

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...may not be a significant reason, in an awful lot of cases the reasons are significant, abusive families, or whatever the case may be and Senator Schimek has alluded to that. Now it appears that there is a suspension motion up prior to the motion that Senator...the amendment that Senator Lindsay and I have drafted. What we thought would happen was that Senator Landis would withdraw his amendment and then we could get to our amendment before the suspension motion. That apparently is not going to be the case. I certainly cannot support LB 769 without this additional amendment and some of us probably would even have a problem with that amendment added. But, in any event, if the suspension motion is up first and if that occurs, then that certainly...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...wasn't the understanding that we had originally.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, what I was going to do, but maybe I won't because Senator Smith has prevailed on me not to do so, but I was going to read to you the present law on the books about the requirement of...for paren...of parental notification. But rather than read it, I will just state it again. It is basically what LB 769 is and it has been enjoined. So why, why is it necessary to do this? And that question needs to be asked repeatedly. Some of the senators who signed onto that bill would not have signed on had they been aware at the time it was introduced what it really contained and what it was going to lead to. But having once gotten locked into that position, it's impossible for them to withdraw. So there is no alternative for us other than to act as though we're taking all this very seriously. And this is not to say that some people don't genuinely believe in what is being attempted by LB 769. But the fact is what they're trying to achieve by that bill is already in the statutes now. It's there. It's like that tomato sauce, everything is in it. And the court has stopped the state from enforcing it. So do those who are pushing this bill feel that the court will take this law to mean we are saying it a second time and you had better do what we say you should do? That's not going to impress the court at all. The court would probably allow arguments.