you on that. I vote for it because I do want us to have something that will hold up and be effective. I realize I go counter on this to some of the absolute pro-life people. At some point, I, as a legislator, have to make a determination as to what is best overall for the state and what is best for this legislation and after trying to bring both sides together I find I have to vote for this amendment, reluctantly, disgustingly but I think it is necessary to hold the legislation intact. I don't ask anybody to vote with me or follow me on it. I ask you to use your own judgment and remember this. This is the last one. It is the one area. I think there were twenty-one total areas. It is the last one where there was not agreement able to be reached. We were within that much this morning and then Mr. Cunningham made his decision that he did not want to accept this amendment and I think he probably will win, but I hope the bill is not jeopardized as a result of that. That is all I have to say.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair understands that your motion is to withdraw the other amendments that you have and in lieu thereof, substitute the amendments that you have referred to and that is the motion before the house. The Chair recognizes Senator Dworak. We are speaking to the DeCamp amendment. Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, this is one of the extremely difficult situations that we have to face on the floor of this Legislature this morning and as a matter of fact with LB 316. I find myself in the same kind of problem that Senator DeCamp is, only even though the decision has been very close and very trying and very rendering, I will probably vote against this particular amendment. But I think in all fairness, what this amendment does is strike the forty-eight hour waiting period that a person would have to wait before they can have an abortion. Now I think that forty-eight hours whereby that person can consider her decision is good and I think the more lives that can be saved is good and therefore I am going to support this amentment, or I am going to oppose this amendment, but I think in fairness you have to look at the Urbom decision, the preliminary injunction because he does say that possibly, and I might stress that word possibly, and this decision is on page 550 and I think some of you might want to refer to that. He said, this is possibly unconstitutional and that it appears to require a waiting period for a particular kind of surgical procedure which apparently is or may well be unique insofar as Nebraska statutes are concerned. Now I think that raises serious constitutional questions on this