

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So this is what is meant when moralists and ethicists talk about the unintended effect. Initially it was unintended, but now that you know what it is, it is intended.

SENATOR LINDSAY: I guess I haven't talked to the moralists and ethicists but I guess that would be, yeah.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if you and I had had this discussion before you offered your amendment, and your amendment had not included a repealer of subsection (3), with what I have said, you then would have offered an amendment to repeal subsection (3) in order to narrow a woman's prerogatives?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, it would have been offered because I think the provision is handled in Section 8 of the bill, although there is a difference there, sure. While there is a difference there, yes, I would favor it as written in Section 8 as opposed to in subsection (3) of 28-347.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if the doctor can certify that there was serious and immediate...an immediate threat to her health, you would not want him to be able to perform the abortion at that time?

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Without giving the notification first.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, you see, I guess we are getting into a little bit of the semantics on it is that if it is a serious and, whatever the word was, grave, I guess, risk to her health, depending upon how serious and grave that is, that is certainly going to result in a serious and grave risk to her life.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, it won't because the two terms are different, and if you take them to mean the same, why are you unwilling to adopt the amendment that I am offering where we make it crystal clear? There can be a grave threat to your health without threatening your life. You don't want a woman....

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, I guess I would grant you that, yeah.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Will you favor the amendment?