

I also resent this particular approach that every member in the Catholic Church, these are people these are just people, like anybody else, people with a particular point of view and people with concerns. The fact of the matter is if there was 3,000 abortions last year in the state of Nebraska, the fact of the matter is that the age limit of youngsters receiving abortions is dropping. We're talking about 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 year old youngsters. Not all of them, but 12, 13, 14, 15 year old youngsters. The fact of the matter is the intent of this legislation is to have the 12, 13, 14 year old youngster consult with somebody about that abortion. I don't think that's all bad. I think whether that consultation is with a group, such as the groups listed and maybe it's wrong to list these groups, but we've changed it in this morning's amendments to say that they should consult with any organization and then they said they go on and list two specific organizations. I don't see this precluding that consultation being with Planned Parenthood. I don't see this consultation precluding a consultation with the Department of Health. But I do think and I see nothing wrong with 12, 13, 14, 15 year old youngsters forced to consult with somebody other than that doctor prior to making this monumental decision that affects her life. We've talked about one side of this abortion issue and about the rights of the mother and this is one side of it, but I also believe that the rights of the unborn also had some rights. The mother is old enough to have been able to make a decision to put her into that particular situation, but that unborn has not had that opportunity of choice. So I think that if this particular amendment still has some areas that could be refined, we should attempt to refine them. But I don't think that we should close our eyes totally on this. I think we're closer than we were yesterday and I think that with some other refinement if there is suggestion, positive suggestions, not just negative against the bill generally but positive suggestions, these should be brought forth in a good spirit and make this bill workable.

PRESIDENT: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: I oppose Senator DeCamp's latest amendment. I think that the charade is continuing. Yesterday he presented an amendment that he said was necessary to collect statistical information. It was absolutely essential and that was the only intent. We had to get the information from the Bureau of Vital Statistics so that they could somehow compile the data and that was the compelling reason for it. Today, because the privacy arguments that were presented yesterday turned out to be right because clearly the amendment yesterday was unconstitutional, the Bureau of Vital Statistics is left out. What happened to the need for all the statistical information? It seems to have evaporated. Clearly the intent of these amendments is to get around. Clearly the intent is to try and get around the Supreme Court decision. We tried yesterday and it failed. It was pointed out to be unconstitutional. We got an amendment today that names private organizations in state law and I'm sure that's unconstitutional. This game of simply trying to tack things in and then finding out that they are unconstitutional and having to take them out will have to come to an end sooner or later. There's no way that this Legislature can overturn those court decisions. I think we ought to comply with them. We ought to make this criminal code in line