

And here we are spending day after day on the issue that may completely change in terms of its focus in just the very near future, and we may have to revisit everything that we might end up doing here. So my feeling is rather than move forward and take more time today and tomorrow and whenever that we'd be better off waiting and seeing what the Supreme Court might come back to us with in terms of a decision. March 20th is a time that we think maybe might have a decision back and still provide enough time to act on this measure toward the end of the session. But, as I understand it, there is a desire to proceed with the amendment before you by Senator Bernard-Stevens, a desire to further debate the merits of the issue. And despite the fact that I, personally, think it's time not well spent at this point, that we would be better off not pursuing the discussion of this bill today as we have in the past, but rather wait and see what the Supreme Court decides, nevertheless, there seems a desire to proceed. So, with that, I'd withdraw my bracket motion.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. It is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next motion, I believe, is the amendment as offered by Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator, this is AM2127.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The Chair recognizes Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Members of the body, we finally at least get a chance to talk about the amendment that I'm not sure many people even had a chance to read because of all the brouhaha that I suspect may not be over yet. The amendment stemmed from my concern and my concern all along with the way that the body has attacked the parental notification issue, and that is we grabbed ahold of the Minnesota law, not because the law was, in fact, a good law, but because the state happened to pass it and it happened to pass constitutional muster at the 8th Circuit Court, which we are a member of. So the theory went that, by golly, if we could adopt that same law exactly and get it into our statutes, when the Supreme Court rules on that, and they are going to rule on that, I suspect, this summer, we could have a law on the books that is constitutional. Of course, we may have one on the books that is not constitutional as well. I know Senator Lindsay will argue until his dying breath, I'm sure, that he's sure what the Supreme Court will do. In fact,