

Re: NYC Council Bill Int. No. 371 re: "limited service pregnancy centers."

To: Council Members, Committee on Women's Issues

File #: Int 0371-2010 Version: * Name: Limited service pregnancy centers.

Type: Introduction Status: Committee

Committee: [Committee on Women's Issues](#)

On agenda: 10/13/2010 Final action:

Enactment date: Law number:

Title: A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to limited service pregnancy centers.

Sponsors : [Jessica S. Lappin](#), [Christine C. Quinn](#), [Maria Del Carmen Arroyo](#), [Julissa Ferreras](#), [Rosie Mendez](#), [Daniel R. Garodnick](#), [Diana Reyna](#), [Helen D. Foster](#), [Gale A. Brewer](#), [Leroy G. Comrie, Jr.](#), [Lewis A. Fidler](#), [Letitia James](#), [G. Oliver Koppell](#), [Karen Koslowitz](#), [Brad S. Lander](#), [Annabel Palma](#), [Deborah L. Rose](#), [James G. Van Bramer](#), [Ydanis A. Rodriguez](#), [Margaret S. Chin](#), [Inez E. Dickens](#)

First, let me introduce myself. My name is Dennis Howard, and I am President of The Movement for a Better America, a leading pro-life education and research organization. I founded MBA 15 years ago after retiring from a long career as an investigative journalist, editor, and market researcher. For the last 15 years, I have been researching and writing about the economic impact of abortion, and have published numerous special reports on this topic. My latest is "Abortion: How many is too many?" -- which is posted on our website as a downloadable pdf file. See: <http://www.movementforabetteramerica.org>.

I am also writing as a native New Yorker who grew up in Queens and Manhattan at a time when they were thriving communities blessed with children who later fought and won World War II and defended freedom in Korea and Vietnam. I now live in New Jersey.

I oppose this bill on the grounds that, first, it is an unwarranted restraint of trade designed to benefit one type of provider by imposing unreasonable and burdensome restrictions on another competing type of provider. The rationale appears on the surface to be motivated more by ideology than by any objective public purpose.

Essentially, it imposes on crisis pregnancy centers that provide alternatives to abortion the irrational burden of denying that they provide what they do not claim to provide. The Orwellian thrust of the bill is clearly to force them to advertise and promote competing services that they do not in good conscience believe serve the well-being of women.

This is like requiring alcohol treatment centers to post signs at their entrances stating that they do not serve liquor. Such postings would send many a recovering alcoholic around the corner for another drink before attending his first AA meeting.

Moreover, it violates the very idea of "choice" that organizations like NARAL and Planned Parenthood have long claimed to defend as a fundamental principle. To place such an undue burden on providers who offer alternatives to abortion while failing to impose comparable restrictions on abortion clinics implies that the state has a right to put its finger on the scale as the consumer is seeking to reach a decision acceptable to her in good conscience. It also demeans women by implying that they are incapable of making their own mature, conscientious choices. Like choice in other areas involving conscience, this is an area in which government does not belong without extensive empirical evidence that serious public harm is being done. No such evidence has been presented.

Unlike abortion, those who choose the pro-life alternative remain free to change that decision at any time. With abortion, there is no opportunity for a change of heart and mind. There is no way to unabort a baby.

However, what makes this proposed legislation so galling is that the Council is choosing to ignore the mounting evidence of social and economic damage being done by the abortion industry. To date, the abortion toll for the United States has reached 53.5 million surgical abortions since abortion was first legalized by the State of Colorado in 1967, California in 1968, and New York in 1970 -- all before *Roe v. Wade*. This does not include the growing number of medical abortions. Yet it is more than all the casualties from all major powers in World War II, including the Nazi Holocaust. By my calculation, the economic impact amounts to a cumulative \$35 trillion in lost GDP, an amount that continues to grow by \$2.5 trillion a year.¹

This abortion toll also represents 31.7% of the entire generation under 40 -- a generation that is now facing the prospect of having to support the aging Baby Boom population while facing the loss of benefits themselves. (For blacks, the discrepancy is even greater. Black abortions are the equivalent of 69.7% of the under-40 black population -- an unrecoverable loss.) In short, the demographic impact of the abortion phenomenon is in fact threatening the future of our nation in ways its proponents never envisioned. Indeed, it is driving a crisis for which there may be virtually no solution from legislators like you.

For our African-American population, the impact of abortion has been genocidal because of Planned Parenthood's historic marketing focus on minority populations. Although they make up just 13% of the total U.S. population, African-Americans account for 31.8% of all abortions. Altogether, blacks have had over 17 million abortions -- which happens to be 5 times the black population of New York State. One has to ask: how many future Colin Powells, Oprah Winfrey's and Charlie Rangel's has that cost us? This is a crushing loss of human resources in a presumably advanced society like ours.

It also has had a major impact on black political power. If those children had been born, there would be at least 20 more African-American Representatives in Congress than there are today even after making similar adjustments for whites and Hispanics.

If you pass this bill, this council may go down in history along with those who passed the Nuremberg laws that led to the second biggest holocaust in history.

Worldwide, this one is already the biggest. You should be working on ways to help women avoid abortion, not take bigger and bigger bites of this poisonous apple.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Howard, President
The Movement for a Better America

¹ Data sources include the U.S. Statistical Abstract, editions from 1978 through 2010. Abortion data is from the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a subsidiary of Planned Parenthood, as cited in the USSA. Marketing and economic calculations are my own, based on my marketing experience from 1960 through 1995 for various publications and for clients such as Waring, Toshiba, Cessna, Baker Industries, and AT&T, among others. Also: "World Population Aging 2009" which was issued in Dec. 2009 by the UN Population Division.