

such district judge, the county court or judge thereof shall, upon it appearing satisfactorily to the court or judge by the affidavit or testimony of the petitioning minor, that the minor is mature enough to make the abortion decision independently or that notification would not be in the minor's best interest, waive the notice requirements of subsection 1 of this section. A petitioning minor may initiate and participate on her own behalf in any proceeding brought pursuant to this subsection, and the court may appoint a guardian ad litem for the petitioning minor. The court shall maintain confidentiality as to all proceedings brought pursuant to this subsection. The court shall expedite all proceedings filed by a minor pursuant to this subsection and shall render a decision within 24 hours of the initial proceeding on such petition. This section shall not apply when an emergency situation exists such that continuation of the pregnancy provides an immediate threat and grave risk to the life or health of the pregnant minor and the attending physician so certified by affidavit. There is a requirement that notification be given to one of the parents at least or a legal guardian. In case that is not to be done or the minor does not want it to be done in that fashion, she can go to court and have what they're referring to as a judicial bypass and the judge, upon talking to the young lady, if he determines that she is mature enough to make that decision herself, will waive the notice requirement and she can get the abortion without the parental or guardian notice. The decision by the judge would have to be rendered within 24 hours. Essentially, that is what LB 769 does. They take a lot more words to say it and, again, it's to give the impression that something different from what is on the books now is being done, but what it is is an attempt to strong-arm a bill through, and I know now why today was selected. Senator...in my opinion, Senator Labeledz said there is a conference of some kind of pro-life people, so that probably was why this was timed to come up at this juncture. But, again, assuming that people who are supporting 769 are acting in good faith, it will do no good to get this enacted into law because a law substantially the same is already enjoined. It is unconstitutional. So why should the Legislature agree to do it again? Because it's the path of least resistance. People have gotten locked...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...into this matter and feel there is no way out, so rather than face the reality of an existing law on the