

Written Testimony in Opposition of SRJ7

First I would like to address a couple of statements made during the presentation of this bill. One assemblywoman shared an anecdote about a friend who would have died had her triplets not been delivered early. The triplets unfortunately did not survive. This is a tragedy and I am sorry for the grief the family and their friends walked through and may still be walking through. However, this situation has nothing to do with abortion, or as the assemblywoman put it, “ending a pregnancy.” This was a premature delivery in an attempt to save the lives of all involved, not the intentional ending of a life which I and fellow pro-life advocates are concerned with.

In response to a question from assemblyman DeLong, the presenter stated this bill was the “creation of a right.” Do you not see the problem with that statement? If we have the ability to “create rights,” by necessity, we also have the ability to “destroy” or “remove” them. I’ll let you follow that to its logical conclusion on your own.

Addressing all other commenters on this bill, it breaks my heart to hear the women speaking in support of this bill who have been affected by abortion and/or feel genuine fear and anxiety over this issue. I understand these feelings are real, and I believe it is cruel and evil that pro-abortion advocates have lied to them and led them to believe the right to abortion is necessary for them to live a happy and successful life.

I apologize for any commenters that were disrespectful to the committees. I do not wish to have such behavior associated with my comments or my side of the argument.

It seems the largest argument given by the presenters of this bill was on the rights of the woman; however, this is an issue that involves competing rights. This choice does not just involve the woman who is pregnant but also the father of the baby, and most importantly, the child who cannot speak for themselves.

Even in the United States, the “right to choose” is not absolute. Many choices are unlawful and there is a difference between a “bad” decision and a “criminal” decision. The law generally leaves people the legal freedom to make *bad* choices, but the law must do all it can to prohibit *criminal* choices. When bad choices inflict injury or harm on others, they become criminal choices. Inflicting harm upon yourself (which abortion procedures certainly can do) is one thing, but inflicting harm upon someone else is quite another.

This then raises the question, is the unborn baby “someone else?”

At conception, every bit of information necessary to create a fully unique human being is present. Just three weeks after fertilization the baby's heart begins to beat. After six weeks the brain emits measurable brain impulses. After eight weeks **every** organ is present and in place.

In what other area do we argue that stage of development (age), environment (city or state, womb, etc.), socioeconomic status, mental capacity, etc. determine a person's value or right to life?

Faye Wattleton, the president of Planned Parenthood from 1978 to 1992, in a 1997 interview with *Ms. Magazine*, stated, "I think we have deluded ourselves into believing that people don't know that abortion is killing. So any pretense that abortion is not killing is a signal of our ambivalence, a signal that we cannot say yes, it kills a fetus."

Naomi Wolf wrote, "Clinging to a rhetoric about abortion in which there is no life and no death, we entangle our beliefs in a series of self-delusions, fibs and evasions. And we risk becoming precisely what our critics charge us with being: callous, selfish and casually destructive men and women who share a cheapened view of human life... **we need to contextualize the fight to defend abortion rights within a moral framework that admits that the death of a fetus is a real death.**"

Margaret Sanger herself wrote in 1932 that "no new life begins unless there is conception." In other words, she knew what she said in a speech from 1916 that abortion was, in fact, "the killing of babies."

Even these prominent abortion advocates admit that the unborn baby is a life, so then, which right is more fundamental? Which has greater value? The non-absolute right of the woman to choose or the right of the baby to life?

I also believe there is danger in removing the language for "informed consent." While abortion advocates would have us believe that the procedures are completely harmless, the fact of the matter is that there are associated risks. A November 2020 Abortion Surveillance report by the CDC cited 519 maternal deaths resulting from abortion from the years of 1973 to 2018. Further, 86.1% of those deaths resulted from **legal** abortion, so this is not simply a case of unsanitary, dangerous, illegal procedures.

In addition to the greatest risk of death, women who undergo abortions are at greater risk for Pelvic Inflammatory Disease which is life-threatening and

can lead to subsequent infertility and an increased risk of ectopic pregnancy. A 2017 article found a “significant association” between induced abortions and placenta previa, which is the superimposing of the placenta on the cervix and causes severe hemorrhage during labor. Abortion is also related to an increase in ectopic pregnancies in future pregnancies, which can seriously threaten the mother’s future fertility and even her life. There has been found to be a 30% increased risk of ectopic pregnancy after one abortion and a 160% increased risk of ectopic pregnancy after two or more abortions. Cervical lacerations, or tears in the cervix, are cited to occur in three percent of second-trimester abortions. Between 0.1 and 3.0 per 1,000 of aborting women suffer perforations of the uterus during a vacuum aspiration abortion. There is contested research on Post Abortion Syndrome, a type of PTSD, that can come with guilt and anxiety, suicidal thoughts, feeling numb, developing eating disorders, alcohol and drug abuse, resorting to sexual promiscuity, and the inability to bond with future children. More research and study must be done on this condition.

Another concern I have is with the language of “fetal viability.” This is variable based upon the proximity to care and availability of care options. This bill leaves the matter open to a subjective decision of the doctor.

Lastly for my concerns, it seems the language of this bill, if added as a constitutional amendment, would override the statutes protecting rights of conscience for health care professionals to refuse participation in abortion procedures. My husband is a nurse and would have to leave a profession he loves and has worked hard for to maintain his conscience, forcing him to find another way to provide for us.

I, and most my fellow pro-life advocates, have no problem with the other care protected in this bill that provide for the production or protection of life. You could end the debate on this bill right now simply by amending it to remove any changes to Nevada’s current abortion regulations.

Finally, as a volunteer at the midtown Reno location of Real Choices Women’s Center, my goal is not necessarily to outlaw all abortions, but to make abortion irrelevant. This organization cares holistically (physically, mentally, emotionally, and spiritually) for the women we serve. We provide a space for women to process their feelings and fears, we fully inform them on their options and walk with them as they determine the best option for themselves, we provide information for other community resources, and we offer pregnancy, birth, and parenting classes along with essential items for the mother and baby. Rather than supporting abortion as the answer to pregnant women in crisis, I would urge the committee and the assembly to support organization such as ours who empower women to chose life.

Thank you for allowing me to submit my testimony. I ask that my opinions and arguments be considered on this issue.

Thank you,

Cassidy Pocock
Resident of Sparks, NV