

answer to my question.

SENATOR LANDIS: Now, Senator Lindsay...

SENATOR LABEDZ: I just want that on the record.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. Senator Lindsay, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yeah.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yes.

SPEAKER LANDIS: Because this is pretty critical. We're now getting to the issue that you were raising on the constitutionality. Senator Labeledz has just said that it's her intention for her language to say that a service provider who provides contraceptive services and abortion referrals, since they could move money around from one pocket to another, actually shouldn't be eligible to make a grant. In the event that is, in fact, the way a court would decide it, does that not run afoul to the Constitution?

SENATOR LINDSAY: That reading, I believe, is unconstitutional.

SENATOR LANDIS: Yeah.

SENATOR LINDSAY: I don't believe that is the way that the courts would read it. I think that the...that the way it would be read and should be read and we can establish this legislative intent is that to read it constitutionally what the courts have decided is that you...we cannot restrict an organization from its freedom of speech rights broadly like that. What we can do is prohibit state funds from being used, not just for this purpose but for any purposes that we do not deem...

SENATOR LANDIS: Exactly.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...are acceptable public policy.

SENATOR LANDIS: And, by the way, that was a very clear and very careful analysis of what the constitutional principle is here. I think Senator Lindsay has quite correctly stated it. You