

parents. Can you imagine these well dressed, middle-class and upper-class women such as Phyllis Schafly (phonetic) who would do all of that talking about the rights of the fetus being surrounded by a horde of little snotty-nosed, ragged, hungry urchins? Do you think Phyllis Schafly would say, oh, that my arms were made long enough to embrace all of these children and give them the love they're denied by a system that puts this kind of injustice on little children. No, she'd turn up her nose. She'd wonder, well, where are the parents of these, these, whatever term she uses? And a lot of these other people profess so much concern for children would have the same attitude. You all would be shocked at the things that young people tell me when I go read to them and when I go talk to them and I have the credentials. I'm always invited to talk to them because I listen to what they say and I look at the reality of what children face. This bill, if you look at page 5 in line 17, this is what would allow the young woman to not have to notify her parents. The pregnant woman declares that she is a victim of sexual abuse, neglect or physical abuse as defined in the appropriate sections of law. That is pressure and an invitation to lie and we know it. The ones offering this bill know that they are putting an incentive to lie, and yet it is supposed to be an ethical bill. Then it goes on in that same portion, starting in line 20, notice of such a declaration shall be made to the proper authorities as provided in various sections of statute. What is that other than a deterrent to this provision being used? Who is to notify the authorities? It doesn't say. But somebody might could be held accountable. Now for those brilliant people out there who are experts in canon law and civil law, this is a criminal law and when you have a provision such as that, and it is vague as to who has the duty and the inability or the unwillingness to follow the provisions of this law are a crime, then you have the vagueness that is necessary to render the bill unconstitutional and you don't get away with that nonsense that some of those canon lawyers put at the end of this, if any section is unconstitutional the rest is, not when you're dealing with a criminal law. You can't pick and choose this portion and that portion, parse this sentence, take the first part of it, the middle of the second one and the tail end of the third one and say eliminate all the rest and push these together and this is what I meant. No, it's clear what they meant. We've got some hardhearted, unfeeling, cruel people trying to work a hoax and further place burdens on our young women who bear more than any other group as a whole in this society. I've talked before