

CLERK: Yes, Mr. President, LB 125 (Title read). The bill was read on January 13th for the first time. It was referred to the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee for public hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. There is a committee amendment pending by the Banking Committee, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, the amendment is simply the emergency clause. If Senator Labeledz desires, I would explain why the emergency clause is particularly significant on the bill and what the involvement of the bill is, if she chooses for me to do so. She chooses. Mr. President, this may well be one of the first major controversial bills we will touch on this session so I would hope that those that have at least an interest in the subject will pay a little bit of attention so that as we develop the themes and arguments they will understand the complexities of it. It does have some complexities. First of all, the bill has to do with the state basically ordering or saying by law that no, what we have deemed to be, state funds can be used to help pay for an abortion in a state insurance policy or a public employee's insurance policy, actually, under this bill. Remember this crosses far beyond where we were last year. This affects all public employees so you would probably be talking, as we understand it, school teachers, public power districts, so on and so forth, that have an insurance policy, group insurance policy, which I am sure almost all of them do, and the essence of it is to say in those policies you cannot have a provision to pay for abortion except in special cases such as death or very serious medical emergency, threatened death. That is the essence of the bill. Now why does the emergency clause come into play so significantly? Because current negotiations are going on for most of these contracts and most of these contracts are three year contracts. Therefore, these contracts would be completed prior to the effective date of the bill if it does not have the emergency clause. Because of constitutional provisions started by the Fathers of our Country a couple of hundred years ago, you cannot make laws retroactive and undo a contract that was already legally done under the law. So quite frankly for all practical purposes, if the bill does not have the emergency clause, it is ineffective for at least three or four years for all practical purposes for almost all contracts that it would involve. The reason that I am stating this is so that everybody understands the fight that may or will develop and the game plan that both sides may or may not choose to utilize but that will become apparent and that is 33 votes are required on this bill to really make it have any