

EDMONT 4
APR 4/5/11
HR 574

Dear Chairman Murphy, Vice Chairman Shockley, and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

Montanans may want their legislators to be free from the tyranny of the Montana Supreme Court, that has "legislated" an overreaching "right of privacy" in order to protect abortion from regulation. Our 1972 Constitution was ratified during the Watergate Era, when Montanans wanted a "privacy" that protected them from wire-tapping surveillance. The "right to privacy" was first invoked in U.S. Supreme Court decision *Griswold vs. Connecticut* in 1965 by an all man court, to defend the marital bed from government surveillance.

I've heard said that a man will go into his cave, and may invoke a "right to privacy" until he comes out, with his problem solved. Imposing a "right of privacy" on a woman so that she alone will be "free" to choose, denies the way women solve their problems. Isolating a woman in such a state of "freedom", alienates her from those most willing to support her. When we women experience stress, we typically will reach out to communicate, talking out our problems in intimate relationships, where we can be heard. This would especially be the case when we experience distress and lost control of our situation and our lives with a surprise pregnancy. After all, we have been trained to control our lives with birth control. A woman who is pressured, manipulated, coerced or forced to have sex, may, when she becomes pregnant, be vulnerable to being pressured, manipulated, coerced or forced to have an abortion. A teenager on birth control may be especially vulnerable.

Women are naturally unstable emotionally in early pregnancy, when their hormones are re-balancing for pregnancy. During this condition of life peculiar to women, they are particularly in need of relational support, requiring particular legal protection, especially teenage women. Otherwise they may be vulnerable to the influence of others, who may put their own interests above the woman's.

The Montana Supreme Court's "right of privacy" renders women vulnerable to coerced abortion (64% report being pressured by others – see *Medical Science Monitor Study; 10, 2004*). My "right of privacy" prevented those I asked to help me, from giving the support I needed to defend my freedom to choose to remain pregnant under pressure to abort. And because of coercion, I was deeply traumatized.

Someone gets paid when a woman has a abortion, and somebody pays for a woman's abortion. Montanans who want to protect women from abortion, or do not want to participate in abortion, ought not to be forced to pay for what is most often a traumatizing experience for women (65% report trauma after their abortions – see *Medical Science Monitor Study; 10, 2004*). Taxes ought to be used to defend the common good, not the private "good" of profit making entities that may exploit vulnerable pregnant women, especially those under coercion and most vulnerable to trauma. Many Montana women have not been able to protect themselves from unwanted abortions. I certainly do not want my taxes to pay for unwanted abortions that traumatize women. Many Montanans may not want or need a "right of privacy" interpreted to protect abortion from regulation as long as abortion is legal. Many Montanans may want surveillance of an industry that has harmed so many of our women.

Let us decide. Please vote YES on HB 574.

Christina Pfarr Hayden
Butte, Montana

April 5, 2011