

SENATOR DWORAK: I call for the question.

SENATOR CLARK: Do I see five hands? I do. The question before the House is ceasing debate. All those in favor vote aye. All those opposed vote nay.

CLERK: Senator Clark voting aye.

SENATOR CLARK: Record the vote.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 2 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to cease debate.

SENATOR CLARK: Debate has ceased. Senator Wesely, do you wish to close?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, I would love to close. Again, I know several people have asked me on the floor, what exactly does this amendment do? Well let me explain for you what it does. We now have in the bill the fact that under this legislation prohibiting insurance coverage for abortion, all public funds. What I would do is strike the "public" and replace it with "state General" funds. So what we would basically be doing is adopting a policy for the State of Nebraska for our state general funds that would not allow them to be used to contribute towards insurance coverage for state employees and for other public employees that would include coverage for abortion and by that I mean specifically the state employees but I think also state general funds are used to aid counties and schools and what have you and that money could not be used then to pay for insurance coverage for abortion. But what we would allow with this amendment is that local areas, local school boards, local city councils, local county boards with their own money collected locally could decide for themselves if there was public support and if there was a desire on the part of their employees to include coverage for abortion in their employee health insurance coverage plan. That would be negotiated locally. Now that would be a local decision and it would not be influenced with this amendment by this bill. I think that is reasonable. We have over 3,000 political subdivisions of government in this state, 3,000, and what we are doing is with the passage of the bill without the amendment is dictating policy to all 3,000 of those and saying basically that even though one area of the state or another may have the support there to do something in this area, we are not going to allow them to do that. We are not going to allow local control and I think that the majority of the members of this body would not support that philosophical position. I think it is philosophically support-able to limit the state employees and state general funds