

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

January 12, 2004 LB 172

Schimek, AM2066. (Legislative Journal page 190.)

**SPEAKER BROMM:** Senator Schimek, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

**SENATOR SCHIMEK:** Yes, thank you. Mr. President and members of the body, what this amendment does is that it reinstates the original language of the statutes and changes only the word "bypass" to "waiver," which is probably a more correct terminology. And I will explain why I am taking this approach as I explain why I'm in opposition to LB 172. First of all, I hope you all had a really good weekend because I'll tell you what I did over the weekend, if you hang on. I read the transcript from LB 425, which was the bill that we passed in 1991, and it was enlightening and it was an opportunity to refresh my memory. But I want you to know that this bill was the cumulation of four years of debate on this floor and it was tough debate. It was lengthy debate. It was contentious debate. And in the end, in the discussion of LB 425, there was a debate that was meaningful and that was agreed on in the terms of the amendments that were added to it, and the bill passed finally after four years. Now I don't know how many people in here were here in 1991 or remember why we did what we did, Senator Foley, when we added the provision about information being provided to students. But I can tell you I remember on one bill, and I think it was the predecessor to LB 425, I heard a pro-sena...or a pro-life senator stand on this floor and tell why he was having trouble with a parental notification bill. That was Gary Hannibal. I don't know how many of you remember him, but I thought it was one of the most courageous speeches I ever heard on the floor of this body. He basically said he had gone home and talked to his four daughters and his wife about this issue, and he was very troubled by this issue because his daughters, during the course of their conversation, said, Dad, we know kids that would be in serious, serious trouble, harm, danger, if this bill were passed, because what this bill tried to do was to encourage communication in families, which most of us in this body, if not every last single one of us, want to encourage. But the truth of the matter is that there are some families in which that kind of communication cannot be encouraged because it is an abusive family, because it is a