

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

June 3, 1997

LB 23

can't do in terms of how you do it. It's the line that's been crossed and now it goes into procedure, a procedure that's at issue, not whether an act can occur or not, in terms of whether you can abort or not. And when you get into a discussion about procedure, that's where you cross the line into health as well as abortion. I am supportive of the bill when it deals with the question of the use of this procedure in performing an abortion. I think that it's a gruesome effort to kill a living being, is the concept that is there, and I have that concern so I am going to support the bill in that regard. But what you deal with with a miscarriage is a situation that's different than that. It's not an overt attempt to try to kill a fetus, to kill an unborn child. It is an attempt...it is not an attempt at all to do any of that. What it is an attempt to do is to medically deal with a natural circumstance that is not wanted by the mother, is not wanted by the physician, but is naturally occurring and must be dealt with to preserve the health and life of that mother. And that means, as I outlined for you with the letters that I read, that there are situations that clearly call for this as a medical best option to take that will, I think, ensure the health and life of the mother. So I suggest again that there are good medical reasons for taking this step forward and there are not any efforts to try to hide something in...under the cover of this amendment. Now, as we've discussed the bill over the course of the last, oh, days or nights that we've talked about it, I appreciate that Senator Maurstad, Senator Brown has talked about this, I'm trying to think of others who have talked about the fact that the bill does not cover miscarriages, spontaneous miscarriages, and that the language in here should cover that. I am suggesting again a reading of this by a physician, by a citizen off the street, in trying to determine whether or not this covered or did not cover a miscarriage, would still be confused and uncertain about it. I appreciate the intent, but I'm not sure that the language accomplishes the intent, at least to the degree that satisfies those that have to face these situations. And so I am suggesting that if the intent is to not cover these miscarriages, and I agree that that makes no sense to do, then why don't we just say it in the bill? Why don't we just make it clear that a miscarriage is not going to have this apply? And I don't...I see that there's a memo from Senator Maurstad that may go into some of this and so I haven't had a chance to look at that before, unfortunately, so I