

May 7, 1973

again this entire area which now brings us to the other approaches. Another approach which many have suggested and which may have some merit, is to not approve any abortion bill or even deal with the problem; to leave it as it is. One person who called me when I pointed out that we had no abortion law, that this could open up an abortion mill, that women would possibly be butchered under such provisions, said that if, if this occurred, this is what God wanted, that these women who would involve themselves in abortion did deserve to be butchered. The other approach, which has been fostered very strongly in recent days, is that of adopting the Rhode Island bill. The Rhode Island bill, which I hope was made clear to you in this opinion, which is not a rumor that a court has done anything, which is not an idea, that opinion is one of the longest opinions the Attorney General has ever handed down, to the best of my knowledge, I requested it sometime ago when the question of Rhode Island arose. For eight pages in that opinion, it documents, with legal arguments, with Supreme Court decisions and with other data, why the Rhode Island bill would be a farce for us to adopt. The conclusion of the Court opinion does say that they don't really know, but for eight pages prior to that one paragraph at the end, they clearly document why Rhode Island is not the way to go. It's my opinion that this body, after very careful study, is ready to adopt the basic committee bill and that the only question now remains whether to adopt the Stahmer amendments or the minor technical changes of the Anderson amendments which maintain the integrity of the bill you have. I believe and I feel at this point that this Legislature should adopt the Anderson amendments and should do so almost overwhelmingly and I believe they should reject the Stahmer amendments. Now do not misunderstand me on this point. The Stahmer amendments are clearly constitutional. The Stahmer amendments quite definitely impose restrictions and the Stahmer amendments in a bill would be as good a bill as could be drafted if one were intending to comply 100% with the Supreme Court decision, but once you have done that, you have directly recognized and, I think, approved the abortion practices as encouraged by the Supreme Court decision and you have eliminated the chance to run this case up to the Supreme Court and have the issue reviewed again. To the best of my knowledge and I have checked it rather thoroughly, the bill as we have it now with the Anderson amendments, is the only bill proposed anywhere in the 50 states that is deliberately calculated and designed by thousands of hours of legal talent, both to impose restrictions and to get up to the Supreme Court. Now for those of you who talked to me earlier and said why couldn't the Rhode Island bill go to the Supreme Court, it might well, but if you listen to the opinion, the Supreme Court has the authority and power to refuse to hear a particular case. They have refused to hear an almost identical situation involving Connecticut. There is no reason to believe that they would do otherwise with Rhode Island on an identical situation and so I would close by saying I hope, if nothing else, that on your behalf as Senators, that some of the things I said have ho--helped to straighten out the confusion on the abortion issue. The easy thing, quite frankly, would be for us to do nothing and to dodge the issue and I have said that in committee and the committee could have done that too, but after a lot of soul searching, after a lot of debate, they decided to go ahead and I think this Legislature now has the obligation to make--take the next step and go ahead and implement the bill that we have come up with which probably, as I say, has as much legal research behind it as another 100 bills in this Legislature combined and so I encourage you to reject the Stahmer amendments, while not criticizing