



Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life

www.mccl.org

August 2005

Dear Candidate,

Since 1972, Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life has sent a questionnaire involving various life issues to candidates for public office. Our questionnaire is a valuable public service that provides a source of accurate information on the candidates' positions on these issues. Our purpose is to help inform citizens so that they can participate in the democratic process with factual information, rather than depending on hearsay and rumor.

We have provided a brief explanation of each question. If you have further questions, please feel free to call our office and leave your name. One of our lobbyists will return your call and discuss the question with you.

Question #1: Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe that abortion should be legal?

MCCL believes that unborn children should be protected by law, and that abortion should be permitted only when it is the only way to prevent the death of the mother.

Question #2: Do you oppose the use of government funding for abortion other than to prevent the death of the mother, when the pregnancy is the result of forcible rape (reported to law enforcement agencies within two days), or when the pregnancy of a minor is the result of incest (with the perpetrator reported to law enforcement agencies)?

In 1977, and again in 1980, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the use of public funds for abortion was not constitutionally required. Subsequent national and state polls have shown that a substantial majority of citizens opposes abortion funding. MCCL supports efforts to restrict government abortion funding.

During the 1978 session, MCCL supported legislation to restrict the use of state funds for abortion in Minnesota. This legislation passed and was signed into law. In 1993, a New York-based abortion advocacy group filed a lawsuit challenging Minnesota's law against taxpayer funding of abortion on demand. In a sweeping decision that goes far beyond *Roe v. Wade*, the decision that legalized abortion in the United States, the Minnesota Supreme Court ignored many Minnesotans' strong opposition to abortion and ruled December 15, 1995, that our state constitution includes a new "right" to abortion, and that Minnesotans must support, with tax dollars, abortion on demand for women receiving state assistance. This decision is *Doe v. Gomez*.

In Minnesota, elective abortions have been funded with taxpayer dollars as a result of MinnesotaCare legislation passed by the state legislature on May 22, 1995.

Question #3: Do you oppose the use of public funds and facilities to train medical personnel to perform abortions?

A recent emphasis of abortion advocates has been to try to increase the number of abortionists through increased training, mandating more abortion providers as part of health reform, allowing non-physicians to perform abortions, etc. Each of these suggestions involves government action and government funding.

In 1994, Hennepin County Commissioners voted to use the Hennepin County Medical Center to train abortionists, despite overwhelming opposition expressed by county residents. Many residents, including those who are not pro-life, objected to their tax dollars being used to train doctors to do abortions when other life-saving medical needs remain unmet.

Question #4: Do you support requiring notification of parents before a minor is given an abortion?

The Parental Notification law was passed by the Minnesota Legislature in 1981 and upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1990. The law requires that an abortion may not be performed on a minor unless parents are given 48 hours notice or the minor receives permission from a court for the abortion (judicial bypass).

Question #5: Do you oppose giving government funds, including "family planning" funds, to agencies that promote, provide, refer or publicly advocate for abortions?

The abortion industry has actively sought government funds from a wide variety of sources. By diversifying their government funding sources, the industry has been able to give the appearance of being more "acceptable" in the community and also has been provided the opportunity to promote their agenda to different groups of people. We believe that abortion industry policies and practices must remain separate and distinct from other programs, and that local, state or federal funding should exclude agencies that make abortion part of their programs and agencies that publicly advocate for abortion.

Abortion-promoting organizations, including Planned Parenthood, have become extremely aggressive in seeking out new government sources to fund their agendas. Sources of funding sought by abortion advocates include programs addressing family planning, teen pregnancy prevention and at-risk and homeless youth, among others.

Question #6: Do you oppose the establishment and funding of school-based health clinic programs?

School-based health clinics have been established in most St. Paul and Minneapolis schools. These clinics are established ostensibly as general health care facilities, but their primary purpose is to deal with "reproductive health care." Some clinics offer abortion counseling (pregnancy testing and informing a pregnant teenage girl that she has a right to an abortion, in most circumstances without parental consent) and direct abortion referrals (sending the pregnant teenage girl to an abortion facility).

In other clinics that do not provide direct abortion referrals, the staff will arrange indirect abortion referrals. They send pregnant teenage girls to an agency outside the school, such as the local Planned Parenthood office, which provides abortion counseling and referral. Studies by school-based clinic proponents reveal that these clinics do not decrease the pregnancy rate. It has proven virtually impossible to prevent indirect abortion referrals from these clinics.

MCCL opposes these clinics because of the inevitability of abortion counseling and referrals in these clinics and the lack of effective parental involvement.

Question #7: Do you oppose government-funded testing and marketing of post-implantation abortifacients, such as the RU-486 drugs, for abortion in Minnesota?

RU-486 (also known as Mifepristone or Mifeprex) is not a contraceptive but an abortifacient. It is designed to produce an early abortion by blocking action of the hormone progesterone, which is needed for the developing baby to stay implanted in the lining of the uterus. RU-486 is not a single drug, but a two-step chemical abortion technique to kill unborn babies whose mothers are five to seven weeks pregnant. RU-486 can cause complications for women using it, ranging from pain, bleeding, nausea and fevers to failed abortions, hemorrhaging, transfusions, surgical intervention and even death.

In September 2000, RU-486 was approved in the United States. However, its approval was rushed through under a procedure generally used to provide treatment for dying patients. Other drug combinations are also being tested for use as chemical abortifacients.

Question #8: Do you support preventing government employees from performing, referring or counseling for abortions, other than those necessary to prevent the death of the mother?

MCCL supports legislation modeled on the Missouri statute considered in the *Webster* Supreme Court case. This legislation is aimed at getting local units of government out of the abortion business. If local units of government allow their employees to counsel and refer for abortions, then the government is encouraging abortion and contributing to the practice, which inevitably gives it government approval. Those who call themselves "pro-choice"

often claim they are not forcing anyone who does not believe in abortion to have one or to participate in one. But if public employees, whose salaries and offices are paid for with tax dollars, counsel and refer for abortion, then the many citizens and taxpayers who abhor abortion are forced to support it. They are robbed of their choice to disassociate themselves from abortion.

Question #9: Do you oppose rationing of life-saving medical treatment as a means of cost control?

Minnesota has set up a health care restructuring effort, which will inevitably result—and is already resulting—in rationing life-preserving health care. Current law includes cost-containing mechanisms, a skewed market that has forced fee-for-service insurance out of the state, and the ability for insurers to deny treatment based on the patient's perceived "quality of life."

The "quality of life" debate is really a debate about values: whose lives are worth preserving? Whose lives are not? Minnesota law bases "cost-effective health care" on "quality of life" measures such as ability to function and return to work. This definition means that older people and people with disabilities are in danger of being denied life-preserving health care simply because an insurance review agent doesn't think the patient's life is worth saving.

Minnesota's law contains severe limits on the growth of health care spending, both public and private. There is a great deal of pressure placed on health plans and providers to stay within these limits, including constant government oversight and the stigma of publishing the names of those who exceed the growth limits. Minnesota's growth limits will force health plans and providers to deny treatment based on the "quality of life" ethic pervasive in Minnesota law.

The pro-life movement has always opposed euthanasia as well as abortion and infanticide. We regard the rationing of life-saving medical treatment as a form of involuntary euthanasia. An October 1993 Wirthlin poll found that 70% of Americans agree that we should not "ration lifesaving medical treatment for people in poor health with a poor quality of life in order to contain health care costs."

Question #10: Do you defend the First Amendment rights of issue-oriented groups to organize and use Political Action Committees (PACs) to engage in issue advocacy, and to conduct "independent expenditure" campaigns that support or oppose candidates for office, and do you oppose devices such as government-mandated "compensation" that would chill or curb political free speech by citizens or citizen groups?

The courts have consistently supported the right of citizens to organize through political action committees (PACs) as an exercise of freedom of expression under the First Amendment. Since few pro-lifers can afford to make large personal contributions to candidates, pro-life citizens have banded together through MCCL's PACs to support the election of pro-life candidates. The courts have ruled that such PACs have rights protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

In its landmark 1976 *Buckley v. Valeo* ruling and in more recent cases, the Supreme Court has ruled that the First Amendment protects the right of citizen groups to comment freely on the positions of politicians on various issues (called issue advocacy), regardless of proximity to elections, without government-imposed rationing or restrictions, and without disclosing the names of citizens who donate funds to support such commentary. The Supreme Court has held that this immunity from government regulation extends to "voter guides," television and radio ads, "scorecards" of votes, and any other commentary on specific politicians, except communications containing "express advocacy." MCCL is strongly opposed to any legislation that would infringe on the right of groups to disseminate printed or broadcast issue advocacy communications that comment on candidates' positions and voting records, including any restrictions on the timing, amount or funding sources for such speech, or any requirement that the names of their donors be reported to the government.

Question # 11: Do you oppose Instant Runoff Voting?

Instant run-off voting would allow voters to rank candidates when they go to vote, rather than simply voting for their top choice. If implemented, this would represent a significant change in voting methods in our state and could result in major changes in election outcomes. MCCL believes strongly in the principle of "one man one vote." Instant runoff elections would dilute a persons vote and would essentially pro-rate it by the number of persons they support in such a run off. MCCL believes that voting is a privilege and that it should be taken very seriously. We believe citizens can — and do — look at all aspects of voting for candidates before casting their votes. Instant run-off voting is also very confusing to voters. Some citizens may become so frustrated with alterations to the election process that they give up and don't vote at all. For these reasons, MCCL opposes instant run-off voting.

Thank you for your response. If you have any questions, please contact our office and one of our lobbyists will return your call.

Sincerely,



Leo LaLonde
MCCL President

MCCL 2005 Local Candidate Questionnaire

Please complete and return this form to our office by August 17, 2005. If you have any questions, please contact our office at 612-825-6831 and one of our lobbyists will return your call.

1. Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe that abortion should be legal?
 In no case
 Only to prevent the death of the mother (the MCCL position)
 To prevent the death of the mother, and in cases of incest (with the perpetrator reported to law enforcement agencies), and in cases of forcible rape (reported to law enforcement authorities within two days).
 Other: _____
- Yes No 2. Do you oppose the use of government funding for abortion other than to prevent the death of the mother, when the pregnancy is the result of forcible rape (reported to law enforcement agencies within two days), or when the pregnancy of a minor is the result of incest (with the perpetrator reported to law enforcement agencies)?
- Yes No 3. Do you oppose the use of public funds and facilities to train medical personnel to perform abortions?
- Yes No 4. Do you support requiring notification of parents before a minor is given an abortion?
- Yes No 5. Do you oppose giving government funds, including "family planning" funds, to agencies that promote, provide, refer or publicly advocate for abortions?
- Yes No 6. Do you oppose the establishment and funding of school-based health clinic programs?
- Yes No 7. Do you oppose government-funded testing and marketing of post-implantation abortifacients, such as the RU-486 drugs, for abortion in Minnesota?
- Yes No 8. Do you support preventing government employees from performing, referring or counseling for abortions, other than those necessary to prevent the death of the mother?
- Yes No 9. Do you oppose rationing of life-saving medical treatment as a means of cost control?
- Yes No 10. Do you defend the First Amendment rights of issue-oriented groups to organize and use Political Action Committees (PACs) to engage in issue advocacy, and to conduct "independent expenditure" campaigns that support or oppose candidates for office, and do you oppose devices such as government-mandated "compensation" that would chill or curb political free speech by citizens or citizen groups?
- Yes No 11. Do you oppose Instant Runoff Voting?

Please print or type name _____

Political Party _____

Candidate for (office and district or county) _____

Name of campaign committee and address _____

Phone numbers _____

Signature of Candidate _____

Date _____

Please return completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope or FAX to MCCL at 612-825-5527.
 Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life o 4249 Nicollet Avenue o Minneapolis, MN 55409
 612-825-6831 o email: MCCL@mccl.org o www.mccl.org