

SENATOR LINDSAY: No, because I don't think it was before him. There was no challenge to subsection (3). I think the challenge was to subsection (1) and (2).

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why do you feel there was no challenge to subsection (3)?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Because in the order that was passed around by Senator Ashford refers to those statutes which were before him.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, does section, if a section is before a judge, you don't have to mention all the subdivisions. You just mention the section. That is why we put in a bill if any portion of this act is unconstitutional, the remainder will remain untouched or however we phrase it. So when a section is before the judge, there might be 20 portions, and he just mentions the ones that will be excised out, but forgetting all that because I don't want to lose the point that I am trying to get to, and maybe I will let you go at this point so I can make some assertions because I am going to elicit from you the answers that I need, even though I know he knows the answers. The present law was put on the books by those who are pro-life. That law was not ruled unconstitutional by Judge Urbom. Senator Lindsay in offering his repealer did not intend to repeal any provision of the law that had not been ruled unconstitutional. My discussion with him about this portion that was not unconstitutional brought to his attention that it...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...allows the woman and the doctor more prerogatives to protect the health of the woman than the present bill. Knowing that the present law gives that additional protection, he now wants to take it out. He knowingly wants to deprive the woman of the right to have her health protected and I want it clearly in the record what Senator Lindsay is doing. I want it clear that he knows it because I asked him, and he said now that he knows it narrows the woman's prerogatives, that is what he intends his amendment to do, and this from a person who has said that this is a bill that is compassionate. We are concerned about the woman. We are concerned about her health. We are concerned about the family. But every time an amendment is offered that would carry that out, they say, no, we don't want that, which means that either their statements that they originally made were not truthful...