

I mean, after all, what are we here to do? What have we been sent here by our constituents and by the people in our district to do? Well, we have been sent here to write good laws and to write constitutional laws. We have been sent here to write laws that will apply and not laws that will be restrained. Now we have a basic public trust and a basic public responsibility and asked to write laws that we think are going to be constitutional. Now again, let me emphasize this is not a question of pro-life or not a question of pro-choice. It is a question of what a conscientious legislator tries to do. Now for ten days most of the lawyers in this body have been meeting almost daily in order to try to work out a constitutional solution to these problems. Now if you are hired to be a college professor or to be a teacher, that does not mean that you go into the classroom and teach wrong stuff. If you work as a banker or if you are hired to be a banker or a teller in a bank, it doesn't mean you go into the bank to embezzle funds, and if you are employed as a legislator your responsibility is to go in and write laws that you know are good and laws that you know are as constitutional. I mean, it is as fundamental as that and for us to stand here and to intentionally defy the United States courts because we do not believe what they are doing is nihilistic. It is an abuse of the legislative process. It is to say ultimately that nothing matters. Now there are procedures for amending the United States Constitution, and this Legislature, last session, followed those procedures. It voted a resolution to convene a constitutional convention to pass a human life amendment. Now that is legitimate. That is fair. That is operating within the framework of our governmental system, but engaging ourselves in an ideological confrontation with the courts is not. It just does not make sense to do that. Now let me remind all of you colleagues that if we pass a law that is restrained it will do us no good at all. It will be like the situation in Nebraska today. We will have no law regulating abortions, no law regulating the practices in Chicago, no law regulating third trimester abortions whatsoever, and as I indicated earlier we are cutting it just about as close as we think we can and keep it constitutional. We are not taking out the forty-eight hour waiting period. We are not taking out the consultation that that would require even though Judge Urbom in as strong language as he can use in a preliminary injunction indicates that it is probably unconstitutional. What we are doing is leaving it in but if the woman can look the doctor in the eye and says that there is an emergency for her best