

concept, we have to make it easier for that young woman to know how the bill works and how the judicial process works. And I would ask for your consideration of that. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Bernard-Stevens, on the Lindsay amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I really have mixed emotions on the Lindsay amendment. And, to be right up front, what I mentioned to Senator Lindsay, number one, is I appreciate his willingness to work in this area and recognize that we have a different problem in rural Nebraska in the case of how this three-day period would work than there would be in the eastern or suburban areas of the state. My mixed emotions are, I really think seven would be better but I understand that there needs to be a give and take and I appreciate Senator 'Lindsay's willing to give on his side because, quite honestly, he would be more comfortable with four. I would be more comfortable with seven, we said, okay, let's try five, and that's what I will be supporting. I think that's...five is certainly a better situation than we have...than we have with three. I guess, one other side is I still can't help think that for our areas in western Nebraska seven would really be the most reasonable number. The only argument that I could hear against seven was that it might be construed because of a ruling in another case with different situations of Ohio than Nebraska in regards to space, particularly, that there could be a possible problem with the bill on constitutionality. I guess my political sense is that whenever we raise the specter of constitutionality and it could harm 425 or 769 in the past, that usually means there will be a flood of lights one way or another mostly against the amendment, anything that would be changed, because there clearly is the attitude that we don't want to make any changes in the bill that would affect constitutionality. Because of that, I realize the votes probably would not be there for seven, but I...with Senator Lindsay stating he would support five, I appreciate that and will do so as well. I guess if the body wants to go ahead and turn this one down and the majority vote for seven, that would be, I suppose, the best of both worlds but I assume that would be asking a little much. I do want to point out again the reason for the amendment. Some of the...again, some of the impact...or input that I received on the three-day period, again, it's requirement of a ruling within three working days of the filing of the petition is not realistic, especially in rural