

since they have decided "what is right". There are a number of religious groups who do not believe that a human is from the moment an egg which is hard to be seen is fertilized but rather that person to be becomes an individual at viability. Why should one religious group who has their choice try to force only that choice on the rest of us? The proposal which Senator Haberman brings to us now is to mandate that that choice, in fact, would be available for employees. If the persons who bring LB 125 are only trying to save "state and governmental dollars", they should wholeheartedly support Senator Haberman's amendment. I support Senator Haberman's amendment that would make it possible for the employee to have a choice. At the same time would allow the introducers of LB 125 to be sure that there are no....

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR MARSH: ..."governmental funds" involved, governmental funds which I do not believe are involved but both of us would have a perspective protected if Senator Haberman's amendment is adopted.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator DeCamp. The question has been called for. Do I see five hands? I do. The question then before the House is, shall debate cease on the Haberman amendment? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted? The question is to cease debate on the Haberman amendment to LB 125. Have you voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Debate ceases. Senator Haberman, you may close.

SENATOR HABERMAN: As the debate was going on, I was sitting here reading the bill, the bill introduced by Senator Dworak, Senator Labedz and Senator Higgins, and when you read the bill, when you read what it says, it says that there is nothing wrong with abortions. Line 10, "This section shall not prohibit the insurer from offering individual employees special coverage for abortion if the costs for such coverage are borne solely by the employee." In their own bill it says, "from offering individual employees special coverage for abortion if the costs for such coverage are borne solely by the employee." So what is the fight? All I am saying is let's add the word "shall" be offered and that is all. Let's offer it. They say it is all right. In their own bill they say it is all right. So let's just say it shall be offered. If the employee wants to pay the extra premium, he may. If the employee does not wish to pay the extra premium, he may not. That is what the amendment says. Now I don't see why