

SPEAKER BAACK: Time. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I want to make two points in my time on the floor. First, I'll be voting against 425. The bill helps those who don't need help. It helps young women who are prepared to speak to their parents, and who, historically and statistically do speak to their parents. It injures, however, young women who don't have access to parents in functional families that are capable of giving them the loving counsel, which the proponents argue is the chief value of the bill. In those families there are risks of physical abuse, and emotional abuse, of alcoholism, or drug experience, or mental unrest, or the lack of an available adult who would be able to and would be willing to provide the kind of loving care which the proponents argue is needed in this kind of a decision. In that case it winds up providing us with little public benefit, and significant public harm. On the other hand, I do want to go back to the fact that our debate has modulated. What I take as a ray of hope from this discussion on General File, from the amendments that Senator Chambers, Senator Lynch, Senator Withem have offered, that have been accepted by the body, and certainly by some of the proponents of 425, if not all, and what that signals to me is this, if there's room to discuss inside the parameters of what is constitutional the public claims of the proponents, for particularly the judicial bypass system, that it be realistic, that it be confidential, and that it be workable. There are areas in which we can continue to refine and pursue that public claim by the proponents. I would be happy to undertake that discussion inside the parameters of what is constitutionally possible, and to eschew the strategy of trying to build into the bill an unconstitutional provision which, if snuck into the measure, could be used later then to overturn it in a federal court, and undo the work. In return, I would hope that the proponents would make good their public claims of achieving a judicial bypass system, which meets their claimed goals for the system, workable, realistic, confidential. And that, I think, that discussion should go forward in the spirit of the debate of the last day or two in which people have announced and pointed out problems, and we have tried to work through those problems inside the framework of a constitutional regime under 425. There is a continuing ground for fertile invention, and it seems to me refinement to capture the goals that the proponents claim would bring about the public good, which at this point I do not recognize in the measure.