Only one La. congressman backing pro-choice act

By JOAN McGINNIS


So far, he is the only declared “yes” vote for the pending Freedom of Choice Act, whichin New Orleans, but co-sponsored by legislation.

Well, the U.S. Supreme Court thought he be
only one vote away from reversing the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision that legalized most abortions, the Freedom of Choice Act is

designed to head off that possible reversal by writing the Roe abortion rights into federal law.


And U.S. Rep. Danny Ray Moore, D-Lafayette, said he has yet to read the legislation and, therefore, will not declare his vote.

“My congressional voting record has been a right-to-life voting record, but I’ve had to think about the issue of Roe v. Wade. I don’t think Roe v. Wade was as constitutional as it is now,” Breaux said.

Based on recent modifications by the U.S. Bush Judicial Council, “the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision is the Pennsylvania case,” Breaux added.

In the Pennsylvania case, the Supreme Court last month reaffirmed the Roe decision by legislating abortion in early and mid-term pregnancies, but it also strengthened states' ability to set more regulations on abortions.

The court specifically upheld Pennsylvania’s requirements that a woman wait 24 hours after obtaining an abortion, that a physician inform the woman about abortion alternatives and fetal development, and that the right to be counseled about abortion be preserved.
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Whenever the opportunity presents itself, Congress has used its power to interfere with certain aspects of the abortion debate. However, the recent Supreme Court decision in Roe v. Wade has raised questions about the future of such legislation.

The Roe v. Wade decision was based on the constitutional right to privacy, recognizing a woman's right to choose whether to have an abortion. However, Congress has sought to limit this right through legislation aimed at regulating abortion services.

One such attempt is the proposed legislation to require all abortion clinics to be classified as "abortion facilities." This measure has been met with opposition from many medical professionals, who argue that it would restrict access to quality care.

Another proposal would require doctors who perform abortions to obtain certification from the Department of Health and Human Services. This has been criticized as a form of regulatory burden that could lead to increased costs and decreased access to abortion services.

Congress has also considered legislation to ban the use of federal funding for abortion services in certain circumstances, such as in cases of rape or incest. This has sparked debates over the role of government in funding medical services.

Some proposals have focused on strengthening existing abortion laws, such as those that require parental consent for minors. Others have sought to expand access to abortion services, particularly in underserved areas.

The overall goal of these proposals is to balance the right to privacy with the need to protect the health and safety of women. However, the debate continues, with each side presenting arguments based on their interpretation of宪法 rights.

As the legislative process moves forward, it is important to consider the impact of these proposals on women's health and the broader issue of reproductive rights. The ultimate outcome will likely depend on the ability of Congress to reach a consensus that respects the diverse perspectives on this complex issue.