CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

----X

November 18, 2008 Start: 10:00 am Recess: 02:48 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

HELEN SEARS Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Speaker Christine C. Quinn

Charles Barron Letitia James

Melissa Mark-Viverito

James S. Oddo Jessica S. Lappin Daniel R. Garodnick

Diana Reyna

Domenic M. Recchia Jr.

Mathieu Eugene Michael C. Nelson

David Yassky

APPEARANCES

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

John C. Liu

APPEARANCES

Karen Agnifilo
General Counsel
Office of Criminal Justice Coordinator

Chelsea Chaffee Legislative Counsel Office of Criminal Justice Coordinator

Merle Hoffman Founder/President Choices Women's Medical Center

Kimberly Walker Ambulatory Surgery Center of Brooklyn

David Friedman Gynecologist Private Practice

Rebecca Simons, MD Family Physician Institute for Family Health

Representative Dr. Emily's Women's Health Center

Kelli Conlin President NARAL Pro-Choice New York

Sharon Lau Director of Clinic Defense & Research National Abortion Federation

Celine Mizrahi Legislative Counsel Center for Reproductive Rights

Sonia Ossorio President National Organization for Women

Msgr. Philip Reilly Director Helpers of God's Precious Infant

Steven McDonald Officer 110th Precinct

Florence Maloney Lead Facilitator Rachel's Helpers

Mary Duvall Volunteer Helpers of God's Precious Infant

Ami Sanghvi Staff Attorney Reproductive Rights Project of the NYCLU

Joan Malin
President/CEO
Planned Parenthood of NYC

Anne Robinson Vice President Planned Parenthood of NYC

Jo Southern Brooklyn Pro-Choice Network

Chris Slattery
Founder/President
Expectant Mother Care

Karisma Simmons Expectant Mother

Julia Sierra Mother

Kaneisha Grant Expectant Mother

Helen Rosenthal National Board Member NARAL

Philip Kim Volunteer Planned Parenthood

Carrie James Volunteer Planned Parenthood

April Gay Expectant Mother

Anaza Robertson Expectant Mother

Cassandra Legari Mother

Brian Strong Intern EMC Crisis Pregnancy Center

Janice Pemberton
Pro-Choice Activist

Fred Trabulsi
Executive Director
The Life Center of New York

Julie Bale Sidewalk Counselor

Carrie Ryan Doula Sidewalk Counselor

Barbara Meara Chair New York State Right to Life Committee

Claire Gallagher Volunteer EMC Pregnancy Centers

James DiSilva Agnus Dei Council Knights of Columbus

John Early Pro-Life Activist

Michael Reddy Member Helpers of God's Precious Infants

Neil Sullivan Sidewalk Counselor

Mary Green Sidewalk Counselor

Art Lovely Concerned Citizen

Christopher A. Ferrara Attorney

John Cain Concerned Citizen

Luis Menchaca Citizen

Robert Maurice Maresca Citizen

Donald Young
Pro-Life Activist

Charles Wright Resident Manhattan

Donald Rosenberg Chairman National Traditionalist Caucus

Sean Degidon Pro-Life/Pro-Family Director National Traditionalist Caucus

Nona Aguilar Citizen

Gerald Maglio Heath Care Administrator

Agnes Hu Citizen

Ann Gilmartin
Pro-Life Clinic Counselors

Rocco Carlucci Citizen

2	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Good morning
3	everyone and thank you for being here. My name is
4	Helen Sears. This morning I'm chairing the joint
5	committee, the Civil Rights Committee and the
6	Women's Issues Committee. We're holding this
7	hearing this morning with my colleagues in the
8	Civil Rights Committee and in the Women's Issues
9	Committee on Intro. 826, a Local Law that
10	strengthens the prohibition of activities that
11	prevent access to reproductive health care
12	facilities. The right to access reproductive
13	health service is an important personal right
14	recognized by the city and protected by both state
15	and federal law. In 1994, the City Council acted
16	to protect this right by amending the Human Rights
17	Law to prohibit interference with a person's
18	access to reproductive health care services and to
19	ensure that those harmed by such conduct could
20	seek redress in the courts. Despite this measure,
21	evidence shows that reproductive health care
22	facilities, although no longer bombarded as they
23	were in the early 90s, still experience
24	substantial protest activity. Some facilities

report that their entrances have been blocked by

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

protestors and that patients, staff and others are regularly harassed and intimidated. The current city law requires prosecutors to show a defendant's intent to prevent an individual from obtaining or providing reproductive health care services. All of these arrests and prosecutions require a complainant. The difficulty of establishing intent and obtaining a complainant that will testify to such private matters impedes the prosecution of offenders. If enacted, Intro. 826, would strengthen the protections afforded to those seeking and providing reproductive health services by eliminating the need for intent to make an arrest or to prosecute. Additionally, protestors interfering with the operation of a clinic do not violate the current law unless they physically damage the facility. Intro. 826 would allow the clinic to complain if protestors willfully interfere with its operation. Arrests could also be made based solely on the observation of a police officer if a protestor is knowingly obstructing or blocking the premises of the clinic. Please understand that the Council recognizes the First Amendment right to peacefully

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

protest and express one's views. The proposed legislation does not infringe upon the rights of protestors to peaceably organize, pray, or voice their opinions. This legislation, and I emphasize this, does not promote abortion. We're not here today saying we're for abortion or we're not for abortion. It's not our function in government and it's not the function of the two joint committees. I'm sure that everyone here is happy to know that the number of abortions in our country has been declining for many years. We hope that the numbers will continue to drop. This legislation is targeted to address the safety and welfare of women invoking their right to reproductive care, the staff of clinics who provide such care and bystanders that enter or find themselves near a reproductive clinic. Before we move on to our first speaker, I want to thank the staff for putting all this together. I have Rachel Cordero, who is counsel to the committee. I'm going to introduce my colleagues. To my right, Jimmy Oddo from Staten Island and Jessica Lappin from Manhattan. The Speaker has joined us. You sneaked in I think. Our Speaker Christine Quinn

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to my left; Charles Barron from Brooklyn and Dan Garodnick from Manhattan. I think we had Diana Reyna. She's in and out, but she'll be back if she's not there. I'm going to ask the Speaker if she would like to have a few words before we call upon our first speaker. Thank you.

SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you very much, Chairperson Sears. Helen, thank you very much for chairing this join committee. Chairperson Seabrook gives his regrets. He had a family emergency he had to take care of and was not able to be with us today. Thank you very much for stepping in, Helen. Good morning and thank you everyone for coming to what I believe is a very important public hearing this morning. As the first female Speaker of the New York City Council, I'm very proud and happy to be here today to discuss a critical women's health issue. Before we begin, I'd like to take a second to recognize some key individuals and organization for their help in facilitating today's hearing on this important piece of legislation. Thank you, as I said to the chair of the Women's Committee, Helen Sears, and to the chair of our Civil Rights

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Committee, Larry Seabrook. I also want to thank all of my colleagues for being here today, but in particular I want to thank Council Members Jessica Lappin and David Yassky for their leadership on this issue. I also want to thank our extraordinary partners in our goal to protect and improve women's reproductive health care: Pro Choice New York, in particular their president Kelli Conlin; Planned Parenthood New York City, in particular their president Joan Malin; and also Anne Robinson, Planned Parenthood's vice president for clinical services. I also want to thank the New York Civil Liberties Union for their advice and guidance to make sure we did everything appropriately within the confines of the First Amendment. I want to also thank Dr. Emily's Women Health Center, the Center for Reproductive Rights, the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, the National Abortion Federation, the Brooklyn Ambulatory Surgery Center, the Phipps Family Practice and Choices Women's Medical Center for coming here today. Last, but certainly not least, I'd like to give a huge thanks to my staff who have worked tirelessly on this legislation.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you with the biggest thanks to our Women's Issue outreach coordinator Danielle Castaldi-Micca, deputy legislative director Alex Pustilnik, Health Committee counsel Adira Siman, Civil Rights Committee counsel Julene Beckford, Sarah Brannen, Damien Butvick, Joan Povolny, and Rachel Cordero for all of their work. The reason all of this work has been done and the reason we're here today is because of what has been brought to our attention. Many of us would like to think the days of women being harassed on their way to reproductive and women's health clinics is over. That that type of harassment has stopped. very clearly brought to our attention, in particular by the very courageous and wonderful staff at Dr. Emily's Clinic that that is not over. Sadly, on many days in different neighborhoods in our city, women throughout our five boroughs are vulnerable to harassment, intimidation and coercion when they're trying to access legal reproductive health care in their city. Harassing and intimidating a woman as they enter and exit a reproductive health clinic is a clear violation of both a woman's right to access care and that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

clinic's right to provide services in our city. Ι want everyone in this room to take a minute and think about how difficult the decision to end a pregnancy must be. You've made this difficult decision. Then imagine you're walking up to a health care clinic and protestors begin to surround and follow you. We know this is happening in our city. They're shoving graphic and bias flies into your hands and they're forcing explicit pictures into your face. They're violating your personal space, they're screaming at you, they're yelling the word murderer in your face and making it difficult for you to enter the clinic or the building where the clinic is. As I said, in 2008, we'd love to think that this was something of the past, a history lesson I just shared with all of us. But that's not true. matter what side you stand on as it relates to this issue, I know all of us believe as New Yorkers that we cannot allow this type of intolerant behavior to go on in our city. why we're here today, to discuss the clinic access bill, a critical piece of legislation that I believe will give our city's women the respect and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dignity they deserve when they're seeking legally assured reproductive health care. Through the implementation of this clinic access bill, health clinic staff can have protestors arrested who willfully interfere with a clinic's operation. Think of it. There is a clinic access law on the books in our city. It's average. This is New We're not going to settle for average and York. we want the best protections we can provide for That's what this bill will do. Think of it. Right now there is no law on the book that allows a clinic provider to call the police and have an arrest made when clinic operations are being prevented. Additionally, this clinic access bill will allow police to arrest protestors they see blocking clinic entrances and exits as well as parking lots and driveways. That last provision is critically important in the boroughs outside of Manhattan. But think of it, what other type of building or service would we allow people to block the entrance and exits and now allow police to arrest them if they were so interfering with someone's ability to conduct their business or do their work. We wouldn't allow it and we shouldn't

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

allow it at women's health care clinics. Chairperson Sears said, this is not a measure to obstruct or outlaw peaceful and respectful methods of protest. We've worked hard to make sure that this bill allows that to continue and isn't a constraint on the First Amendment. obviously, we fully support and respect people's ability to utilize their First Amendment rights and we are going to continue to protect that right. But we are not going to allow women to be harassed and have coercive behavior go on in our city and prevent their ability to access legal reproductive health care. Our city is the most diverse city in the world. It's one that's based on the concepts of tolerance and respect. for ideas, respect for individual choices, and respect for people's ability to have their own physical in which they can conduct their lives. No one has the right to infringe on somebody's personal space, their individual right to make choices and no on has the right to stand in someone's way, literally or figuratively, and prevent them from getting the reproductive health care they and their family have decided they need.

This bill today will make sure that when a woman
walks down a street in any of our boroughs, there
might be people somewhere demonstrating
appropriately, but there will be no one who
prevents her or her nurse or her doctor or her
health care provider from going in and out of the
building where they need to go to provide legally
allowed reproductive health care in our five
boroughs. I want to again thank everyone who has
worked long and hard on this piece of legislation
to make sure that the clinic access law of the
City of New York is as strong and appropriate as
it should be. Thank you, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you,

Madame Speaker. We're joined by Domenic Recchia

from Brooklyn, Michael Nelson from Brooklyn and I

believe Letitia James from Brooklyn. Thank you

for being here. Council Member Lappin?

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Thank you,
Madame Chair and thank you, Madame Speaker. I'm
so proud to be a member of this body today. This
is a very important piece of legislation to me. I
cherish my First Amendment rights. As an American
I feel very strongly about my First Amendment

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I stand on street corners handing out fliers more than most. As a woman and a mother, I cherish my health care. I have a right, just like every other woman in this city, to access safe and legal health care and to make choices about my health. I have been a clinic escort. I took the training from Planned Parenthood a few years ago and I spent a Saturday morning volunteering outside of the Bleecker Street Clinic. yelled at, screamed at and my photo was taken as a way to try to intimidate me for being there as a volunteer. There were protestors with signs and yelling and screaming at the patients at the clinic who were both women and men. Just the fact that we need to have volunteers standing outside of clinics to be a welcoming presence is a statement in and of itself. To have volunteers to make the patients feel comfortable and welcome and have somebody that they can reach out to as they're walking into the clinic while they're being yelled at and while they're being protested I think is a very strong statement. experience showed me firsthand that there needs to be a safe buffer zone for patients accessing these

clinics. I just wanted to make an important point. Not every woman entering a health care clinic is having an abortion. They may be going there for their annual checkup. They may be going there for contraception. There may be men going there for contraception. They're going there for their basic health care, because for a woman reproductive health care is basic health care.

Every person entering a health care clinic in New York City has a right to do that and to do it free of harassment.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. I'm going to call our first panel. It's Karen Agnifilo, she's the general counsel to the Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator. With here is Chelsea Chaffee. She's the legislative counsel to the Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator. Thank you for being here.

KAREN AGNIFILO: Good morning,

Speaker Quinn, Chairperson Sears and members of
the City Council. My name is Karen Agnifilo. I
am general counsel to John Feinblatt, who is Mayor
Bloomberg's Criminal Justice Coordinator. I am
happy to be testifying here on behalf of the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

administration today. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard. I'm testifying today on behalf of the administration to discuss Intro. 826, a bill that we support. This bill balances the rights of New Yorkers to access reproductive health care services with the constitutional rights of individuals to peaceably protest and express their views. This bill would clarify an existing law and facilitate its enforcement. Currently it is a misdemeanor under Local Law to engage in three types of conduct. First, the current law prohibits physically preventing another person from entering or exiting a reproductive health care facility or otherwise obstructing the premises in which the facility is located, such as by blocking a doorway. Second, the existing law prohibits following or harassing another person or engaging in course of conduct that places another person in reasonable fear of physical harm, such as making verbal threats or physical violence. Third, the current law prohibits physically damaging a reproductive health care facility so as to significantly interrupt its operation. This could include

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tampering with locks on facility doors or setting off the fire alarm or sprinkler system. guilty of a misdemeanor under the current law for committing any of these acts, a person must have acted with the intent to prevent another person from obtaining or providing reproductive health care services or counseling. This means that law enforcement has the burden of proving two separate elements. First that the person committed the prescribed acts and second, that they did so with the specific intention of preventing someone from receiving services. Intro. 826 strengthens this current law in several important ways. First, the bill amends the existing intent requirement. this means is that law enforcement will now only have to prove one element, that the person committed the prescribed acts. It will no longer have to prove that they intended to prevent someone from receiving reproductive health care services or counseling. This change will help facilitate enforcement of this law, both for police officers who are called to the scene and the assistant district attorneys who will ultimately prosecute these cases. As you pointed

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

yourself, it will no longer require in many instances that a client has to come forward and share the sensitive information and go through the criminal justice process, something that not everyone would like to go through. Intro. 826 enhances the already existing protection against disorderly conduct or harassment within a 15-foot zone around the entrance or exit of a reproductive health care facility. In this zone, a person cannot follow and harass another person, or engage in a course of conduct that places another person in reasonable fear of physical harm. Individuals will be permitted to peaceably exercise their First Amendment rights inside of this zone by holding signs, passing out literature and attempting to speak to individuals entering these facilities. However, conduct that constitutes harassment within this zone will not be tolerated and will be penalized. Defining a delineated zone will further enable police officers to effectively enforce this law. Additionally, whereas under existing law, a person must have caused physical damage to a reproductive health care facility so as to significantly disrupt its operation to be

guilty of the misdemeanor, Intro. 826 allows for
enforcement when someone has merely willfully
interfered with the facility's operation without
having to demonstrate that its operation was
significantly disrupted or that physical damage
was caused. We believe that this bill strikes the
appropriate balance between protecting
reproductive health care facilities and the rights
of their clients, while at the same time ensuring
that others may peaceably and freely exercise
their First Amendment rights. Thank you for the
opportunity to speak today. I'll be happy to take
your questions.
CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I think we'll

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I think we'll hear from Chelsea Chaffee first.

CHELSEA CHAFFEE: I don't have prepared testimony.

Or two questions and then I'll turn it over to my colleagues if they do. Before I do, I think that my colleague Dan Garodnick wishes to make a statement. What would be an example of an intent requirement?

KAREN AGNIFILO: An intent

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2 requirement?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Under the current law. And then what we do under the new law.

KAREN AGNIFILO: Under the current you require two things. It has to require both the intention to do something whereas it could be blocking an entrance or doing something to the facility or to the client. But it also requires the second element, which is to try and affect the rights of the reproductive services. So it's the two different elements. This new law removes that second element and only requires the first action. In other words, a police officer could see something and could bring an action and testify that they saw this harassment or I saw this conduct without having to prove that the intention was also to try and prevent the services of the reproductive care facility.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: What does it mean to significantly disrupt the operation of a reproductive health care facility?

KAREN AGNIFILO: Again, that would be a case by case basis, but that would be a much

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Barron.

higher burden to prove. A court would have to examine what would significantly disrupt its operation. For example, we could see a court saying, well tampering with the locks might not have significantly disrupted the operation because you were still able to get in and operate. Whereas, here you're actually interfering with the operation by doing that. We think that would be a much more enforceable law, given the types of things you could see. Or someone tripping a fire alarm or something that, doing something to the facility in order to interrupt its operations, as opposed to significantly disrupt. You could see a judge saying that would require maybe being putting out of business for a day or two or something like that. So this way law enforcement could more easily enforce the conduct that would occur to these premises. CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I have some more, but I'll return later. We have the Speaker that has a question, Dan Garodnick and Charles

So we'll yield to the Speaker first.

Thank you.

SPEAKER QUINN:

one quick question. I want to thank you and Mr.

Feinblatt and your staff for your help and guidance when we were drafting this legislation as well as the folks at the NYPD. I think this is fairly clear from your testimony, but just to be clear on the record. You, on behalf of the administration, believe this law is a good one, is necessary and something that will help the City of New York do a better job protecting women as they're trying to health care and clinics throughout the city as well as protect staff and make sure people have the ability to go to and from work and to get the health care that they need.

this legislation. It certainly helps clarify the existing law. In the situations where law enforcement and prosecution is necessary, this absolutely helps the situations.

SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you very much. Thank you, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. Dan Garodnick has a question. We have several questions from our colleagues. So I'll ask you to get to the point and keep it brief. Thank you.

2.0

2.3

2	COUNCII	MEMBER	GARODNICK:	Thank

you, Madame Chair. I, too, can be very brief. I am a co-sponsor of this legislation and very proud to be part of it. I just wanted to explore just the converse of something that you said. The intent requirement is there today. So you need intent plus one of those specific acts. So if somebody physically prevents entry today, and you don't know whether there is or is not intent, that would not be a misdemeanor under the law today.

12 Is that right?

13 KAREN AGNIFILO: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And if somebody followed or harassed a person of physically damaged a facility so as to significantly interrupt its operation without knowing what one's purpose was there specifically, it would not be a misdemeanor under the law today.

KAREN AGNIFILO: It wouldn't be under this current law that we're talking about. There might be other charges, other Penal Law charges that could be brought, such as criminal mischief in the Penal Law if there's some kind of significant damage to the property or the

2	premises, but those are different laws that may or
3	may not apply. If you're talking about laws that
4	apply to reproductive health care facilities, what
5	you just described, for example, would be a
6	violation, not a crime, not a misdemeanor, without
7	proving specific intent to try and prevent seeking
8	services of a reproductive health care facility.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Under
10	the proposed law, who would be able to make a
11	complaint about protestors' conduct around a
12	facility?
13	KAREN AGNIFILO: It could from the
14	clinic itself. It could be a police officer. It
15	could be an anonymous 911 call that the police
16	come and they see if themselves and so the police
17	bring the complaint on behalf of the city.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: That's
19	in contrast to the current law?
20	KAREN AGNIFILO: In order to prove

that that person was trying to prevent the services, you have to prove that those services were trying to be sought. That's the difference.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very much. I think this helps.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

Charles Barron?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you very much. From one who does a lot of protesting and certainly would always want to protect the right of those who are protesting, I, too, think this is a good law. I think it's good because of the fact that in many other instances and many other facilities and places that you can protest and do things, we do things sometimes to intently get arrested. But in this instance it does border on some serious harassment and denial of people's rights, women's rights to get the services that they choose to get, no matter what one's position is on the issue. But I think it would be important if you could just reemphasize, for those of us who are concerned about the right to protest, if you can put more emphasis on that to assure people that there's nothing wrong with peacefully and lawfully protesting. But when it borderlines on harassment and blocking services, that's what this bill is getting at. I think it would be good if you could just emphasize that a little more.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

KAREN AGNIFILO: You're absolutely correct in the way you put it. This bill does absolutely nothing to restrict First Amendment rights in any location, even within the 15-foot You have a right to exercise your First zone. Amendment rights peacefully and this bill is content neutral. So whatever your views are, you can express them. What this bill does though is it takes it one step further. It doesn't prescribe conduct that borderlines on harassment, it prescribes actual harassment. So you have to do something more than just expressing your views. You have to actually be harassing someone, threatening someone, annoying someone, it can be physical harassment, it can be verbal harassment, it can be doing a combination of things that constitute harassment. It's what you're doing and how you're doing it and the way you're doing it. When it becomes harassment that's when it becomes a violation of this law. When you're specifically trying to harass a person as opposed to expressing your views in general.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Let's say some people came to the entrance and opened up

books and decided to read their books here. We're not trying to block anybody but we just stopped here for a moment to just read our literature.

KAREN AGNIFILO: I think what would happen in that situation is someone would ask them to move. If they refuse to move then they are actually intentionally blocking a doorway and you can't do that.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And if a person is not coming through yet, or let's say a person sees it from a block away and says I'm not going there because it looks like something is going on, does this bill protect that person's right to have a peaceful entrance?

Again, it takes away that requirement that you have to have a person that they're trying to prevent from accessing services. So, for example, before there is any clients that arrive, a nurse or a doctor or someone else who works at the facility could see that there are people blocking entrance and refusing to leave when asked and they're clearly acting intentionally to try and do that. They could call the police and they could

2.0

have that situation taken care of under this new law without having to have anyone actually have their rights blocked. It's just trying to do that is what would be effected in this situation.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: If I may follow up with a question on Council Member Barron's testimony. Will the police be trained additionally whenever they get their instructions and in their training as to exactly what constitutes harassment? Because I think probably one of the worst things that could happen is for police to be called and to constantly have a misinterpretation and not have something effective. What is the next step in actually defining for the police what this constitutes? Is it in the books to somehow train the police?

KAREN AGNIFILO: Absolutely. The police have ongoing training and they continue to have ongoing training. This will certainly be a part of their ongoing training whenever there are new laws. But harassment is not a new concept in the Penal Law. Harassment exists in many other

2.3

situations as well. It's defined in the

Administrative Code, in the Penal Law, and Case

Law. It's something that the police are very

familiar with as a concept and as a term, which is

one of the reasons this bill actually is also

going to be very helpful for them because it's

taking a concept they're very familiar with and

they know how to already work with and applying it

to a specific situation.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: We are also joined by Dr. Eugene, Mathieu Eugene from Brooklyn. Council Member Jimmy Oddo from Staten Island has a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Thank you,

Madame Chair. I'd just like to follow up on the

last point. It's good to see you again. I was

concerned that I can't find the definition of

harassment within this bill. Just to follow up on

the point that you made, you're saying that

harassment is defined in other parts of the

Administrative Code that can be extrapolated for

this.

KAREN AGNIFILO: Harassment is located in the Penal Law. I had a feeling you

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO:

So

25

operation of reproductive health care facilities?

25

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Τ	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS 36
2	Is saying the rosary? Is handing out baseball
3	cards? What constitutes that definition?
4	KAREN AGNIFILO: Again, those are
5	all very case specific. So, given your example,
6	singing the Ave Maria in front of the facility
7	would in my view not affect that. But if you were
8	to somehow pipe in some kind of mechanical loud
9	speaker into the facility and turn it up so many
10	decibels that no human being could actually
11	physically be inside there while you're singing
12	the Ave Maria, that could be construed as
13	willfully interfering with the operation. Again,
14	it's very, very case specific and fact specific.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: So I should

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: So I should not be troubled by the clause as is. Forgive the term, I don't mean to be prejudicial in the term but, other pieces of legislation are as vague as this is? I mean we have other examples of that or is that troubling to you?

KAREN AGNIFILO: Are you done? COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Yeah, I'm sorry.

I was waiting for KAREN AGNIFILO: you to finish. Harassment also in the Penal Law

24

25

Τ	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS 3
2	is open ended in that way. It's because as smart
3	as the lawyers are who work on drafting
4	legislation, you can't anticipate every single
5	scenario or every situation that could come up.
6	So it's important to be clear but both open ended
7	so that it can cover conduct as it occurs.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: You talked
9	about the need for removing the mens rea of
10	intent. Essentially when you remove intent you
11	have strict liability. I'm not sure if this is a
12	fair question to you. If it's not, you can tell
13	me. Can you give me other examples where we in
14	the council have removed intent or the Bloomberg
15	administration have supported pieces of
16	legislation where we removed the intent and we
17	were all happy about that?
18	KAREN AGNIFILO: I feel like I'm in
19	law school again. You're asking me law school
20	questions.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Believe me,
22	the hives on me right now indicate my uneasiness

with going back to law school as well.

completely remove intent, because the original

KAREN AGNIFILO: This doesn't

2.0

2	bill actually has two separate intentions. This
3	one just takes away the second one. You still
4	have to have intentional conduct. You still have
5	to do something. So you're not removing the
6	intent of the crime. This is not a strict
7	liability offense. You still have to
8	intentionally commit the acts. You just don't
9	have to do the second intention part. The
10	intention to prevent services for example. You
11	just have to intentionally do the act that are
12	prescribed here such as the harassing or the
13	blocking.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: The benefit as my colleagues would see it of removing intent is what then?

example, if you are intentionally trying to harass someone, or intentionally trying to block access to a reproductive health care facility and that's under both the current law and the proposed legislation. But say the client of the health care facility does not want to testify or go forward, or say there is no client that you know of, there's no person there. Say they don't want

2.0

2.3

to participate in the criminal justice process,
how can you prove that the actor who intentionally
was harassing or obstructing the entranceway of
the facility, how can you prove that they were
intentionally also trying to prevent the
reproductive services of that person who is trying
to get those health care services? That second
part is what you need to have a complainant for.
That's what this removes. But it does not at all
affect the intention still to try and commit these
prescribed acts.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: My friends,
Speaker Quinn and Council Member Lappin told about
their own personal experiences and what's been
told to them about what's happening outside of
these facilities and the need for a new piece of
legislation. Is that the experience of the
administration and do you have empirical data
which demonstrate that this in fact is happening?

that when these situations arise that the police department are called in fairly early on and on a local level the precincts have very good relationships with the reproductive health care

facilities and they try and take care of these situations in a non-criminal prosecution sort of way. They try to resolve them informally as they do in many other situations where you have people expressing differing views coming together. That is how it's generally handled. In situations, however, where it does rise to the level of criminal conduct, this new legislation actually makes in enforceable. The other current law makes it much more difficult for the police to enforce when it does rise to that level.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: I absolutely hear what you just said, but I just think for the record that I should put on there that according to stats from the Division of Criminal Justice Services, ten people have been arrested in the entire state since 2003 under the Penal Law that you refer to. Five of those arrests were made in New York City and six people have been convicted across the state for them from the city. I understand your point. You'll explain why those numbers aren't larger, but I think that needs to be put on the record to counter the comments of how frequent an occurrence this is. I thank the

Chair Lady for her indulgence. I couldn't help
but be somewhat amused by my good friend Charles
Barron's willingness to accept a curtailment on
the free speech. But then I thought about this
council in the early 90s when we passed the first
clinic access bill and it struck me as a staff
person then that the people who were the strongest
proponents of the clinic access bill at the time
were the strongest opponents of the aggressive
panhandling bill. I've been struck ever since of
the inconsistency. So maybe I shouldn't be
surprised. Thank you, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Council Member Oddo. That's very nice but you have to keep it short. Council Member Nelson I think has a few questions.

Statement, Madame Speaker. I was confused because I think some opponents were applauding what should have been proponents. But at least everybody is listening. I have to excuse myself in a moment. For personal reasons I must be up at Columbia Presbyterian Hospital, but I just feel compelled to make a statement. I'm happy to be co-sponsor

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whether you're pro-life or pro-choice, we can put this aside for the moment. Everybody in their hearts feels that they're doing the right thing. There's such a compelling argument that can be made, I believe, that it is wrong, morally wrong, to harass somebody, hurt somebody, frighten somebody as they're trying to do something they feel is right for themselves. This is just so important to me. As a man, I don't believe I will be utilizing the facilities myself, but if you were to do so, and I believe in dear lord, my god so fervently, but I do not believe that god would want somebody to hurt somebody. I don't even mean physically. We know it's going in some extreme cases to murder, very rarely, and other type of pain or damaging the building. But it just a strong argument to be made that if you believe that the god that you believe in wants you to upset people, hurt people or frighten people, I believe you should make an appoint with the god of your choice, I believe is everybody's god personally, make a quick appoint and have a discussion and find out if what you think is right for you to do is truly the right thing to do to

second one is you're doing that conduct with the

25

This new

The 15 feet requirement only covers harassment. It's not about the other conduct. So there's where you can't harass someone within 15 feet. Currently harassment alone in the Penal Law is a violation. It's not a misdemeanor. If you were to harass someone on the street just anywhere walking outside, that is a violation. What this does it

22

23

24

25

Τ	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHIS 4
2	is brings that same conduct of harassment, if you
3	do it within 15 feet, in that zone of the
4	reproductive health care facility, that elevates
5	that same conduct from a violation to a
6	misdemeanor.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: If you're
8	within the 15 feet and you're protesting or doing
9	whatever you're doing, then you could be arrested
10	and get charged with a misdemeanor.
11	KAREN AGNIFILO: Only if you
12	harass. You can be within the 15 feet and
13	peaceably exercise your First Amendment rights.
14	You can speak, you can hold signs, you can sing,
15	you can pray, you can exercise your First
16	Amendment rights however you see fit. But you
17	cannot harass a person. That's the difference.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: And then
19	you're saying that we look to the Penal Law 240
20	for the definition of harassment?
21	KAREN AGNIFILO: That in
22	conjunction with Case Law. Case Law also
23	interprets it a little more specifically.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: It's not

really clear on the definition of harassment.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

It's up to the interpreter.

3 KAREN AGNIFILO: And are you asking 4 me a question?

5 COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Yes.

Because what I see here is a problem in what you can and cannot do. The last thing we want to do is take away people's rights. It's not clear by this new law on what you can and you cannot do. If you would like to protest, pro or con, for or against, it's not clear. You're saying that you have to go look up in the Penal Law and the Case Law to find out the harassment. That's the problem that I have with this bill. It's not It's not clear to the people who wish to clear. express themselves. It's not clear. legislators to say that you have to look up 240 to find harassment or go look up the Case Law, well you could find Case Law and all kinds of different harassment for conduct that you think is not harassment but you think it is. So what I think we're doing here is that we have to clean up this bill because it's not clear. There's an issue with the harassment part of the bill. The second part is that in the first bill you could be

Т	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS 4
2	charged with a misdemeanor. Correct?
3	KAREN AGNIFILO: Correct.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: And in the
5	second bill you could be charged with a
6	misdemeanor.
7	KAREN AGNIFILO: Correct.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Now why
9	are you saying that's a B misdemeanor in this new
LO	bill?
11	KAREN AGNIFILO: If I said B
L2	misdemeanor, I misspoke. They're both
L3	misdemeanors.
L4	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: They're
L5	both unclassified misdemeanors in both bills.
L6	KAREN AGNIFILO: Correct.
L7	COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: But in the
L8	bill doesn't it say it could be charged with a B
L9	misdemeanor?
20	KAREN AGNIFILO: The bills, as I
21	understand them, for the first offense there's one
22	level of penalty and then the second one there's a
23	second level of penalty. There's a lesser fine
24	and lesser imprisonment the first time you're
25	convicted of it. The second time I think it's up

different in the law. So if that's cleared up and should stay with that for just one second. that clear, Councilman? Because it's the same

24

25

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

when you suffer from reasonable harm. When you believe that an individual is acting in an intentional manner that would result in you feeling like you have been harmed, that their conduct is harmful. There's two statutes in the Penal Law currently. It's Section 240-25 and 240-Section 240-25 is a harassment in the first It's a B misdemeanor, which means that it carries 60 days in jail. Section 240-26 is harassment in the second degree, which is a violation, a crime which is a violation and not a crime under the statute. It's comparable to a traffic ticket. In fact, there is some case law. For my colleagues, the case that I cite is rather instructive. It says that evidence that did not establish that the defendant intended to harass her husband when she picketed his office protesting his lack of support. It obviously was not harassment. That case is People versus Jemurzor [phonetic]. As someone who recognizes that all that you are doing is removing a hurdle, one hurdle, so that individuals can go forward and have their rights protected under the law is something that I strongly support. Let me also go

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on to say that I have known constituents who wanted to file charges but for personal reasons decided not to file charges because they wanted to protect their privacy. This statute that's proposed would give the right of the clinic to file charges. Currently a clinic cannot file charges. To me, that is instrumental. The fact is that you are now giving the right of a clinic to serve as a complainant, as a complaining witness. Right now the hospital or someone in the hospital cannot serve as a complaining witness. There are sometimes instances, and I know of one, where young ladies, particularly the young girls who I see in the back row and up there who look like my constituents, do not want to step forward and basically serve as a witness. They do not want to go forward and have their life before a judge or in a court of law. So someone else should step in their shoes. I should be given that right to step in their shoes when I witness someone harassing them. This statute does just that. What's interesting is individuals who would oppose this would oppose the fundamental right, something that is sacred, and that's the right of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

privacy. The privacy of all young women to protect their bodies and so that their bodies will no be instruments of politics or instruments of campaigns, or instruments to whatever. basically a right of privacy. All that this statute is doing is just removing a hurdle. That's all that we are doing. It's really difficult to prove intent. As an attorney, it is very difficult to prove an intent. Just like it's difficult to prove the intent to discriminate. You can't prove it. Or the intent to hate. You can't prove it. It's very, very hard. you could never demonstrate and there's never evidence sufficient to prove mens rea. So I'm happy and confident, I'm happy and support the fact that you have removed a hurdle and you have made it easier for women to go forward and for clinics and hospitals and individuals such as myself who care about reproductive rights in the City of New York so that we could be protected. So I thank all of the individuals who are here to support. All of those who do not support, I protect your right to protest, but I also protect the right of young ladies who come to my office

who have nowhere else to go and who basically want to be protected. I thank you and I support and I hope that all of my colleagues in the City Council, particular the men, will stand strong and support this statute. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. We have been joined by David Yassky from Brooklyn and John Liu from Queens. Before I call on David Yassky, Charles Barron seems to have a few words to say.

I just wanted to say to Council Member Oddo, it's interesting how you have such brilliance in your inquiry and your lawyering knowledge and then when you come to a very fundamental thing like First Amendment rights versus harassment, you lose it. So there's no way that I would deny anyone's First Amendment rights. This bill doesn't do that. For you to be confused on that is interesting. There are probably some hidden views on this issue period. But anyway, I just wanted to say that. I just wanted to say that.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Madame Chair,

I'm going to take a point of personal privilege.

1	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS 5
2	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Madame
3	Chair, calm him down.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Are we going
5	to allow that? Did I get disrespectful with any
6	of the witnesses? I did not.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Tell him to
8	stop talking. I got the floor.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Do you want
10	to go back to yesterday, Charles, we'll go back to
11	yesterday.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I've got
13	the floor. I got the floor.
14	SPEAKER QUINN: Council Members,
15	stop.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Well, you
17	stop him because I'm the one who has the floor. I
18	didn't finish making my point.
19	SPEAKER QUINN: Charles, you have
20	made your point.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I didn't
22	finish making my point. I did not interrupt him
23	and I'm not going to allow his interrupting to
24	look like Charles Barron is out of control.
25	SPEAKER QUINN: Charles, can I say

Τ	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHIS 55
2	something?
3	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: He spoke
4	and no one said anything.
5	SPEAKER QUINN: Wait. This hearing
6	is not about me, Helen Sears, Charles Barron, or
7	Jimmy Oddo. It's about a piece of legislation and
8	finding the right balance. People should avoid
9	making references to each other.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Well he did
11	that first.
12	SPEAKER QUINN: Okay, and you have
13	made your point.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: And mine was
15	directing on the record.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: He did that
17	first.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: It wasn't
19	some hidden innuendo and reference and implication
20	that you said about me, Charles.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: You
22	shouldn't have mentioned my name.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Suddenly we
24	can't speak to each other after three and a half
25	years?

1	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS 56
2	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: No, we can.
3	When I speak back then be quiet and listen.
4	SPEAKER QUINN: Can I just say
5	something.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Charles, we
7	can speak back to each other, but don't imply
8	something that I have some hidden agenda here.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I can say
10	whatever I want to say. Well don't imply that I'm
11	denying First Amendment rights.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: I didn't
13	imply that.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Oh, yes you
15	did.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: I certainly
17	did not imply that.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Yes, you
19	did.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Charles, I
21	just said it's interesting how inconsistent it is.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Yes, you
23	did.
24	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I'm taking a
25	recess for five minutes. Stay where you are, but

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we're in recess. We're in recess. Five minutes. I just have a comment to make. As Chair of this committee I apologize to Charles Barron and to all of you there because it is wrong for any of us to ever use the name of a colleague when they're making a statement. Some of you may have agreed with my colleague on that. I disagree. It was my responsibility to stop that right then and there and we would not have had what we had. It went by me so fast that I really apologize because I would have stopped it right then and there. It is not right for us to do that. I hope that all of the committee hearings that are held in this chamber will take such a policy. Because I have sat in hearings. I'm on nine committees and I chair this and another and there are times when that happens. I've been in hearings when there has been discourse among colleague, colleague and colleague. That is not going to happen when I chair anymore. Out of a courtesy to a colleague we allow them to go on, but then it's a discourtesy to another. So publicly, Charles, I apologize to you because I'm chair of this committee and I should not have allowed it to go

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 on.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I accept

Madame Chair. And it's not about Jimmy Oddo or

Charles Barron, it's about women and their right

to access reproductive services. I apologize for
any disruption.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. With that, we'll go on to David Yassky.

COUNCIL MEMBER YASSKY: Thank you, Madame Chair. I really just want to thank you and thank Speaker Quinn, who I know was here earlier, and the administration for proceeding forward on this. I'm sensitive to the issues raised by eliminating an intent requirement and making what it is, in effect, a strict liability offense. Generally we're reluctant to do that because we want a culpable intent to go with punishment. But you know what, here I have no problem whatsoever because what we're doing is simply telling folks who do want to be disruptive that's the reality on the ground, that they can't get cute by saying they don't intend to do X and Y. We're giving the police a very constrained and very carefully defined ability to say to people to move out the

2	way, period. No argument. I think we need to do
3	that. I have in my district a reproductive health
4	facility at which one can commonly find people
5	standing in front of the door. Their goal is to
6	make it difficult for people to access
7	reproductive health services. That's the goal.
8	That's not a legitimate goal. We have to meet
9	that determination with a governmental
10	determination to allow women to access
11	reproductive health, as is their right, as should
12	be their right. This is an unfortunately
13	necessary, but an absolutely necessary step to
14	take. I thank the administration for working so
15	collaboratively on it. I hope that we will pass
16	this at our earliest opportunity. Thank you,
17	Madame Chair. I think we've had enough applause
18	for a moment. We're going to have to move on.
19	Councilwoman Diana Reyna has a question. That
20	will be the last question and we'll move on to the
21	next panel.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you,
23	Madame Chair. I just wanted to understand the
24	arguments as far as whether or not we're

diminishing the rights of people to protest and

2.0

where in the language that is being proposed by this legislation does it state any type of watering down First Amendment rights?

KAREN AGNIFILO: This legislation in no way diminishes any First Amendment rights or waters them down or changes First Amendment rights in any way whatsoever.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And therefore, currently on the sidelines, if this legislation were to pass the protestors who would be on the premises and a woman trying to access the clinic were to find protestors and feel like there's an intimidation, immediately what or how does this law or change of law protect that individual?

KAREN AGNIFILO: A protestor would have to either knowingly block the individual from entering the facility.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Can you just stay right there? As far as block is concerned, the intent of a protestor giving a flyer, is that considered blocking the client from seeking services?

KAREN AGNIFILO: Not unless they

2.0

2.3

are	e sta	anding	j in	the	doc	rway	z and	now	allowing	the
per	son	to wa	alk	throu	ıah	the	door	. No).	

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: As that client approaches the door and somebody else comes and gives them a flyer, will that be considered harassment?

KAREN AGNIFILO: No.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: So at what point will harassment as far as blocking be considered harassment?

proscribed conduct in this proposed legislation.

One has to do with knowingly blocking the person from entering, blocking access to the facility.

Another has actually blocking the doorway of the facility. And another has to do with harassing the person. So those are separate conducts.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Can you just give me a scenario? Because right now I find it very disturbing to think that a woman would have to be escorted to receive reproductive services, health services, even if it's just to seek information. For there to be the need to have a body guard is what this particular change of

legislation is trying to address, is it not? Is there going to be the need for an escort upon passing this legislation?

of escorts, and I'm not an expert by any means, is it also has to do with emotional support and informational support. It's also just having someone to go with you. So an advocate, if you will, on certain times on behalf of the client as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: But it also diminishes the emotional aspect of being able to walk through without being confronted on whether or not seeking information or health services is appropriate at that moment. So that as a client entering into the facility, when I go to the doctor I don't have people telling me don't go there. When I go to the doctor I'm able to go freely in and out. It's important that I understand if women's rights are going to be protected by this legislation to the point where protecting their access as soon as they park their car in front of this facility and understanding how the change in legislation is going to allow

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that. The explanation that Letitia James gave was far more eye-opening to mention the fact that we're removing a hurdle. I want to understand what that hurdle is so that people in the public who are listening to this debate understand that

hurdle and understand why this is so important.

KAREN AGNIFILO: I think the hurdle that we're all referring to is under the current law it's very difficult. It has more to do with law enforcement and prosecution. Under the current law it's harder to arrest someone or prosecute someone for conduct because in many instances it requires the cooperation of the client of the health care facility. So in other words, the women who is seeking reproductive health care services in many instances would be required to have to participate in the law enforcement process. That's something that not everyone would like to do, especially in matters that can be considered, such as health care and reproductive health care. What this new bill does is it makes it so that law enforcement can prosecute these cases with the same exact facts as before but they can prosecute them without, in

That's the hurdle that it's removing.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

services.

many instances, the need of the testimony and
cooperation and pressing charges of the individual
who is seeking the reproductive health care

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I am the client walking into the clinic and under the current law I'm being what would be considered harassed. I would not be able to call the police and they would not be able to take my complaint.

KAREN AGNIFILO: Under the current law, if you were harassed in front of a reproductive health care facility, the police could called and the person could be arrested, but for a prosecution they would need you to testify. You would have to actually, if the case ever went to trial, sit in front of a jury and tell your story that you were going to a reproductive health care facility to seek services there. would be involved in that process. The proposed legislation would now make it so that given the same exact scenario, that same person is going into the facility being harassed, the police are called. That person no longer needs to participate in the criminal justice process and

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

very much.

2	testify in that regard. So that's the hurdle
3	that's being removed. It protects the privacy of
4	the individual seeking the services.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: It's my understanding that it also will allow for another entity to witness what has occurred and be able to speak on behalf of that individual.

> KAREN AGNIFILO: That is correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: That is the basic and most important aspect. Not just the protection of privacy of the individual who is placing the complaint, but the ability to continue prosecution because someone else can speak on behalf of what they had witnessed.

> KAREN AGNIFILO: That is correct. COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very That concludes this panel. I want to thank much. We've had a lengthy and contentious a little you. But thank you for being here. Our next bit. panel is a panel of five. They are the following: Dr. Emily Women's Health Care, Kimberly Walker. Is Kimberly here? All right, if you'll come to be

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

part of the panel. David Friedman [phonetic]?

Yes, you're part of the panel. Rebecca Simons,

MD, are you here? Merle Hoffman? So we have our panel.

SPEAKER QUINN: Madame Chair, if I could just cut in for one second. I just want to apologize to the members of the public who are here that we had to recess the hearing. A good thing about the New York City Council is that it is passionate. A bad thing is sometimes that passion, myself included, boils over. This is an incredibly important topic. We are going to get through this topic and in my hope, but obviously it's up to all of my colleagues and myself, my hope is we'll get through this topic and we will change the law in the City of New York to make it stronger to protect the rights of women and their health care providers to access and provide health That said, I think clearly the fact that care. we're discussing this law as it relates to this topic and the emotion that chamber speaks to how emotional an issue this is, how important an issue this is, how critical this issue to many people's lives and how necessary it is to have appropriate

constructs around protecting people's right to
access this care. Perhaps we made our point in
not exactly the manner we had planned but perhaps
the point was made nonetheless. I want to thank
everyone from the public again for being here. I
want to thank all of my colleagues for returning
to the hearing because I think all of us being
back here shows that the subject matter is the
most critical thing. Certainly I think that will
be most clearly dramatized by, no disrespect to
any of the other panels, but by the health care
providers we will hear from now. Thank you,
Madame Chair and thank you, all of my colleagues.
CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. You
may go in any order that you choose. State your
name for the record. We'll start with you.
Because we have so many panels, we're going to
give two minutes each and we're going to go by the

21 testimony, I'm going to ask you to condense it.

Your name?

MERLE HOFFMAN: My name is Merle
Hoffman and I am founder and president of Choices
Women's Medical Center, one of the first and no

clock. So if you have very, very lengthy

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

currently the largest licensed women's medical facility in the country. Since 1971, two years before Roe v. Wade, Choices has been providing reproductive health care to millions of women in the five boroughs and tri-state area for abortion, family planning, gynecology, prenatal care and mental health services. I have been on the front line of the struggle for reproductive justice in this city and in this country for the last 38 years. As a psychologist, I have counseled and held the hands of countless women as they experience the most powerful and vulnerable moments of their lives, their abortions. As an organizer, I organized the first pro-choice civil disobedience action at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, co-found the National Abortion Federation and the New York Pro-Choice Coalition. I have debated all the leaders of the religious right, including Jerry Falwell. I have faced personal death threats. My clinic has had multiple bomb threats. I have been unfairly closed down. Janet Reno had to send armed guards to protect me against my landlord's threats to bulldoze my space. I have had federal marshals

minutes, okay?

guarding me and the clinic for three months after
the physician murders in Pensacola. I have had to
take my landlord to federal court under Face the
Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances for
constructive eviction because I got no relief from
the New York City Landlord Tenant Courts. I'm
currently fighting another eviction action as I
speak. Every day patients at my facility have to
pass by people who scream at them that they are
murdering their babies and if they are black that
they are desecrating the legacy of Martin Luther
King. Every day patients have to walk through a
gauntlet of psychological abuse. Every day
counselors have to deal with this emotional
blowback to their patients. Your proposed
legislation is critical because it allows local
law enforcement far more leverage than what is now
in place. I'd like to finish this. I spoke to
Dicandi [phonetic] and she said I could read it.
It's really important.
CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You spoke to
whom?
MERLE HOFFMAN: Just two more

For the record, representing Ambulatory Surgery Center of Brooklyn in support of passing a new Clinic Access Bill in relation to prohibition of activities to prevent access to reproductive health care facilities. hope I can finish this in two minutes. Ambulatory Surgery Center of Brooklyn, referred to

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as ASC, is a New York State licensed Article 28 Facility certified to provide ambulatory surgery, primary care, cancer detection, diagnostic radiology, family planning and diagnosis treatment of venereal disease. ASC received its operation certificate in June 1993 and is Joint Commission accredited. Since its inception, ASC has provided termination of pregnancy services, GYN services, primary care services and has a significant number of patients with HIV disease who receive essential care at the facility on a daily basis. In 2007, we received a recognition by the AIDS Institute of the New York State Department of Health as having complied with a myriad of standards and monitoring of outcomes. As a licensed health care provider also in the sensitive business of offering termination of pregnancy services, we continuously struggle with the presence of anti-abortionists who protest immediately at our front door, oftentimes inhibiting access in egress of all patients, not just those planning to or having undergone abortions. This persistent harassment has materially harmed our ability to attract patients and physicians to utilize this licensed

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and accredited facility to provide quality health care across a broad spectrum of services. Due to adverse business conditions brought on by these aggressive anti-abortion activists, it is evident that protestors are not merely expressing their displeasure over a woman having an abortion, but intimidating and harassing people who are using the facility for other reasons as well. Some of these services that the center currently provides are everything from podiatry to gastroenterology, HIV care, pain management and vascular. While we recognize that the access of termination of pregnancy services is extremely important, we have also experienced considerable resistance from patients, employees and physicians who prefer to not just be subjected to this harassment but the exposure of the extremely distasteful signs displayed at the entrance of the facility and partially down the sidewalk. I'd like to submit some of these pictures if I may.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Just sum up
please. I'm sorry, I know it may seem that you've
been waiting and I'll give you the extra time.
But we have so many and I think if you can stick

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

expressed is the difficulties of those going to the clinics. So all of you, those who will testify, if you can stay with exactly what the issue is today, which is this proposed legislation and if you're for or not for it and the reasons why you are supporting, if you could condense it to that. I interrupted you. So if you can just sum up, that would be fine.

KIMBERLY WALKER: We take serious issue in the behavior and the actions of these protestors. These people should be prosecuted. For example, grabbing patients by the arms, touching them in inappropriate ways, badgering and listening to the rhetoric and showing them the literature, chasing them down as far as three blocks away from the facility, physically forcing patients to read their distasteful materials, calling them names like baby killers and telling them that if they have an abortion they are breaking the law, telling them that they're going to hell and they'll be arrested. This new law will make it difficult for these words to be said and heard. Their veritable camp outside, it

includes these large posters that are attached to
public telephone poles. They use a police
barricade right now as a scaffolding to hold their
posters and pictures that clearly states New York
City Police Department, which suggests that it's
being supported by the New York City Police
Department. These so-called regular protestors,
it has been suggested that they are paid to be
outside and protest. This is not individuals
exercising free speech. They're not interested in
resolution. This would cost them their income.
The current law makes it difficult for the police
to determine whether the law is being broken and
it's difficult to enforce because of the intent
requirement. The local police precinct and has
favored the protestors and the community expense
by overlooking these protestors parking in front
of fire hydrants everyday, signage that clutters
the sidewalk, incorporating this police barricade,
physically obstructing and blocking the person,
following them, and willfully interfering.
CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You have to sum
up please.

25 KIMBERLY WALKER: The police

2	officer that was appointed to our facility for
3	many years, she had a bible in her police buggy as
4	well as protesting with them. She had to be
5	removed. It's very difficult to get our employees
6	and our physicians into the facility. In
7	conclusion, our testimony is asking for your
8	assistance in clearly defining this law, in
9	resolving an urgent matter that affects the
LO	viability of our business. ASC strongly supports
11	this new clinical bill. In doing so, the Brooklyn
12	community and the rest of New York would be met
L3	relative to the aspect of care and equal
L4	protection would be ensured and the city
15	government would be exercising its responsibility
L6	for the safety of patients.
L7	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very
18	much.
L9	KIMBERLY WALKER: Thank you very
20	much.
21	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: If you have any
22	written testimony, please give it to the sergeant-
23	at-arms so that it will be recorded for the
24	hearing. The next to give testimony?

DR. EMILY'S: There's a problem.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In two minutes I can't do anything. I will say

one paragraph if that's all you're allowing me.

4 SPEAKER QUINN: Identify yourself

for the record.

DR. EMILY'S: I'm from Dr. Emily Women's Health Center. To tell the truth, the first time I saw an abortion protestor, I was proud to be an American, to be in a place where diverse views can be heard. I felt that way right up to the time when one of these self-righteous fanatics knocked me to the ground unconscious so that I could no longer hear the shouts of baby killer ringing in my ears. I would now like to provide some reasons, just as my colleague here did and before her, for the things that are actually happening the field. There is actually no question as to whether somebody's messing with you or not. You feel it. There's no question. But the police were so blocked, they were virtually impotent in taking care of anything. What happened to me was actually something that the old law would cover, but the police didn't get there in time. Now the police are going to be unfettered in the sense that the people who come

2	to protest will know that there is something to be
3	afraid of. That when they cross the line there
4	will be consequences. The police will be able to
5	arrest them. That clinic staff can bring charges.
6	That patients will see that their complaints are
7	being taken care of. These are not small things.
8	These are huge. The police would stand there and
9	look at you and say there is nothing I can do.
10	Finally now the police will be able to react to
11	what's going on, on the ground. If that's all the
12	time that I'm being given then I'll take it.
13	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You have about
14	14 seconds. Use them up.
15	DR. EMILY'S: It's a concern for me
16	because it's hard to take four years and squish it
17	down.
18	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: But you're
19	getting your message across though. You really
20	are.
21	DR. EMILY'S: Yeah, but I had to be
22	knocked over the head to do that.
23	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: But your
24	statement should be given to us so that it's in

the record because it will be most effective.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 Just sum up if you can.

DR. EMILY'S: Then I will. You stop me when you have to. One of the things we have found is that protestors don't treat everyone exactly the same way. You see, they are afraid of the big tall dudes with attitude who look dangerous and might be carrying. So the protestors leave them alone. Their favorite targets are small women who speak only Spanish, no English and are probably illiterate in both languages so those women can't read our signs. One of their very favorite things is to stand in front of the clinic door and tell them in Spanish that there's no doctor there and they lead then to go down the block or around the corner endlessly. Again, now these are things that the police will be able to arrest for. When they stop FedEx. When they stop UPS. When they won't let them in the door. When they won't let them go on. are all things that are stopping the operations of our clinic.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

DR. EMILY'S: So basically what this law does is simply allow the police to arrest

for things that are happening.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. The next one giving testimony. Please state your name. If you have any testimony, please give it to the sergeant-at-arms because it'll be included in the record. State your name. DAVID FRIEDMAN: My name is David Friedman.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Two minutes.

DAVID FRIEDMAN: I'm a

gynecologist. I have a private practice that happens to be located in the Ambulatory Surgery Center in Brooklyn. I've had the practice for many years. I've recently moved it into that office. One of the problems that I face is I've had these longstanding patients, many of them from Bensonhurst, Dyker Heights, and Staten Island. They've been coming to me many years. A lot of them are not coming for anything to do with termination of pregnancy, and some of them are. They get harassed just the same. I provide a full range of women's health services; breast health, pap smears, cancer prevention, and I do lots of surgeries. The protestors really do not select in

our instance who they're going to harass and who
they don't harass. Recently I had a very nice
little old lady from Bensonhurst come in. They
grabbed her arm. They gave her some literature,
which I have some here I'd like to submit. The
patient was really scared. It took a good 10 or
15 minutes to calm her down. By that point we had
to first then start getting around to giving her
care. Then I had to worry that she might not come
back. So I think if we had laws in place that
would ensure that everybody coming to my office,
which is basically what this building is, is
protected and they will not be discouraged from
seeking care, I think it would be a service from
all New Yorkers.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. Next?

REBECCA SIMONS: My name is Rebecca Simons. I'm a family physician at the Institute for Family Health. Thank you very much for the opportunity to present this testimony today in support of 826. All women in New York should have the right to access reproductive health care services in a safe and confidential environment.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A woman's decision to seek any type of reproductive health care is her own. When she is unable to do so in a safe and private way, she may effectively be unable to get that care. One of my colleagues, a provider of comprehensive reproductive health care for well over a decade recalls the story of a young woman in precisely Samantha, which is of course not this situation. her real name, was the 30-year-old mother of a six-month-old. She worked days and her husband worked nights. They had no help with child care. Samantha had lost custody of two other kids from a previous relationship because of neglect and She was an unhappy and angry woman and abuse. very distrustful of the medical system. into fights with clinic staff. We started to have concerns about her six-month-old early on because she came for visits with a puzzling rash on the baby's body. It looked a bit like eczema, but some of the lesions could have also been burns. In the midst of treating the baby and handling the potential abuse situation, Samantha became pregnant. After full options counseling she decided to have an abortion. My colleague

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

suggested she come to Planned Parenthood on a day that she herself worked so that the procedure could be done by a provider already familiar to the patient. Samantha never showed. Several months later she came back to the office, by then six months pregnant. She had been too frightened by the protestors and was unable to bring herself to walk across their intimidating picket line. So this overburdened, angry and unhappy woman had another baby girl shortly thereafter. She stopped coming to our health center after other fights with staff over appointment times. So we don't know how those kids are doing. Needless to say it's extremely worrisome. Clearly, it's the most vulnerable women who are affected by a lot of these protestor issues. That, to me, as a family doctor who takes care of women and their families, is what's most concerning. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. We have a question from the Speaker and then I will have one question.

SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you. I'm sorry about the length of time of testimony. I know we had hoped that some of you might be able

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to speak a little bit longer. But given the fact that we have 60 people who want to testify today, we had to cut back. I know we originally had suggested maybe five minutes, but I know Danielle had to tell folks it was only two. apologize, but we want to make sure everyone and all opinions get heard on the record. But thank you for your deference. I'll just open this question to whoever would like to answer it. Earlier a statement was made, which I think is a quite illuminating one. It was a statement about how many people have been arrested under the existing law. The fact that that number isn't that high but we hear a lot of reports is what in fact brought us to look to see if the law on the books, which was intended to be very effective, but sometimes you write things and then the real life experience is different. You've given us some examples of what happens in front of your clinics or your practices. If you were to give us one additional example of what happens that now can't get addressed, what would that be. I think that's important for us to know something that's preventing your ability to do work, but wouldn't

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

end up in an arrest statistic just because it's

not technically illegal or enforceable or

whatever. Just make sure the mike is on.

DR. EMILY'S: This is a peculiar one because in our clinic we have a parking lot and sometimes women go for a walk and they're thinking about stuff. We have protestors who offer the patients water to drink. Kind, huh? Women who are going to have pain relief for the abortion procedure, in PO, they're not allowed to have anything to drink because it can cause aspiration. They could get an infection. can lose their lives. They're doing it deliberately to hurt women because pro-life has nothing to do with women. They don't mean women's They have a very particular agenda, which lives. is very small and is the only thing that they're interested in. So that's an example of something that they can finally be arrested for because, again, the patient happened to be an illegal immigrant who couldn't create the compliance herself. I had no legal standing in court so I couldn't do it. All of those things are now going to be changed. Were they within 15 feet?

bet. It sounds peculiar, but it's very serious in terms of the lives of our patients.

SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you. That's the kind of info we wouldn't know aside from a

clinic provider.

just have one question for a gynecologist. As was stated earlier, reproductive facilities provide many services. You do that. When the protestors have been outside your facility, how much has your practice been damaged by not being able to provide the other services that you provide?

asking that question. I am in the process now of looking into this because it's very serious. I moved my office there very recently. My patients like me, they trust me, they come to me.

Universally they express that they might not want to go to that office. They're afraid of the protestors. It's really a struggle to get them to come in for things that have nothing to do with abortion. They may have an abnormal pap smear.

They may need a procedure to prevent cancer. They may need a mammogram. It's sometimes hard to get

25

2	them to come in. Thank you very much. I think
3	that that's a very major point that needs to be
4	made and not just have the facilities related to
5	abortion. There are many other services at
6	women's services. As chair of the Women's
7	Committee, I can tell you, the services are
8	numerous, they're short, they're difficult for
9	women to get to them. The harassment for women in
10	all kinds of areas is very, very strong. So I was
11	very sensitive to when you made that comment. I
12	think in order for women to have the progress, we
13	need to be very sensitive to those issues. I
14	thank you all very much.
15	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I'm sorry,
16	Councilwoman Reyna has a question.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you,
18	Madame Chair. I just wanted to go back to the
19	scenario. I'm sorry, I didn't quite get your
20	name.
21	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: That's Dr.
22	Emily's and Dr. Emily's does not give their name.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I just

wanted to address the scenario that you had given

because I'm particular interested in

1	WOMEN'S ISSUES AND CIVIL RIGHTS 87
2	understanding
3	[Pause]
4	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: The current
5	law would not protect that client, despite the
6	fact that it was within 15 feet. Do you mean to
7	tell me that if a police officer were to be called
8	and she made a complaint there would be no arrest?
9	It's my understanding that there would be an
10	arrest.
11	DR. EMILY'S: A couple of things.
12	First of all, the police had to see it. They told
13	us that they had to see it. If they didn't see it
14	that that was the first block that they had. The
15	patient had to want to do, the patient had to
16	agree to go through the process of a criminal
17	investigation. She was an illegal immigrant. She
18	would not do it. I don't blame her. And so she
19	couldn't do it. She couldn't be the complainant.
20	I couldn't do it.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: The law does
22	not recognize you currently.
23	DR. EMILY'S: The old law doesn't.

DR. EMILY'S: The old law doesn't. The new law says that we, the clinic, would be able to bring the case. First of all, when we

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

called the police, the police would be able to arrest that person and then that person can go through the judicial proceedings and the clinic could bring the complaint or the charges. I'm not a lawyer, so I'm not sure exactly what the correct terminology. Basically, the case would get to court. One of the problems is that because the police were so neutered, so to speak, they had to see. Because we all want to protect everybody's rights, I understand what the problem was. law wasn't specific enough to what they needed to do in order to be able to do it. What this law does is it makes the protesters responsible for crossing the line. That had never happened Did it interfere with the operation of the clinic? Yes, it does. Then that's simple. Did the police have to see it? No. Can the clinic bring the charge? Yes. And we will do that.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And one step further. I'm sorry. Just to make sure that we take it from the arrest level to the prosecution level. At the prosecution level, will there need to be a witness on both the client as well as the

clinic rendering the services? Or would neither need to be there because at this point with the proposed law, the police officer would be able to testify and say on both of your behalf and neither of you would have to be there to say services were disrupted and the client was harassed?

DR. EMILY'S: The clinic would have standing. With the old law, the clinic had no standing. Only the woman who was trying to get an abortion had standing to say they prevented my getting an abortion.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And it's not just abortion. This is about women's health services. So I just want to be very clear here because we're talking about more than just one particular line of service.

MERLE HOFFMAN: You say it's not only one service. But if you do only one abortion in a multi-serviced environment, you're an abortion clinic. So for instance, Ambulatory Surgery and Choices, who are both licensed surgical facilities that can do multiple outpatient surgery, nobody wants to come there because they do abortions.

clinic escorts, et cetera, happened during

25

25

2	Clinton's term. All of the high extreme violence
3	happened during Clinton's terms. So while a
4	majority of this country is awash in this
5	jubilation of the election of a pro-choice,
6	progressive president, we have to be very aware
7	that this can fuels the fires of rectitude,
8	righteousness, anger, helplessness, disengagement
9	from the right, which will then in fact create, I
10	am thinking, even more radical anti-choice
11	actions. So that creates a timing factor of this
12	bill and why I say that the council is so
13	prescient and strategic to actually protect us
14	more strongly now because we're going to need it.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I appreciate
16	that point.
17	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Councilwoman,
18	is your question answered?
19	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: My question
20	is answered. She's just trying to clarify one of
21	my points.
22	KIMBERLY WALKER: I think all of my
23	colleagues would agree. We don't wish to silence

anyone. But we take serious issue in the behavior

and the actions of these protestors.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

Councilman Oddo has a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: I need some clarification on what the clinics will have standing to do. You just mentioned one thing.

The previous witness spoke about how the existing law requires intent to do something in general and also intent to prevent someone from receiving reproductive services. Now, under this bill, you would do away with the need to prove that that person intended to stop the person from getting reproductive services. So, trying to reconcile all of that, you believe this bill gives the clinics standing to say what exactly?

DR. EMILY'S: I'm not sure that I see things exactly the way you stated them. The way it was explained to me is that the police had to see it in order for it to have standing. In order to arrest somebody, the way that they could say that there was intent was because they saw it. So that's what the difference was. Now the police won't have to be there anymore. Look, we have the chart of a patient. We have the information about

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the patient. If we take the example of water, that patient didn't get a procedure because she drank water. We are not going to endanger anybody's life because we don't do that. If you're asking me would there be evidence, yes there is evidence. Because of the way the law was, the police weren't able to react to what was going on.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Thank you,

Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: There is just one point that I would like to make. With all due respect to the panel, because I think some of the issues that you're raising are actually within the law that need to be defined that way. What is the violation? There are various violations for that. So as I understand the shift is from the individual who would file the compliance to the facility that could make that so that the one who is being offended can remain anonymous through all of this. So the question, I think, in terms of the facility would be, depending on what the violation is, and that would depend probably on the police and the different violations. I think

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that might be the issue. Council Member Barron has a question. May I say that we have many more panels.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I just wanted to be clear. I don't understand why in the first place that you even had to have the police there. Because any other compliance on harassment in any other situation, the police they don't have to be there. If someone is harassed and they go to the precinct and say that I've been harassed then the police take those complaints and they go ahead and determine so valid litigation. just unfair in your instance that the police would have to be there. So I think this law puts you and protects women and puts them in the same place as everybody else. That if I am harassed and I go complain to the police department, they take it and based upon what I say and what the other person says, it's dealt with. So this law is not even doing anything special. It's just getting fairness and equality in the application of preventing a harassment for women who are trying to access reproductive services.

MERLE HOFFMAN: By giving the

2.0

clinic standing or anyone else standing to bring
this complaint, you're not placing the burden on
the victim, which is the woman or child who just
wants to go in and to get services

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Exactly.

MERLE HOFFMAN: So you're not

blaming the victim.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: That's the critical part of this new piece of legislation.

Everybody's First Amendment rights are still exercised, but it gives the clinics and a right to access reproductive services without harassment.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: That is the main difference, Councilman. I think that's what may be a difference of opinion at some point.

With that, I'm going to thank you.

SPEAKER QUINN: Madame Chair, if I could just say one thing. It's not really a question. I just want to particularly thank the folks from Dr. Emily's Health Clinic. Because whatever opinion anybody has on any issue, one of the key things for us and the city council is to hear directly from New Yorkers. That's how we often hear what's happening out on the streets in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our five boroughs. That's how we often hear how laws are or are not working. The folks from Dr. Emily's Clinic reached out to NARAL and then NARAL reached out to us. So I want to thank both the clinic and NARAL. We wouldn't have known to the degree we came to understand how challenging it was to implement the existing law. I think for anybody to call and say this problem is happening, can you engage government in helping us is sometimes a risk, because that can backfire sometimes. I just want to thank everyone at Dr. Emily's Clinic for being so concerned at your work and your patients that you took that risk to say what was happening to you. It was really that risk that brought us to today and what I believe will be a better state of affairs in our city. So thank you.

DR. EMILY'S: But I just need to say, and this is really important, that only Speaker Quinn did something. There were many people before you and after you actually who we spoke with. No, Speaker Quinn, what's important is who heard us, I think, and who actually created something that will allow the police to do their

		job.	This	is	huge.	Thank	you	very	mucl	a.
--	--	------	------	----	-------	-------	-----	------	------	----

3 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

4 SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you very

much.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Our next panel is Kelli Conlin, who will go first. Sharon Lau, are you here Sharon? Celine Mizrahi? Sonia Ossorio? I'm going to ask Kelli Conlin to go first. Please, if you have written testimony, see that the sergeant-at-arms has it. We're sticking to the two minute because we must move on, although what you have to say is very important. Identify yourself for the record. If you have a very lengthy testimony, I'm really asking you to just kind of pull it together so you get the main points across. Thank you.

NELLI CONLIN: Good morning. My name is Kelli Conlin, president of NARAL Pro-Choice New York. I would first like to take this opportunity to thank Speaker Quinn, Chairman Sears and our many friends and allies in the New York City Council. Doesn't being able to access health care without intimidation sound like common sense? I think so. Unfortunately, to protestors who

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regularly band together to prevent women from doing that, it's not. Imagine getting off the subway, having made the personal decision to terminate a pregnancy. You climb the stairs onto the street and you are confronted by a line of anti-choice protestors blocking your way. You nervously try to walk past the crowd but they follow you to the doors of the reproductive health facility. As they move closer to you, you become increasingly fearful. You try to step aside, but they push forward, surrounding you and try to intimidate you into turning around. This isn't a scene from Somewhere Else, USA. Women throughout the city's five boroughs encounter harassment, intimidation and coercion when they try to access legal reproductive health care. Such behavior should not stand in New York. We therefore proudly support the Clinic Access Bill that ensures women will receive the respect and dignity they deserve when seeking reproductive health This Clinic Access Law will prohibit anyone from preventing access to reproductive health care services, physically obstructing or blocking another person from entering a clinic, following

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or harassing another person within 15 feet of a facility, behaving in a way that places another person in reasonable fear of physical harm, or damaging a reproductive health care facility. Additionally, it protects providers and clinic workers, allowing them to perform their vital jobs without fear. To be clear, and I'm wrapping up, this bill does not inhibit or punish peaceful protest or prayer vigils. Instead, it ensures that women and clinic workers can access and provide legal medical care without fear of harassment and intimidation. There is no other legal health service that people are blocked from There is no legal health situation accessing. where strangers feel entitled to impose their will on someone else. Passage of the Clinic Access Bill will ensure that women can access any type of reproductive health case service without threat or intimidation because harassment is not acceptable. Not in New York. No anywhere. We need this law to stop it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. The next one that is speaking? State your name and remember, if you have written testimony,

2 the sergeant-at-arms would like a copy.

3 SONIA OSSORIO: Hello. My name is 4 Sonia Ossorio. I'm president of the National 5 Organization for Women here in New York City. want to thank the Council for having these 6 7 hearings on such a very, very important topic. 8 First and foremost, New York, as we all know, has been a beacon for women's rights and reproductive 9 10 rights. This bill will only further enhance that. 11 As Merle so eloquently pointed out, the next four 12 years, anything could happen and we could be under 13 assault. It is already happening in our clinics here in the city. The things that have been 14 15 outlined in this bill, expanding the definition of 16 clinic entrances and exits, the 15-foot harassment 17 free zone, broadening who can rightfully file civil actions, and most importantly allowing law 18 19 enforcement to do their job and prosecute is 20 vitally, vitally important for women to be able to 21 seek their reproductive health care needs here in 22 our city. In so many of the bills that the 23 National Organization for Women has worked on in the last few years, that last component is 24 25 critical. To be able to give law enforcement the

2.0

tools to move forward on tracking, whether it's protestors or human traffickers, so that women don't have to be in the line of fire in terms of being witnesses, in terms of having their lives threatened and go on to rebuild their lives and to focus on what's ahead for them. I know there's been much testimony here today and there are many people who still want to speak. But the National Organization for Women fully supports this Clinic Access Bill and we are here to help you see it through in any way that we can. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. Next?

SHARON LAU: Good afternoon. I'm

Sharon Lau. I'm the director of clinic defense
and research for the National Abortion Federation.

NAF is the professional association of abortion
providers in the United States and Canada. Our
members include health care professionals at 400
clinics, doctors' offices and hospitals across
those two countries. NAF has been compiling
statistics on violence and harassment since 1977.

Serious anti-abortion crimes, such as shootings,
arsons, and bombings have been at an all-time low

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recently, thanks in part to the federal FACE law and other state and local laws addressing clinic violence. However, despite the success of clinic staff, law enforcement and the national advocacy groups, clinic violence continues to impact the lives of women and reproductive health care providers throughout North America, including New York City. In the past 18 months alone, clinics across the United States have been the targets of arsons, attempted bombings, attempted arsons and blockades. In addition, patients and staff endure all the things that have already been noted so well earlier. New York, unfortunately, has a long history of clinic violence and harassment, including the tragic murder of Dr. Slepian in Amherst and arsons at New York City clinics. such as the one proposed by the council help keep everyone safe. Clinic staff, patients and lawful protestors have the right to exercise their constitutional rights free from harassment or violence. Numerous other communities across the United States have recognized the need for and enacted similar type of legislation. recently places as diverse as Oakland, California;

2.0

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and the state of Montana have enacted law addressing clinic harassment and violence. Our statistics and experience show us that when laws such as these are put into place and all laws are consistently enforced, the risk of escalation is reduced and communities at large are safer. Thank you very much for this important bill.

10 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

11 Pretty close on target.

CELINE MIZRAHI: Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Celine Mizrahi. I am the legislative counsel at the Center for Reproductive Rights. For the last 16 years, the Center for Reproductive Rights has used legal strategies to promote and defend women's access to reproductive health care services in the U.S. and around the world. We believe that effective clinic access protections are critically important to protecting reproductive rights and health care access. We support the proposed amendment to the current Clinic Access Law. The center's work allows us to get a national picture of the barriers that

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prevent women from accessing reproductive health care services and especially from accessing abortion care. Efforts to stop women from getting abortions around the country are relentless and come from many fronts, including clinic by clinic attacks on access. As we hear from clinics around the country, protestors block driveways and doorways and health care providers face threats and even assaults. When protestors step beyond their protected speech rights to interfere with women's ability to access abortion services, the impact on women can be even more pressing than the impact of the hundreds of restrictive state and local laws that we see introduced each year, many of which are enacted. New York City, on the other hand, has been a leader in protecting women's access to reproductive health care services. The city has policies and programs in place that require hospitals to provide emergency contraception for sexual assault victims and that require abortion provider training for OB/GYN residents trained in public hospitals, among others. In addition to these policies, the city's current Clinic Access Law shows that New York

2.0

recognizes the importance of preventing protestors
from going beyond their protected speech rights to
physically interfere with women seeking
reproductive health care. The proposed changes to
the Clinic Access Law will make this law more
effective, enforceable and more respectful of
women's privacy and confidentiality by making the
law's scope clear and the law enforcement's
authority clear. The proposed amendment to the
Clinic Access Law will maintain New York City's
proven leadership in protecting the rights of its
women. We urge the City Council to adopt the
proposed changes. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. Do my colleagues have any questions? I see we are joined by Melissa Mark-Viverito from Manhattan.

I'm sorry. Just a question for anybody, but I'll start with Kelli. As I said before, and you're very kind in your comments. Thank you. We only found out about the problem at Dr. Emily's Clinic because they reached out to NARAL and then you guys reached out to us. How frequently do you get calls of that nature?

2 KELLI CONLIN: We don't have a log 3 but I will say that from time to time our office 4 is inundated with calls. I know it's only anecdotal evidence but it really has been the 5 consistent drum beat of providers calling our 6 7 offices and pleading with us to reach out to 8 public officials. That really got our attention where we felt like it was important to bring it to 9 10 the Council because it became more and more 11 obvious that the current law is not effective for 12 many of the reasons that others have brought up. 13 I mean, quite frankly, a young woman who's just trying to access medical care is not interested in 14 15 becoming part of the law enforcement system, part 16 of judge, jury, pleading her case. Everyone has 17 different situations, but all of us when we seek to access medical care are in one of our most 18 19 vulnerable states and it's very, very important 20 that people's privacy is protected. It's so, so 21 important that this is passed because really there 22 is a problem in New York. I will just say to add 23 on that there are many local officials across the country that see all of you on the council as 24 25 leaders. But on this particular issue you should

take comfort in the fact that many other cities have done similar kinds of bills to protect its citizens.

SONIA OSSORIO: If I may add, at the National Organization for Women we do have a help line for women. The calls that we get mostly come from women. Many of them from young girls.

Just recently one that I field when I was in the office by myself was a young girl who had the courage to make her appointment and went down to the clinic and ended up leaving. Then she was on the phone just crying. Now she had to start over again. So these are the kinds of calls that we do get. People are also calling and finding if there are any funds that they could access to go to a hospital somewhere else rather than having to deal with some of the clinics.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Council Member Barron has a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I just
wanted to know if you know of any clinics or
services in the clinics that are threatening not
to be available anymore because of a lack of
enough utilization of them because of this kind of

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

problem? Or even if it's not happening immediate

if things continue the way they are, could it lead

to something like that?

SONIA OSSORIO: I think the more this problem goes unaddressed and unabated, the more likely it is that clinics will simply say it's too difficult to be in this profession. Already you see providers having to take just unimaginable steps to protect themselves and their families, both in this city and across the country. I think it's really the job of public officials and all of us as advocates to make sure that people who do this courageous work are protected to the extent of the law and to the extent that we can. It's really a difficult life and I applaud them immensely. Being the mother of two children, I can't imagine them going to school and being harassed or having my workplace harassed constantly. I just think that this law will go a long way in helping providers to feel protected and feel good about going to work in the morning.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. Thank you for being here. Our next panel is Philip Reilly, Michael J. Reddy [phonetic],

2.0

22

2.3

24

25

2	Steven	McDonald	and	Florence	Maloney.	Thank	you.
---	--------	----------	-----	----------	----------	-------	------

3 If you have testimony, be sure the sergeant-at-

4 arms has it. And also Mary Duvall [phonetic], I'm

5 | not pronouncing it correctly so you have to help a

6 little bit. Is there a Mary in the house? Are

7 you Mary? He'll hand them out to us. Thank you.

8 | You may start. I have to say it's good to see

9 Steven McDonald here. I see him at the 110th

10 | Precinct on our national night out. State your

11 name. We're going to stay within the two minutes.

So if it's very, very length, as I've said before,

if you could pin down.

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: I would hope that I could at least do the page I gave to you.

16 They asked me to come and to give a statement of

two pages, which I did. So I'd like at least to

do that. Because we have been here for two and a

19 half hours, to get a little balance here.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I understand

21 | that. It's an issue.

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: Good morning, dear Speaker and members of the City Council. My name is Monsignor Philip Reilly, the director of the Helpers of God's Precious Infant. For the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

past 20 years, here in the City of New York, no matter what the weather and in spite of my yearly struggle with facial skin cancer surgery, I have been standing daily for hours outside the places where abortions are performed to offer prayers, information and help to the women approaching these places. It has been my constant experience that no woman comes to these places because she wants to kill an unborn child. She comes because she has problems and they are real. There are right and wrong answers to human problems. Obviously, I do not believe that having an abortion is the right answer, for it will not bring back yesterday for the woman in difficulty and allow her to go on with her life. Indeed, I witness on a daily basis that abortion not only results in the unjust shedding of the innocent blood of our youngest brothers and sisters, but also causes painful mental and spiritual problems for the women. Although the first reaction for women after an abortion is relief because she says thanks be to god, my womb is empty. Later the same woman will say, oh my god, my womb is empty and then begins the pain in her head and her heart

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that remains with her beyond tomorrow. I have witnessed on a daily basis that there are two victims when an abortion is performed. deserve better and so I try to offer them the better way that will result in the life of the unborn child and peace for the mother. Any law that would hinder mothers from receiving the right answer by discouraging good citizens from offering that answer due to a chilling fear of an unjust punishment if they should exercise their First Amendment rights would be a travesty of law. Т believe that the approval of the amendment under consideration would be a source of great suffering for many women tomorrow, indeed have a chilling effect on good citizens in the exercising of their First Amendment rights. Indeed, I am one of the million disappointed citizens who approved the referendum on term limits to find out only recently that the votes of the citizens were meaningless because of special interest groups. Sadly, I believe Intro. 826 is, again, not expressing the will of your constituents, but only of special interest groups. For I don't know how otherwise in good faith the Intro. 826 amendment

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

could say that the council concludes that the current law does not adequately protect reproductive health care for those seeking abortions. I'm not aware of any of the Helpers or others violating the law or any record of their arrest or violations. Why then should you reasonably increase the penalties in the law when the present law is not being violated. For me then it is clear the only reason would be to create fear and intimidate the average citizen who believes in the sacredness of the life of the unborn from exercising his or her First Amendment That scandalously shouts out the hidden rights. hand of special interest groups again making a mockery out of democracy. According to the 1970 U.S. Census Bureau, the population of the City of New York in 1970 was eight million people. the influx of immigrants and the natural increase in births, one would project that 30 years later the population would be at least 12 million in the city. Yet, according to the United States Census in the year 2000, the population of New York City was the same as 1970, namely eight million people. How could this be? The answer is clear according

to the Vital Statistics of the New York State
Department of Health, which indicates that since
the passing of the New York State abortion law in
June of 1970 to the present time, 3.8 million
abortions have taken place in the city of New
York. That's equivalent to half of the people in
this city. With numbers like that, how can we
possibly speak about the difficulties of the
people in this city having access to so-called
abortion procedure

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Monsignor, I'm going to have to ask you--

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: [interposing]
No, I just want to finish. According to the 2005,
New York State Vital Statistics, although the
amounts of abortions, thanks be to god, has
continued to drop, the rate of abortions remains
tragically high. For example, I counsel in the
County of Kings, where in 2005, for every 1,000
white babies that were born, 371 were aborted.
For every 1,000 Spanish babies born, 623 were
aborted. For every 1,000 black babies born, 1,298
were aborted, namely 65 out of every 100 black
babies were aborted. With numbers like these to

2.0

2.3

speak of difficulties of access to abortion
facilities is beyond reasonable belief. To me
these numbers shout out that there is little or
nothing of true counseling being done in the so-
called abortion clinics. The women are not shown
the sonogram. They are not informed of free
health to them to carry the child to term.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Mr. Monsignor, could you address the legislation? That's what I would like you to do. If you could speak to the legislation.

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: This is the legislation.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Well, no, not the statistics. You need to really address the legislation.

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: Indeed, some clinics even have escorts on the sidewalk outside the clinics whose job is to prevent the woman from hearing the sidewalk counselors who are telling her that help is available through the wonderful New York State PCAP program. They even have guards in the entrance whose job is to take or encourage the woman on the way into the clinic to

throw into the garbage the materials given them by 2 3 the counselors that provide information of where they can get help to keep their unborn children. Indeed, in this past election, both candidates 5 agreed that together we should do all we can to 6 7 lessen the number of abortions by helping the 8 mothers to keep their unborn infants. amendment will do the opposite. I ask you to 9 reject it. Believing all legitimate authority 11 ultimately comes from god, I teach people that 12 lawmakers should be respected and obeyed. On the other hand, may I remind you that since your 13 authority does come from god, on some future 14 15 tomorrow each lawmaker will surely have to stand 16 alone before that same god to be judged on how you 17 used your power. As Martin Luther King so eloquently said, the law may not make you love me, 18 19 but by god, it should make you respect me. 20 more and more the group most discriminated against 21 around the world is the voiceless, helpless unborn 22 They need your help that their very infants. 23 lives be respected and protected by law. I pray, I plead that each of you, before finally deciding 24 25 your support or non-support of this amendment will

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seriously reflect that each of us in some future tomorrow will stand alone before the lawmaker and judge to give an account on how we treated god's precious infants and their mothers. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you,

Monsignor. We'll go now to officer McDonald.

Officer McDonald?

Madame Chair, STEVEN MCDONALD: Madame Speaker and members of the Council, I was an outsider looking in up until several years ago when I met friends of Monsignor Reilly. Then as a casual observer I came to know the good work that he did. So far this morning I've heard nothing that resembles the work that the Helpers of God's Precious Infants do. They're very respectful of the law as it was written. Monsignor Reilly contacts the local precincts to have supervising officers and rank and file to be there so that nothing is done outside of the law and that no one seeking reproductive health services ability to go into the building or to leave the building would be in jeopardy. I'm against Intro. 862. I would hope that you would give the pro-life movement a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chance to better explain their position and what they would hope to do for the law to protect those women and men who are looking to make available the services in the clinic. I've never seen any of you there on those mornings that I've been with Monsignor. Again, I've heard many mischaracterizations of our activities the days that we're there praying and singing. I would offer to Madame Speaker and Madame Chairwoman and the members of the Council to come with us on those days that we're praying just to see what goes on there and how I don't believe we need this increase in penalties and a different description of the law for the health care service, the reproductive services and the protesting that does go on there. I would tell you this past Saturday we were outside the clinic in Brooklyn and compared to our peaceful protestations and those who were there countering our prayer vigil, that was scary. That was loud. That was threatening. We were not. So please, do this before you do anything on this legislation. Monsignor Reilly has helped many people of all different colors and backgrounds in the 30 plus years that he's been

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	doing this work. And I would say the Catholic
3	Church has been the leader in this cause. Please
4	come see what happens before you enact this

5 administrative code change. Thank you.

> CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. Thank you. Next to give testimony? Identify yourself please. We're going back on the clock.

> FLORENCE MALONEY: Good afternoon. I'm Florence Maloney. I'm with the Helpers of God's Precious Infants and also with a group called Rachel's Helpers, which I will include in my statement. I have served as a lead facilitator for a service called Rachel's Helpers for the past ten years. Rachel's Helpers is an nondenominational outreach program for women who had one or more abortions. It is affiliated with the Helpers of God's Precious Infants and a postulate led by Monsignor Philip Reilly, who is its executive director. The principle work structure of Rachel's Helpers is in small group, consisting of five or six facilitators and a similar number of group participants. A bible study program, forgiven and set free, is followed over a period

2	of 11 weeks. The program, contained in eight
3	chapters, refers to scriptures from the Old and
4	New Testaments, which guides the participants
5	through a process of spiritual and emotional
6	healing. The facilitators support discussion
7	within the group related to the readings as they
8	touch upon the abortion experience. In our
9	current society, the psychological damage which so
10	many women endure after an abortion is denied for
11	the most part. Our society tells them to get over
12	it and to move on. However, women know that they
13	have been profoundly changed by the abortion
14	experience. The deliberate destruction of one's
15	own child
16	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: [interposing]
17	If I can interrupt, it would be good and helpful
18	if you stayed directly to the legislation.
19	FLORENCE MALONEY: I have to do
20	this in order to get to the legislation.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I know but you need to condense. So if you can get directly to the legislation, because that's why we're here today.

25 FLORENCE MALONEY: I'm skipping the

2.0

2	important part. The critical part is that
3	Rachel's Helpers has served women of all different
4	ages, from teens to seniors, from different walks
5	of life, from different races and from different
6	ethnicities. Some have suffered from substantial
7	emotional problems, complicated with bouts of
8	severe depression. The abortion experience
9	further increased their feelings or worthlessness,
10	futility and desperation. I am here to speak to
11	this council today to help its members to
12	recognize and to understand the losses and the
13	damage suffered by women who are victims of
14	abortion in New York City.
15	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I want you to
16	direct your testimony to the legislation.

FLORENCE MALONEY: As the abortion seeks to prevent--

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: [interposing]
You must do that.

FLORENCE MALONEY: Finishing up.

As the abortion industry seeks to prevent sidewalk counselors from offering counsel and assistance, not protest. That's a key difference. That's all I heard this morning was protestors. We are there

2	to offer counsel and assistance to vulnerable
3	women. The industry likewise refuses to recognize
4	the enormous toll it has taken and continues to
5	take each day. So to conclude, I believe the time
6	is long overdue for the reality of post-abortion
7	trauma to be known. More counseling of women is
8	needed, not less. That counseling cannot be
9	provided by a self-serving industry directly in
10	conflict. Sidewalk counselors are unpaid
11	volunteers who have only the best interests of
12	troubled women in mind. Sidewalk counselors need
13	to be supported. Restrictions would serve the
14	abortion industry only. Thank you very much.
15	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very
16	much. If you can confine your testimony to the
17	legislation.
18	MARY DUVALL: I'll do my best.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: No, no, you've got two minutes. We well recognize what God's Helpers do and that is not the issue. Because the work they do is tremendous and they are helping and there's no question about that. But what we're here for today is there's a legislation proposed and it's that hearing. So you could be

2	very helpful if you directed your testimony as to
3	why you think the legislation is not good or why
4	you think it is. That's what we need to conclude
5	with today is why all of you are here and why you
6	support or you do not support this proposed
7	legislation. Everything else is important and I
8	can tell you that this committee is very sensitive
9	to the issues that you are raising. We're not
10	insensitive to the work that is being done for
11	those that are opposed to abortion. We're not
12	insensitive to that. We also have a role and
13	we're going to deal with that. So I'm asking you;
14	you've got two minutes to address this
15	legislation. You can be very helpful with that.
16	Thank you.
17	MARY DUVALL: You're not trying to
18	make me nervous are you?
19	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: No, no, not at
20	all. I want to hear your comments on the
21	legislation. That's why we're here.

MARY DUVALL: Thank you. I'm Mary.

I'm also with Helpers of God's Precious Infants.

So much has been said about abortion protestors

physically striking, shoving, restraining,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

grabbling, et cetera. To highlight the main point so what I was going to say is that we are not protestors. We are not demonstrators. highly trained before we go out. We don't send people out there that are not trained. We stress not to block anyone. We don't approach the women in twos. That' intimidating. We try to approach the woman one at a time. If she says, get away and leave us alone, we're not going to force it. We may encourage her to take a pamphlet from which the abortion people snatch right away from them. So that's one of the main points. We do not threaten, intimidate or in any way harass the women, but we do try to encourage them and we do try to get the literature to them. That is one of the main points. We also pray for the abortion clinic workers. We're not against anyone, but we are for the life of the unborn. And Monsignor Reilly succinctly defended that. That's the main point is that those children are being killed mercilessly and the women incur a lot of damages themselves. That's already been stated. Some of the things we might say, and I need to say this because all of these points being made about

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

threat. It's never too late to change your mind. God loves you. That's what's being said from our group. Another succinct point is there's no arrests. I'm always at Dr. Emily's. The reason there's no arrests is because we are not breaking the law. I stress to all people that I train to stay out of the driveway, get out of the doorway. I might hand something to a girl going in, but we do not stand blocking a doorway or a driveway and I stress that continuously. One thing that we learned is we are law abiding. We're not there to violate the laws. We're there to work within the confines of them. The police department are there as a neutral presence. They're only too willing to tell us what we have to do and remind us and also to the other side. So they're like a neutral presence. And there have been no arrests. last point I want to make is that the abortion clinic providers have a vested interest, which is financial. That's it. Thanks.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You are saying and you're separating yourselves from protestors because there are protestors. That is a fact.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You are saying, and I just want it straight for the record, that you don't belong in that category and you don't belong in that classification. I think that's an important distinction.

MARY DUVALL: I just want to say one thing. Make no mistake though, if the abortion clinic providers who have a vested financial interest are the persons that could accuse us, that point may quite accurately be blurred.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I do have to correct you on one thing though. These clinics provide more than abortion. They provide women's I have to tell you that as chair of the services. Women's Committee, I am a strong advocate for women's services. That includes everything. Everything from, as you heard, from a mammography to gynecological checkups. So I think that when you're talking about abortion and you're talking about women's services in a clinic, and I'm speaking for myself now and not for the committee, I think there needs to be a complete distinction about that. Because women's services are not being given as they should. They are far between

and when they get into a clinic they are harassed. They're going in for gynecological checkups. You've heard testimony that a doctor's practice is
You've heard testimony that a doctor's practice is
really suffering from that. Well, he may be
suffering, but the people that are not going in
who need these exams are suffering for that.
Women need to have their checkups. They need to
do everything. The distinction that you made
though is an important one. I think though that
what this bill is talking about is women's
services. It's talking about getting into clinics
and being able to have peace of mind getting into
those clinics. Because when they go in, man,
woman, whatever, you don't know why they're going
in, as was testified earlier. You do not know
what the services are that they are seeking.
They're not going through that door and telling
you that they're getting a gynecological checkup.
They're not telling you they're going in for an
abortion. I feel very passionate about that.
MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: May I briefly
speak?

24 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I know that we 25 have to go.

2 MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: You're

talking the Ambulatory Surgery Center. I am there
every day. You talk about the men and women that
come there for AIDS as though they're afraid of
us. God knows that's not true. All of them, they
have received rosaries from us. They actually
pray for the women going there that they would
able to choose life. Anytime a woman or any
person is coming there for another reason,
immediately we say god bless you and if you know
somebody that needs help, take it. The idea that
we're harassing. The other thing is that the
administrator did say to me that 80% of the income
here comes from abortions. So while they mention
other things and other areas, he did say 80% of
the income comes from abortions. He told me that
himself. So I would have to presume most of the
people coming there are for abortions. As soon as
I realize they're not, we let them go. We talk to
them. I tell the people that anytime a person
says no, to let them go. We're trying to convert
them, we're not trying to witness that this is
wrong or right. We're trying to touch the heart.
So you must let them be free. They must

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

experience love and give them help. That's the approach we do.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Charles Barron has a question for the panel.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I just would like to say from hearing your testimony and I certainly appreciate your right to do what you're doing. I see no reason why you would be against this law. The reason being is because you're not doing anything that would violate this law here. Everything you're saying with the sidewalk counseling, you're not trying to block and you're not trying to prevent services. There's nothing you have testified before us that this law would stop you from doing exactly what you're doing. Even if the clinicians inside are the ones that can now raise the complaint, that's not for you, that's for those who are harassing and for those who are blocking and for those who are creating havoc by those who have decided to make a very tough decision in their life. matter of fact, I think they might even appreciate some of the sidewalk counseling if it's a positive thing for them making this tough decision.

2.0

2.3

2	when it reaches to harassment and blockage, if
3	you're not doing that, this law does not stop your
4	First Amendment right to provide sidewalk
5	counseling. I just wanted to make that very, very

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: I would hope so because the truth is, indeed, thousands of women take the help and come back out and thank us later. That's a fact.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right.

Exactly.

clear.

add one sentence here, the big problem is the identification is going to be given to the provider. The defense has to be of the person who is accused. There's going to be a lot of ambiguity there. Somebody who is offering help and somebody who, as you called, protesting.

There's a big difference. A different service and a different purpose. But in the actual enactment of what you're talking about in legislation, there's a huge area for persecution.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: That's absolutely correct. But let me just say this very

2.0

quickly that any law can be abused. The court of the law will determine whether someone is abusing that law or not. That could happen with any law. But I doubt seriously that if a woman going into the clinic sees what you're doing as a positive for them that they would now go inside the clinic and say that I want these folks arrested. If someone abuses it and does that, then like any other law, that will be something that has to be taken up in the courts. But I think there's nothing in this law that would prevent you from doing what you're doing.

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: The only thing I was fearful of would be that the abortion provider simply would accuse us falsely. What defense do we have if you don't have to have a witness or someone doesn't have to come forth as claiming it to be true, that it's just on their word then I'm arrested?

MARY DUVALL: Councilman, may I make one comment? One of the reasons that we're here is that in actual health care you would not be allowed to pressure a patient to get on your side to take a lawsuit. The problem at Dr.

2.0

2.3

Emily's is the women don't want to press charges
because they don't feel threatened or harmed.
That is going to allow the clinic providers to
make a lot of false claims. The police got tired
of coming there because their claims very
frequently are not true and they can't be
substantiated. That's why we're here with this
bill because they couldn't get over with the bill
that they had before because we were not breaking
the law.

respect to you, I think there are women who could make those charges who don't make the charges because they're fearful and because they are being harassed. There are women that need to be protected and that's what this law does.

MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: And I would say if they do make those claims, I have no problem with that, but I do want that person who has been harassed to be the one to make the claim so I can defend myself on guilty or not guilty.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: But it's easy for you to say, Father, but when it's an immigrant person or it's a person that has

problems and needs more protection and would be in more trouble if they make the complaint. It's easy for you to say that. You're not a woman.

You're not an immigrant. You're not being harassed. So it's easy for you to say, Father, in all due respect of who you want to be the complainant. But we need to protect women and I

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Before we wrap up, I'd like him to ask his question.

think this law does that.

on, and in hopes of finding common ground with the previous council member who spoke and dovetailing with the last statement by Monsignor. The distinction is between those people who are breaking the law currently, who are going outside the confines of the law, who are doing the wrong law and the folks from Monsignor Reilly's group and others who are offering their alternatives. The concern is, I think you expressed it and then the Monsignor expressed it, and my concern and the reason for my very specific questions about language is that an imprecisely written law will impact all activity. The bad people doing the

2	wrong thing and the good people at the table who
3	are doing in their minds what they think is the
4	right thing. I'm not one to throw out slippery
5	slope and chilling effect but that's the question
6	at hand. I think the previous Council Member
7	alluded to that initially about the distinction.
8	I think that's what you're concerned about. An
9	imprecisely written law is not going to catch the
10	folks who are doing the wrong thing. Based on the
11	previous testimony from some of the other
12	witnesses, I believe the wrong thing is happening.
13	But it's going to impact all activity. It makes
14	it too easy to stop all activity. That's my
15	concern.
16	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.
17	Thank you, Mr. Councilman. Thank you very much
18	for being here. We do have to get to the next
19	panel.
20	MSGR. PHILIP REILLY: Thank you for
21	listening and you're attention. God bless you.
22	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very
23	much.
24	SPEAKER QUINN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I'm going to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

call in this order: Ami Sanghvi, Joan Malin and Anne Robinson and Jo Southern [phonetic]. Ami, if you could start and give your name. All who have testimony, we must stick to the clock. minutes. I'm sorry. I know when it comes and people say there's a little flexibility here and there. We have five more panels and it's just not The room could be empty when the last panel fair. comes and I think that's not fair. Condense your testimony. I think we've heard a lot and a lot of reiterations about the issue. So if you can address the legislation, you see the pros or the cons with it, that could be very helpful and it is helpful. So just deal with that. Introduce yourself. If you have testimony, the sergeant-atarms will have it.

AMI SANGHVI: Thank you. My name is Ami Sanghvi and I'm a staff attorney in the Reproductive Rights Project of the New York Civil Liberties Union. I would like to thank the City Council members for inviting the NYCLU here today. In light of NYCLU's long history of vigorously defending and balancing sometimes competing constitutional concerns, the NYCLU is uniquely

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

positioned to provide testimony on this bill. They NYCLU believes that the right to decide whether to continue or terminate a pregnancy is fundamental to women's equality, dignity and personal autonomy. However, we also recognize that issues associated with reproductive health care are controversial. We value and encourage dialogue around those issues and would contest any unlawful attempt to censor that dialogue. For that reason, the NYCLU has always carefully considered the impact of measures to protect access to reproductive health care facilities and have opposed measures that violated protected free 14 speech rights. We believe that the Clinic Access bill strikes the appropriate balance between free speech and the right to access reproductive health Despite existing laws at the city, state care. and federal level, which criminalize blocking clinic entrances, various problems have been reported with the enforcement, as we've heard While there's a need to strengthen the today. existing law, it is essential that the mayor's office and the police department focus on adequately training law enforcement and ensuring

robust enforcement of the law. While it is 2 3 critical for the government to safeguard access to clinics, it is also necessary to ensure that measures intended to do so not impinge on 5 protected First Amendment activity. In examining 6 7 whether a particular measure withstands 8 constitutional scrutiny, the first inquiry is 9 whether a given measure implicated protected 10 speech or expression. If the measure is content 11 neutral, which this one is, the inquiry is whether 12 the measure is narrowly tailored to serve a 13 significant government interest and whether it 14 leaves open ample alternative channels to 15 communication. This proposal does that. First, 16 the primary concern of the provision is conduct 17 rather than speech. That is an important 18 distinction. And if the bill prohibits conduct 19 that has expressive value, such as a peaceful sit-20 in, the provision does not run afoul of the 21 Supreme Court's established tests. The only 22 provision of the bill that has been discussed is 23 the follow and harass language and we believe that this language will continue to be understood 24 25 narrowly and in fact there will be no violation of

the First Amendment rights. I will wrap up. To be very clear, and what should calm the concerns of the panel before me, the proposed legislation does not prohibit prayer vigils, sidewalk counseling, leafleting either within the 15-foot zone or elsewhere. This bill is narrowly tailored to serve significant government interests and the bill is a very good balance in safeguarding reproductive rights as well a the diversity of views of all New Yorkers. Peaceful protest activity is permitted anywhere and we have prepared a lengthier legal analysis which we have submitted in written form.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: That will be in the record, and that will be very helpful. Next, please identify yourself.

JOAN MALIN: Thank you. My name is

Joan Malin. I'm the president and CEO of Planned

Parenthood of New York City. I'm pleased to be

here today in support of and to provide testimony

for Intro. 826, the Clinic Access Law. I first

want to thank the committee members and Council

Member Helen Sears and Speaker Christine Quinn for

your leadership of issues regarding women's

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

health. It means a great deal to us at Planned Parenthood. On behalf of Planned Parenthood New York City's board, staff and especially our clients, I say thank you. Planned Parenthood has been providing reproductive health care services for over 90 years here in New York City. In 2007, we provided reproductive health care services to more than 42,000 women, men and adolescents at our 2 health care centers in the South Bronx, Downtown Brooklyn and in Manhattan at Bleecker Street. provide our services for anyone who needs us, regardless of their ability to pay. overwhelming majority, more than 85% of our services are basic preventive health care services for women. Our administrative offices are colocated with our clinic on Bleecker Street. everyday I pass the women and men who have come to us to seek help and reliable affordable health care. I share the sidewalk with their partners, friends and family members who have come to lend emotional support. Many days I, too, navigate my way past picketers and protestors dedicated to making our job as difficult as possible. Many of them are peaceful, but nevertheless, it is a very

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

difficult gauntlet that we must transpire. to be clear at the outset that I am a fervent believer in freedom of speech and the right to protest. I have actually personally used that right many times in the last eight years and I would be the last person to try and diminish that in any way. But I also believe that every person has the right to access health care free of harassment and intimidation. It is this commitment that makes me proud to support Intro. 826. I applaud you all for crafting this legislation that strengthens current laws, protects individuals' access to reproductive health care while at the same time respecting First Amendment constitutional rights. One final comment that I would like to make, and again, my colleague from NYCLU said it as well. That if this legislation is to be successful, we also need to look for the support and partnership of the New York City Police Department. They will need to have training, monitoring and accountability around this issue and we at Planned Parenthood, we welcome the opportunity to work with this. now going to turn if over to my colleague and vice

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

president, Anne Robinson, who oversees our

3 clinical services.

ANNE ROBINSON: I'm honored to have the opportunity to testify in support of Intro. 826. Over the years, our clients and staff have experienced periods of intense harassment and intimidation. I can recall one such period in particular, beginning in 2003 and escalating in 2005. In the fall of 2005, the New York State attorney general filed a lawsuit, Spitzer versus Cain, under the FACE law, which is the Federal Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances law, as well as FACE's New York State counterpart and a New York State Law concerning public nuisance. Spitzer versus Cain grew out of repeated protests by two demonstrators at our Manhattan Center, the Margaret Sanger Center. The two protestors engaged in verbal abuse, physical obstruction of the clinic, confrontations, physical threats and sometimes physical assaults. I'm happy to report that in February of '06, the U.S. District for the Southern District of New York, issued an opinion and an injunction finding in favor of the state. We are grateful for the support that we received

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

from the AG's office. However, it was not an easy process. Had Intro. 826 been available in 2003, our health center would have had legal options that could have led to an easier and potentially quicker solution. It would have been easier for our clients and for the police. Under Intro. 826, intent would not have to be established in order for protestors to be arrested and prosecuted for violating the law. As a result, it would have been easier for police to make an arrest. addition, the health center could have made a complaint to the police without a statement from a patient based on the fact the protestors were willfully interfering with the operation of the clinic. More than 14 years ago, Planned Parenthood launched a clinic escort program to make our clients feel supported when entering our clinic. Each month we train volunteers and activists to become escorts. We have over 50 active volunteers that give their time to help protect the safety of our clients. Unfortunately, even with our escort program, many clients are still intimidated, harassed, and shouted at by vehement protestors. The protestors often follow

2.0

2.3

much.

our clients directly to the door and sometimes
block the entry. We're fortunate that our budget
allows for safety features that for the most part
discourage extreme protest activity.

6 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Can you please 7 sum up.

ANNE ROBINSON: I'm wrapping up.

We're keenly aware that many clinics in New York

City are small and operate on limited budgets.

The litmus tests of this law's success is whether

it protects the smallest clinic in the city and

not only the largest. This is where the city

Clinic Access legislation comes in. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

JO SOUTHERN: Thank you. I'm Jo
Southern, speaking on behalf of the Brooklyn ProChoice Network. There has been a great deal of
discussion this morning about concepts, such as
freedom of choice, freedom of religion and First
Amendment. But this bill is not really about
concepts, it's about real people, real patients at
reproductive health facilities. I would like to
presume to speak for them, on the basis of our

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

group having had to spend 18 continuous years every weekend standing around outside clinics as escorts, helping patients and gathering information. Very briefly imagine that you're going into a clinic for outpatient surgery. You're, of course, a little bit nervous, want it over with, and a partner is with you. If you're a young woman going to a reproductive health clinic, whether for an abortion or something else, you're often very stressed by the situation that brought you there. As you walk up you're startled by the sidewalk display of gory posters and then a perfect stranger, sometimes in religious garb, is within inches of you, right by your face, walking insistently right next to you saying things like: mom, don't kill your baby; won't you reconsider; how far along are you; look at this picture, this is what your baby looks like now; here, take this pamphlet and think it over. When you finally do glance at the pamphlet, it has yet more gory Sometimes of a procedure that is not pictures. even performed at this clinic. You have just met the sidewalk counselors, as they call themselves. They may not technically be protestors, but effect

2	is not the same as intent. There may also be
3	people praying on the sidewalk next to yet more
4	gory displays. By our estimates, this happens at,
5	at least eight New York City clinics. An
6	additional number receive large periodic prayer
7	vigils right in front of them, facilitated and
8	escorted by the NYPD. People sometimes ask, well
9	why don't the patients file complaints? Why don't
10	they even just say get out of my face and go away
11	to the counselors? Once in a while they do, but
12	very rarely. They're generally young women,
13	almost always women of color by the way, and often
14	immigrants. They've been taught to be polite and
15	to deal with unpleasantness by ignoring or
16	avoiding it. They just want to get away.
17	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Can you sum up
18	please?
19	JO SOUTHERN: Yes, I'm about to.
20	The effects of what goes on produces guilt. It
21	produces in effect, harassment, although that may

The effects of what goes on produces guilt. It produces in effect, harassment, although that may not be its legal intention. Now, to 826, why do we need this bill? We need it because the existing legislation in many ways has been successful. But those laws were designed for an

2.0

2.3

era when the main threat was physical blockades
designed at shutting things down and physical
danger. Nowadays, rather than risk arrest and bad
publicity, anti-choice activist, such as our
predecessors here

7 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: [interposing]
8 You must conclude.

themselves. They set up a social and psychological barrier. We ask whether this bill would remove all of the interference going on with restricting access and the answer is no because its prohibitions incorporate very high standards in line with the design of it being narrowly tailored. However, it will, and this is why we support it, it will clarify the definition of the premises; it will assist providers in establishing boundaries; it will establish a small but objective and measurable zone which has specific prohibitions and this will allow the complainants to assist the NYPD in enforcing this legislation.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You have to conclude. I'm sorry, but we have many more panels.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

JO SOUTHERN: We support this

legislation because it provides an excellentbuilding block. We would like to thank the City

5 Council for bringing it forward.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. Ι just have one question because I think one of you addressed it. The panel before, persuasively, said that they are not protestors. They are peaceful demonstrators. You mentioned prayer, you mentioned rosaries and all kinds of things that this bill does not stop. They have every right to do that. So you somehow made some reference to associating some of that with what some of the protestors do. Maybe you need to clarify that because this bill does not stop prayer. It does not stop the rosaries. They are peaceful demonstrators. I have seen them. I've seen them in Grand Central Station. I've seen them in many places because I do get around the city. So I'm asking you to address that because you're addressing that.

JOAN MALIN: From our perspective we are fully in support of peaceful demonstrations and folks who want to come in front of the clinic

2.0

2.3

and to protest in a peaceful way that does not
restrict access to our services and does not
intimidate or harass our clients. As I spoke in
my testimony, we obviously are in support of
freedom of speech. We think this bill does create
the proper lines that allow for access to our
services, not harassment and yet allows people to
protest as they need to.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I think one of the things is that the very fact that it's removed from the individual to the facility is in the case of peaceful demonstrators intimidating in itself.

That is what I get from some of the testimony.

Can you address that?

JO SOUTHERN: I'm sure they
perceive it this way. From our perspective, they
may be peaceful, but their goal is to restrict
access using peaceful means and guilt and fear
rather than actual physical blockages. So we want
to talk a little bit--

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: [interposing]
Well that's what you're saying. That's not what
they said. I'm not going to take your hearsay for
what we had from their testimony. Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AMI SANGHVI: I just wanted to make one point that as an organization that looks very carefully at First Amendment protected speech and that takes that extraordinarily serious, this bill does not harm any protected free speech protected by the First Amendment. An individual is absolutely free to express his or her self regardless of whether they oppose or support the reproductive health services that a person is receiving at that facility. I want to be very clear that we also interpret this proposed legislation as not prohibiting peaceful protest activity, prayer vigils, sidewalk counseling, leafleting, even within the 15-foot zone as long as it is peaceful and it does not run afoul of the many cases the Supreme Court has heard on this issue. CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

JOAN MALIN: I just want to add that since we had our decision in 2006, for the most part we have many peaceful protestors and it doesn't create an issue on a day-to-day basis.

But it's when these principals are violated that we object to.

2	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very					
3	much. Does Councilman Barron have a question?					
4	Thank you. Our next panel is Chris Slattery,					
5	Christina Simmons, Julian Sierra [phonetic] and					
6	Kaneisha Grant [phonetic]. Are they all here?					
7	Do you have any testimony? Again, please see that					
8	the sergeant-at-arms has it. Stay to the clock.					
9	Perhaps Mr. Slattery wishes to start?					
10	CHRIS SLATTERY: Good afternoon.					
11	My name is Chris Slattery.					
12	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I have to say					
13	thank you for waiting so long, all of you. I know					
14	that you've been very patient.					
15	CHRIS SLATTERY: No problem. My					
16	name is Chris Slattery and I am the founder and					
17	president of Expectant Mother Care. I founded the					
18	largest network of crisis pregnancy centers and					
19	alternative to abortion offices in New York City.					
20	We have ten centers in the four boroughs and we					
21	also have been out in front of Dr. Emily's for two					

years with a mobile clinic where we counsel and 22 talk with young girls and women. Three of them 23 24 are here with me and there are three upstairs and I'd like them to get to testify later. We are not

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at Dr. Emily's or any of the other clinics that we go to, to protest. We are there to talk to these young ladies. We are there to reach out to them in love and in compassion because we care about them and their futures. We love them. In the 24 years that I've run Expectant Mother Care, we have counseled and served 95,000 girls and women, most of whom are pregnant. At Dr. Emily's we're counseling about 1,000 girls face to face per I see bill 826 as a huge threat to the free speech outreach to reach and talk with these girls in a non-harassing First Amendment way with love and compassion. We have mainly female counselors who approach girls like these three women who had appointments at Dr. Emily's, who did not feel harassed, threatened or in any way intimidated, but talked with our counselors, came into our mobile clinic and voluntarily chose a different path than they had scheduled that morning. fact, on an annual basis, I estimate 3,000 women turn away from their appointments by being counseled by Monsignor Reilly, the sisters, the brothers and the lay people that in love and compassion have not been harassed. Can you image

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3,000 women changing their mind and their plans for an abortion because they were harassed? But because they were given love. There's one thing that disturbs me this morning, this issue about giving out or offering water as if we're trying to sabotage a person and cause them harm. I had no idea that offering someone on a hot July day a glass of water or a bottle of water would be considered like a hostile act of harassment. Since when is that true? Well, any, that's beside the point. I'd like the ladies to speak. have no prepared statements. They weren't told what to say. They're going to speak from their Each one of them is pregnant and each one hearts. of them made a different choice than they originally planned. If I can't approach them and our counselors are intimidated and so scared to death of lawsuits and arrests that we can't speak to these women, even in that 15-foot zone, then these kind of women will get more abortions when you said at the beginning, Ms. Sears, that you were in favor of a reduction in abortion. exactly what our organization does. We help reduce abortion by helping young women like those

here.

to speak in two minutes. But I have a question after they testify because I'm not certain how this proposed legislation stops you from doing what you're doing. Answer that after they testify.

9 CHRIS SLATTERY: I would be happy to.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: They need to stay to the clock please.

KANEISHA GRANT: My name is

Kaneisha Grant. I live around the corner from

Emily's Health Clinic. Actually, to tell you the

truth, I'm not scared of protestors. I'm not

actually scared of them. I think they are very

helpful. There's a lot of women, there's a lot of

my friends that do get a lot of abortions just

because they don't have anybody to talk to. When

you do go to the clinic you don't get the

conversation that you get from them to help you to

actually change your mind and to stop having

abortions. I pretty much had a bad experience and

this is the reason why I am here because I would

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

like people to hear it from me to. I've been to the clinic at least two or three times. The last time that I did go, I was pregnant and I was told that I wasn't pregnant. And then turned around that it was too soon for me to find out that I was pregnant. This is what they told me. I should be getting my period soon. That Monday I thought it was a period, which it wasn't. I was actually pregnant. I was pregnant for like two or three months not knowing because after that period I wasn't getting any more. You understand what I'm saying? When I did go back to them to let them know that I missed and I'm pregnant or whatever, it was too late. Because already now I'm having contractions not knowing. So I wound up having to go to the hospital. I had my baby. My baby passed away. I didn't learn my lesson that time. I went back to them again. This time that I went back to them I was pregnant and I didn't know what I really wanted to do so I had an abortion. didn't do everything that they were supposed to do with my procedure and I almost lost my life. is why I do not go in. I would never go in. would not even tell my friends to go in.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 understand that? Since I've been talking to Julie 3 and her staff, it's been wonderful for me. I have

4 two children now. I'm trying to have one now.

They have been really helpful. Thank you

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

State your name please.

KARISMA SIMMONS: My name is Karisma Simmons [phonetic] and I'm here with the ladies from the EMC in the Bronx. I just want to say that I feel what these women are doing is not harming anybody. There are plenty of people that stand around and give out fliers. What they're doing is just raising awareness. They're giving young ladies like myself an alternative and something to think about before you walk in there and do something that you might regret. Regardless of what they say to you, it's your choice to walk in or to walk out. I did witness the ladies giving out pamphlets and fliers. They didn't harass anybody. They didn't grope anybody. They didn't do that to myself. I wasn't harassed. I was basically educated. Thanks to them I'm going to have a baby any day now. My first choice was to walk in that place and not give my child

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the chance to live. I would say they gave me
insight. They have helped me since I have met
them. They're not doing anything wrong. They're
just raising awareness to people who don't know
what they're probably going to get themselves into

once they walk in there. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

Julian Sierra: Good afternoon. Mvname is Julian Sierra. I'm 19-years-old and I have two children. The one that I have now, that you all see, my first choice was to give him up. But then I thought about it. Why can't I give my child life? If I can't take care of him, there's other choices. So, no, they're not harassing. They're giving me a chance to know what an abortion is. At first I thought that an abortion was just a bill and then the baby would just come There's more to it than that. So I'm learning. I'm getting to know what it is and what I'm doing. I'm young and I don't know right now what life is really about. We have our choices to get in and get an abortion or not. We have the choice to raise our child and give other people a chance to know what life is about. I gave my

child a life and I'm proud of that. Because of
Julie, because of all of these women protesting
and giving me a pamphlet. I don't have to read
it. It's my choice to read it or throw it away or
whatever. But, as I said, they're not harassing.
They're giving me a chance to know what it's about
and what an abortion is. I did not know what an
abortion was. From my instincts, it was just
drink a medicine and that's it. I didn't know
what we had to do. Whether we had to put
something up there up cut the baby up or vacuum, I
didn't know any of that. But I thank them so much
for making me understand what an abortion was.

much. I thank you for coming because it's not easy to come and testify at City Hall and you waited a long time. So I really appreciate that. I think I have to say and then Mr. Slattery will answer my question. The proposed legislation is not stopping them from coming to you. It's not doing that and if there was any attempt to do that, that would be wrong. That would be breaking the law. The fact is that there are areas where young girls and women are intimidated rather

10

2 badly. Now, certainly, Monsignor Reilly 3 testified, as I said, very persuasively that they're very gentle and they're really doing the work that they believe in. This is not to stop 5 them and it is not for City Hall to stop them. 6 7 What City hall is about in making laws is that 8 people are treated fairly, that they have a safe environment. Because I think you said a very key thing. You really said it was your choice, but 11 you're talking about free will. It is government 12 that must create an environment for people to exercise their free will. At the same time, as 13 14 much as you've heard other testimony, there are 15 demonstrators and that's within the law, to 16 persuade you otherwise. Nobody is stopping that. 17 But you certainly wouldn't want to be violently 18 attacked because you were listening to them. 19 think there was a separation of peaceful 20 demonstrations and protestors. I can tell you the 21 testimony that you heard was not manufactured. 22 People get into these facilities and they are 23 harassed. They're really intimidated and in many instances that their safety is really at hand. 24 So 25 I think that you need to do that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

commendable that you're here. Obviously you are
the success of the efforts of the group that is
doing this. Certainly they are successful. I
don't know why you think that this proposed law
would stop you from doing what you're doing. I'm
still not clear on that.

CHRIS SLATTERY: May I answer that question?

10 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Yes.

CHRIS SLATTERY: We heard the testimony from a leader of Dr. Emily's. On the day that you announced the legislation, which was the launch, probably not coincidentally of the National 40 Days for Life Campaign on September 24th, Dr. Emily's was prepared and had gone to the police and made sure that the police were at Dr. Emily's every day during the 40 Days for Life Campaign that I conducted. This was conducted with a great amount of prayer, a great amount of attention to training of the counselors to make sure that they don't block doors and they don't block people's path and they don't stop and hold someone or touch their arms, but just extend brochures and discussions and invite people to

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

come over to the edge of the property for

discussions.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: How would this bill stop you from doing that? I asked the question.

CHRIS SLATTERY: The police were there and observing us every single day. Yet this woman is screaming bloody murder to the police all the time for refusing to arrest us. Now you want to give these people the power to have us arrested and you ask us not to be in fear. I'm sorry, I don't give them the benefit of the doubt. This is a business for them. When these three girls chose to have their babies, they lost their business. You are giving a one-sided bias law to protect a business so that they will continue to make their They're not interested in reducing the profits. number of abortions.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Mr. Slattery, that's really not addressing what the legislation does. I'm not going to suddenly pivot panel against panel. I'm not. You answered the question and I think that's something that certainly what this bill is to do is not to

2	intimidate	thogo	Tuzh O	220	thoro	obozzina	+ho	7 2547
4	IIILIMILAALE	LIIOSE	MIIO	are	unere	opearing	LHE	law.

CHRIS SLATTERY: Well I am the leader of this group and I can tell you that you are intimidating me with this bill and all of my staff. We're not some other fictitious bogey men and strong men.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You have made
your point and you've answered my question. I
don't want to take another recess. We have other
panels. I appreciate your cooperation. Thank you
very much. Our next panel is Helen Rosenthal
[phonetic], she representing herself, Reynals
Tenazis Norman [phonetic], and Carrie James
[phonetic]. Are all three of you here? The third
name that was called? Can you tell me your name?

HELEN ROSENTHAL: Helen Rosenthal.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: And you are?

CARRIE JAMES: Carrie James.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: So Reynals

Tenazis Norman, is he here? Is Philip Kim here?

Please join this panel. Thank you. You can

start. Just identify yourself. If you have any

24 | testimony, please give it to the sergeant-at-arms.

25 HELEN ROSENTHAL: Thank you for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

holding this hearing and thank you for the patience during the process. My name is Helen Rosenthal. I'm on the National Board of NARAL Pro-Choice America and I am the chair of Community Board 7 on the Upper West Side. But I'm speaking to you today as a private citizen. wholeheartedly support bill 826 introduced today. Here in New York City we have commendable laws that protect reproductive health care rights. the laws do not do enough to protect the people who need access to reproductive health services. As you've just talked about, there is a difference between peaceful protest and an angry mob. bill today takes an important step in making this distinction. We all deeply cherish the freedom of speech and as citizens we can and should make our voices heard about the things we believe. However, we need to make it clear that a person's right to speak their mind does not allow them to harass, intimidate or inflict violence on anyone. I live on the Upper West Side and during the early 1990s there was only one reproductive health center in the area. I happened to live across the street from their clinic. It was in an office

2.0

building in a residential area with a variety of medical practices, including dental offices and physical therapists. At the time, there were often protestors outside. I saw the crowds gather on weekends intimidating all of those trying to get in. It became an economic issue for all of the tenants. In 1994, when the center's lease was up, they were unable to re-sign or rent a different space in the area. Many believe that the clinic was repeatedly turned down because the landlords were concerned about the dangerous protestors. The terrorizing actions had the effect of preventing people from receiving care. How did that happen?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Well you're reading slowly.

HELEN ROSENTHAL: I was? Listen, we need to remember how far we've come along in terms of gaining access to reproductive rights.

We need to think about how far we still have to go. Let's take this subtle and important step today so we can ensure that all New Yorkers and Americans can feel safe in making their decisions about their own bodies for every generation to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

come. Because we have the freedom to choose, we have to have the freedom of access. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

CARRIE JAMES: Hello. My name is Carrie James. I've been volunteering for Planned Parenthood for about the last two years. I am the co-chair of the political action group with that group, but I am here speaking for myself. One of things we do is exercise our First Amendment rights and do demonstrations of support outside of the Bleecker Street clinic to counter the prayer vigils that are very peaceful outside of that clinic. However, they do dispatch a couple of people to each side of the clinic who I have seen running down the street to grab people. people are obviously asking them to leave them alone and they still follow them all the way up to the clinic door. Or, if they don't go in the clinic, they'll follow them to the end of the street and then finally leave them alone to go to the next person. So I personally believe in unfettered access to reproductive health care and health care in general. That's why I'm supporting

this bill. 2 Thank you.

3 PHILIP KIM: I'm Philip Kim and I'm 4 a volunteer captain of the Planned Parenthood of 5 New York City clinic escort program. I'm not here as an official spokesman for Planned Parenthood. 6 7 I and the escorts I organize have been witness to 8 the escalating aggression of protestors just in the last couple of months. We've had three 9 incidents at two of the many clinics in New York 11 City that this legislation could give victims of 12 harassment legal recourse. In the three recent incidents, patients seeking services were harassed 13 to the point where the patient had exclaimed out 14 15 loud in the street, I'm just here to get my birth 16 control, or, I'm not here for an abortion, and in 17 the last case, you don't understand. protestor was relentless. Before an escort could 18 19 go and help them, the patient was exasperated and 20 yelled, I was a victim of rape and began to cry. 21 The escort finally forcibly had to step between 22 the patient who was sobbing and the protestor who 23 was still harassing the sobbing patient who was trying to get in and held her arm and helped her 24 25 into the clinic. People should not be allowed to

harass and intimidate patients to the point where they are forced to divulge personal information on the street to strangers. And as a spokesman for the 98 volunteer escorts I organize, we who act as buffers, I'm only 5'10", 15 foot would be a lot better, believe that the men and women should have the same rights to privacy and respect when trying to access health services. That's why I'm here in support of this bill.

much. If you're wondering why when we first it seemed like I was with an optometrist it's because my glasses were left at home and the only prescriptions I have are the dark glasses. So they all went fetching to get me glasses and none of them work. So I keep having difficulty with the names unless I put my own prescription on.

Our next panel is April Gay [phonetic], Anaza Robertson [phonetic], Cassandra Legari [phonetic], and Brian Strong [phonetic]. Are you all here? You may start. Please introduce yourself.

ANAZA ROBERTSON: My name is Anaza Robertson. About two months ago I met a woman named Julie and she helped me to keep my baby.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

She did not harass me. She gave me all the answers. She treated me with respect, love and dignity. It was like an angel telling me this was wrong. I would tell young women to think before you get an abortion. There are people who will help you and treat your lovingly, keep your privacy confidential and treat you with respect.

Thank you for your time.

much. Next? Pull the microphone over to you.

APRIL GAY: Hello. How are you doing? My name is April Gay. Good afternoon. What I want to say is that last week I was about to do something that I would regret for the rest of my life. I just want to thank the EMC staff for stopping me from doing that. Like I said, everybody expressed their issues and how they feel about certain things. I'm saying how I feel is that I don't really think an abortion is right. You know what I mean? I think women who are going to an abortion clinic should at least have options. The abortion people should at least give you options of whether you want to keep your child or not. Do you understand what I'm saying? Му

- whole thing is that to me it's about the money.
- 3 I'm just being honest. I'm just speaking how I
- 4 feel. I really do appreciate what they did
- 5 because I would have done something I would regret
- 6 for the rest of my life. I really want to thank
- 7 them for that. That's it.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.
- 9 Next?

10 CASSANDRA LEGARI: My name is

11 | Cassandra Legari. About two years ago I found out

12 I was pregnant and I was very indecisive because I

13 had gotten accepted to Penn State and I wanted to

14 continue with my goals. I didn't know if I should

15 bring a baby into the world. So outside of the

16 clinic a man greeted me and asked me to rethink my

17 position. He did not force himself on me in any

18 way. He didn't harm me. He didn't harass me. I

19 went in and the clinic was full, ever seat was

20 | full of people who had gotten in unharmed. And

21 due to my decision, I left and they took me to the

22 RV where they talked to me about all the pros of

23 me having the baby and how I could still fulfill

24 my goals if I kept the baby. She's one-year-old

25 now and I couldn't be any happier. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

My name is Brian 3 BRIAN STRONG: 4 I'm a senior at Fordham University up in 5 the Bronx. I'm currently president of the senior class at Fordham. I was president of Fordham's 6 Respect for life club. It's a pro-life 7 8 undergraduate club. We had about 40 members last year. I'd like to give a guick shout out to my 9 10 Respect for Life Club members up there that are 11 still standing. I am also an intern at EMC Crisis 12 Pregnancy Centers and I've been sidewalk 13 counseling outside of Emily's for about a year and 14 a half now. I'd also like to say I'm thankful for 15 little Jason who was up here before with one of 16 our girls who is too young to understand that he 17 was a product of hate and coercion. I'm grateful 18 that we have a chance to be heard in this city. I 19 know that our opinion and our actions are not 20 popular and not always welcomed. I speak primarily for those women who do welcome our 21 22 opinions and for those children who have been born 23 because their mothers opened up to us. I know 24 that the workers of Dr. Emily's are good citizens. 25 I've conversed with many of them and believe that

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

many of them have the best intentions. And though I do believe that they care for women there is undeniably an economic influence on what they do day to day and what they're trying to do to sidewalk counselors now. It was actually them who proposed this legislation, as mentioned before. They really don't have much protest activity outside. It's basically sidewalk counseling activity. Every woman we talk out of going into the clinic to get an abortion costs them somewhere between \$350 to \$1,000. On our good day's well change the minds of six or seven girls' minds. I have yet to talk to a woman who has come out of this clinic choosing life for her child because of what a counselor inside Emily's said to her. We're the alternate point of view for these women. We give them options so that they can actually make a choice. We have no economic incentive to do so. I think this goes for the other Fordham students as well who have helped me sidewalk counseling, the abortion clinic is the last place we want to be at 7 a.m. on a Saturday morning, hung-over, quite honestly. The only thing that could really motivate us to do this is love for

25

2	these women. We know that harassment is not love,
3	so we don't partake in that. By passing this law
4	specifically, I think that the clinic is being
5	given the power to have us arrested without
6	evidence. I plead you to ask yourselves if we are
7	the enemy and do we make society worse off.
8	Should we be punished for our youthful idealism
9	and desire to help those in our Bronx backyard?
10	Would these mothers have been happy today if we
11	weren't there? So I plead you to allow us to
12	continue our service to the Bronx community.
13	Please vote no on this bill. Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. Our
15	next panel is Jane Balatria [phonetic] and Janice
16	Pemberton [phonetic].
17	JANICE PEMBERTON: I'm Janice
18	Pemberton, if that helps.
19	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: There was one
20	other fellow. He's not here. Go ahead.
21	Introduce yourself.
22	JANICE PEMBERTON: My name is
23	Janice Pemberton. I'm a participant in a lot of

the groups that have had a pro-choice position

this morning. I am basically here speaking for

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I became a pro-choice activist after an myself. abortion I had 22 years ago. The reason it affected me was because my only concern going in for a surgical procedure was whether those people would be at the door holding that stuff in a jar that I didn't want to see. So I decided if that was my experience that it had to be other's experience also and I had to do something. I've been a clinic escort in Los Angeles and in Queens, Brooklyn and Manhattan for most of the past 21 years. I want to speak out to the sidewalk counselors and protestors of the antichoice persuasion with the honest intent of providing information to let them know they have nothing to fear from Intro. 826. Speaking respectfully to clients is an action I support. encourage this. I think everybody needs to have their point heard. But when a woman says no to the point that I can hear her, or no thank you, or refusing literature, or refusing rosary beads, or refusing the plastic models of a fetus, or expressing no interest at all, it is respectful to step back and accept that no is the answer you're getting. I appreciate the fact that the police

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will now be able to hear these women and men who are in the midst of these issues and be able to assess for themselves whether this is harassing and be able to move forward on their behalf through criminal or police issues. It's really important. A lot of these women do seek their privacy. I also want to speak to the Monsignor who was talking how they would assess whether a woman was going in for an abortion and if she wasn't going in for an abortion leave her alone. I don't feel the need to pass a litmus test for what medical service I'm getting today. I'm a woman first. I have feet. I have teeth. I have I could be going in for another procedure eyes. and it's none of your business. Thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. Our next panel is Fred Trabulsi, John Gibson [phonetic], Julie Bale [phonetic], and Carrie Ryan [phonetic]. Are all four here? We were just putting the panels together. And you are?

FRED TRABULSI: Fred Trabulsi.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I guess the

behalf of the women who find themselves in

25

situations where they feel they have no 2 3 alternatives than to abort the child they are carrying. Let me say, in the 25 years that my organization has been in existence, we have given 5 those alternatives to countless women. The number 6 7 of women who have passed through our doors in all those years have been approximately 25,000 to 8 If it had not been for the sidewalk 9 50,000 women. 10 counselors that are able to speak to the women 11 approaching the abortion clinics, many would not 12 have had the chance to know that there are 13 alternatives. We are able to help the women with 14 all the means to ensure them decent treatment and 15 assist them in all their needs throughout their 16 pregnancy and well afterwards as long as they need 17 We have heard that they did not know there was alternative help out there. One of the most 18 19 important means of making them aware of this help are the sidewalk counselors. I have never heard 20 21 from any woman coming to our office that a 22 counselor harassed them in any way. They are 23 always spoken about with appreciation and respect. I urge this body in no way to hinder or impose any 24 25 restrictions on their peaceful assembly, which is

guaranteed by our Constitution. For what I hear today, regarding Intro. 826, is that "the clinic would now be able to file a compliance for the person already being harassed." I believe I still live in America and one has a right to face his accuser. How can the clinic be the accuser? To me it's a conflict of interest. Again, I want to thank you for letting me appear here. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. Go ahead. Please state your name.

CARRIE RYAN: Hi. My name is

Carrier Ryan. I am a doula and sidewalk counselor in the Bronx. As part of my training as a doula,

I have studied theories regarding pregnancy and birth. One text, Varney's Midwifery, Fourth

Edition, is a textbook where Yale University did a study of pregnant women. It showed seven out of ten pregnant women, that's 70%, have regrets regarding their own pregnancy. The factors include psychological and physiological conditions such as their upbringing, particularly relationships with their on mother and economic status. With the proper support these women can

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and do work past their fears. As a sidewalk counselor, we look to assist women with making smart decisions, decisions they won't regret. Keeping in mind that 94% of women regret their decision to have an abortion. Women don't regret babies, they regret abortions. Never have I yelled or blocked a woman. In fact, most of the time they have trouble hearing me. My goal is not to hurt or shame the women, but rather never to let another woman feel she had nowhere to turn or that she had to have an abortion even though this was not her first choice. I am their friend, sometimes their only friend, not their enemy. Му question for the council is if I help a woman, am I going to jail? Whose decision is it? woman who chooses life or the clinic who loses money? I have been yelled at and cursed at by clinic owners even without blocking doorways. was threatened to have the police called on me for talking with a client. I can easily see this bill being a way to target me and others like me for stealing business, even though all I want is to provide a woman with options. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

First of all, thank 2 JULIE BALE: 3 you committee members and everyone here for 4 hearing me. My name is Julie Bale and I have worked outside at Dr. Emily's Clinic for almost 5 two years. In that time I have had the privilege 6 7 of speaking with thousands of women. Of course 8 not all of them have welcomed me and I understand that my presence alone might be off-putting. 9 10 it is with love, sincerity and respect that I 11 approach women heading for the clinic. Please 12 consider for a moment my position. It is my goal 13 to let women know that I have help for them if 14 they have second thoughts about having an 15 abortion. How could I then, as a stranger to this 16 woman, even have the chance to be heard by her, if 17 I were to approach her with anything other than love and respect. Please believe me when I say 18 19 that the women who already have their minds made 20 up to have the abortion, which is only 21 approximately 20% of those coming in to Dr. 22 Emily's, will quickly let me know that they do not 23 desire my help through direct communication by 24 telling me or through their body language or 25 attitude towards my presence. I respect these

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

women and the decision they have already made and I back away. But the majority of women, approximately 80% based on my own humble estimate and experience, have come to Dr. Emily's because of some pressure, whether financial, situational or maybe they are very young or have no support from the baby's father, or emotionally, perhaps confusion or doubt about their ability to raise a child. What I try to do is offer them services and assistance or help that will meet their personal needs to help them overcome perceived or real obstacles to carrying their pregnancy to I have seen that the majority of women going to the clinic had no idea that help existed. They didn't realize that the right to choose abortion also implied their right to not choose abortion. But how could they choose to have their baby when everything about their circumstances made it look impossible? They need to be informed about real help and alternatives, even at the last minute, even within 15 feet. That is why I plead that you allow us to continue our peaceful lifechanging work.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

much. Our next panel is Barbara Meara, Claire

Gallagher [phonetic], James DiSilva and John Early
[phonetic]. Any one of you may start first. Just
introduce yourself and if you've got testimony,
we'll take it and put it in the record.

JAMES DISILVA: My name is James DiSilva. I'm appearing here personally. But also I'm an advocate for the local Knights of Columbus Council in the Bronx, the Agnus Dei Council and also on their pro-life committee. The one thing I wanted to stress, which I think has not been heard today is our pro-life work is supporting spiritually and materially women in crisis, women who have the courage to turn away from abortion. Most of the time they are facing economic crisis and often the sidewalk counselors' work bring us those women so we can help them. We can help them find jobs. We can help them deal with their economic crisis. We can help them materially. This is really the primary issue that is here. We have a split of opinion. Some people think that an unwanted baby needs to be aborted. What these sidewalk counselors say is that it's not the only choice. You're in a position and we can help you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Knights of Columbus really depends on those sidewalk counselors so we can do the work and get them the help that they need. I would just like to address a couple of issues with the bill. Section 6, where it says willfully interfere with the operation of a reproductive health care facility, I'm not sure what that means. Anyone reading that may not be sure that means. I think the council really needs to be concerned about the vagueness in this statute. You have a Council Member, Councilwoman James, and I quote her. Today she said, "harassment is feeling harm." Now that statement is directly opposed to what's in this bill, which talks about reasonable feel of harm, which is an objective standard. If you have a Council Member who is going to take complaints from constituents and thinks harassment is subjective, if someone feels harm, no matter what objectively these sidewalk counselors did, that is in direct opposition to this statute. So these sidewalk counselors have a reasonable fear of being prosecuted and have a chilling effect on That is the most important thing that needs them. to be taken in consideration. This statute has to

be looked at very carefully. I'll conclude with
this. Why do we need this bill? You're heard
testimony about murders. As far as I understand
there is a Penal Law on the book that says it's
illegal to murder someone. You've heard testimony
about arson. We have a Penal Law for arson. We
have statutes about harassment. So why is this
bill necessary? Why are the sidewalk counselors
being singled out? And as Councilman Oddo talked
about there is a vague nature of what is in this
bill. A sidewalk counselor may say I do not want
to go to jail and what is going to happen if we
don't have sidewalk counselors, we're not going to
be able to communicate to women that they have
choices. They have choices to make with
themselves. They have choices to make with their
babies. It's up to them to make the choice. All
the sidewalk counselors do is give them
information, give them options and give them
choice. If this council is concerned with choice,
it should vote no on this bill.
CHAIRDERSON SEARS: Thank you

CLAIRE GALLAGHER: Hi, my name is

Claire Gallagher. I am with EMC Pregnancy

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I volunteer approximately 20 hours of my week in front of Dr. Emily's offering in a loving manner information and help to these women who feel like they have no choice but to be there. just wanted to share with the council an experience I recently had in front of Dr. Emily's with a young girl who I'll call Rachel, in order to protect her privacy. Rachel is 17 and due to pressure from her boyfriend and a fear of the unknown, was seeking abortion. She was telling me, and I quote, she felt like she had no choice. After a long conversation in front of Dr. Emily's Rachel admitted she would regret her decision. Rachel clearly hesitated, but proceeded with her decision that she had made to abort her 15-weekold baby. After Rachel came out of the clinic that day, she told me that if she could turn back time she would do anything to have her baby back. She hugged me as she walked into the subway and said to please call her. I ask you, if this is the kind of work that sidewalk counselors are doing in this city, is this considered harassment? We offer support, even though not always accepted, to women who feel like no one else is there for

2 them. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

BARBARA MEARA: My name is Barbara 4 5 I'm chairman of the New York State Right to Life Committee. I'm here as a private citizen 6 7 as well. I'm very concerned about this bill 8 because I always thought First Amendment rights included the fact that the accused should have the 9 10 ability or the right to confront his accuser. This bill hands it over to the person who has a 11 12 financial interest in getting us away from the clinic because, as you've heard, some of these 13 girls are very conflicted and do walk away once 14 15 they realize there are alternatives. I'm very 16 concerned about the young women walking into these 17 clinics. We know that many of them do not have any information about the physical, emotional and 18 19 psychological complications. The Guttmacher Institute which is connected with Planned 20 Parenthood and the Elliot Institute which is 21 22 connected with pro-life groups have recorded more 23 than 100 physical and psychological complications, including infections, abdominal pain, damages to 24 25 internal organs, depression, increased drug and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

alcohol abuse, and the inability to have more So this is a critical decision that's children. being made. The people in the clinic do not offer them alternatives to abortion. I've had several surgeries over the years and I was told more about the procedure and about the possible complications and all the ramifications of the surgery and more than I wanted to know in many cases. These young girls are not told. They're told this is just a clump of protoplasm. It's like removing a little tumor or wart on your finger. There's nothing to They're not told about the development of the We just spoke recently to a young woman who baby. had had an abortion and she said she was denied by the clinic people the opportunity to view the sonogram of her baby. This is simply not fair. I'm not going to go all through this because I know the time is up. If you are really concerned about these young women and not just the abortion businesses, pass legislation requiring abortion businesses to give information on alternatives and on the possibility of complications and on the development of the unborn child. Pass legislation requiring Health Department checks on these

facilities as is done with any other medical

facility, but is not done on the abortion clinics.

Support the pregnancy care centers which offer

5 positive help to these young women. Thank you.

JOHN EARLY: My name is John Early.

I have no affiliation other than I do belong to a couple of the pro-life groups. My actual interest was eugenics. I find that the whole idea of abortion can turn into a real eugenics issue. I just don't want the United States to become like

Nazi Germany and that can happen I think. I have seen a sonogram or two and it tells me that a fetus is real and it's growing and it's a sentient being. Therefore, I want to do all I can to preserve it.

much. We'll go to our next panel, but I want to thank you for staying this long and giving your testimony. You've made some points. Let me say something about the hearing. We're having this hearing on this Intro. and we're hearing every side that we have to hear. Don't think that when we have a hearing that that's it. It isn't.

Because we listen to what you have to say. We go

back and we look at whether anything needs to bedone. But we take your comments very seriously.

JAMES DISILVA: Can I make one just 4 ten second comment on the bill in terms of the 5 legislation itself? I think what's important to 6 consider is that the bill in its current form the 7 8 definitional section, in my view, is totally 9 inadequate. If you would compare the current bill 10 to the 1994 federal bill, the federal bill is very clear in having precise definitions of what is 11 12 intimidation, what is harassment and what is interference. That is absent from this bill. 13 That's what gives a lot of people concern. 14 15 Because when you read this bill, for example, just 16 a quote from the criminal justice coordinator when 17 she was asked what harassment was, she said, well it's case specific. It's fact specific. 18 19 that's what creates a chilling effect because you 20 don't know. I mean the sidewalk counselors are 21 not lawyers. They don't know what it means. 22 what really is concerning to people is actually 23 who this statute is directed at and what conduct it is directed at. It's really, really not clear. 24 25 This ambiguity is a real problem that I think the

2 chair should consider.

3 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: We've noted 4 that. Thank you. But I also want to say this 5 bill is not directed at the sidewalk counselors. Now somebody raised that question. It really 6 7 isn't. This is not open discussion. We've been 8 all sitting here since 10 o'clock. I haven't moved from my chair once. Stop. I'm being very 9 10 respectful to everybody. I expect you to do the 11 same with the chair. I am saying that we've all been here since 10. The intent of this bill is 12 not. There was a big distinction that Monsignor 13 14 Reilly made. He separated what you all do, the 15 sidewalk counselors, to strong heavy violent 16 protestors. He made that separation. So this 17 bill isn't directed to the sidewalk counselors. You may go out thinking that but I have to tell 18 19 you that is not the case because you are not 20 violent people. I'm not open for discussion right 21 now. We've heard a lot of testimony and ewe have 22 I'm not defending either side. more to do. 23 really not. But I am just saying that this bill was not drawn up for that. There are issues that 24 25 have been raised and certainly they don't go by

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the wayside. It has not targeted any particular groups. Its intent and its purpose is to see that women, young women, older women, have a right by their choice to be protected by the decisions they make. That is the impetus for this bill. Now if there are other thing that come into it and you raise issues I would be absolutely remiss if I let you walk away. You may shake your head, Mr. Slattery, but I am speaking the truth. certainly don't disrespect the work you're doing. I said to respect the chair or I'll adjourn the meeting. It's my prerogative to do that. fact is that you may think what you're doing and I don't disrespect what you're saying, but I do have issue when I'm making a comment here of what the intent is of this bill and then you say that's to the contrary. Because the intent is not to target sidewalk counselors. I will say that again and again. I will not let you leave here thinking that's the case. The case of this bill is to see that women, if they exercise whatever rights they have and certainly with the work that you do, persuasively, you have persuaded women to make other decisions. That is your purpose.

	purpose of this bill is to see that they are just
	as much protected by that and your standing there
	and your rights to do that as it is for someone to
	make another decision and get into a clinic. So
	what this bill is about is protecting the rights.
	I'm going to call the other panel now. I want to
	thank you. You've made some good points. I will
	call Michael Reddy [phonetic], Neil Sullivan
	[phonetic], Matthew Sullivan [phonetic], Mary
	Green [phonetic] and Art Lovely [phonetic]. Are
	you all here? I'm sorry. You may introduce
	yourselves and anyone who would like to go first
	may start. Be sure that for the record we have
	your name and if you have any written testimony,
	please see that the sergeant-at-arms has it. You
	are?
- 1	

ART LOVELY: My name is Art Lovely and I am a concerned citizen from New York.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You may start.

ART LOVELY: If I've been listening to all of the testimony today and I hear that 80% of the procedures in the reproductive health care facilities are abortions, I think we might rightfully say it's also an abortion clinic.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is in the DNA of every American. Some of the greatest minds in America, in government, in law and religion and above all and not least of all, in medicine, have claimed that abortion is a horrific, selfish act beyond comprehension. They have called it an intrinsic evil. The killing of your own children. We all have lost loved ones, but not purposely. Now we get into the bill 826. All I've been hearing is about harassment and intimidation. Are we getting a little overly sensitive? Really, are we? Webster describes harassment as somebody that annoys people or pesters people and so forth. Every school teacher has harassed their students if they're not doing well in school. Better get your marks up, Jimmy, or you're going to have to be staying after school. And then we're talking about intimidation. Every football coach intimidates their players. If you don't do it right, buddy, you're going to be sitting on the bench. wrong with harassment and intimidation? We're not talking about physical assault here. I don't know how many people that have gone into these abortion

2	clinics that have been physically assaulted.
3	You'll have to tell me that. But who's being
4	intimidated? How about the lady that's going to
5	have the abortion and how about the baby? Is he
6	being intimated? How about the psychological and
7	physical and emotional problems that it creates?
8	We've heard it from many of the other panelists.
9	In summary, I don't think that the council should
10	be involved in these things. You can't favor one
11	side over the other. We have laws. If somebody
12	is assaulted at an abortion clinic then they
13	should be arrested. There are police to do that.
14	But who's going to define what harassment is or
15	what intimidation is? We have good laws and we
16	have bad laws. Slavery was a bad law. We got rid
17	of slavery. Abortion is a bad law. Killing your
18	own children. Any rational person that can
19	support abortion, it's really tough to understand.
20	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Can you sum up
21	please and address the legislation?
22	ART LOVELY: Yes, I can. Please
23	give me my First Amendment rights, Madame Chair.
24	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Maybe you'll
25	have to yield to the others.

ART LOVELY: What are we saying?
That women cannot produce or fish can't swim or
birds can't fly? What's more wonderful than a
woman having a child? As far as protecting the
child, all I will say is that I'm opposed to 826.
I'm opposed to abortion. It's a terrible,
terrible plight. I'm in the last half or the
ninth inning, unfortunately or fortunately, and I
remember before Roe vs. Wade when abortion was
illegal and was considered a terrible procedure or
practice. So I want to thank Madame Chair for the
chance to express my comments. The only other
thing I would have to say is I'm very sorry to see
that the rest of the council has left. Because if
we have to listen to them and they have to vote on
this, they don't even know what we're talking
about. This is a very important issue and I just
wish that they were all here to hear the entire
testimony of all of the attendees. That's all I
have to say, Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.
Just so that we know your statements are on the
record. Testimonies are re-read. I have done

them so it's not to no available for any of you.

You can go next.

3 MICHAEL REDDY: My name is Michael 4 Reddy. I'm a member of Helpers of God's Precious 5 I pray at the abortion clinic, or life Infants. termination center, if you'd like to call it that. 6 7 I've heard the word ambulatory reproductive center 8 all day long. It's an illegal document to my poor judgment. I don't know very much about this but I 9 10 would think that the nomenclature of what it is 11 should be correct. There is no birth taking place 12 within that building. So to call this a reproductive clinic, it's not. It's a life-13 terminating center or abortion clinic. 14 15 number one. I've worked closely with Monsignor 16 Reilly for ten years. I pray at the abortion 17 clinic. All that time I've been there have I yet to see that man raise his voice or even frown. I 18 19 wanted at one time to protect him. I wanted to 20 bring cameras to the site and he said, Mike, don't 21 you dare. These girls are so important and their 22 privacy is so important. How dare you. 23 ever bring a camera. I was going to put a camera 24 in my car to protect him because there was other 25 cameras there. He said no way, the privacy of the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

girls that are coming here is of the utmost importance. Young women from all over the world, not just the United States, come. I've picked them up at the airport and bring them in. conversation of do you realize the privilege you have of walking with him. This is from Australia, from Africa, from Germany, from Ireland, from England and from everywhere. Do you know the privilege you have? I know that. He's a walking saint. You have heard of Christianity I'm sure. This is part of the suffering when you work against evil, against the evil of abortion. I'm obviously from Ireland. I have an accent. didn't have very much, just little thatch cottages and seven or eight kids. I think you would know that they made a name for themselves every where Today they have mansions with two dogs they went. and two Mercedes and no children. The new world order and this is what's coming and this is what this is about. NARAL and Planned Parenthood has wrecked my country over there. I just have one question. I want to find out if what I do is legal and if I will be caused harassment. I want to tell the court here what it is that I do.

2.0

2	it's this, it's Our Father who are in Heaven,
3	hallowed by they name. Thy kingdom come, thy will
4	be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this
5	day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses
6	as we forgive those who trespass against. And
7	lead us not into temptation but deliver us from
8	evil. Amen. Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord
9	is with thee. Blessed art though among women and
10	blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus.

11 CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very 12 much.

MICHAEL REDDY: Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen. Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit as it was in the beginning is now and every shall be world without end. Amen. May God help us all in this city.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Amen. Thank you.

MICHAEL REDDY: For what we've done.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I need to call the next panel. I'm sorry. I was distracted.

NEIL SULLIVAN: My name is Neil

2 Sullivan. I'm a taxpayer and a believer in the 3 First Amendment rights. I feel very comfortable 4 with Thomas Jefferson at my back. Just to address, Council Chair, about intent. It's 5 interesting that intent is going to be taken out 6 of this bill via the former law. I also remember 7 8 the road to hell is paved with good intentions. It's not about intent only. It's about the 9 10 results. The results of this bill would it cause 11 harassment and intimidation against those 12 exercising their First Amendment rights. Let's take those counselors and let's take those 13 peaceful protestors, just as an aside, a lot has 14 15 been said about blocking doors and blocking 16 parking lots. I'm not a Harvard lawyer, even 17 though my son is. That's illegal. You don't need this bill to stop that. That's all that was 18 19 talked about today. But let's get about the 20 results. I'm a sidewalk counselor and I'm out 21 there. Before I would have to face my accuser, 22 which would be the complainant, which would be the 23 person who is going into the abortion mill. Now that's substituted for the person who owns the 24 25 abortion mill, who is not independent and who has

2 financial gain. Every woman that does not go in 3 there is a monetary loss. Now that's my accuser. Is that fair? Under what assumptions? Under very loose determination of harassment and fear. 5 is fear? Intent is there by this City Council to 6 7 protect First Amendment rights and to face your 8 accuser. All of the sudden, no intent, and no accuser. Now, self-interest becomes the accuser. 9 I'm a sidewalk counselor. I'm there to help 11 I'm unsophisticated. I don't know my people. 12 rights. I don't have money. The next thing is 13 I'm arrested because I approach somebody with a 14 piece of literature and they feel threatened. 15 Where do the abortion mill people see this? From 16 a window? Are there going to be right there on 17 the street? Where is the evidence going to come? So I get arrested by a policeman. I now am in 18 19 jail. I have to get a lawyer. I'm not 20 sophisticated. I don't have all those type of 21 things or the money. So what am I going to do? 22 Someone else finds out that happened to me they're 23 going to say I don't need this; I'm not going to show up. We've seen this in the history of the 24 25 United States, whether it's civil rights or

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

protesting war in Vietnam, harassment that just the intent of doing something and having to appear in court will prevent people from exercising their That's what's not in this bill. rights. reason they had the bill before and those safeguards about facing your accuser and intent was to protect those rights. The American Civil Liberties Union, the New York Civil Liberties Union, talk to Alan Dershowitz, talk to Nat Hencor [phonetic]. Let them tell you. The American Civil Liberties has come in support of Roe versus Wade. It's not an independent group. So as a First Amendment protector in this case, they don't have standing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

Please state your name.

MARY GREEN: My name is Mary Green.

I pray at Dr. Emily's. I've been doing that for about a year. I've never witnessed any harassment at all whatsoever. I have witnessed a large number of young, very ordinary women coming into the clinic. A disproportionate number of African Americans. I know from statistics from the Alan Guttmacher Institute that in 2006, of the 90,157

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

abortions in New York City, 40,570 were African That's 45%, almost half. That's from Americans. Guttmacher. While I'm there to pray in between when I get distracted by the women who are coming in, looking at them and seeing them, all I want to say is what Saint Paul said to the Galatians, oh stupid Galatians. He spoke to them about law and I see African Americans, almost half of faith. the women coming into this clinic, aborting their babies. To me that's homegrown genocide. Where are the protectors? I just want to say another thing about the abortion clinic owners. They are not the protectors, yet they are the ones now who can claim that I said something maybe too loud, maybe harassing. I could be in jail on Saturday. You can imagine anything that happens on Saturday that I'll be there until Monday. I don't have any accuser. All I have is the word of the owner of the business. This is really, I would say 1984, but it's 2008. It's scary and I'm scared and I have nothing to do with harassment, but I'm scared. I feel I want your protection as well as protecting the women who are going in and the clinic owners who seem to be the ones who will win

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the most out of this legislation. Thank you.

much. We're going to call the next panel: Dawn
Crickey [phonetic], Christopher Ferrara
[phonetic], John Cain [phonetic], Luis Menchaca
[phonetic] and Robert Maurice Maresca [phonetic].

CHRISTOPHER A. FERRARA: I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to address it. My name is Christopher A. Ferrara. I'm a member of the Bars of the states of New York, New Jersey, South Carolina and a number of federal Bars. I engage in extensive trial and appellate practice in numerous jurisdictions in matters involving the First Amendment rights of pro-life Catholics. I have been privileged to represent Mr. Slattery's organization and Mr. Cain and Mr. Menchaca as well. In one action Mr. Cain is a plaintiff. He was falsely arrested based on nonsensical, nonexistent charges which were dismissed when the police officer failed to produce any evidence of probably cause and that's a typical problem that causes people like my clients to be worried about this bill. I have heard a lot of talk about who is covered by this

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

bill, but there's been a lot of vagueness about who isn't covered. Or I should say a studied I think one of the comments that the vaqueness. Chairwoman made is probably illustrative of why pro-lifers have everything to fear from this legislation. Madame Chairwoman distinguished what she called strong, heavy, violent protestors from sidewalk counselors. I don't know what a strong protestor is. I don't know what a heavy protestor Those words have no meaning whatsoever. know what a violent protestor is. Violent protestors are covered by laws that prohibit violence. So according to that indication of the law's intent, there seems to be an intent to prohibit conduct that is not already prohibited by existing legislation. There are two problems with The first problem is legal. this bill. Harassment contains no statutory definition. Following contains no statutory definition. Intent is eliminated from the statute. Basically the bill would create a strict liability offense for undefined harassment and undefined following. Mr. Slattery explained why that's a problem. The people at Emily's are demanding arrests for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sidewalk counseling, which you say is not covered by the bill. They seem to think that that bill will permit those arrests. There's another problem, the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides something called the right to confront witnesses. This bill takes that away. You're saying that the clinic will be the complaining witness and that the real complainant will not be identified. It's blatantly unconstitutional. Then finally, there's an evidentiary problem. No evidence has been produced that I can see before this committee or otherwise of any actual illegal conduct. You're heard a litany of complaints about protected He handed me a gruesome pamphlet. upset. They were crying. That's what the First Amendment is all about. The First Amendment doesn't protect happy speech. It protects speech that makes people unhappy, that makes them cry, that makes them upset because what's at stake here is a human life. If the First Amendment no longer protects that speech and only protects happy speech then we've become a police state. I think that this ordinance is a sign that we are edging

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

towards the status of a police state. One final suggestion, if you think there's evidence of harassment, I would suggest you do one thing. Convene a special hearing and make these abortion clinics produce the videotapes that most of them have on a 24/7 basis. I have done that in three or four cases. In every single one of those cases, the videotape destroy the claims of the abortion clinics. They show nothing. So I would say if you're interested in fairness and getting to the truth of this matter, make them produce the videotapes. Finally, let me say this, pro-life advocates already face a daunting array of laws that potentially criminalize their conduct, subject them to jail terms, fines, injunctions and crippling damage awards. There is no need for yet another law targeting pro-life activists. perception here is one of piling on by legislators an pro-abortion activists. The kind of hostility to one political protest group that we see here has no precedent in America's long and hallowed tradition of respect for the First Amendment rights of political activists. The pro-life movement is already the most heavily regulated

5

6

7

8

9

24

2 protest movement in the history of the world.

Enough is enough. This bill must be rejected for

4 the sake of First Amendment liberty. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

much. Next?

JOHN CAIN: My name is John Cain.

That's really irrelevant because what I am about

to speak of is very relevant. What we have now is

we seem to be at the mountaintop at the edge of a

moral abyss and that's what we're going to slide

into. My memory is pretty good. I lived through

Nazi Germany. Now, let's look back. The

14 Nuremberg Trials, as part of the legal decision it

was noted and demanded that above the entranceway

16 at Dachau, George Santayana's advice, as given in

17 1929 in French, English, Hebrew and Polish is

those who forget the mistakes of the past are

doomed to repeat them. On September 19, 1939, the

Nazi Supreme Court said that Jewish people were

21 not people. You could do what you want with them.

We have gone one better. Totally declassifying a

group of people and subjecting them to murder,

mayhem and experimentation. We have declassified

25 the fetus, which is Greek for little baby. We

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have declassified him as a human being. I'll just go back to what you said. Part of what the law is, is to exercise freedom of will, to foster that for the people. So if I go home and get my legal handgun and come and blow you away, then I'm exercising freedom of will. Of course I wouldn't do that. What I would like to get into now and I'll you for a little forbearance since the other side has spoken more than two hours over their allotted time. What I would like to do is go into how this whole thing started and what abortion really is. I call it the abortion story. Oh, unborn child, life is there inside. It's soon the time for you do be born. While you await, a selfish world makes choices. Your parents say that you must die. Your put to death. You've known no love or mercy. The pain was great for nothing you had done. Oh, little baby, they've ripped you from your womb and thrown you in garbage bag for your bloody tomb. Is this America or Nazi Germany? Hang our heads, hang our heads, heads in shame. Oh unborn child.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you, Mr.

25 Cain.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOHN CAIN: God bless you, Madame.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I'm sorry, go

4 ahead.

ROBERT MARESCA: My name is Robert Maresca. I did not know I would have the privilege of speaking on the same table with Christopher Ferrara. So I would gladly relinquish my time to him. I just want to say one thing and it's from a different perspective. We've heard a lot of things here about rights. A right is a moral claim to something good spiritually or physically. I just want to put that on the record. I'll repeat that. A right is a moral claim to something good, spiritual or physical good. It would be absurd to say I have a right to blindness. That's a physical evil. So I think the passion that you see and you've heard here from folks on our perspective is because we know that what goes on in the abortion clinics is an unspeakable moral and physical evil. I've heard a couple of comments about clinic violence. I think you used the words, Madame Speaker, safe environment. What goes on as we know and we believe at least is clinic violence and an unsafe

2	environment inside that building. I think that's
3	
3	what the bottom line is here. You may say, again
4	I think your words were that this bill is not
5	directed against sidewalk counselors. But what
6	sends a chill through us is that we believe you're
7	correct. You believe that. What the problem is
8	that the consequences that these sidewalk
9	counselors are going to suffer, perhaps at the
10	biased hands of a provider who sees them as taking
11	money out of his pocket. That is what the chill
12	is. I think unless this bill is specific, worded
13	specifically to protect their rights against
14	harassment and intimidation, unless that happens
15	then I think that's the great fear that we have.
16	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very
17	much.
18	LUIS MENCHACA: Can you hear me
19	okay?
20	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Yes, we can.
21	Identify yourself please.
22	LUIS MENCHACA: Take a look at the

LUIS MENCHACA: Take a look at the ceiling up there. A government of the people, by the people, for the people. You're forgetting the little people. They're being torn to pieces.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's a matter of life and death. You want to talk harassment. You want to talk about harassment, look at the treatment we got down here at 26 Bleecker Street. A woman threatened to smash my head with a brick. Another guy at another abortion mill threatened to stab. Our signs are torn up. A guy let's his dog do number two on the sidewalk and then he throws the dog's number two on our sign. I can go on and on and it'll take until 3000 about harassment. Do you think they're getting harassed? Take a look at what's happening to the babies. Take a look at what's happening to those that try to protect them. I'm darn glad I did every bit I did. I've been to jail and I've rescued and I'm absolutely not ashamed of having been to jail because there was an unjust law that said it's okay to kill the babies. I was among those that God gave me the grace to go out there and save some babies. Not me, it's God. There's a boy that's going to be 18 years old in February because I was among those that went to jail. Talk about harassment, you're throwing it off course here. It's special interests. They want to get us out of there. This bill, 826, I saw destroyed

when I was in the Navy, the number 826, USSR
Agerholm. I was on the Hollister myself. But
this bill 826 is an abortion. You want to abort
our right to free speech and to tell is like it
is. A baby is being murdered in there. Murdered.
That abortion is murder. The business of abortion
is making a killing, that's abortion. It's got to
stop. God will not bless this country unless it
does stop. Then they'll do Terry Schiavos too.
Murder is murder is murder. I do not feel that
the little tiny people or those who try to defend
them are being represented at this council. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you. Can you state your name for the record please?

LUIS MENCHACHA: Luis Manchaca.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. We'll go on to the next panel. Thank you. Donald Young, John Verdone [phonetic], Charles Wright [phonetic], Donald Rosenberg [phonetic], and Sean Degidon [phonetic]. Any of you can start. Please identify yourself for the record. If you have written testimony, the sergeant-at-arms will take it. Otherwise, it's recorded.

clinics is already the standing and enforced law

25

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of New York. Bill 826 serves only to abridge the civil right of abortion protestors to assemble and speak, as is guaranteed under both our federal and state constitution. It especially contradicts the letter and spirit of our constitution by limiting such basic liberties based not on how one protests but why. If peaceful demonstration is thwarted on issues deemed too controversial, then freedom of speech is a triviality. If government can waive free speech for politically unpopular views then it is an empty platitude. If harassment can be charged by an abortion clinic, even if the patient doesn't consider herself harassed, then our police are being used as pinkerdons for a politically connected industry. It is argued that special standards are required because of occasional disruptive incidents at abortion clinics, since Roe versus Wade was enacted 35 years ago. fact, those years have seen incidents erupt in the name of various causes, from picket lines to antiwar protests, from AIDS activists to civil rights activists. There is no legal, social, or moral justification for singling out anti-abortion protestors, among whom no group or leader has ever

2	condoned violence. Rather I would suggest that
3	the abortion industry is seeking special status
4	because of what most anti-abortion protestors are
5	doing, which is attempting to steer its clients
6	towards other services. This is quite
7	understandable but it is no ground for granting
8	abortion clinics special privileges or those who
9	protest them special burdens. What I and others
10	here seek is equal protection under law. Nothing
11	more and nothing less. As long as abortion is a
12	legal business, such clinics are entitled to the
13	legal protections of any business and its
14	protestors to the rights of any protestors. I am
15	aware that the city has a comfortable majority of
16	abortion rights supporters. But before you vote
17	for Clinic Access Bill 826, please observe the
18	admonition pertinent to all civil liberties. Ask
19	not for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee.
20	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very
21	much. John, are you going next?
22	DONALD YOUNG: My name is Donald
23	Young. I've been kind of active in the pro-life
24	movement for many years. I've been at three

abortion clinics in Manhattan, three in my own

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

neighborhood, Jackson Heights. Helen knows. And I think one or two in Brooklyn. This is what I'd like to say. At this point in time as incumbent New York City Council Members, you have an opportunity and some would say a responsibility to secure our right of protest in a political atmosphere in which citizens have less and less opportunity to express and demonstrate their views without being called un-American. You above all have the opportunity to ensure that those contemplating an abortion have an equal opportunity of hearing about and being referred to service providers who will offer them help if they choose to give birth and need help caring for their infants after their delivery. Obstetricians assisting pregnant women and basing their prenatal care and directions on the biological fact that life begins at conception cannot afford to enter a debate when life begins since their profession and those women seeking their help deal with the As legislators who have already been elected to office you must also be guided and governed by truth and the knowledge of when life begins and your responsibility to protect it.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

count on you. Many citizens wonder if the rights spelled out in our Declaration of Independence and supported by our Constitution are still being upheld. Following the 1973 Supreme Court decision, Roe V. Wade, we witnessed and have experienced an institution division in our beloved country, one that identifies parties. Keeping them alive, but barely protecting human life. We are quickly approaching and may have already experienced the loss of 50 million lives by abortion. Liberty has trumped life. We fear passing the Clinic Access Bill will now allow business to trump liberty. We are witnessing some of the results of that today. Please vote against this bill.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.

CHARLES WRIGHT: My name is Charles Wright. I live in Manhattan. Most of what I had prepared to say has already been said and said a lot better than I probably would have said it. So I'll just read you an abbreviated statement. For a little over two years now I've spent Saturday mornings saying my Catholic prayers near an abortion facility. I've watched hundreds of men,

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

women and children enter and exit the facilities. The little old ladies and men and a few younger ones and professional men and women and students and the occasional priest or nun praying or offering literature are their neighbors and they're your neighbors and they're good people and good citizens, just like you. Yet, in the statements by various council members and other interested parties and also contained in the press release for this bill that's on the website for this chamber, I have seen and heard expressions like prevented, or intimidated, or stand in the way or, or facing threats, or physical harm, or 14 blocking or fearing for their lives, or facing reprisal, or aggressive attacks. I am quite sure that the patrons are not harassed, threatened or attacked aggressively or otherwise in any manner by the neighbors who present themselves in the marketplace as witnesses to the dignity of life. Claims to the contrary are straw arguments that serve only to inflame an otherwise peaceful debate. By invoking such language in its statements the council makes a mockery of the process of representative government by

obfuscating facts and irresponsibly 2 3 sensationalizing fictitious fears. And I just want to digress here and say that one of the things that I was going to say is this legislation 5 centers on harassment and protection of access to 6 reproductive health facilities, which so many 7 8 people have said before is clearly established in the New York Penal Code. And I found out this 9 10 morning it's also in local ordinance. 11 submit then that promoting redundant legislation 12 does violence to the principles of limited government explicitly upheld in our Constitution. 13 May I have your permission to speak a little 14 15 Principles proven over time to protect longer? 16 and promote individual liberty and civil liberty. 17 Reproductive health, as it's used here, is simply a euphuism for abortion. People who are 18 19 witnessing outside of an abortion facility are not 20 offering literature and alternative to obstetrics, 21 gynecology, dentistry or any other health 22 services. Abortion providers have been given 23 great representation here before this council. 24 These abortion providers do what they do for a 25 profit. This is a business matter. Businesses

seem to be interested in silencing any 2 3 alternatives for their services and silencing the expression of any alternatives for their services. It appears to be an abuse of the legislative 5 This might be considered an anti-trust 6 question, but to cloak it as a civil rights issue 7 8 is more than merely misleading. It's an insult to that great cause and it's an insult to the 9 10 intelligence of the electorate. I for one muse 11 within myself what possesses the council to so zealously and with such rhetorical overkill 12 13 promote a law that is not only redundant but also 14 discriminatory. In summary then, the Clinic 15 Access Bill is a rerun of already adequately 16 established law with potentially a discriminatory 17 slant to it. I humbly wish to remind the council 18 members that the electorate, all of it, is 19 depending upon you to invest your valuable time, 20 talent and this office to represent us with 21 unbiased honor and not to use inflammatory 22 rhetoric to promote dubious legislation. Finally, 23 I don't believe for a minute that anyone on this 24 council would doubt that a one-year-old baby is 25 any less a person than an adult simply because it

has not developed into an adult yet. It will and everybody knows that it will. I call on each one of you to acknowledge that the infant that emerges from the womb of his mother during the ninth month of pregnancy is a slightly more developed version of the infant that began its life there at the beginning of the first month of that pregnancy. I do sincerely thank you for the opportunity and for your time and for your service to the good people of this great city.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much. Our next panel is Nona Aguilar [phonetic], Gerald Maglio [phonetic], Robert Walsh, and Agnes Hu [phonetic]. Why don't you start? I think the fourth one is not here.

AGNES HU: My name is Agnes Hu.

I'm here as a private citizen. I made time to come here today because I'm passionate about justice. I could not help but notice that inscribed in your ceiling here in the words of Thomas Jefferson and he said equal and exact justice for all men of whatever state of persuasion. Now, I am against what we are voting for here today. I know you mentioned many times

about intent. The intent of this bill that you 2 3 want to pass is for violent demonstrators and that 4 it really didn't apply to sidewalk counselors. But the reality is that the side effect of this 5 bill is going to affect the sidewalk counselors. 6 7 What this bill is doing is giving undue influence 8 on the side of abortion clinics to make claims that cannot even be verifiable. So if it cannot 9 10 be verified, how can that be justice for the person who has been accused of committing 11 something that cannot be substantiated? So I 12 13 think that is something that the council should 14 really study very carefully. I'm not a lawyer. 15 I'm just an ordinary citizen and I'm just speaking 16 as someone who has common sense. I just heard of 17 this law just two days ago and I could not believe that we were passing a law like this. I mean, who 18 19 are we really protecting? The purpose of sidewalk 20 counselors is to really give information which has 21 not been provided by the abortion clinics. We are 22 trying to help the woman to make an informed 23 choice. We know that many, many of these girls 24 that come are very young. They're placed in a 25 vulnerable position. The boyfriend who claims to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

love them is no longer loving them because he wants an abortion. The parents don't want to deal with it because she was disobedient. She didn't listen to what I say. So then she has no help. The first thing they think of is to get rid of this child. So to give undue influence to the abortion clinic is not really protecting the rights of everyone. If this bill is passed, it takes away the ability of the sidewalk counselors to really counsel. You're talking about 15 feet, that's a lot of distance from the clinic. I mean what are the statistics of violence in the protests in front of abortion clinics? Are we overreacting with this bill? So we should really use common sense to quide what we are passing here and who are we truly protecting. Is the woman who comes for an abortion given the full information? Are the sidewalk counselors being protected or are their rights being violated with this bill? really true that the abortionists are giving undue help from the side of this bill? So we should have to really study every side and not be emotional, but let's say are we really giving equal justice to each group, the sidewalk

counselors, the women who wants an abortion and the abortionists. It should be equal. I think that this bill will not give equal. It will give more rights to the abortionists. I mean, it's like they're in control. They can come and say she said something and my client felt threatened so they have to go to jail. How do we substantiate this? So this law should have a clear definition of what is harassment and what is fear. There has to be proof. That's why I'm here. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much.

GERALD MAGLIO: My name is Gerald Maglio and some of the things I was going to say were said before. But I'm coming a long distance, so if you don't mind, just a minute would be fine. Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee. My background is health care administration. For the past 33 years I've been servicing tens of thousands of patients. I'm a lobbyist. I've advocated on behalf of the indigent, the poor and vulnerable populations for over a quarter of a century, particularly the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

voiceless and defenseless, protecting from abuse, harm and neglect. One of the things I just wanted to point out as being a health care professional and it was touched on slightly before. But for the most part I've recently retired in doing counseling. We only have 10 or 15 feet and less than a minute to possibly provide information to the girls and women entering clinics. Most of these clients have never been informed about the development of their babies. They've never been informed about the risks involved and the availability of support services, as you've heard. Being in the health care field for 33 years, I find it somewhat appalling. I find it appalling that patients are required in hospitals, nursing homes, housing of all kinds involving medical care have always required patients to know the risks and benefits and the side effects of treatment. Even our staff are required through OSHA standards to know the effects of products used. And yet at abortion clinics they're not required to provide even the most fundamental of information necessary for the well-being of the patient or information necessary to make informed decisions. That's what

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I see as the role of the sidewalk counselors to address that need. As a health care professional, again, and as policy makers I believe that more stringent measures need to be taken to protect these vulnerable populations, especially minors, from exploitation. One of the exploitations that I see is Planned Parenthood receives \$500 million a year in government funding and yet there is reports of failure to report statutory rape or suspected sexual abuse among minors. legislators are remiss in not ensuring women's rights to know that abortion is an intrusive medical procedure that involves risks. I think you've heard some of those risks. They are very serious risks. Then the last thing, also as a health care professional, one of the other things you also heard touched on was black genocide. Reverend Clenard, the director of Life, Education and Resource, and he's outspoken about black genocide. He did say that 78% of the Planned Parenthood clinics are in minority communities. He did point out that the founder of Planned Parenthood, Margaret Sanger was a devout racist who felt that colored people were like weeds to be

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exterminated. Over a third of the black race has been denied the right to be born. Is her vision being fulfilled today? Lastly, having been responsible for physical management of health care facilities, numbers go in my head and when I see four or five girls turning around, that's 15,000 to 20,000 a week which accounts to about 750 to a million a year per clinic. And as you've seen, several of these clinics are owned by one organization. You're easily talking about tens of millions of dollars if even a few girls change their mind. So I think as policy makers it's important to be concerned and not allow restriction of information and education to clients and patients, which would do a great disservice, over an agenda of increasing profits. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very much.

NONA AGUILAR: My name is Nona

Aguilar. I'm here as a private citizen. I'm

actually here because I'm against abortion but I

don't make a big deal about it. But I've been

surprised the people who will speak to me about

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

their past abortions, their grief, the sorrow, what they are suffering and every one of them I have asked if they received some kind of counseling at the clinics. They're supposed to. No one has told me they have gotten that kind of counseling. The problem with that is they made a decision that later they come to understand and then can in no way reverse, change or alter. Т don't even want to tell you because I've had people sobbing in my arms about it. Didn't you know? No. In one case a woman was forced by her husband. She didn't want the abortion. have assumed that the clinic would have recognized this woman who told me she was crying and sobbing as she went in, her husband pushed her in, would have been turned away. No. She's had enormous psychological problems and drug addiction She was a school teacher. She had to problems. finally just leave teaching. She's had problems with depression, and thoughts of suicide. didn't get the counseling. So that's one category of people I've spoken to. I've heard from men who regret bitterly their involvement. A third category that may surprise you is I've spoken to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

two physicians who were former abortionists who bitterly regret their involvement. They've all told me the same thing, that no, they didn't really know there were alternatives. reference to the Clinic Access Bill, I would like to say that I do believe, Madame Chairwoman, that you are about treating everybody fairly. believe that. I also believe that you do believe the intent is not to target sidewalk counselors. But I would just like to remind you about a much greater law that we are all aware of, the law of unintended consequences. I think those counselors 14 have a right to fear that they will be targeted. I thank you. CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

Thank you for being patient. Our next much. panel is Ann Gilmartin [phonetic], John Broderick [phonetic], Wayne Atkinson [phonetic] and Rocco Carlucci [phonetic]. This is our last panel. You have been extremely patient. I think most of you have been here since 10 a.m.

ANN GILMARTIN: John Broderick, a pro-life lawyer, had to leave. I'm Ann Gilmartin and I'm speaking for the pro-life clinic

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

counselors. You asked what was wrong with this bill. For us, plenty. First, directed to the many lies that's projected and incorporated here such as pushing, shoving, assaulting or whatever it might be. This has never happened. Over 30 years doing this, especially outside the various abortion mills that were and not now. listen to the abortionists themselves appreciating our work. Employees and employees they have. I want to direct mainly to the 15-foot bubble zone. This is serious. First of all, we're in New York City. It's busy, especially 42nd Street abortion mill, one of the biggest in our town. The Israel Building on 42nd Street, how can we reach them with a bubble zone. We can't go up to everyone. That's the key thing. We want to only approach those who we think are going in to have an If they say they're not, they're going abortion. in for something else, or they just put up their hands, we don't bother. We can't waste our energy. It's very draining out there. If a counselor goes within that bubble zone of 15 feet, what happens to her?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Your testimony.

2	ANN GILMARTIN: Yes, but that's a
3	key question because this is the law you're
4	promoting that you're going to enact. Again, it's
5	a big city that's very busy. We do not want to go
6	to anyone except those entering the building.
7	That's the key thing here. We're there to save
8	lives. Consider this, no bubble zone, we want to
9	go up to the door. We stop. We can't go in. Why
10	can't we go in? We wish they would do the job we
11	were doing. We don't want to be there day in and
12	day out. You're taking away the child's rights.
13	You may not claim that. You're taking the
14	father's rights. He has no say. Has the father
15	any say, whether he's married or single? It's
16	chilling. Again, I'll repeat, you're taking away
17	the child's rights and you're taking away the
18	father's rights. There's no say for the father,
19	married or single. This is not law. Third,
20	you're moving in on us. We're on the Titanic as a
21	nation. We're sinking. Nearly all the portholes
22	are open. Another porthole you're going to open?
23	CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you.
24	ROCCO CARLUCCI: Hi. My name is
25	Rocco Carlucci. I'm here as a private citizen and

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

one of the helpers. It was interesting before when we got into a little debate, shall we say, about intent. Madame Speaker was able to confront those who disagree with what we thought was the This bill will eliminate our rights to do that. We will not be able to see those who are accusing us of something. Maybe it's a little vaque, you know, what happened is not exactly This law may stop that from happening. Ι'm also concerned that this may have further consequences. This is a slippery slope. When we become a country where a person can be accused of a crime and not be able to confront or debate our accusers, what is next? Not to make light of anything, but I as a Yankee who chants Go Yanks in Shay Stadium, will I then be accused by Shay Stadium on behalf of an anonymous Met fan that I can be harassing. I'm making a point. You see the slippery slope we can be going down. This is my concern. As a prayerful person outside, I'm concerned that accusations may be made that are a little vague and the laws are a little vague and we need much more specifics in this law.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you very

2 much. Is there anyone else that would like to

3 testify? If not I want to thank all of you. You

4 have been here all day and have been very, very

5 patient. I want to thank you for being here.

With that, this hearing is closed.

I, Donna Hintze certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Ema	dentje

Signature_

Date ___February 16, 2009_____