1 2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES JUDICIARY COMMITTEE	
3	In re: <u>House Bill 1658,</u> Reporting Anti-Abortion and Anti-Contraception Violence	
4	***	
5		
6	Stenographic report of hearing held in Room 140, Main Capitol, Harrisburg,	
7	Pennsylvania	
8		
9	Tuesday, May 27, 1992, 10:00 a.m.	
10	HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN	
11		
	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE	
12	Hon. Jeffrey Piccola	
13	Hon. Ruth C. Rudy	
	Hon. David Heckler	
14	Hon. Kevin Blaum	
15	Hon. Jerry Birmelin Hon. James Gerlach	
17	Hon. Robert D. Reber, Jr.	
16	Hon. Chris R. Wogan	
17		
	Also Present:	
18	Mary Woolley, Esquire, Republican Counsel	
19		
20	David Krantz, Executive Director, House Judiciary Committee	
21	Galina Milohov, Research Analyst	
22	Martin Durkin, Legal Intern	
23	Katherine Em Manucci, Secretary	
24		
25	Reported by: Emily R. Clark, RPR	

Cumberland Valley Reporting Associates (717) 258-4542 & 233-7901

1	INDEX	
2	Speakers	Page
3	Hon. Ruth C. Rudy, Prime Sponsor	3
4	Ms. Martha Tornblom	5
5	Escort, Hillcrest Women's Medical Center	
6	Ms. Annette Kolski-Andreaco Executive Director, Women's Health Services, Inc.	13
7		
8	Linda Wharton, Esquire Managing Attorney, Women's Law Project	22
9	Rev. Philip Beachey Concerned Citizen	37
10	* * * *	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I would like to start today's hearing on House Bill 1658. The prime sponsor of the bill, who is Representative Ruth Rudy, will co-chair the hearing with Chairman Piccola and myself. And I would like to see if she would like to make some opening comments and we'll start the testimony.

REPRESENTATIVE RUDY: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Caltagirone. I would like to make some opening comments.

First of all, I would like to thank the chairman and the members of the House Judiciary Committee for holding this hearing on my legislation dealing with clinical violence. I believe that after you have heard the testimony of the witnesses here today, you will agree that the incidents at clinics are more than just protests. They are actions which harm, embarrass and frighten those who are seeking services.

House Bill 1658 will provide abortion clinics the same legal protection that we now give to banks, schools, businesses, churches, state office buildings and other places where criminal violence is prohibited.

Under present circumstances, law enforcement has treated violence at these clinical facilities differently than at other places, very often treating the perpetuators with kid gloves by imposing small fines or by sentencing them to a night in jail. This is, indeed, unfortunate,

since often these protests take on insidious forms such as vandalism, death threats, bomb threats, and on occasion, arson and actual bombings of abortion clinics.

National attention has most recently been drawn to Buffalo, New York, and Wichita, Kansas, where the tactics of anti-choice demonstrators has often led to violent confrontations affecting patients, health care professionals and law enforcement personnel.

According to National Abortion Federation statistics, last year alone there were two incidents of arson at clinics in North Carolina and Florida; a shotgun was fired through a window in Little Rock, Arkansas; a clinic doctor was detained at a rest stop, and protestors chained themselves to a car in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. In Aurora, Illinois, a doctor's office was vandalized with damages estimated between \$175,000 and \$200,000. In Springfield, Missouri, a masked gunman entered a clinic, shot two people and then escaped unharmed.

The U.S. Constitution allows legitimate forms of protest. However, it also protects an individual's right to seek services at these facilities. Those seeking and providing services are law-abiding citizens and they should not be subjected to taunting, threats or violence.

No matter how you feel about the abortion issue, clinic violence should not be tolerated, because violence is

violence. Individuals have the right to freely enter a reproductive facility, just as we have the right to seek services at other medical facilities.

б

I respectfully urge the members of the House

Judiciary Committee to look at this bill and consider moving
the bill from the Committee so it can be considered by the
full House. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Representative Rudy.

Linda Wharton I understand is on her way here, so we'll skip over her and move next to Martin Tornblom? If there are other people that you would like to have sit at the table with you.

MS. TORNBLOM: Representative Rudy, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Martha Rich Tornblom. I'm known to my family and friends as Marty Tornblom.

I'm a mother and a grandmother. I'm a woman who has experienced combat as a volunteer while defending the right of women to obtain safe and legal abortions.

For over four years, I've been a volunteer escort at Hillcrest Women's Medical Center in Harrisburg. I'm one of dozens of men and women of diverse age, occupation and beliefs who have been trained to provide support to patients as they arrive at the clinic to have

abortions.

б

A need for this support was recognized following one of the first rescues, quote, by a large group of anti-choice demonstrators who attempted to prevent entry to the clinic in December of 1988. The Harrisburg city police arrested 79 that day, and they were transported in bus loads to Fort Indiantown Gap to be processed. The escorts and clinic staff speculated then what the ultimate cost to the city would be in terms of the number of police personnel, vehicles, overtime and court expenses.

Since that time, last December in Wichita, there were 2,600 arrested, and in Buffalo this summer, the cost of to the city was \$14,000 per day. Baton Rouge is next.

secured the services of a security guard. On the morning of March 18th, 1989, I had arrived at the rear parking lot of the Hillcrest Clinic to escort patients from the rear parking lot to the front entrance. The security guard was present and fewer than a dozen protestors were shouting and demonstrating in the alley adjoining the parking lot. All at once, the designated leader of that group walked on to the parking lot and attempted to engage me in conversation. Without warning, a crowd of men rushed to the rear door and attempted to gain entry. I somehow pushed through the throng and placed my body between them and the corridor

which led to the lab and procedure rooms. From behind me from the bullhorn held by their leader, came the command, "we must subdue that woman."

My memory of the next few moments is a blur. I recall flashing images of being thrown against the wall amid the rush of invaders trying to push through the door, of a staff person helping me pull the door closed, and another helping to restrain one of the four men who had gained access to the corridor.

I became aware of a progressive numbness in the fingers and thumb of my left hand. It was painful to rotate my wrist. The security guard who had been busily engaged outside the building, arrived with the police who took the four men into custody.

When I mentioned to an officer that I had been injured, he asked me to identify those who had pushed me. I was able to recognize two of them and I signed complaints against them.

I went outside and into the front door of the building. There I learned that two of the, quote, patients, whom I had escorted to the waiting room, were the ones who had rushed through the building and had opened the rear exit doors, allowing their friends access.

Seven invaders had entered the front door, sat on the floor and locked themselves together with Kryptonite

bike locks.

Another invader harassed and threatened patients by thrusting a camera into their faces, taking pictures and implying that such pictures would be made public.

When it was determined that the police had confiscated the camera and taken control of events, I helped to escort patients out of the waiting room to an upstairs area away from the pile of people who remained locked together.

The doctor examined my hand and suggested that I leave the clinic and be examined immediately at Harrisburg Hospital. Tests determined I had suffered no fractures. Sprains and bruises were evident. I received treatment and was released. I went home and called the clinic. It was then mid afternoon, and I was told that the police and fire department had been trying for a few hours to separate those who had locked themselves together. They had finally called upon special equipment, normally used to cut through heavy metal in the rescue of auto accident victims, and the equipment was damaged in the effort.

Several days passed before I began to experience flashback and sleep disturbances. My daily routine became affected. I sought counseling. I learned that in focusing on the responsibility that I had assumed for the safety of the patients and the security of the clinic, I had

suppressed all fear and anger that day, and I learned that my reactions were the same as those of a soldier who had been in combat.

Several months later, a hearing was held before a district justice to hear the cases against those who had been arrested. My assailants and the others were well represented by legal counsel. I observed the frustration of the arresting officers as one by one, cases were dismissed or fines of \$25 were imposed, and I was not called upon to testify.

The cost of several hundred dollars for the repair of the rescue equipment was divided among the seven on whom it was used. I have never been able to determine whether any of these fines or costs have actually been collected.

Since 1989, I have been attending numerous hearings in Dauphin County relating to acts of violence on clinics and attempts to prevent access to clinics. I have also followed cases where complaints were filed and then they evaporated into the system with no judicial resolution. There has been no mechanism for compiling the collective cost to individuals, the clinics, and most important, to the municipalities for dealing with such acts.

Many of the same names appear on list after list

of those arrested for similar crimes. Some boast of having been incarcerated in a dozen or more states. While most media reports focus on clinics where abortions are performed, facilities whose services are limited to reproductive health and contraceptive services are also targeted.

During the time that I was employed in the administrative office of Planned Parenthood of the Capital Region in Harrisburg, the police department assisted us in developing staff procedures in the event of explosion or invasion following threats that we had received by mail and telephone.

Abortions are not performed at Planned

Parenthood of the Capital Region. However, the

informational literature which we provide to our patients
was labeled pornographic by individuals who considered our
presence a threat to the quality of the community in which
we were establishing a new clinic.

The quote, nuisance, violations involving trespass and harassment may seem frivolous when addressed individually. The more serious cases of arson or criminal mischief may appear to be the isolated work of a few dangerous zealots from whom the public can be protected by existing laws. Only when every case comes into one report under a title which describes their truer nature, only when

the names of the violators and the collective costs are placed under one cover, can the issue of clinic violence be identified as a dangerous and very costly crime.

б

House Bill 1658 is a first step in getting statewide recognition to this crime to which recent events in Wichita and Buffalo have brought national attention. For the clinics, their staffs and patients, as well as for me, this hearing is providing the first opportunity to make our experiences part of the public record.

Should the Abortion Violence Prevention Act become law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we will see for the first time an effort to make consistent and accountable the recording and resolution of this specific crime.

I thank this Committee for the opportunity to tell my story. As those words, we must subdue that woman, reverberate beyond that corridor and that time and that event, we must keep in mind that clinic violence is not just an attack directed toward a building nor toward the patients and staff. Reproductive decisions are not made here. They're made in private, at home, at work, church, doctor's office, with the support of family, friends, loved ones, or alone. The clinic is the place where the decision is carried out. The right to make personal private reproductive decisions is, therefore, the true target of

1 these violent crimes. The women who must exercise that 2 right in an atmosphere of danger, harassment and threats of 3 public exposure are victims. So, too, is the public at 4 large, which ultimately pays the cost in tax dollars to 5 protect this right from senseless violent attacks. I thank 6 you. 7 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Questions? 8 I really do not have REPRESENTATIVE RUDY: Yes. 9 any questions but I just want to reiterate something that 10 you brought out in your statement, and that is, the 11 exorbitant costs in tax dollars that are paid for the 12 protection of these clinics, and this should not have to 13 I thank you for bringing that out in your statement, 14 because I think this is something that needs to be brought 15 out, and that is, the collective costs are never put down 16 into figures that anyone can read anywhere, and this is 17 something that I think is necessary for the people of this 18 Commonwealth to understand. Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any other 20 questions from members of staff? 21 (No audible response.) 22 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very much for 23 your testimony. 24 I understand that there was a major accident on 25 the turnpike and there is a possibility that the first

1 witness may not appear, but we certainly will accept the 2 written testimony when it will be presented to the Committee. 3 4 We'll next move to Barbara Thomas, Esquire, a 5 volunteer from the Northeast Women's Center. We'll see if 6 she shows up. 7 REPRESENTATIVE RUDY: She may be caught up in 8 the same fiasco. 9 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: The same traffic, yeah. 10 Annette Kolski? Annette Andreaco. Did I 11 pronounce it correctly? 12 MS. KOLSKI: No, not even close. It's Annette 13 Kolski-Andreaco. 14 Thank you for inviting me here today. 15 said, my name is Annette Kolski Andreaco, and I'm the 16 executive director of Women's Health Services in 17 Pittsburgh. 18 Founded in 1973, Women's Health Services is a 19 nonprofit corporation governed by a voluntary board of 20 directors. The services included comprehensive gynecology 21 and contraceptive care, counseling and public education. 22 Mr. Chairman, Representative Rudy and members of the Committee, violence at facilities that perform abortions 23 24 is an increasingly dangerous phenomenon. Since 1977, there

have been 961 incidents nationally reported to the National

25

Abortion Federation, a figure probably lower than the actual numbers.

б

In 1991, vandalism was the most common form of violence, 22 out of the 39 reported total incidents. There were three bombings, three arsons, three attempted bombings or arsons, four invasions, three assaults and battery, and one death threat.

Violence reached a fever pitch in Buffalo, New York, last month, and in Wichita, Kansas, last summer. In Pittsburgh, anti-choice terrorists have chained themselves to the doors of clinics and cars parked in front of clinics, made threatening phone calls to staff and harassed and followed patients and doctors.

Other types of harassment have included bomb threats, bombing entrances of facilities to prevent patients from entering and leaving, mass scheduling of no-show appointments, invasion of the facilities to destroy property, assault of patients and staff, refusal to leave the premises, jamming phone lines, death threats, tracing patient's vehicle license plate numbers and picketing of staff members.

Since the founding of Women's Health Services about 20 years ago, the patients and staff have experienced constant intimidation and harassment. In just the last year, a staff person resigned because she was accosted and

threatened by anti-abortion terrorists while shopping.

In 1989, anti-choice terrorists entered the clinic, poured tar throughout the hallways while patients were there, and chained themselves to the tar buckets. Not long afterwards, vandals destroyed property by pouring a noxious substance throughout the clinic.

These incidents have cost thousands of dollars in damage, but more importantly, they have resulted in emotional distress to patients who are exercising their rights under the law to seek medical service, after much soul searching and anguish for themselves and their families.

Women come to Women's Health Services for many reasons. Abortion services is only one. We provide all aspects of reproductive health care, a full range of gynecology services, mammography screening, psychological counseling and fertility counseling, and referrals for adoption and prenatal care. We employ some of the best physicians in Pittsburgh, and have trained about 120 residents in almost 20 years of the history of the agency. We also employ social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, nurses and nurse practitioners. We are a state licensed health care facility, and yet our patients and staff are continually subjected to violent acts.

The impact of abortion clinic violence is

considerable and can be disasterous for the patient. For example, every Saturday from 30 to 300 protestors may gather outside of our building. While some have peacefully marched, others accost anyone else entering the building, patient or not.

Patients have been grabbed, pushed, had
literature thrown at them and been called baby killer and
murderer. They have been intimidated getting out of their
cars in the parking garage across the street, to the point
that the garage managers have had to hire extra off-duty
police officers.

Invariably these same patients express the view to us that the decision to end an unwanted pregnancy is a painful choice, based on very personal individual circumstances that anti-choice protestors do not know and have no right to judge. Let me read to you from the words of these patients.

Immediately after crossing the street we were overrun by picketers. One was shouting at me in front of my face. Another was tugging at my arm, trying to pull me across the street. A man in a yellow T-shirt helped me get through. It didn't bother me that I had to pass them. It was the fact that they had harassed me and tried to pull me across the street. They tried to tell me that they knew what I was going through. They told me that I was stupid.

They put their hands on my daughter and physically stopped her, told her people have died upstairs and the doctors were being sued for malpractice.

I am upset enough about being here, through no fault of my own or my daughter's due to her rape. The added trauma and worry put on me by those people was unnecessary and very upsetting.

A female came running from almost a block away. She confronted each of us. She then displayed pictures of a fetus both before and after the abortion. We said nothing and continued into the building. She insisted on forcing the pictures upon us, even though we ignored her. As we were escorted into the building, she was stepping on our heels and yelling things like, I care, don't do this to your baby.

Freedom of speech is a major part of this country. However, ethical values and feelings of others must be considered.

I was personally stricken by this outrage, as were other members of my party. This is a final step to a much considered, much deliberated decision. How this woman could possibly think we didn't care or that we didn't know the consequences of the decision is beyond me. This harassment is an outrage. This is not the time or the place.

Two demonstrators tried to force me to take pamphlets by stuffing them in my pocket. Also, two women tried to physically prevent me from entering the clinic by pulling at my arm and obstructing my path. The two police officers were a help in controlling them. The experience is not a pleasant one to begin with, and you know that when you are arriving. Screaming protestors just added to the anxiety and unpleasantness.

We left the parking garage across from the building. Myself, my two daughters and a friend started to cross the street. A group of people wearing pro-life shirts came running at us, shoving pamphlets in our faces, saying don't do this, it's murder. They would not leave us alone and kept harassing us until we reached the police line in front of the building.

When they could no longer reach us physically, they shouted things like, don't kill your baby, this is murder. I experienced undescribable pain for my daughter, whose emotions were already so much in turmoil. I felt absolute rage against troublemakers who harass already troubled people.

When a woman is frightened by such protestors, she is more agitated during what is, after all, a surgical procedure. The quality of care is adversely affected if her fear or stress is increased because of legitimate concerns

about violence directed at her or the facility.

In 1986, Dr. Phillip G. Stubblefield testified before the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights on abortion clinic violence. At that time Dr. Stubblefield was the past president of the National Abortion Federation. He stated: In my opinion, the beliefs of protestors do not justify actions that jeopardize medical care. Our society would not tolerate protestors who would destroy blood samples at a Red Cross clinic because they do not believe in transfusions, or who would invade an operating room during heart surgery procedure because they oppose the concept of heart transplants.

Staff are also frightened by these violent tactics. Physicians of Women's Health Services have had their offices and houses picketed, their children have been harassed and threatened. This invasion of rights of doctors to practice what they believe and know to be a necessary medical procedure has been so intimidating that it is increasingly difficult in all parts of the country to obtain physicians to work in this field.

These actions are nothing short of crude vigilanteism. Why no one has yet died while undergoing a procedure as a result of clinic violence is just short of a miracle.

While freedom in the United States means the right to hold and express differing points of view, it stops short of denying others their constitutionally protected rights. In Pittsburgh, we have been fortunate that the police and the public prosecutor have, for the most part, seen it as their duty to enforce the law, regardless of their personal views on the question of abortion. The county courts have dealt firmly with perpetrators of violence against patients and staff.

This swift, sure approach has had the desired deterrent effect thus far. But the cost to the city to employ off-duty police officers to make mass arrests, detain hundreds of protestors and section off whole areas of the city should not have to be necessary, when so many other needs exist for public taxpayers' dollars in urban areas, as we well know.

While some may disagree that abortion is a moral choice, there are others and, indeed, as every poll shows, a majority in this country, who believe that decisions such as this one are a private, personal matter best left to a woman and her family to make in consultation with her physician.

I would like to close by reading to you the words of a young patient who wrote to one of our doctors recently.

Dear Doctor: I was in the clinic about a week

1 ago on the 28th. Although I've always been pro-choice, I 2 never really knew anything about abortion. It never 3 occurred to me how selfless a doctor in your position is. There are less financial rewards, respect from peers and 5 hate mail from protestors. Being harassed by protestors that morning made me realize how scary the situation is for 6 I am very grateful to you and feel that you have everyone. 8 saved my life, and I have a lot of respect for you, which has even increased since I learned that there is a shortage 9 10 of doctors willing to perform the procedure. I am so happy 11 to be alive and healthy. For some reason, I thought I was going to die. 12 13 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there questions from 14 any of the members or staff? (No audible response.) 15 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 17 We will accept testimony from any late comers or 18 anybody else that might prefer to submit it to the 19 Committee. 20 We did make an attempt, from what I understand from staff, to have counterpoint to what's taking place here 21 22 today, but let me just say this. I happen to be pro-life 23 and that's been my position. I've made no bones about it 24 over the years. But I think the incidents of violating a 25 wall and creating the turmoil that's been created in various

areas of this state and this nation, I think does not speak well of the people using the law for whatever purposes they feel they want to use the law for.

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The law is there. The tactics that have been utilized, I think everybody has a right to demonstrate peacefully. I think that is been historically noted in our changes that we've taken place politically and otherwise throughout the history of this country. I do think that violence on the part of anyone, any group, regardless of which side of an issue they may happen to be on, should not be tolerated, period. And I think the law is the law and everybody should obey it, because if we start to collect negative if areas of the law for whatever purposes they suit us, then we become nothing as a society. And I think people should really start to realize this in the situations that are confronting us in our society today. If anybody just wants to take the law into their own hands, what are we becoming as a society? What does that say for us? Regardless of the issue.

Are you ready?

MS. WHARTON: Good morning. I apologize for being late. There was a major traffic jam on the Pennsylvania turnpike this morning.

I'm very pleased to be here to testify on behalf of the Women's Law Project in support of the Abortion

Violence Prevention Act.

Violence against reproductive health care providers and women seeking abortions is a subject of profound importance to the lives, liberty and safety of women in Pennsylvania. This proposed legislation represents an important and effective step towards combating such violence and harassment in this Commonwealth.

I am the managing attorney of the Women's Law Project. My name is Linda Wharton. The Women's Law Project is a nonprofit public interest law center dedicated to advancing the legal and economic status of women and their families, through counseling, advocacy and litigation.

During the past 17 years, The Law Project has played a leading role in Pennsylvania and nationally in the struggle to defend the right of women to choose whether to terminate or continue a pregnancy. We believe that the right to reproductive freedom is central and fundamental component of a woman's right to equality in law and in society, and we include in that definition the right to make informed choices about reproduction, free of violence and coercion.

The Women's Law Project has brought legal challenges to the harassing and brutal tactics which many anti-abortion groups have been employing against women seeking reproductive health services and providers of such

services in the Philadelphia area.

Operation Rescue, a lawsuit filed in 1988 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. In November, 1990, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit upheld the permanent civil injunction in that case, that which prohibits blockading, harassment and trespassing at reproductive health care providers in the Philadelphia area. The Third Circuit held that such harassment and blockades violates a trespass law and state law prohibiting intentional interference with contract.

Like their counterparts across the nation,

Pennsylvania abortion providers and their patients have

experienced vicious violence and harassment by opponents of

abortion. Attacks on health clinics which provide abortion

as well as other reproductive health care services have

ranged from arson and bombs to harassment and assault of

clinic employees and patients.

Other specific tactics include invading clinics, blocking entrances, making threatening phone calls to clinic employees, videotaping and photographing patients as they attempt to enter the clinics, shoving patients and employees, flinging plastic fetuses and photographs of fetuses is the faces of patients trying to enter clinics,

and screaming abusive epithets at patients.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As you will no doubt hear from other witnesses today, reproductive health care providers in Pittsburgh have experienced serious act of criminal violence. In 1989, the Allegheny Reproductive Health Center in Pittsburgh was fire bombed. Although fortunately no individuals sustained personal injury, the facility itself sustained substantial damages, which cost approximately \$20,000 to repair. 1990, that same clinic suffered extensive roof and water damage resulting in repair costs in excess of \$50,000. Finally, in September of 1989, five opponents of abortion forced their way into the offices of Women's Health Services in Pittsburgh and dumped buckets of tar onto the main patient care area. Repair costs in that case were I believe in excess of \$27,000.

Currently, in Pennsylvania and elsewhere throughout the nation, however, the most common harassment tactic of opponents of abortion is the clinic blockade.

Large groups of demonstrators physically block the doors of abortion clinics. Women seeking abortion and other services are prevented from entering the clinic. Taunted and followed, staff are tracked inside or outside the facilities. They're verbally abused and they are sometimes physically assaulted.

Large blockades began in this state in July of

1988, when nearly 900 people were arrested in three days of demonstrations in Philadelphia. They continue to occur here in the Commonwealth and elsewhere throughout the nation.

Most recently, clinic blockades in Wichita and Buffalo, which were highly publicized and which I'm sure you've all heard about, resulted in thousands of arrests in those cities. Between 1991 and 1992, 24 blockades resulting in 829 arrests took place in Philadelphia.

Clinic blockades and other forms of anti-choice harassment are not simple, harmless expressions of opinion. To the contrary, this is criminal activity which seriously threatens women's health. For example, a woman seeking a first trimester abortion who is prevented from entering a clinic may be forced to delay her abortion and to undergo a second trimester abortion, which poses increased health risks to her. Other women may be blocked from receiving treatment in the middle of multi-day procedures, or they may be denied medically necessary reproductive health care totally unrelated to abortion.

As a result of harassment and violence, abortion providers experience higher security, insurance and legal costs. They are threatened with the loss of their leases and they face serious staff morale problems and staff turnover. The cost to the community that's targeted is also very, very high. In Wichita, clinic blockades produced more

than 27 arrests and they cost that city \$650,000 in police and court costs. In Philadelphia, the city has estimated that it spends \$10,000 to \$25,000 each time there is a blockade.

These blockades and other forms of harassment also pose a serious threat to the continued availability of safe, legal abortion. Nationwide, as a result of constant harassment, many physicians have given up performing abortions. In 83 percent of the counties in the United States, there are presently no abortion providers. In Pennsylvania, of 67 counties, 42 have no abortion provider, and an additional 12 counties provided only seven or fewer abortions during 1990.

There is little doubt that continued anti-choice violence will no doubt exacerbate the crisis of the dearth of abortion providers available to perform abortions safely.

In spite of the high cost of anti-choice harassment and violence and its plain illegality under existing Pennsylvania criminal laws, the sad reality is that in some municipalities in this Commonwealth, there has been a failure to enforce the existing criminal law zealously and effectively against anti-choice law breakers.

In Philadelphia, for example -- since my experience is specific to Philadelphia I will focus on

Philadelphia -- police policies have repeatedly enabled blockaders to keep clinics closed for several hours at a time while arrests are made. Police have failed to maintain access to clinics during the very slow arrest process.

The district attorney's office has failed to charge offenders with the highest criminal offenses possible, and they have failed to apprise sentencing judges of the defendant's repeat offender status, which would trigger stiffer penalties for those defendants who have done this time and time again.

On several occasions, municipal court judges in Philadelphia have allowed their personal views about abortion to influence sentencing decisions. One judge, for example, likened anti-choice protestors who were convicted of criminal trespass, to protestors at the Boston Tea Party, and imposed no fine or jail and only a \$25 court cost.

Among those defendants were defendants who had been convicted 10, 12, 15 times for the same offense, and on many occasions they walked away without even the \$25 court cost.

In over 1,000 prosecutions of anti-choice protestors which occurred in Philadelphia during the two-year period between 1988 and 1990, the maximum fine imposed was \$25 and no defendant received a jail sentence.

As a result of Philadelphia's lenient enforcement efforts, clinic blockaders are increasingly

choosing Philadelphia as the site for their activities, and are openly telling their members not to fear any punishment for arrests and to come to Philadelphia. It's become a haven for clinic blockaders.

More serious, more zealous and effective enforcement efforts in Philadelphia and other cities in this Commonwealth would decrease the level of violence and harassment. That has clearly been the experience in other states. Where high fines have been imposed, the blockaders have left and gone to other states.

I believe that this bill, House Bill 1658 will cause municipalities such as Philadelphia to improve law enforcement efforts by making those cities accountable to the Attorney General. In the event that local law enforcement efforts fail, the act provides an additional avenue for enforcement by giving the Attorney General's Office concurrent prosecutorial and investigatory jurisdiction with the local district attorney.

Finally, I believe that this legislation will also provide the citizens of this Commonwealth with valuable information about the actions taken by their city to prevent and combat anti-abortion violence and harassment.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I would be happy to take any questions.

REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: You mentioned the

prevalence of blockades to clinics, and I'm wondering, will this bill allow easier access to people that wish to enter the clinics? Or do we need to have a stronger statement within the bill to make it so people can enter and leave the clinics more readily?

MS. WHARTON: I think a stronger statement would be helpful, but I think that this bill would no doubt cause lots of improvement, because it would make the police department, for example, in Philadelphia, accountable. It would have to make a specific report about what they were doing, and I think they would be quite embarrassed to report what they're doing now, and I think that their reaction to these situations would change if they were accountable to the Attorney General.

REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: If this bill becomes law, we'll be keeping records on the offenders also that have been arrested and we'll be able to identify multiple offenders? Is there a way that we should grade multiple offenders, like we do with our current sentencing guidelines? Or do you have any recommendations along that line?

MS. WHARTON: I think it would be very helpful if we could somehow figure out who the multiple offenders are. In Philadelphia, no one presently is keeping track of that, including the District Attorney's office. If somehow

1 the state could keep track of that and set up a system where 2 individual communities were informed that a given protestor 3 had performed this activity elsewhere, that would be very 4 helpful, because under the law it should trigger a higher 5 sentence. The problem is that information is not being given to sentencing judges. б REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: You also mentioned that 7 8 Philadelphia is becoming a haven for clinic blockaders, in 9 that there was intrinsically the idea that there are out-of-state protestors being brought in and that they are 10 11 instigating blockades all over the United States. 12 Would this track them if we were able to find 13 out people that were being activists in blockades around the 14 United States? Would that be --15 MS. WHARTON: Yes, I believe there would be a possibility of tracking them as well. The list, the arrest 16 17 list would include their names as well. 18 REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Chairman Piccola? 19 20 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Thank you, Mr. 21 Chairman. 22 Mrs. Wharton, thank you for your testimony. 23 As I read House Bill 1658, it is largely a 24 reporting requirement bill, requiring certain reporting by 25 municipalities, but I guess the key feature from your point

of view, and you did get to it finally in your last page of testimony, is the proposal to give concurrent jurisdiction in the investigation and the prosecution of criminal charges to the Attorney General.

Now, I don't know how familiar you are with the history of the Commonwealth Attorneys Act, but the General Assembly has been very reluctant over the years, since we adopted that statute, to go any further than we already have in providing concurrent jurisdiction to the Attorney General, because of the potential for overlapping jurisdiction confusion.

Right now we have a bit of that problem in our drug law enforcement activities, and the chairman and I are probably more intimately familiar with some of those, and I won't bore you with the details, but my question I guess is, and to some extent I guess you answered it on your last page, but from my perspective it's really not satisfactory, because I'm curious on how you think giving concurrent jurisdiction to the Attorney General is going to somehow improve local law enforcement in this area? I have doubts about that, but perhaps you could shed some light on why you think that's case.

MS. WHARTON: I see it as a back rub. If once the individual municipalities make their reports, and there's some feeling on the part of the Attorney General's

1 Office that there have not been zealous enforcement efforts, it gives the Attorney General's Office the power the step in 2 3 and do something. So it's another level of protection for 4 the citizens of the Commonwealth. That's how I see it. 5 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Do you think the Attorney General, the Attorney General's Office has the б manpower or the person power to do what is suggested that 7 8 they might want to do under the provision of this bill? MS. WHARTON: Frankly, I don't know that for 9 10 certain. I would hope, though, that given the seriousness 11 of this problem, the fact that it's very serious criminal activity, that it would be made a priority by the Attorney 12 13 General's Office. REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: You also alluded to 14 15 Philadelphia's lenient enforcement efforts. Are you 16 suggesting that there is a conscious policy by the 17 Philadelphia police department or somebody in Philadelphia 18 hierarchy to not prosecute or to be lax in prosecution of 19 certain criminal activity? 20 MS. WHARTON: No, I don't mean to suggest that. 21 I just think that this matter has not been, enforcing these 22 laws zealously has not been made a priority in Philadelphia, 23 as it has been in other states. 24 I don't mean to suggest, I don't know if there's 25 a conscious choice. I mean, that's a possibility, but I

don't know that for sure. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: What makes you think if 3 that is the case, that simply Philadelphia has not made it a priority, what makes you think or gives you reason to 4 believe that the Attorney General, if given concurrent 5 jurisdiction, would make it a priority? 6 7 MS. WHARTON: Because the legislature of this state has, by passing this legislation, will have directed 8 9 the Attorney General's Office to make it a priority, and will have set a tone, and I would hope that the Attorney 10 11 General's Office would follow that mandate. Presently that 12 mandate is not there in the law. 13 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: I don't read anything in the bill that says the Attorney General would have to 14 make it a priority. I think it simply gives you an area of 15 16 concurrent jurisdiction which he in his prosecutorial 17 discretion could choose to exercise or not exercise. MS. WHARTON: That's correct, it's not there 18 19 expressly. But I think implicit in the passage of this bill 20 is a statement by the legislature or recognition that this 21 is a very serious problem, and it needs to be dealt with 22 seriously and effectively. 23 REPRESENTATIVE PICCOLA: Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Any other questions?

25

Representative Heckler?

REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

Really, I suppose what I have is more on the order of an observation than a question. Having been involved with the criminal justice system in a county which had adequate resources in terms of jail cells and prosecutors and police, I'm struck by the fact that all of those who participate in the system, from police through district justices, prosecutors and Common Pleas judges, are so accustomed to dealing with people they clearly identify as criminals, people who are willing to do violence to others, people who are willing to steal from others, that when they encounter someone they perceive as at least more or less a regular citizen, they tend to view them in a different way.

That's one bit of sociology that I would suggest to you. Unless you are dealing with individuals who have actually committed acts of violence or directly committed acts of vandalism, I suspect that you'll have a lot of judges, whatever their views, pro-choice or otherwise, may simply not view these people -- they're viewing them as part of a continuum of thousands of people I used to generically refer to as dirtballs when I was a prosecutor, and these folks in that context are going to look pretty good.

Number two, I'm wondering whether you have had

much dialogue with, for instance, the District Attorney's office in Philadelphia, simply because burglars, minor drug dealers are being turned loose almost immediately upon arrest in Philadelphia simply because there is a terrible lack of jail cells. I'm wondering if the difficulties you encounter in Philadelphia may not in part be a symptom of the criminal justice system that has almost ground to a halt, is almost incapable of dealing with murderers.

Do you have any comment on that?

MS. WHARTON: Well, first of all, there has been dialogue with the police department and the District Attorney's office and we've seen over the years some improvement, though I think the situation is still not very good.

I agree with you, I think the overcrowding in the prisons is an issue here. But that doesn't explain the failure to impose fines. You know, for the most part that's what I've asked for, that the maximum fine for a summary offense, which is \$300, be imposed, and that just is not happening.

The other, it's really a suggestion, we've seen in the events in recent weeks in this country the tremendous power of visual image to involve people in what's happening. I wonder if you folks have thought about as part of your anti-terrorism activities, videotaping the conduct

1	of people in the vicinity of your clinic? Again, while it
2	sounds pretty dry if you're sitting in the courtroom to say
3	someone spoke or whether it was shouting or speaking, that
4	they waved things, seeing this conduct on videotape might
5	just bring home to some of the judges who would consider
6	these cases, the nature of this conduct and its actual
7	impact on the victims subpoena.
8	MS. WHARTON: I think that's a good suggestion.
9	We have done that on occasion.
10	REPRESENTATIVE HECKLER: Thank you. That's all
11	I have, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No other questions?
13	(No audible response.)
14	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very much for
15	your testimony.
16	MS. WHARTON: You're welcome. Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is there anybody else
18	that would care to testify that's here today? If you would
19	just state your name and who you represent.
20	MR. BEACHEY: My name is Philip Beachey,
21	B-e-a-c-h-e-y. I'm a pastor and I live in Perry County.
22	I am a rescuer, and I'm very familiar with
23	Philadelphia and also Pittsburgh and also Harrisburg. And
24	I'm not sure quite what to say other than that this is an
25	issue of our times and no matter what the Supreme Court

does, it is not going to go away.

For us who are considered pro-life and are very much activist in it, we look at -- there are violent acts that happen. We would not condone the violent acts, but I think that when we're on trial in Philadelphia and other places and they do bring in the videocameras, the police regularly take video pictures of what we do, when you see our action and the actions of others that are there, you would be struck and you would also see a contrast in what happens. Most of the people there are prayerful, most of the people there are singing. Obviously when we put our bodies between there in one sense that is trespass.

I would argue that if we break the law, and do what's wrong, there's a law on the book. Why count us out, separate us out as something specific or particular? Deal with us as the legal system should and we're willing to take what may happen.

It is true they impose fines. It's often true with people who rescue that they are willing to go to jail if they have to. Presently there are a number of pro-lifers who are right now in jail. We look at that as a small price to be paid.

The issue, again, is a matter, from our perspective, of life, and we would argue from our activities, depending on which side you are, how you portray

it, that as the result of it today some people are alive, and we argue that that is worthwhile.

Violence does take place. It takes place every day in our country today. This week in Harrisburg, over a hundred abortions will be performed. We argue that's violent. Who is to judge what's most violent? I'm not sure. But we made our judgment and accordingly we do that. We do act.

So I have a copy of the Constitution, and the first preamble it mentions about our right, inherent right to defend life, and from our perspective we're looking at that as defending life.

We are not violent people. We at times get very emotional. There is violence at times that happens, but we by nature are not violent people. I think most people are very religious, and it's looked at as an act of obedience in what we're doing.

So I listened with interest. I would argue that if crime is committed, deal with us according to the criminal system. But to specially pick us out, I noticed in statistics that were used nationwide, I'm wondering when the last violence was that took place in our state.

I noticed also, on the statistics that were given, violence, picketing, is that violent? We do have a first amendment and the right to speak. And I think that

there may be a dampening effect on some of the things that one is trying to do.

So we have a wonderful Constitution. It protects life and liberty for all pro-life and pro-choice.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Reverend, I think you would agree that anybody has the right to demonstrate, I think that's a given, peaceably, so as not to encroach on somebody else's rights. Anybody that violates the law and with violence, of course, that's perpetrated in these instances, on either side, I personally feel should not be tolerated, and that violence begets violence. And what happens, you have an escalating situation which does not speak to the issue. It's not going to be resolved on the streets.

I think cooler heads have got to prevail as far as how these situations can be escalated, because all of it combined just creates tremendous problems for everybody that's involved, tremendous costs on our already overburdened judicial system, and that the taxpayers of this state and of the counties and the cities where these actions take place, start to create a tremendous burden on the system that we've all paid for.

Some people may say that's a small price to pay, but I think the point is well taken that in most of our counties, the jail time, the pro-life people realize this,

are so overcrowded, that for minor offenses most judges will not put people in jail simply because there's no room in those jails for those offenders.

I think a previous speaker had indicated that if people are willing to violate the law, then they should be fined accordingly, at least that at the maximum level if they continue to be repeat offenders.

MR. BEACHEY: And I would mention just from the pro-life point of view, I'm very familiar with certain situations in the neighborhood of Philadelphia, and some of us who were found guilty ended up spending five days in jail, some 10 days, some 15 days in jail. You can argue cost effective? What's most effective? Most pro-lifers are willing to pay the price for what they're doing.

We see an analogy to what took place back in the '60s, although some would argue that that's not fair, but civil disobedience, we would add biblical obedience is part of what happens. And I would argue that the issue is not going to be resolved legislatively. It will, in fact, be resolved in the streets.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, if that would be the case, then we might as well just throw that Constitution out and our laws right out the window.

MR. BEACHEY: I didn't say --

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: It wouldn't be worth the

1 paper that it would be written on. 2 MR. BEACHEY: I didn't say violently. 3 The street is where you take your views. 4 have a right, according to the Constitution, to demonstrate, 5 to remonstrate, to picket, to do all these things. 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Peacefully under the law. 7 MR. BEACHEY: That's right. And it's in this 8 way that the issue's going to be, in my mind, resolved. I 9 may be wrong on that. But violence is, I'm very much active 10 in what happens, and these people who are involved are very nonviolent. 11 12 Now, sometimes we speak, sometimes we argue, and 13 one can arque back and forth, but there is no hitting, 14 there's no slugging. I've been in situations where people 15 come at you, and it can be rather intimidating. 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: If in the cases which 17 evidently occurred in the Pittsburgh clinic, where buckets of tar were poured over the floor, you feel that that was 18 19 going a little bit too far? 20 MR. BEACHEY: I will not condemn it, although I 21 will mention to you there the reason why the people did it, 22 and I do know personally the people who did it, was to get, 23 gain time. So they had their feet in the buckets in order 24 that it might take the police a longer time to remove them.

The police came in, didn't like what they were doing and

25

went to remove them, the tar went over.

So was it wise? Was it not? You can't remove move. I'm not going to condemn it, because I would argue that there was reason for what they're doing. It may not have been the best reason.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You don't think it would be appropriate if somebody took buckets of tar into your church and poured or stood in the buckets in your church, knowing full well that that tar was going to get all over the floor of the church? Do you think that would be appropriate?

MR. BEACHEY: The tar got all over the building by them being yanked over, but not by them standing there.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I understand.

MR. BEACHEY: No. I would argue that's not necessarily the place to go, but I would argue also that in church, the people aren't being destroyed, either. There's a reason why they're where they are. It's not the church or the legislature or some local place down the road, it's because something there's happening there that the people go there.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'm not arguing the merits of the issue. The argument that I have is whether or not people's property and safety should be safeguarded, regardless of whatever position people are going to be on in

1 | this issue.

MR. BEACHEY: See, we can't resolve that, from my perspective, because there's property and there's life.

Up on the fourth floor where the Supreme Court and Superior Court meet, behind their wall is the 10 commandments. A lot of beatitudes. They list the scale of law and the top is divine law and it goes all the way down to natural law and all that. But it basically says that that law which is contrary to God's law is not basically, it loses its force or it impact. And whether a commonwealth or a country condones an act which some people believe is inherently morally wrong, you have that conflict. How it's going to work out, I do not know.

The people on the one side think I'm real bad; I think they're very bad morally. How we're going to resolve it I don't know. 70 percent of the people in the middle, they don't care and they wish that we would go away. But we aren't going to go away and they're not going to go away, either. It's not an easy problem.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I know, and the point that I'm making is especially with what we're here for today with the legislation is to provide some sanity into what's taking place so that people's property and persons are not being encroached upon, because I don't think it's right that people tread on other people's rights to prove their point,

and the Constitution safeguards all our rights.

MR. BEACHEY: But now you're making a law that specifically designates or calls attention to a specific group. One could wonder if that's equal justice or that is our crime of trespass worse than some other person's crime of trespass?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I think the incidents and what's going on is what's concerning a lot of people, and whether or not the laws are, in fact, being enforced, number one, at the local level, and number two, whether or not people's rights are also being violated.

We are a country of law. That's what we're all about with this body here. That's what we stand for.

That's what we're in these positions to look at, the law, and whether or not, to see whether or not this law needs to be expanded, broadened, defined or whatever.

MR. BEACHEY: And as long as Roe v. Wade is the law of the land, you will have people who are engaged in their view civil disobedience and so that that will have to be dealt with. They believe that morally. They believe it as a --

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Reverend, that's where I think many of us differ on the aspects of how we express ourselves, and whether or not that form of expression starts to encroach on somebody else's rights, especially by some of

the violent behavior that's taking place. Does it make it right? And your point of view is, and you know, some people will say whatever it takes. But I don't personally agree with that.

MR. BEACHEY: No, I'll say again just for the record, that violence, the hitting, the hurting, the harming, the violence, the bombing, the arson, is to be condemned. That's not the way to go. It's not right for pro-lifers, it's not right for others. Those incidents happen at times.

But to block an entrance to a building and call that violence, you may wish to equate the two. Other people wouldn't share your judgment on that, and we would see a difference.

To be praying and singing in front of the door, in our minds is not violent. And if you want then to take special records and get the Attorney General and others and classify these as real bad criminals, you may, but that won't solve the issue.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I think protest, peaceful protests without blocking entranceways to any kind of a building, period. They can block the entrance to this building, they could block the entrance to your home or your church. Denying somebody entrance to whatever facility or whatever building I think is a form of harassment, I think

it's obstruction of a person's, whatever their point of view may be. Whether they agree or disagree with your personal philosophy or my personal philosophy, is not the case here.

I think marching around in a peaceful protest or sitting on the pavement praying has nothing to do with blocking an entranceway to a facility, whether it happens to be an abortion clinic a church or a governmental building or whatever. And that was dealt with during the '60s as I can recall, also.

MR. BEACHEY: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interfere.

The main point, and I don't know that it can be resolved, is that from the pro-life viewpoint, and I'm speaking personally, it's not so much a matter for philosophy, it's a deeply held thing where you have to put in practice what you hold, and that's our view of the violence, using our terms of what takes place there, causes us to do that.

So we trespass and do other things that are portrayed as violent in order to stop a greater violence from happening, to save life. Now, is that justified? Is that reasonable? That's the issue. And even among pro-lifers there's a big difference of opinion as far as what should happen. There's not a consensus on what should happen.

1	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Reverend.
2	MR. BEACHEY: Thank you very much.
3	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is there any other
4	testimony to be given today? I know that we're lacking one
5	additional party, Linda Wharton, but we'll accept
6	REPRESENTATIVE RUDY: Linda was here. It was
7	Barbara Thomas.
8	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Barbara Thomas, that's
9	right. We will accept her testimony, and we'll now conclude
10	the hearing. The hearing is now adjourned. Thank you.
11	REPRESENTATIVE RUDY: Thank you.
12	(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at
13	11:26 a.m.)
14	* * * *
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 {	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	I hereby certify that the proceedings and
2	evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes
3	taken by me on the within proceedings, and that this copy is
4	a correct transcript of the same.
5	d
6	amely Clark
7	Emīly Clark, CP, CM Registered Professional Reporter
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
	The foregoing certification does not apply to any reporduction of the same by any means unless under the
17	direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.
18	reporter.
19	CUMBERLAND VALLEY REPORTING ASSOCIATES P.O. Box 696
20	Carlisle, Pennsuylvania 17013
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	