

nists. Because to vote for John McCain, a feminist would have to be insane. Let me rephrase that: she would have to believe that the chief - indeed the only - goal of the women's movement is to elect Clinton, not to promote women's rights. A vote for McCain would be the ultimate face-spiting nose cut-off. Take that, women's equality!

Not that the media will help women get in.... the mainstream press is doing its best to persuade us that McCain is a moderate - barely distinguishable from Barack Obama - even on abortion rights, one of the brighter dividing lines between the parties. In the *Providence Journal* five days after Clinton suspended her campaign, columnist Froma Harrop was typical: "Would McCain stock the Supreme Court with foes of *Roe v. Wade*?... The answer is unclear but probably 'no.'" After all, in 1999 he told the *San Francisco Chronicle* editorial board that he "would not support repeal of *Roe* because women would seek unsafe, illegal procedures. Since the Democrats will control Congress, Harrop figures, "McCain would probably choose a cipher" rather than get bogged down in the abortion wars.

This fake shrewdness, buttressed by much use of "probably," "seems," "may," and "my guess is," has as much value as a bet by a drunk in a bar. We all have our hunches - usually they magically line up with our wishes and preferences, in Harrop's case, her support for Clinton. By the end of the column she's castigating Obama for his "present" votes on abortion bills in the Illinois Assembly, and by the time she's finished, you'd never know that NARAL and Planned Parenthood give Obama 100 percent ratings and McCain a big fat zero.

How antichoice is John McCain? Let's leave the psychological tea leaves out of it and look at his record. In his four years in the House, from 1983 to 1986, he cast eleven votes on reproductive issues. Ten were antichoice. Of 119 such votes in the Senate, 115 were antichoice, including votes for the ban on so-

called partial-birth abortions and for the "gag rule," which refuses funds to clinics abroad that so much as mention abortion. In 1999, the year he said he opposed repeal of *Roe* on health grounds, he voted against a bill that would have permitted servicewomen overseas, where safe, legal abortion is often unavailable, to pay out of their own pockets for abortions in military hospitals.

His record on contraception and sex education is just as bad. He voted against a 2005 budget amendment, sponsored by Hillary Clinton, that would have allotted \$100 million to reduced teen pregnancy by means of education and birth control. He voted to required parental consent for birth control for teenage girls and to abolish Title X, which funds birth control and gynecological care for the poor. He voted against requiring insurance companies to pay for prescription contraception, when they pay for other prescription drugs - like, um, Viagra. The beat goes on, and on. With a handful of exceptions (he voted to confirm prochoice Surgeon General Dr. David Satcher after voting against prochoice Dr. Jocelyn Elders), he has a just about perfect antichoice record, including votes to confirm the Supreme Court nominations of Thomas, Roberts and Alito....

If that's not clear enough for you, how about this: "I do not support *Roe v. Wade*, period. It should be overturned." (Associated Press, February 18, 2007). Or this, from his campaign website: "*Roe v. Wade* is a flawed decision that must be overturned."

As the Bush years have shown, the President has a tremendous amount of power; Supreme Court nominations don't begin to describe it. He nominates all the federal judges (302 since Bush took office). He appoints the heads of dozens of regulatory agencies, many of which (HHS, FDA, National Institutes of Health) directly affect women's lives. He submits legislation and the budget to Congress. He has a veto.

Bush, we all know, has filled the government with right-wing Chris-

tian hacks and family-values fanatics, with room left over for incompetent cronies. He has done just about nothing good for women. McCain's record suggests he would not be any different. His opposition to the Ledbetter Act, which would have overturned the Supreme Court's restrictions on women's right to sue for paycheck discrimination, tells you everything you need to know about where he stands on economic justice for women.

The media can call John McCain a moderate if they want. Not matter how aggrieved women are by Clinton's loss, I'm betting that the ones who care about women's rights are too smart to fall for it.

----- Transfer Stations: We Need Better Recycling in Wooster -----

Years upon years ago communities discovered that citizens would use conveniently placed sites accepting materials for recycling.



Neighboring Smithville's Recycling Site

The sites, called transfer stations, had portable containers into which sorted recyclables were placed. From the sites items often finding their way onto city streets and county roads ended up in the transfer stations; from the stations the items were taken for processing. Recycling was not only encouraged, and facilitated, so was local responsibility in environmental stewardship. There is an obvious need in Wooster, the Wayne County seat, for such recycling stations. Our present recycling system is awkward and consequently much underused. It's time the Wooster City administration instituted transfer station recycling.