

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

April 8, 2003

LB 513

SENATOR BYARS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think...in all due respect, I appreciate what Senator Pederson has said, and thank you, Senator Foley, for your support. I think what Senator Pederson has said I think is just the tip of the reason why I came with this bill the way that I came, in the little baby step, in requiring a vaccination but giving an out, was to try not to make this punitive and try not to make it a mandate that would immediately get people to stand up and have huge objections. I understand what Senator Pederson is saying. Are we getting involved in the administration, basically, of the university with all of their staff? Yes, we are, to a certain degree. We aren't to a degree that it's punitive or is so difficult for them to administer that it doesn't have efficacy and that it doesn't make sense. What we're charged with, with public policy here...and which I think we've been very mindful of. This Legislature has shown time and again in recent years how important the public health of its citizens is. This is another step in that direction. There is virtually not one piece of legislation that we enact on this floor that isn't in some way going to affect, in a mandatory way, in a way that is going to require something of the citizens of this state. This is not different than that. Do we, in effect, stop making public policy that has any kind of requirements in it for anyone? That way we can certainly be...say that we're not mandating, we're not having any government interference. We're just being a "non-legislature." I don't choose to be a "non-legislator." I choose, in any way I possibly can, to try to further the cause of public health in this state. Again, I will go back to us not being mind readers. We cannot, as much as we would like, forecast what will happen in the future, except based on empirical and historical evidence elsewhere. Because we have not had an outbreak of meningitis in this state, does it mean we should wait to react until some of our students are maimed and have their limbs amputated, or they die and their families are faced with that grief? Or do we, as a matter of public policy, look forward rather than backward, and instead of responding only to crisis that we try to be proactive in the way that we manage the public policy of this body? It is my choice, whether you agree or whether you don't, to be proactive. I won't apologize for bringing this piece of legislation. I think