May 11, 1989 LB 769

Members, please return to your seats in anticipation of a roll call vote on the motion to suspend the rules. Mr. Clerk, call the roll.

CLERK: (Read roll call vote. See page 2299 of the Legislative Journal.) 27 ayes...Senator Labedz changing from yes to no. 26 ayes, 17 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Motion fails. The call is raised. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next motion I have on the bill is to bracket until January 3, 1990. That is offered by Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to speak a great deal. Just to remind the body where we are at now. We did not suspend the rules. Senator Chambers has two amendments pending. There are amendments to the amendments There have been five other amendments, I believe, pending. offered or are going to be offered. There is a suspension of the rules that is two amendments down. I think the body knows where we're heading at this particular point. I think the best thing for the body to do is to bracket the bill until January 3, 1990, and we'll wait and see what the Supreme Court does. We'll wait and see what the mood of the body is next year and we need to then move onward. So I hope we can bracket the bill, we've certainly debated enough, and let's move on.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. A number of lights, we'll go through them quickly. Senator Smith, would you care to speak to the motion to bracket? Senator Smith, followed by Senator Labedz and Moore.

SENATOR SMITH: Well, Mr. President and members of the body, I'm not sure that what I'm going to say is really something that is addressing the bracket motion and yet indirectly it is. You know, I guess I take a little offense at the statement being made in closing that this is a vote that is going to say whether or not you support notification of parents. All the way through, I don't think there...I have said this and I'm sure a lot of other people have said it on the floor and I want to again say it then since it's been stated the other way around, I want to make perfectly clear. I have said that I do oppose