

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

February 2, 2004 LB 172

trying to do with hers. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Perfect time, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: This is your third time, Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you. I'd like to take us back a few years to 1991, when this original legislation passed, and I would like to have you hear what Senator Withem had to say on that occasion. They were talking specifically about the notification of students about the effect of this law, and he says: I'd like to make just a few general remarks about this issue. I have been here for eight years. I have never, in those eight years, gotten on my feet to speak on an issue that is related to the question of abortion. The reason for that is that in many ways this is a...this is one issue that, by our previous actions as a body, the message is sent that you don't participate in this discussion if you want to make reasonable, rational remarks. Is that what's happening here today? You are either pro-life or you are pro-choice, and there is no in-between. You cannot make suggestions onto a pro-choice bill to improve that bill without being branded as pro-life; the same thing on a bill like this, he says. You cannot make suggestions to improve a process on a pro-life bill without being branded as being as being pro-choice. That doesn't exist on practically any other type of issue we as a body attempt to deal with. If it is a gambling issue, funny he should mention that, and you don't particularly like gambling, you can offer amendments to improve a gambling bill and make it function better, and your suggestions are viewed on their merits, and if they are good suggestions they tend to get adopted. That doesn't happen. It doesn't particularly happen in this area of pro-life/pro-choice legislation. I think it is unfortunate. I had a lot of comments off the floor last year, a lot of colleagues very frustrated with the manner in which we approached the legislation last year. There are really two sides. One side was trying to get a bill passed that had to be passed word for word the way it was originally introduced. The other side was