

I am a lifelong registered democrat, campaign volunteer, and canvasser residing in AD 25 and SD 15. I strongly oppose SJR 7 in that it expands abortion rights far beyond existing Nevada statutory law, well past the point of viability of an individual human fetus, up to the point of birth. This prohibits any consideration of a legitimate and compelling societal interest in providing legal protection for an individual human fetus beyond viability and approaching birth.

This flies in the face of findings in the fields of prenatal biology, pediatrics, and genetics as to the formation of individual human life. While a woman may possess bodily autonomy the exercise of that autonomy does not extend to the destruction of another; a viable human fetus is no longer an integral part of her body but instead a distinguishable individual living human fetus naturally progressing toward birth and as a human being, entitled to some legal protection. To be blunt we have a compelling societal imperative not to kill off our future progeny but rather a stewardship obligation to provide the necessary resources, childcare, prenatal care, parental leave to allow them and their parents to thrive.

I think most Nevadans, and many democratic voters share this view. Out canvassing I did not hear calls for expanding abortion rights as a basis to choose democratic vs republican candidates. Instead, most voters i spoke with found it important to vote against "election deniers" and conspiracy opportunists. As a result, I question the credibility of the testimony of Naral Nevada that implies that over 80% of Nevadans would favor SJR 7. I have tried to find the poll cited, but can't, to see what questions are asked. However, the key question to ask is if one favors extending the right to abortion beyond the current law to the point of birth or not. As per the recent Marist poll, most Nevadans, and many democrats like me, do not.

George Postrozny