

CLERK: The second suspension motion would allow for a vote on final passage of 688 without further motion or debate.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, because of those final suspension motions, it was only through the filing of a couple of amendments that allowed me a chance to talk about this which is why my amendments appear there. I have a couple of amendments that are basically designed to say that in the instruction of the special care providers by their attending physician training, that that training shall not contain any information about abortion referral. Apparently, whenever contact is made between two individuals in this state, it's going to be the public policy that they don't ever talk about abortion referral so I want to make sure that it doesn't creep into this bill someplace. Got another amendment in there in which they can't talk about contraception or contraception counselling for fear that this health care provider and this attending physician may be subverting the religious rights or perspectives of the individuals on this floor. Lastly, since there is to be a provider that performs these services, it indicates that they should declare to the Department of Health that they're not doing any of that stuff. In fact, they're taking care of the development of disabilities of quite young children and it does seem to be a little irrelevant but it's exactly the problem that Sandy Scofield faced on LB 662. Let's make sure that nobody is going to talk about abortion or contraception counselling. Now, frankly, that's not my purpose in introducing the amendments because I knew that the '769, the parental notification bill was coming, and because I had heard that there was going to be the suspension motion so that we wouldn't be able to amend or further debate the issue and then to vote on it without final further amendment powers, it seemed to be the only way to have a chance to discuss LB 769. Since the parental notification bill is to be attached to this measure and since there is an attempt to foreclose amendment and debate, let me initiate the discussion of that topic by referring to you the statements made before the Judiciary Committee on this issue, one by a professional and an attorney who serves in a volunteer capacity with respect to some of the Family Planning Agencies in the state. In discussing parental notification and referring to the Minnesota experience, Ms. Johnson talks in the recorded testimony before the Judiciary Committee as to why the judge in Minnesota found this act to be unconstitutional and pointed out that there were three reasons in particular why this