



OPINION *This piece expresses the views of its author(s), separate from those of this publication.*

Texas abortion law pits safety against control: Your Say

Published 8:02 p.m. ET Nov. 5, 2013 | Updated 8:03 p.m. ET Nov. 5, 2013

Letters to the editor:

As a family physician in California, where I provide comprehensive reproductive health care, including contraception counseling, pregnancy termination, prenatal care and delivery, I am troubled by claims that the purpose of Texas' anti-abortion law is "to protect the health and safety of Texas women" ("Court reinstates most of Texas' new abortion restrictions").

Abortion is far safer than childbirth. In the context of outpatient procedures, having an abortion carries no more risk than having a colonoscopy.

Moreover, we in the medical community know that hospital admitting privileges, as required by the recently upheld Texas law, are not related to patient safety. I and my physician colleagues across the country continually seek out and welcome measures that improve patient safety, but absurd laws such as this one only hurt women and families by decreasing access to essential reproductive health care services.

Sarah McNeil; Berkeley, Calif.

Abortion rights advocates have deemed Texas' abortion restrictions a threat to the health of women.

These zealots are exhibiting their lack of knowledge on sound medical practice. Women receiving abortions are much safer if their doctor has a hospital as backup in case things don't go as planned. This is a reasonable requirement and shows the wisdom of the federal appeals court in restoring that part of the law.

Thomas F. Shields; Auburn, Maine