

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 28, 2000 LB 1405

this issue; it will come before us, it involves us, it's appropriate for us to function here. I still believe that. In whatever time I'm able to have and whatever thoughts I can set forth, I hope to illustrate what led me to that conviction, and to do so in a calm and reasoned way. Whether or not the debate is substantive will be in the eye of all the beholders. But, as we have heard many times and as I have been taught, the public record is important and it ought to be made and it ought to be protected. I began my deliberations in this process by a premise that some of you will believe is flawed. I said it is the public policy of this state to be pro-life; I cite for that Nebraska Revised Statutes 28-325, where we say that, as an expression of the will of the people of the state of Nebraska and the members of the Legislature, we will provide protection for the life of the unborn whenever possible. Very specifically in subparts of that statute we say that we expressly deplore the destruction of unborn human lives, we also legislate that every precaution be taken to ensure the protection of every viable unborn child. We also say every precaution be taken to provide life-supportive procedures to ensure the unborn child its continued life after abortion, and we said all that in 1973. Now it will be argued that that's mere intent language. Well, intent language, you know, is there, put there by the majority for the purpose of guiding public policy. Last year I quoted to you more often than you wanted to hear some intent language that everybody, or at least the majority found favor, or it found favor with a majority last year. That intent language was life is the most valuable possession of a human being, and before taking it the state should apply and follow the most scrupulous standards of fairness and uniformity. So at least I'm being consistent. If we have intent language in one section of the statutes and we can use it to support the arguments that we make, then I guess we can spend a little time talking about the intent language that we put in the statutes in 1973, and we can debate whether we believe it or not, whether we mean it or not, whether we support it or not. Maybe ultimately somebody who opposes it will spend the time and the effort to seek to repeal it, and then we'll make a new decision about that intent language and whether our public policy is what we say, to expressly deplore the destruction of the unborn human lives...

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: One minute.