the last 10 years in post-abortion healing and recovery work, who chose an abortion in the second term of pregnancy or later have been unable to have children due to complications despite “legal & safe abortions”.

These are facts and real life stories of real women who were lied to and sold a bill of goods that their abortions were “no big deal”. They were reassured, “You can have lots of children later when you are more ready.” Do you realize the depths of grief, depression and relationship difficulties these women have had to endure based on the lies they believed about “safe & legal abortions”!

In closing, I have so often tried to run from the work I do in post-abortion healing & recovery - Oh believe me! It’s so hard to hear the heart wrenching real life experiences surrounding women, young and old. More than half of them were not given a choice, they were pressured, forced, coerced, manipulated and in some cases their very lives threatened without protection from the abortion clinics. How does this affirm women’s choices?

So, I ask you...no, I beg you, to rethink and go back to the drawing board and don’t just take my word for it. Do the research, dig deep and really search your own hearts. Let’s find ways how we can really help women.

My only true regret in this life is that I robbed my own children, our family, this world and this mama’s heart the opportunity to love and be loved by my child, who’s life was ended because of the lies of abortion.

(Show picture of Brian, Ashley & Ethan)

Thank you so much for your time and your devoted consideration of what I have shared.

Again, thank you for your time. I can be reached at 775-224-0717, or deborah@lifestory.com.

DEBORAH TILDEN

Deborah is a licensed facilitator of the Identity & Destiny - 7 Steps to a Purpose-Filled Life program. Deborah is a native Oregonian, with a few years spent in Nevada and California, from 1998 - 2005.

Deborah is the co-creator of LifeVictory Coaching – Promoting a LIFESTYLE of *Considering the Infinite Possibilities through Spirit ~ Soul ~ Body Balance*. She is also an Achiever associate with USANA Health Sciences, offering high quality nutritional products and coaching for better health through the many stages of life, creating a stream of income for the greater work of her heart in promoting LIFE, LOVE AND WISDOM.