

back, lashing all these poor dumb Senators in here, keeping us all in line like the ponies in the Anheuser-Busch ads. Would you believe that some of these poor ponies, maybe poor old pony Labeledz there, maybe, maybe poor old horsey Hasebroock, maybe they think with their own minds that this is what they want to do and that happens to coincide with some pro-life groups. Maybe Senator Fowler is supporting the amendments, not because somebody is whipping him, but because he believes this is the best solution. So I urge you not to return it to committee. Instead of always calling names, criticizing and calling me Henry Clay, which is starting to get on my nerves just a trifle, instead of doing that, why don't you offer some positive suggestions as to where you think you would like to make a change and we will discuss it. I don't think it is such a bad idea to try to get input from all sides rather than just call each other names on the floor. I urge you to advance the bill.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Well, I both agree and disagree with Senator Koch. I agree that we should try and pass a constitutional bill. I think that would be nice for a change for this Legislature to do that. I disagree that sending it back to the Judiciary Committee is going to make that any more possible. I think there is more than one issue in here that is unconstitutional and I agreed to go along with these amendments, not giving any commitment as to either my vote on the bill on its final passage or a vote on any subsequent amendments. I, for one, believe that subsequent amendments should be offered either still here on General File or on Select File, that certain isolated issues that could not be agreed on had to come to the legislative floor but these amendments I think took some issues, some rather minor in scope, and resolved them to the satisfaction of both sides but there are still very major and substantive issues that I think this Legislature should address. If Senator Koch or other senators want to put amendments in to try to resolve those issues, I certainly would support that effort. I think the forty-eight hour waiting period is still unconstitutional because it applies to the first and second trimester, in fact it is probably unconstitutional for all three trimesters. I think there are serious questions even with the emergency situation clause added whether that parental consultation will stand the court test. I think Senator Chambers has already pointed out that the Supreme Court has already made the ruling that makes this law unconstitutional upon the date it is signed. I agree with