

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

August 2009

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On July 11, 2009, we received a message from a twenty-six-year-old woman from Savannah, TN. She had just seen our abortion video and photos and said: "I didn't realize how this was really done. How dare any woman kill a baby like that?" We frequently receive notes from people who had no idea how evil abortion actually was but this email was especially remarkable in that the writer added: "A mom used this site to help a[nother] mom wanting an abortion and emailed it to me [through Yahoo.Answers.com]." We are educating mothers and equipping others to educate mothers. But educating voters may be even more important, as America deals with the great evils hidden in the ObamaCare legislation currently working its way through Congress.

Americans don't want to pay for mandatory health insurance which defines baby-killing as "essential care." They are turning against "end-of-life" counseling which is more coercive than consultative. It is becoming increasingly clear that this horrifying plan is designed to reduce the numbers of preborn children who can ruin their parents' careers and the numbers of elderly parents who can spoil their children's retirements.

But who knew? The Associated Press ("Government insurance would allow coverage for abortion," August 5, 2009) reports that "Since abortion is a legal procedure, experts on both sides say not mentioning it would allow health care plans in the new insurance exchange to provide unrestricted coverage." The article adds that "Abortion opponents are seeking a prohibition against using any federal subsidies to pay for abortions or for any costs of any health plan that offers abortion. Such a proposal was voted down by the House Energy Committee"

The *Los Angeles Times*, July 28, 2009, ran a story headlined "Abortion may further stall health reform," in which our evasive president was exposed for trying to change the subject and stifle debate. When asked about abortion and health care reform, the *LA Times* quoted him as telling CBS News, "I think that it's appropriate for us to figure out how to just deliver on the cost savings [changing the subject] and not get distracted by the abortion debate [ending the discussion]." Naturally, he doesn't want to "debate" abortion. Our "transparent" president only wants to ram it down our throats before anyone has had time to read the bills which mandate abortion coverage for every American woman, paid for with every American's tax dollars and every American's insurance premium. But Mr. Obama's front-man keeps trying to dodge the issue: "When asked about abortion prohibitions in the bill, White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said last week that 'a benefit package is better left to experts in the medical field to determine how best and what procedures to cover.'"

Who are those "experts"? ApNewsMyWay.com ("Government insurance would allow coverage for abortion," August 5, 2009) reports that "As the House and Senate bills stand now, the decision to offer abortion coverage in the public plan would be made by the Health and Human Services (HHS) secretary." That "secretary" happens to be Kathleen Sebelius, who began her tenure at HHS by forcing pro-life health care professionals to provide, against their will, drugs and devices which kill human embryos. As governor of Kansas, she vetoed attempts to limit access to late-term abortion. She also took hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from the infamous late-term abortionist George Tiller, for whom, among

others, she hosted a reception in the capital. Does anyone doubt that this unelected pro-abortion bureaucrat was nominated and confirmed to ensure that abortion will be ordered into the “basic benefits” package, whether voters like it or not?

As the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) noted in April of this year, the *Chicago Tribune* carried a story on July 18, 2007 headlined “Democrats Pledge Support for Wide Access to Abortion.” It reported that “Asked about his proposal for expanded access to health insurance, Obama said it would cover ‘reproductive-health services.’ Contacted afterward, an Obama spokesman said that included abortions.”

HumanEvents.com pointed out on July 1, 2009 (“Abortion by Any Other Name is in the Health Care Bill”) that Hillary Clinton, speaking for the Obama Administration before Congress in April, said, “We happen to think that family planning is an important part of women’s health and reproductive health includes access to abortion”

Euro-style health care advocates, of course, dishonestly deny that federal money will be used to pay for abortions. “‘It’s a sham,’ said Douglas Johnson, legislative director for NRLC. ‘It’s a bookkeeping scheme. The plan pays for abortion and the government subsidizes the plan.’” The AP article (“Government insurance would allow ...”) reports that “Abortion opponents say [ideally] private plans in the insurance exchange could be allowed to cover abortion, but only if it is offered under a separate, supplemental policy that individuals would have to buy on their own.”

How radically would socialized medicine expand abortion access? National Right to Life (July 20, 2009) says the president of Planned Parenthood told National Public Radio that “her organization saw the legislation as a ‘platform’ to extend ‘access’ to abortion to ‘all women.’”

But there is also the incessant euthanasia “rumor” which Mr. Obama can’t seem to kill. On August 9, 2009, the StarTribune.com (“Obama confronts fears on health care”) quoted the president, in his Saturday radio address, as “...dispelling the outlandish rumors that reform will promote euthanasia ... or bring about a government takeover of health care. That’s simply not true”

Really? Won’t “promote euthanasia”? On that same day, *The Washington Post’s* Charles Lane published a sharp editorial rebuttal: He says “... Section 1233 of the health care bill ... would pay doctors to give Medicare patients end-of-life counseling every five years – or sooner if the patient gets a terminal diagnosis.” Adding that this provision “is not totally innocuous,” he is concerned that the bill “... addresses compassionate goals in disconcerting proximity to fiscal ones.” Of greater concern, he asks, “If it’s all about obviating suffering, emotional or physical, what’s it doing in a measure to ‘bend the curve’ on health care costs?” He also observes that the section “lets doctors initiate the chat and gives them an incentive – money – to do so. Indeed, that’s an incentive to insist.” He concedes that “Patients may refuse without penalty, but many will bow to white-coated authority. Once they’re in the meeting, the bill does permit ‘formulation’ of a plug-pulling order right then and there.” He is skeptical of the claim that the bill won’t “place senior citizens in situations where they feel pressured to sign end-of-life directives that they would not otherwise sign.”

He is most troubled, however, by the fact that the legislation “dictates, at some length, the *content* of the consultation. The doctor ‘shall’ discuss ‘advanced care planning, including key questions and ... suggested people to talk to.’” This leads to a requirement that “The doctor ‘shall’ explain that Medicare pays for hospice care (hint, hint).” He ends by asking: “What are the ‘key questions’? Who belongs on ‘a list’ of helpful ‘resources’? The Roman Catholic Church? Jack Kevorkian?” His conclusion is that you don’t have to be a “right-wing whacko” to question this alarming initiative.

The *New York Post*, July 23, 2009, published a story headlined “Trying to talk around the facts,” which said: “The president insisted in his press conference last night that ‘the bill I sign must also slow the growth of health care costs in the long run.’” That means rationing, concerning which Charles Krauthammer says (“Obama: The grand strategy,” RealClearPolitics.com, April 24, 2009) “... a single-payer system, is fiscally unsustainable without rationing.” As far back as July 17, 1996, *Christian Century* published a cover story titled “Saying what we mean: The redefining of euthanasia – managed care and rationing.” The article quoted bioethicist Margaret Pabst, who asserted that “... society is ‘coming to use the term euthanasia not just for pain-sparing deaths but for resource-conserving deaths as well.’” The story adds “She argues that justice requires ‘the practice of euthanasia’ as resource-saving denial of treatment ‘in certain kinds of scarcity situations.’”

Investor’s Business Daily, at ibdeditorials.com, July 31, 2009, “How House Bill Runs Over Grandma,” reports that “At a town hall meeting at AARP headquarters in Washington, D.C., President Obama was asked by a woman from North Carolina if it was true ‘that everyone that’s Medicare age will be visited and told they have to decide how they wish to die.’” After making a lame joke, he said that “... the idea was to encourage the use of living wills ...” and that his critics were misrepresenting the bill’s end-of-life provisions. The article adds, “He did not say, ‘No, they wouldn’t be contacted.’”

Yet on August 10, 2009, *USA Today’s* “Faith and Reason” column denounced, as “unethical politics,” Sarah Palin’s expression of concern that ObamaCare would mean “death panels,” deciding whose lives are worthy of curative care. The writer condemned her remarks as “hyperbolic ... rhetoric” and “unsubstantiated and preposterous” allegations and “a wild distortion” Those charges might have resonated more convincingly had ABCNews.go.com not run a story on August 6, 2009 headlined “Death Drugs Cause Uproar in Oregon.” The article describes a decision by the state-run Oregon Health Plan, which refused to pay for a woman’s \$4000 per month cancer medicine, but instead, offered her a \$50 prescription for assisted suicide drugs. Of the cancer medicine, Dr. Jeanene Smith, administrator for the Office of Oregon’s Health Policy and Research staff, said, “We need evidence to say it is a good use of taxpayers’ dollars.”

Incredibly, Mr. Obama denies that he is pushing for a single-payer system. On June 15, 2009, the *Chicago Tribune* (archives.chicagotribune.com) reported a story headlined “Obama tells AMA health care costs are a ‘ticking time bomb’” in which the president was quoted as saying, “What are not legitimate concerns are those claiming a public option is a Trojan horse for a single-payer system” But as Deroy Murdock reported at RealClearPolitics.com (“Government Medicine Should Horrify Americans,” August 7, 2009) Mr. Obama told the AFL-CIO in 2003, “I happen to be a proponent of single-payer, universal health care coverage That’s what I’d like to see.” The story also notes that when Mr. Obama addressed the Service Employees International Union health care forum on March 24, 2007, he said, “I don’t think we’re going to be able to eliminate employer coverage immediately. There’s going to be potentially some transition process. I can envision [single payer] a decade out or 15 years out or 20 years out.”

Then on June 29, 2009, *The Wall Street Journal* reported (“Obama’s Health Future”) a conversation Mr. Obama had at an ABC televised town hall meeting. He was speaking with the daughter of a 105-year-old woman who had initially been denied a pacemaker five years ago but successfully fought the denial and the device succeeded in giving her five more years of life. The daughter asked Mr. Obama if his plan would consider the “spirit” of a patient in making funding decisions for treatment and the president pointedly refused to say “yes.” In a mildly scolding tone, he lectured that “...at least we can let doctors know and your mom know that, you know what? Maybe this isn’t going to help. Maybe you’re better off not having the surgery, but asking for the painkiller.”

The Democrat National Committee claims that if we do nothing about health care, insurance premiums will rise faster than paychecks, insurance companies will dictate treatment, insurance company profits will soar as they deny coverage, and insurance companies will require copayments and out-of-pocket expenses which will become increasingly unaffordable. But suggesting that our only alternatives are to do ObamaCare, or

to do nothing, is to pose a false dilemma. The real solution has been proposed by real leaders like Governors Tim Pawlenty (R-MN) and Bobby Jindal (R-LA).

They say ban junk lawsuits. The Democrats won't do that because they are in the pay of the trial lawyers, but every doctor's medical malpractice insurance premiums get driven up by ridiculous jury awards and settlements and those costs get passed straight through to patients. Worse yet, Charles Krauthammer, RealClearPolitics.com, August 7, 2009, in an article titled "Health Care Reform: A Better Plan," says that a "Massachusetts Medical Society study found that five out of six doctors admitted they order tests, procedures and referrals, amounting to about 25% of the total – solely as protection from lawsuits."

Our Republican governors also propose prohibitions against insurance exclusions based on pre-existing conditions, requiring portability of health insurance for people changing jobs, electronic prescriptions and records, paying doctors based on performance instead of the numbers of procedures they perform, tax-code revisions which would enable people to economically purchase insurance as individuals, and increasing competition by allowing the marketing of health insurance coverage across state lines. These reforms would improve every aspect of health care, without the government taking control of every aspect of your life. But that is exactly why Mr. Obama and his left-wing allies oppose reform which empowers patients instead of politicians.

The Democrats tried and failed to speed this monstrosity through Congress before voters or even members of Congress knew what was in the bill(s). Their next ploy could be to force it through the Senate (where there is more opposition than in the House) by abusing the budget reconciliation process, which was never intended to be used for the enactment of sweeping changes such as health care "reform." Making a mockery of any claimed commitment to bipartisanship, their goal is to achieve passage by a mere 50 vote majority, instead of the 60 votes required to avoid a filibuster. John McCormack, posting at blogged.com, August 3, 2009, in an article titled "Schumer Preparing for Nuclear Option to Ram Through Health-Care Bill," predicts that "It won't work" because "The problem with breaking the rules" is that "Nearly all Senate business requires unanimous consent to proceed." Then he drops the bombshell: "If Democrats try to invoke reconciliation and then override the parliamentarian ... the GOP will quickly and easily close down the chamber." Pray God that he is right. But whether he is or not, CBR will continue to show the American people that abortion and euthanasia are fights worth fighting.

Lord bless,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregg Cunningham', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Gregg Cunningham
Executive Director

P.S. On July 24, 2009, we received a note from a thirteen-year-old girl who was from TN. After looking at our abortion imagery, she concluded that "Abortion is killing a blessing that has come." Girls at this age are almost always so innocent and tender-hearted that once they have seen the truth about abortion, they are vaccinated for life against the lies with which their teachers will try to confuse them. We thank God for your help, which enables us to reach them before they make a terrible mistake.