



Produced & Edited by Greater Toledo Right To Life

Friday Five

March 4, 2022

~1~



Ohio bill would require in-person exam before abortion pill.

Ohio Senator Steve Huffman Introduced the Chemical Abortion Safety Act, SB304. The bill was introduced to prevent the dangerous and deadly chemical abortion procedure from becoming unregulated. It will ensure that current Federal safeguards are incorporated into Ohio's law. In Ohio, chemical abortions are the number one method of abortion. Medical abortion, more commonly known as chemical abortion, are four times more often than surgical abortion to cause several severe side effects. According to the Charlotte Lozier Institute, emergency room visits from chemical abortions have jumped by 507% between 2002 to 2015.

Abortion pills and online consultations are far more profitable for abortion businesses than running surgical clinics, despite the increased risks for women's health. The Biden administration is ready to rescind current FDA safety regulations on abortion-inducing drugs. Absent these safety requirements, abortion mills will diagnose and prescribe to patients online, over the phone, in schools, and use the mail to send abortion pills to women seeking abortions.

Senator Huffman is quoted as saying. "That's why we need this bill, to put current federal safeguards into our state law. Otherwise, these extremely dangerous chemicals could become entirely unregulated. It is vital we update Ohio law to regulate chemical abortions and protect women's lives and health." The proliferation of chemical abortions requires that Ohio law be modernized to ensure that women receive appropriate medical care and not abandon them to hazardous and unsupervised at-home abortions.

Huffman's bill would also require:

- A state certification program for doctors and distributors of abortion-inducing drugs

- An in-person examination before a chemical abortion
- An ultrasound to rule out ectopic pregnancy
- Verification that gestational age is under ten weeks
- A check of medical history for potential adverse reaction to an abortion pill
- Testing to protect a woman's future fertility
- A follow-up examination to check for complications

[Guttmacher Fact Sheet HERE!](#)

~2~



Victory! Senate Vote Blocks Radical Abortion Expansion Bill.

Senate Republicans, with the help of Democrat Senator Joe Manchin, voted to defeat a Democrat bill that would overturn every pro-life law in America and legalize abortions up to birth.

Lawmakers voted 48-46 against cloture — against ending debate and allowing a vote on the the misnamed Women’s Health Protection Act. All Republicans voted pro-life against cloture on the radical pro-abortion bill and all Democrats voted pro-abortion for cloture, except for Manchin. Democrats Feinstein, Lujan and Warnock missed the vote but would have voted pro-abortion while Republicans Inhofe, Kennedy and Paul also missed vote but would have voted pro-life.

Democrat leaders and many mainstream news outlets portray the bill as an effort to simply “codify the right to an abortion” in the U.S. in response to the likelihood that the Supreme Court will overturn *Roe v. Wade* later this year.

The bill would:

- Eliminate all state and federal parental consent laws in relation to abortion
- Eliminate all state informed consent laws, including those that allow women to view an ultrasound prior to abortion
- Prevent states from passing laws to protect babies at 20 weeks, thereby joining countries like North Korea, China, Vietnam, Singapore, Canada, and the Netherlands in not protecting unborn children later in development
- Force doctors and nurses opposed to abortion to lose their jobs, and Catholic hospitals could lose public funds unless they perform abortions
- Eliminate decades-long limitations on direct taxpayer funding of abortion – including the popular Hyde Amendment, which has saved more than 2 million lives since enacted

In short, the legislation would overturn all federal and state pro-life laws and make it illegal for elected officials to even introduce pro-life legislation.

Pro-life leaders say the bill would go beyond even *Roe* by nullifying state laws that protect unborn babies from late-term and partial-birth abortions.

“This radical ‘Abortion Until Birth Act’ would block popular pro-life laws around

the country, including limits on late-term abortions when unborn babies feel pain, and effectively enshrine an unlimited abortion 'right' in federal law," said Susan B. Anthony List President Marjorie Dannenfelser. "Pro-abortion Democrats are desperate to stop the pro-life momentum demonstrated by pro-life laws advancing in state legislatures nationwide."

[Full LifeSite News Read HERE!](#)

~3~

Pro-aborts Sued Ohio to Stop Abortion Law That Could Close Clinics

COLUMBUS, Ohio (AP) — A lawsuit filed Friday seeks to block enforcement of a new Ohio abortion restriction signed in December that included additional licensing requirements that the ACLU and Planned Parenthood argue are unnecessarily onerous.

The action filed in Hamilton County Common Pleas Court asks the court to issue a temporary restraining order followed by a preliminary injunction preventing the Ohio Department of Health from enforcing the law before it goes into effect March 23.

The bill's stated goal was to impose criminal penalties on doctors who fail to give medical care in the extremely rare circumstance when a baby is born alive following an abortion attempt. However, provisions were added to the legislation that prevented abortion providers from contracting with backup physicians who teach at or contract with public medical schools.

The bill was sponsored by Republican state Sens. Terry Johnson, a retired doctor, and Steve Huffman, a practicing physician. Huffman has called the bill "another step in our continued commitment to uphold the sanctity of human life."

Ohio Right to Life, the state's oldest and largest anti-abortion group, calls the new law "anti-infanticide."

[Full Cleveland.com Article HERE!](#)

~4~



COVID vaccine mandates violate 'constitutional and bioethical principles,' scholars argue.

Nine highly credentialed academics issued a comprehensive [pre-print paper](#) documenting an array of significantly negative outcomes that result from experimental COVID-19 vaccine mandates, passports and discrimination policies based on vaccine

status.

“Restricting people’s access to work, education, public transport, and social life based on COVID-19 vaccination status impinges on human rights, promotes stigma and social polarization, and adversely affects health and well being.” The authors documented how “[i]ncomplete or misleading information by health authorities and the media” caused great confusion and distrust among the public.

In order to counter the natural distrust resulting from these policies, the authors stated that public health and political authorities adopted “*Stigma as a public health strategy*” by singling out the unvaccinated for “scapegoating, blaming, and condescending language using pejorative terms and actively promoting stigma and discrimination as tools to increase vaccination.”

In addressing the erosion of civil liberties, the scholars assert “COVID-19 vaccine policies represent a broad interference with the rights of unvaccinated people.”

In fact, “unvaccinated but previously infected people will generally be at substantially *less* risk of infection (and severe outcomes) than doubly vaccinated but infection-naïve individuals.”

Summarizing their conclusions, the authors warned that the “adoption of new vaccination status policies has provoked a multilayered global and local backlash, resistance and polarization that threaten to escalate if current policies continue.”

“Denying individuals education, livelihoods, medical care, or social life unless they get vaccinated does not appear to coincide with constitutional and bioethical principles, especially in liberal democracies,” they wrote.

It is therefore time “to regain a focus on non-coercive public health measures,” including data transparency, “media independence, and public debate and scrutiny about COVID-19 vaccine policies,” the authors concluded.

[LifeSite News Read HERE!](#)

~5~



Abortionist Celebrates Killing Unborn Baby at 37 Weeks: “I Do Any Abortion I Think Appropriate.”

In **an article**, in the Irish Independent, Dr. Susan Robinson, who does abortions in the third trimester, says that in the state of New Mexico (where she works) there are no restrictions on late term abortions.

She says:

“So there is nothing legal to stop me from doing any abortion that I think is appropriate.”

The article describes how Robinson uses ultrasound to date the ages of babies in the third trimester.

However, this is unreliable:

She gives an example where this happened:

“Robinson still recalls the shock she felt when she terminated the pregnancy of a fetus she thought was approximately 32 weeks. But when she saw the aborted body she realized that it was more like 37 weeks. She was devastated. “It was quite a moment,” she remembers”...

[Full Article by LifeNews HERE!](#)

