

on the second?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes, again I won't take long, but simply point out once more what you are, in fact, voting on. This part of the amendment says that all public employees who are presently covered for abortions prohibited from coverage under this amendment shall be compensated in full for the cost of purchasing coverage for the abortions that they will no longer be covered for. So, in other words, it is simply saying that you are taking compensation away from the public employees and this is giving it back to them so that nobody loses on it. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, the motion is on the second Beutler amendment. All those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? Have you all voted? Okay. Record the vote.

CLERK: 10 ayes, 31 nays, Mr. President. Mr. President, Senator Chambers moves to amend the Dworak amendment. Page 1, line 8 after the word "for" insert "any form of blood transfusion or".

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, since we are going to respect people's religious point of view and not allow money to be spent for any procedure surgically or medically which will offend somebody's religious persuasion, Jehovah's Witnesses and probably Christian Science adherents don't believe in medical treatment. The Jehovah's Witnesses certainly don't believe in blood transfusions. This amendment has more legitimacy than the one that was offered before and is being considered now in terms of trying to prohibit abortions being covered. I think that we ought to be consistent since now we have lost all reason. There can be an internal consistency to that which is illogical, irrational and unreasonable. So I am seeking an internal consistency in this illogic that is being presented to the Legislature this morning. It has never been persuasive to this body to realize that a particular piece of legislation is unconstitutional, inhumane or any of a number of other things that might mitigate against its being enacted. If you look at this amendment, you will see that it is appropriate. Why should a Jehovah's Witness adherent see his or her tax money be put into a program that is going to pay for something which violates their religion? The only reason that you are doing what is being done on abortion today is for religious considerations. There is no attempt to be legal or constitutional. Those efforts have been