

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

April 8, 2003

LB 513

one that is valid, and one that is justifiable. I think in this body, on daily basis, we bring legislation that we take one step at a time. I think the mood politically of this body at this point is that if you're going to mandate something, you need to think through that very, very carefully, and if that mandate is in effect, give people an option to think through this themselves to make a decision on whether they would want to opt out or not. And this is what I've attempted to do politically, very honestly, with you, straightforward. It is a requirement to have a vaccination. It isn't strictly an educational bill. It does require all students...and as I'm talking to people from the university system and elsewhere, they feel that the language in the bill would cover the fraternities, the sororities, anyone who is in a congregate-type on-campus housing. I feel it's important. I feel it's good public policy. I don't feel I'm bringing you something that isn't of worth, that isn't of value. I think it's very much of value. And I...it does require a vaccination unless you sign a waiver form. I would rather have that push in the bill, that club, if you will, saying you have to have a vaccination, you have to be educated. If you choose not to, you sign the waiver form. But it's more than just an educational piece. And I really do feel strongly about that. I understand Senator Chambers' point of view. I think he consistently has, in any legislation he has brought, or any legislation that he's opposed, he would rather go for the whole nine yards in the legislation that he introduces, do the mandate, do the...whatever the appropriate point of his bills are. I don't choose to always do that. I would rather take baby steps sometimes to be able to educate and to be able to move people in a direction that I feel they should be. I would like to see many more immunizations for many diseases required in this state. And I will be researching and looking at those and bringing those back to this body over the next several years, as long as I am able. But I feel this is something that is good legislation. I don't see...I truly don't see any negatives toward moving this forward. This is not punitive. This does not segregate any group of people and unfairly discriminate against them. I think it's something that's good public health policy. And as we've moved forward strongly to develop a worthwhile public health system in this state, this is another piece that fits into that. And I would strongly urge