

CHAPTER 29

PARENTAL NOTIFICATION

The U.S. Supreme Court's Casey Decision allowed states to pass laws requiring parental notification.

Explain such a law.

Typically, such a law requires the abortionist to notify one or both parents of an unemancipated minor daughter prior to an abortion, a “minor daughter” being under 18 and living at home. Under most state laws this only requires notification. In some states it also requires consent.

The court has also required a “judicial bypass.” This means that if the girl feels that she may be abused by her parents when they find out, she may go to a judge and ask for the court’s approval to abort without parental notification.

This requires some time?

Yes, and because of this, these laws are often paired with a waiting period. This would be a required 24 or 48-hour waiting period after she has been examined and the abortion agreed upon. Sometimes such a law is paired with parental notification. In some states these

laws requiring a waiting period have been passed standing alone.

What has been the usual ruling of a judge?

With few exceptions, cases have gone to judges who have given blanket approval for abortion.

What percent of teenagers tell their parents freely?

The abortion industry tells us at least three-fourths. Experience by pro-lifers has been about one-third. This is supported by a study where 37% told the mother and 26% told the father.

Minor Women Obtaining Abortions:
A Study of Par. Notif. in a Metro. Area, F. Clary,
Am J. Pub H. Mar. 1982, Vol. 72, No. 3, P. 283

Why don't they tell their parents?

The main reason is embarrassment, shame and reluctance to hurt their parents. There's also a certain element of "My mom would just die!" and "My dad would kill me." In fact, such retaliation rarely happens. "The girls go through this alone because they don't want to shatter the good-girl image their parents have of them."

T. Welsh, Fam. Plan. Persp. Dec. '83

But, there is a simple preventive measure.

What is that?

A pregnancy diagnosis is almost always made by a physician. If the girl fears her parents, ideally, that physician should call one or both parents into his office and break the news to them in front of the girl. If not face-to-face, this can be done by the physician over the telephone. The result of this is that the parents, particularly the father, have been notified that this authority figure knows and can and will report any child abuse. As a result, it never happens.

But think of the emotional impact of notifying the parents!

I believe the following article answers that:

Your Daughter — Pregnant?

And under 18 years? What does she think of you, her parents? Should she tell you? Sadly, few girls want to. They think you'll explode, condemn, reject, feel ashamed. She doesn't want to hurt you. She is alone, frightened, defiant, worried, yes, but still a young girl who desperately needs your love and help.

The Supreme Court ruling assures her that she can have her baby killed, can internalize all of the psychic trauma, the loneliness, the bitterness, and never know that . . .

If she had told you — yes, you might have “exploded” initially — but then, with rare exceptions, you would have shared your tears and given her the help, support, and love she so desperately needed. To her surprise, you would not condemn, but offer all the love, help, and understanding you could in this time of trial.

In my 25 years of counseling, I have found that when a girl does come to her parents and receives the help they can offer, it becomes the occasion of a real growth in maturity, self-confidence, and ability to love by the girl. She faces her responsibility and stands tall. The family bond is strengthened by the sharing of the burden.

But no, now the tragic Supreme Court Decision can guarantee that she'll never know that you really love her and would have helped her. Thanks to them, she can have her baby killed in secret and become disillusioned, embittered, hardened.

May God have mercy on those judges for what they have done.

J. Willke, *Cincinnati RTL Newsletter*; July 1976, p. 3

What effect have parental notification laws had on the abortion rate?

In some small states, like Massachusetts, the answer is confused because some teenagers cross into neighboring states for abortions. In a much larger state like Minnesota, where such travel is almost prohibitive, the record is very clear.

What is the result?

The State of Minnesota had such a law in place since 1981. Then the law was challenged in court and enjoined (suspended) in March 1986. The Supreme Court later ruled that the law was constitutional, and it was reimposed.

Hodgson v. State of Minn., 853 F. 2d 1452,
1458 n. 9 [8th Cir 1988]

In that state there were excellent records kept for several years with the law in place, several more without the law, and then again with the law. Results were very clear.

Perhaps not unexpectedly, the number of abortions to unemancipated minors dropped, and by a figure of 34%. Correspondingly, the number of live births to this group increased. The unexpected result was that the number of *pregnancies* in this age group to unmarried girls decreased by 27%.

Impact of MN Par. Notif. Law on Ab. and Birth,
J. Rogers et al.,
Am. J. Pub. Health, Mar. '91, vol. 81, no. 3, p. 294

A 27% decrease in teen pregnancies? That's never happened before, has it?

Correct. It was an amazing and heartwarming result. As everyone knows, government at all levels, private groups, schools, churches, etc., have all been trying to reduce teen pregnancies over the last several decades. The results of all of these have been essentially negative, hardly moving the percentage one way or the

other. Then here we saw a full one-fourth decrease in teen pregnancies, an absolutely astonishing and heart-warming effect.

That's exactly what Planned Parenthood has been trying to do. Were they pleased?

Not at all. In fact, they brought the lawsuit which enjoined the law. Planned Parenthood has constantly been telling the world that it wants to reduce teen pregnancies. Here was an outstanding example of an effective method, and Planned Parenthood showed its true stripes. It went to court to stop the only major successful program that limited teen pregnancies. So much for Planned Parenthood's claims that it wants to reduce teen pregnancies.

But didn't the Becky Bell case show otherwise?

The Becky Bell case ranks among the most totally misrepresented happenings in the history of the abortion conflict. Let's recall her story.

Becky Bell is the now-famous 17-year-old Indianapolis girl who died September 16, 1988. Her death has been portrayed by pro-abortion groups all over the country as an example of why parental notification and consent laws are undesirable. The story as told by her parents and others is that she had an illegal induced abortion, became infected, developed pneumonia, and died from the infection. Indiana has a parental consent law that is being enforced. Her parents state that if she could have gotten a legal abortion in Indiana without her parents' knowledge, she would be alive today.

The fact is that Becky never had an induced abortion. She died from massive pneumonia and septic shock.

Becky Bell

She had become pregnant. This was confirmed at a Planned Parenthood clinic. She attended a drug party, became ill and died six days later. Your authors have a

copy of the autopsy report which showed no evidence of an induced abortion, but massive pneumonia, lung cavitation, and septic shock as the cause of death.

In the first edition of this book is a six-page detailed description of this case.

Conclusion

Becky Bell did not die from an induced abortion. The entire attempt by the abortion industry to so label her death was a total lie.

[Next Chapter](#)

[Previous Chapter](#)

[Contents Page](#)