

think as I say this addresses the question raised by Senator Chambers and some of the others, Senator Fowler and that goes... Let's go to page 25, then and in line 10 we have, "to insure the unborn child its" line 10 "continued life after its abortion and" and then go on "that currently, this state, is prevented from providing adequate legal remedies to protect the life, health, and welfare of pregnant women and unborn human life;". Now let me explain how that resolves the question, at least, the question raised. I'm not suggesting that Senator Chambers and that group will agree in philosophy here, but those who believe the Supreme Court decision did cause the destruction of human lives and did believe that it prevent them from doing things to protect them are reciting the absolute truth here when we say that currently this state is prevented from providing adequate legal remedies. As I say, there's a difference in philosophy, but at least this correctly states the one philosophy. So I would move adoption of that amendment and since we are running out of time I think very shortly I would hope we exhausted most of the discussion on this section on the previous amendment and we could go right on this voting on it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I have one recommendation since it's obvious the group is going to go along with what Senator DeCamp is doing, but in the interest of trying to be accurate there is an additional Supreme Court decision which was given July 1, 1976 and it is going to cause some changes in the statutes. So just to be technically correct, I think that ought to be included where they're going to specify, since they are, not only this decision but a catalog of all the decisions from here on out. I would offer that Senator DeCamp as a suggestion and then I'd like to ask you a question about this subdivision 4. Do you feel, what do you feel prevents the state from adequately providing legal remedies to protect the life, health, and welfare of pregnant women? What relates to the health and welfare of a pregnant woman that cannot be protected by law?

SENATOR DECAMP: Senator Chambers, if your philosophy were that the very act of abortion is a danger to pregnant women because it dangers their mental and physical health. If your philosophy were that and there are many people that have that philosophy, then a Supreme Court decision that compelled you as a state to legally provide for that would indeed prevent you from providing adequate legal remedies to protect these things. I say if your philosophy were that, do you understand what I'm saying?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, Senator DeCamp, thank you. It was a very weak one, but it was a valiant attempt. They have put too many things together here. If they're concerned about the life of the embryo or the fetus, there has to be a distinction made between that concern and the concern for the maternal health of the mother. The Supreme Court quite frankly stated that all early abortion statutes, anti-abortion statutes, making it a crime were aimed at the health of the mother. Because the procedures were dangerous and hazardous and often led to damage to health and even death, laws were put on the books to protect women from being subjected to and subjecting themselves to those procedures. There was no concern at the common law in the early