

better way of doing it, perhaps all those ways have been tried before, I don't know. Senator Warner could tell us because Senator Warner would have that institutional knowledge, but I don't think the way we do things right now is perfect and there is always another way to look at doing them and I would encourage you to think about what Senator Morrissey said on the floor a little bit earlier. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Landis, you're next, but may I introduce a couple of guests, please. Senator Schimek has some guests under the north balcony. We have Casey and Sarah Diekmann who are in her district and they have moved back to Lincoln from Kansas City where they had been living for a while. Would you folks please stand so we may recognize you. Thank you. And Senator Lamb has some guests in the south balcony, 41 seventh and eighth grade students from Ainsworth, Nebraska and their teacher. Would you folks please stand and be recognized. Thank you and thank you for visiting us today also. Senator Landis, please.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, LB 769 is a companion, as Senator David Bernard-Stevens so correctly pointed out, to the Minnesota Act which is its origin. It is a very, very close parallel, one in which, in fact, we have had our hands tied for making any adjustments that might moderate its harsh effects in Nebraska, and it's interesting then to note the legal outcome of this predecessor bill. The Minnesota law which was carried out for several years, eventually wound up in court. The Federal District Court in 1986 reviewed the Parental Notification Act which had been on the books for about four years. The case was Hodgson v. Minnesota. The court limited itself to looking at, striking down an abortion law passed in Minnesota on two narrow grounds, the fact that both parents had to be notified and it's their determination that the mandatory waiting period was too long, 24 hours, as in 769. The court did find that the bypass operation which is used in LB 769 and in the amendment that is projected for LB 688, this judicial bypass mechanism reached "only mature minors and immature minors driven to this choice by their own interest. Such a regulation, the court said, will fail to further the state's interests in protecting immature, nonbest-interest minors." The court also found the law failed to protect minors, failed to promote parent-child communication and failed to improve family relations generally. A three-court panel of the 8th Circuit has upheld Judge Ulsop's decision. The