

[Anna.Borgerding@house.mn.gov](mailto:Anna.Borgerding@house.mn.gov)

Comments By John Robinson.... Desire to make these personally during comments time.

### Proposed Bill HF91 – Abortion Bill

In 1854, a law passed by the Illinois territory which emancipated those bound by slavery who resided in the region for an extended length of time was challenged by the State of Virginia against a relation of mine and his wife Mr. Scott and Henrietta Robinson (relation through marriage). The supreme court apparently found the law “inconvenient” as laws which flow through human life and hence human dignity are inconvenient, they decided to make the decision that Mr. Scott was not human, and as such was not able to receive the relief of emancipation. For the Illinois territory administration for devising this law, I say thank you. For there continued support of this law until wonderful and proper passing of the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment, I also say thank you. I need to state clearly that I do believe that the current Minnesota Supreme Court case is nonsensical in its current form. I say this as most people will ascent to the liberty to eat if for no other reason than if we don’t eat, we die. Are we going to prohibit all health inspections of restaurants. By the fact pattern the Minnesota Supreme Court used, not just inspections on restaurants are unconstitutional, but any methodology or standards of cleanliness, food safety, all of it. All it would take would be one restaurant calling fowl on the Minnesota Government for closing there doors for any reason to file suit with the federal circuit court based on the fact pattern of the abortion case against the state of Minnesota restricting the rights of the public and the restaurant industry or for that matter limitations on grocery stores handling perishable food to have the right to sell said food to their customers, and their customers to have the right to consume said food. As such, like the emancipation law, it is worth noting that indeed this law does have

Interestingly enough, the call will immediately come out that we need inspections of restaurants and those handling food for food safety. Interestingly enough, by the arguments of certain representatives on the floor concerning the “safety of abortion” which itself is tied to there being historic limitations on the standards of care allowed, and the prescribed bill arguably eliminating the application of any restriction, the standard which she is saying is safe, and the standard to which she is saying will be safe are two completely different worlds. So I propose the following question. Does there exist a standard of care, perhaps one which was caused by a Republican of which Republicans are keenly aware and unwilling to allow to occur again? I believe that we have that in Kermit Gosnell. Interestingly enough, many of the negligent acts including unlicensed personnel administering medication would be standardized under PRO. Even CHOICE staffers, an organization which fosters access to abortion contacted the Department of State and the Philadephia Public Health Department with warnings with regards to Grosnel. No action was taken. The laws that they complained in the state of Pennsylvania include several which are currently under this bill trying to be removed. Even if currently they have been found unconstitutional, I would suggest like the proper Illinois emancipation law, for posterity’s sake and to show that plain good laws which both sides when rational see there is not craziness in the air even if currently due to a questionable, and currently undefendable decision by the Minnesota Supreme Court are unenforceable, these are rules which are designed to stop a situation like Grosnel’s organization from developing in the first place, and if horribly such an organization does develop, we have the tools for complaints from organizations like CHOICE are able to be heard and the lives of young women are able to be guaranteed a reasonable modicum of safety. If indeed there is a collection of individual’s who still believe that abortion regardless of standard of care is safe, not can be safe, but is safe, needs to read the notes from the investigators who entered the building of the Women’s Medical Society in the 2010 raid.

When the team members entered the clinic, they were appalled, describing it to the Grand Jury as 'filthy,' 'deplorable,' 'disgusting,' 'very unsanitary, very outdated, horrendous,' and 'by far, the worst' that these experienced investigators had ever encountered. There was blood on the floor. A stench of [urine](#) filled the air. A flea-infested cat was wandering through the facility, and there were cat [feces](#) on the stairs. Semi-conscious women scheduled for abortions were moaning in the waiting room or the recovery room, where they sat on dirty recliners covered with blood-stained blankets. All the women had been sedated by unlicensed staff – long before Gosnell arrived at the clinic – and staff members could not accurately state what medications or dosages they had administered to the waiting patients. Many of the medications in inventory were past their expiration dates... surgical procedure rooms were filthy and unsanitary... resembling 'a bad gas station restroom.' Instruments were not sterile. Equipment was rusty and outdated. Oxygen equipment was covered with dust, and had not been inspected. The same corroded suction tubing used for abortions was the only tubing available for oral airways if assistance for breathing was needed...[\[1\]](#) [F]etal remains [were] haphazardly stored throughout the clinic– in bags, milk jugs, orange juice cartons, and even in cat-food containers... Gosnell admitted to Detective Wood that at least 10 to 20 percent... were probably older than 24 weeks [the legal limit]... In some instances, surgical incisions had been made at the base of the fetal skulls. The investigators found a row of jars containing just the severed feet of fetuses. In the basement, they discovered medical waste piled high. The intact 19-week fetus delivered by Mrs. Mongar three months earlier was in a freezer. In all, the remains of 45 fetuses were recovered ... at least two of them, and probably three, had been viable."[\[1\]](#)

[1] William R. Seth (January 14<sup>th</sup> 2011), Report of the Grand Jury, Court of Common Pleas, First Judicial District of Pennsylvania

Question.

1. Are the conditions then that led to the third degree murder conviction of Kermit Grosnell of Karnamaya Mongar, considered “safe” (note: as PRO does not define what constitutes a standard of care, the particulars unless they are expressly prohibited are by default allowed)? Are these the conditions that young women expect of the State of Minnesota? Are these conditions that other abortion facilities desire to be existing in the State of Minnesota bringing additional scrutiny on their entire industry?
2. Are these the types of conditions which have been advertised as being available to young, vulnerable women? Are these the types of conditions that they desire?
3. Even if the current laws which are currently unenforceable, is it not still right and just to maintain them as they directly address the concerns of the grand jury report with regards to the Grand Jury evaluation of the crimes committed and how they should have been stopped in Pennsylvania?
4. While not described in this particular quote, one of the major issues uncovered where thousands of dollars worth of prescriptions for controlled narcotics inappropriately prescribed. This was uncovered by the DEA. Considering narcotics are used for certain procedures, and PRO specifically makes these procedures legal in the state of Minnesota, and PRO specifically prohibits limitations on these clinics even though they by the above statement will be handling controlled substances, wouldn't it be appropriate to maybe not get rid of the bills in question as some of them through licensures and other mechanisms have the ability to regulate and properly deal with the fact that controlled substances are involved in certain procedures?

5. If indeed we are going to remove all limitation on abortions and abortion facilities, don't we also need to eliminate all regulations and controls then on all substances used in these procedures? What if these substances include things controlled by the federal government? How is that going to work out?

The substances used by Grosnel include OxyContin, Percocet, Xanax, syrups of phenergan and promethazine with codeine, OxyCodone, Alprazolam, and cough syrups containing codeine.

6. In the Little Sister's of the Poor vs. HHS where Obamacare was trying to force the Sister's to pay for abortion insurance, it was found that even moving accounts around was indeed attempting to force the sisters to pay for a service which violates there deeply held beliefs. Forcing taxpayers through MNCare to pay for abortion, some of the taxpayers being people of sincere religious conviction like myself whose religion precludes not only engagement in abortion, but facilitating abortion in any way, is a violation of the free exercise of religion. As such, removing the prohibition on MNCare to pay for abortive services which in any way are paid with by tax dollars, even if through a mechanism which seeks to make the payments in an indirect way due to the fungible nature of funds, by the sister's of charity vs. HHS is unconstitutional. Why would we want to do that? Is it so hard to understand that there are people who legitimately have deeply held beliefs which they have a right to act on which differ from yours? Additionally, a certain lawmaker at a townhall concerning part of her constituency said that people which held such beliefs are ,”extremists” for having a different opinion. I would ask for the legislature to suggest that calling constituents names tends to breed hate on both sides.

Additionally, I ask why we are positioning ourselves for litigation?

7. In the end, the position that certain lawmakers seem to be pushing would put us in a more undefined legal state directly align us for litigation in federal court where the precedence is against us.

Furthermore, the reality of what constitutes safe I don't believe is what anyone desires. This bill is generally poorly written, poorly thought through, and should be thrown out in it's entirety.