

back wages that she wants, given the fact that she was let go. It's true that she is pro-choice, her attorney is not, is an ardent pro-lifer and has used this as a way of gaining strength, newspaper contacts, allegations off the subject of the nature of the claim in the case basically to draw attention, hoping to pressure I suppose for a settlement. Ms. Reay has offered to settle and it is the clinic who has refused to settle because they don't think the charges are true and they don't think that the claim is justified. What this is, is a well orchestrated legal strategy by a pro-life attorney attempting to use this situation to pressure the clinic into making a pecuniary judgment for Ms. Reay. That's what the case is about and it is not evidence of the need for or the lack of need for LB 78. It is an irrelevance. I said I wanted to talk about three elements of Senator Lindsay's opening and I've talked about one. John and I have a difference of opinion as to what is regulated and what isn't regulated and how we characterize the state, but I think I've made a case that the abortion procedure is a highly regulated procedure, more highly regulated than any other medical procedure in the state. Let's go on to the second point that John raised so well in his opening and that was that the abortion clinic has a rationale, a pecuniary interest to pursue, that if it's possible, since there is money being changing hands here, it would be in the abortion clinic's best economic interest to pressure people, put the thumb screws to them, sell them a bill of goods, move them through in some kind of a cattle herding procedure and rake off big money. If the problem is to attack some level of care because of the pecuniary interest of the clinic, this bill would be written differently than the way it is. This bill would highlight this role as a consumer and as somebody who is, when which money is changing hands, this bill would have some kind of financial penalty and it would be limited, would it not, to those abortions which are done for a fee.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: If the fear here is that pecuniary interests are forcing bad service or inadequate service, then this amendment would be limited to those places where abortions are charged for and a fee changed hands. That is not the case. LB 78 applies whether there is a fee for an abortion or not, whether there is a pecuniary interest, or not. One can't justify LB 78 on the nature of a pecuniary interest and then have it apply to any abortion no matter what setting, no matter