

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, with that explanation I withdraw my amendment and I ask you to adopt Senator Dworak's amendment to LB 1004. Thank you, Senator Dworak and the anti-abortionists.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the Chambers' amendment to the Dworak amendment. Oh. What is the next motion?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Stoney moves to amend the Dworak amendment by amending the Fowler previously adopted. In line 2 strike the word "shall" and insert the word "may".

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, this amendment is very simplistic in its approach. As the amended form now stands, it provides that an insurer must provide this particular coverage to an employee. I think there are a number of mandates that insurers have and I feel that in the private sector the companies themselves through their decisions of their boards should be able to make a determination as to whether or not they choose to offer this particular coverage. So rather than a mandate, this would provide that those companies make this decision themselves. They can provide it if they choose, and if they choose not to it will not be provided. I would ask for the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Any further discussion on the Stoney amendment? Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I would have to oppose Senator Stoney's amendment to my amendment. First of all, the intent language covers only the group policies the State of Nebraska provides. We are not talking about all insurance companies. It is simply the carriers that the State of Nebraska must contract with. Therefore, I do not feel that this adds any burden on all the insurance companies in the state, but it does establish some criteria that must be looked at. Now when my amendment was adopted, I made it clear that I felt that there should be some choice for the State of Nebraska employee that if a woman wanted abortion only coverage she should be able to pay for that. Senator Stoney's amendment removes that option of choice, leaves it with the insurance providers that the state contracts with, and takes it away from the Legislature and takes it away from any individual state employee. Basically, what I hoped with my amendment was that if Senator Dworak and Labeledz were sincere about choice, that the choice would be available. Now if insurance providers can't offer that choice, I don't think we should adopt this amendment. This is intent language. It is not legally