

I don't want to take a lot of time. "As to the first paragraph of the Arizona statute prohibiting state funds for abortion-related services, the court concluded that 'Arizona may not unreasonably interfere with the right of Planned Parenthood to engage in abortion or abortion-related speech activities, but the state needs not support, monetarily or otherwise, those activities.'" I shall move down. "It is not clear from AM2294 whether it would deny funding only for the excluded abortion or contraceptive services, or whether it would deny funding totally to applicants providing these services, but with other than state funds, within the prevention, early identifications and intervention services eligible for funding. If the amendment would require the state to deny funding to an applicant whose prevention, early identification, and intervention services include abortion or contraceptive services, even though the applicant is not requesting funding for the abortion and contraceptive services, the statute most likely will be found to be unconstitutionally overbroad as in the Arizona statutes." Many of you can read the Webster v. Reproductive Health Services back down again further, "AM2294 appears to be vulnerable to constitutional attack in several respects. It implicates both constitutionally protected speech rights, and the right of a state to adopt a policy favoring normal childbirth over abortion. Because the First Amendment is involved, the statute will be subject to a strict scrutiny analysis, requiring a compelling state interest to interfere with protected speech activities." Let's go down further, the Ninth Circuit, "However, the state would be allowed to show that withdrawal of all funds would be the only way to insure that no funds were being expended for the ineligible activities. Id. at 946. More troublesome with AM2294 is the ambiguity of the words counseling and refusal. This statute is unclear as to what 'counseling and referral for' means. Can abortion or contraceptive be mentioned at all? Can questions by a client about abortion or contraception be answered? Can no referral be made to any agency providing abortion or contraceptive counseling when the grantee program does not provide these services? The statute's failure to make clear the answer to these questions, in our opinion, causes the statute to be unconstitutionally vague as to its meaning and applications." That is simply what I am basing it on, and other than to muddy up 662, I thought it was best that we just remove this amendment, and I think it is very clear for the body. They can simply read what it does. LB 662 is intended to focus on prevention, address comprehensive needs, and allow for community input and decision-making, and the