

have a bit more likelihood of success and, if it does, then the wings of expedition, not expediency, may attach to LB 110 and it may flutter, fly or sail from Select File to the next stage of consideration. What I'm going to do is let the rest of the time that I'd have go back to the Chair and Senator Bohlke would have the opportunity to close. Is that correct? Then, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I give that time back.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek, you're next.

**SENATOR SCHIMEK:** Yes, members of the Legislature, members of the body, I'd like to yield my time to Senator Landis.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Senator Landis.

**SENATOR LANDIS:** Thank you, Senator Schimek. Understand that the goal of informed consent is one which opponents of LB 110 have supported and continue to support and are attempting to support in the Bohlke amendment. It is a remarkable path that we have reached, a juncture in that path when Senator Bohlke, Senator Schimek, Senator Rasmussen and myself say this is the form of a measure adding further burdens to what exists under general law, adding further burdens to current law that we would yet still accept and support. In fact, not only do we support it, we offer it to the body as a form of solution. This is a categorically different time than we've had before and I want that recognized because it is not the same thing to claim that informed consent or information is the object of one side and not the other in this debate. In fact, both of us agree to the principle that women are entitled to and should receive appropriate information upon which to base this decision. What I really fear on the other hand is that what the general strategy is, is to fight this fight on every possible strategic way that it can be done, meaning that if you can make it more difficult for the clinics, great; if you can make it more difficult for the docs, great. Understand that with the new Sandra Day O'Connor standard in the Supreme Court juris prudence you can't make it all the much more difficult on the woman because that would constitute an undue burden and therefore be unconstitutional, so I think the proponents are careful to make sure that there isn't a great deal of burden for women. But if there's any other way that you can close the pipeline down, opponents to abortion want to do that. They want to shift the burden away from the woman in recognition of the recent Webster