

for the "L" squared amendment. The section that would be stricken would be the following: The Legislature hereby finds and declares that: (a) Abortion is a serious, emotionally-charged, divisive issue in the United States and in Nebraska; (b) All Nebraskans are concerned with the physical and emotional well-being of the people of this state; (c) A 24-hour waiting period and a requirement that a woman receive information regarding fetal development are both viable topics of debate; and (d) The United States Supreme Court in 1983, in the City of Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, found the 24-hour waiting period and the requirement that a woman receive information regarding fetal development were unconstitutional. Second section would be: It is the intent of the Legislature that if the United States Supreme Court reverses the decision prescribed in the above subsection, the Legislature should revisit the issue of the 24-hour waiting period and the requirement that a woman receive information regarding fetal development; that the members of the Legislature on both sides of the abortion issue should work diligently, should diligently work together to find the best possible solution for all citizens of Nebraska. That's what we would be deleting. The reason I feel very strongly in offering this, I did not offer a lot of amendments and I had no intention of offering a lot of amendments to LB 78. In fact, I believe this is only about the fourth time I've spoken in the four or so hours that we have been going. The reason is, one, number one, the amendments that I did offer were legitimate amendments, I felt, to the substance of the bill. One of the amendments was a definition of clearly when did the 24-hour clock start to run, and I was referring particularly to the discrimination process that could take place with women in western or central Nebraska and that was a legitimate amendment that we have not yet gotten to and, hopefully, this evening at some point we will. But my first aim was to try to avoid that which we find ourselves in at this time and I suspect at this point it's getting to be a little bit, to a point, it's hard to say that we can avoid as much but we could avoid another four hours, I guess. My point was that this bill, in offering the resolution, it would give the body a chance to both sides agree. We would agree that it's an important issue. We would agree that it was temporarily, at this time, unconstitutional. We would agree that there is a case pending that may change the constitutionality. We would agree that we would go back and relook...revisit the issue if, in fact, the Supreme Court did change the case law and, even more importantly, we would all agree that we would strive to work