

May 14, 1981

LB 466

not have any trimesters. You don't have the first three months and you don't have the second three months or the third three months. You don't have any of that. We have gone on the theory of viability for this reason, first of all, to force the Supreme Court to start defining when viability is instead of saying automatically at three months something occurs, automatically at six months, and the Supreme Court has started in some of the decisions to narrow the range to say you can have controls and we don't know as much as we did about viability sometime before, and, indeed, the risk that Nebraska took in not having any of these three month, three month, three month periods has paid off. As I say, our definition, the definition we have put into our law of viability has been upheld by the courts which most people felt it wouldn't be. It has been so we have made progress there. By adopting the Marsh amendment, we would in a sense be abandoning the whole theory, the heart of the Nebraska abortion legislation in going to the three, three trimester theory and I would suggest that that is unwise. I would suggest that the Supreme Court decision that just came down on saying you could command a hospital is indeed more restrictive but there was not enough information in that decision. It was just more a footnote than anything else. To base anything on...in this particular subject and any major changes like this in the abortion laws, we should be waiting until next year to even look at them. I would like to say one final thing. You know everybody talks about what is unconstitutional, how this is unconstitutional and that is unconstitutional. Look at the other side of the coin. Nebraska's law has not been declared unconstitutional. You see, that is what you all keep forgetting. All you people that are always opposed to it, you had a couple pieces stricken out under the severability clause, and by the way, they were pieces which I stood right at this very identical microphone and told you the courts would strike down a couple of pieces and indeed they did, but the bulk of it, eighty, ninety percent, the court said is constitutional and it is what we are operating under. Now as I say, everybody always gets on this constitutional...you lost this case. Did you lose the preacher case? Well, I don't know. You listened to a preacher here this morning, didn't you? You listened to one yesterday and I reckon you will listen to one Monday. Did you lose or win the preacher case? I would kind of say you won it because the main thing that I think my good friend Ernie wanted to do was to run the preacher out of the room. Well, Ernie made it so you couldn't pay him and I kind of didn't want to pay the preacher anyway but we have still got him. In fact, we have got a whole host of them. So did we win or lose that? I think we won. It was

5186