

are, let's let kids know what the rules are about this bypass procedure, let's understand that if they go to the school nurse, they learn about it as well so that they know what their rights are. Now my guess is the right to know that Senator Labeledz supports ends with 769 and does not endorse Senator Lynch's right to know because they are conceptually different. My guess is she is going to stand up and oppose this amendment. It is the same idea, by the way, that happened a couple of years ago when Senator Labeledz spoke on behalf of a bill that put in some credentials for people who were identifying or giving advice to or counseling pregnant women about family planning and abortion, and she wanted to put in the statutes some special terms and qualifications and credentials. The motion was made to apply that language to the pro-life counselors who also have open counseling sessions, the notion that if, in fact, these credentials make sense, let's do them for everybody who is out there giving information to young girls. No, no, no, that wasn't acceptable. Senator Labeledz, Senator Hall fought that amendment trying to adopt this generalized rule of good credentials, good information, the burden was borne on only one side of the ledger. Senator Labeledz, also, in LB 338 just this year, among others, spoke about the need to put into our public health law language that says, gosh, you can't use this public health law to give information that would include abortion among other things. The right to know comes to an end when it doesn't enforce the message that Senator Labeledz believes in and the pro-life organizations. The right to know is not something in which, by the way, she is willing to endorse this by having people learn through LB 338, through the public health system what available forms of medical assistance there are. My guess is this one isn't going to meet it. My guess is that there was an attempt, as there was in this case, like there was, they attempted to stonewall the counselors who argue the pro-life counseling circumstances, that they should have no credentials, unlike the ones who counsel on, you might say, the other side of the issue. The purpose of 769 is not to assist parents, and it is not to assist children. It is part of a nationwide strategy that has at its heart a simple very heartfelt belief, and that national strategy has one arm that is litigation, one arm that is legislation, and one arm that is agitation, some of it violent. The goal of that nationwide strategy is to rescind a constitutional right to privacy for all women. That is the goal. I do not share that goal and, frankly, these arguments at the edges are meant to be forms of harassment and to continue to make sure that pot boils. And while accommodations might be