

April 4, 1990

woman's decision to have an abortion. It aggravates a very difficult time for her. This, of all the so-called antiabortion bills, probably will achieve the least because what I would expect is that somebody will immediately enter court, if this passes, and obtain an injunction, and there would be a victory of sorts because it was rammed through the Legislature, but it will not have achieved anything in terms of really restricting abortions or the woman's right to make that choice. The way the bill is drafted it cannot prohibit an abortion anyway. So when we get these letters and people stand on the floor and say that they are concerned about the unborn, even if this bill passes, and even if it were not to be enjoined, it is not a bill that prohibits abortions. The desire on the part of those who offer it is to try to set up various little court tests to see if Roe v. Wade can be chipped away in increments, and they have no concern about the difficulty that it could cause to women in the meantime while waiting for some court action which may strike it down. I am not able to look at that kind of a strategy and call it fair or considerate. I do not think that this bill ought to pass, even though in my opinion it is unconstitutional, because it will demonstrate once again that this Legislature, as it has done several times in the past, will knowingly enact unconstitutional legislation because it wants to oppress women. These bills ought to carry A bills, and some of us have talked about adding one in order that the cost of the legal action can be absorbed. If this is not going to ultimately and absolutely prohibit any abortion, what is the purpose of it? Even those who support the bill say they have no desire to send certain young women into an environment where they may be brutalized or even killed, but that is the only effect it can have. That is the only effect that it can have. So if the only effect that it can have is the one they say is not their intent, then they must say that they have another intent. It can't be to compel those young women to talk to their parents who are going to talk to them anyway. The only ones it will impact on are those who have a reason not to want to do that, yet the supporters of this bill say it is not their intent to put those women into a dangerous environment. So what is it for? To harass? To make a statement? They can make a statement through a resolution, and I am sure they could get a resolution adopted with the numbers that we are told on this floor who support what they want to do, and that is how they could get their vote on the issue. And the vote on the issue would be there for them to make whatever use they chose of it, while at the same time not burdening women who have enough in the way of a serious problem confronting them. I