

vote. (Record vote read as found on page 2466 of the Legislative Journal.) 30 ayes, 6 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to advance the bill.

PRESIDENT: The motion to advance carries, prevails, the bill is advanced. Now we move to a one-half hour debate on LB 663. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, 663 was a bill that was introduced by Senator Labeledz and a number of the members. (Title read.) The bill was read on January 22, referred to Judiciary, advanced to General File. There are Judiciary Committee amendments pending.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Chairman Hoagland of the Judiciary Committee. Time will begin to run on the one-half hour debate. Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President and colleagues, LB 663 is a bill brought to the Judiciary Committee by Senator Labeledz and, how many of your colleagues, Senator Labeledz? Twenty-five, 26 co-sponsors of LB 663 and it was designated a priority bill in the committee and we subsequently advanced it with some committee amendments. Now LB 663 is a simple bill and in order to understand the committee amendments I guess I would encourage you to open your bill book because what the committee did on two separate votes was simply to strike language in the existing bill. The committee amendments do not add any language to the bill and the votes to strike language were split on each particular vote. Now what the bill provides is that when an individual seeking an abortion comes into the clinic or the hospital, why in order to secure that individual's informed consent, why she must be advised of the particular risks associated with the abortion procedure to be employed. And the bill goes on to indicate that she must also be advised of any risks associated with repeat abortions if the individual has had more than one abortion and, secondly, in addition to the advice as to the particular risks associated with the abortion procedure to be employed in here case, the statement that is signed indicating that the advice was given must include a verification by the attending physician that the individual providing the information is, in the physician's medical judgment, reasonably qualified to do so. Now the committee heard testimony that...there was a dispute in the testimony in the committee hearing as to whether or