

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

January 12, 2004 LB 172

obtaining of it. You're attaching a condition to this; you're not attaching a condition for this. It is a condition to obtaining an abortion. Since the word that I'm striking is "for" and the one that I'm adding is "to," you could call it the "to-for" bill. But there is something else interesting here. There are three ways to spell the word "to": t-o, t-o-o, t-w-o. There are also three ways to spell the word "for": f-o-r, f-o-r-e, f-o-u-r. But some of my colleagues would have a fourth way, Senator Aguilar. They would spell it f-o-a-r. And then some would add a fifth way: f-o-a-r-e. But those are those who have not been careful about doing their spelling lessons. This is an amendment that I'm offering seriously. And I've done things similar on other bills when they were brought to us, even when it went to language that was already in the statute. I'm going to give the example again. You have something which is being sought, and that is an abortion without notifying parents. You attach a condition "to" that. You do not attach a condition "for" that. And I know people say all the time, this is a condition for doing this. It's still incorrect. If they say, it's a condition with this, it's incorrect. The word should be "to." We're talking about information, aren't we? We're talking about what the schools do. We're talking about education. Then when we have incorrect grammar, we don't want to correct it. That's all right with me. It gives me a chance to talk about the cynicism connected with this bill. It is not designed to do anything other than to give anti-abortion people an issue. There is no way they can directly attack a woman's right to an abortion. When the U.S. Supreme Court determined that the law Nebraska passed with Senator Foley and everybody's help except mine--I was the only one who voted no on this so-called late-term abortion--when that was struck down, Nebraska decided they had to leave that alone, because Sandra Day O'Connor, on the U.S. Supreme Court, who was the swing vote, made it clear that consideration had to be given to the safety and health of the pregnant woman. In addition to that, the language was vague, overbroad, and ambiguous. And guess whose arguments the U.S. Supreme Court relied on? Guess whose work on the floor of the Legislature the federal courts relied on? From the district court here in Lincoln that first said the bill is unconstitutional, as I argued; 8th Circuit, same thing; and then the U.S. Supreme Court. Brothers and sisters, friends, enemies,