

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

January 12, 2004 LB 172

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...more critical to a young woman's life than the rules of the road. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Landis on the motion to recommit.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, there is a level of rhetoric used to justify our positions, and then there's the bottom of the iceberg, what we really are about, and what this bill is really about. And I thought, frankly, Senator Foley was candid when he said, look, I'm a pro-life senator, I'm...I see the world this way, and this is an expression of that. Now, the stuff about mandates for schools, oh, we do that six times before lunch in this body. That's not the problem. The cost is not the problem. Angry parents, angry students, yes, those are the problem in part. People who feel like their schools don't reflect their values, yep, that's part of the real problem, I confess. It's really about, however, I think, the nature of the information itself, because it's about abortion, because it's about abortion. This is about abortion. And that's a problem. In fact, I think Senator Foley's argument is, we should not mandate the distribution of information of this very intimate, controversial nature that divides us as a people. And yet, I got to tell you, the pro-life movement was in here demanding that we mandate information, when it came time to get an abortion, about human development, required that it be done, had state money to do it, made sure that we had a copy for everyone that would be distributed, so that the...we would pay for the information necessary to make that decision. In fact, the pro-life movement very much wanted to mandate information of the right kind, of the right kind. And what is it about this information that makes it the wrong kind of information to mandate? And that is to say, you know what, your rights as a child include a judicial bypass. I'll tell you what I think the real problem here is, and that is that if there was a preferred position, it would be that there would be no judicial bypass, and that there would be utter silence on this, because the right itself shouldn't exist, that this should be a matter between children and their parents alone, and not the government. I think that's a relatively fair characterization: This should be between parents and children, and not the government. I heard