

And this is a way of dividing those two groups on the fate of this bill. Now, it is the height of symbolism in that the existing law is exactly what this amendment does and in one sense you can say, why object. Well, I objected in 1981. I thought that was the wrong policy to do. I thought a fringe benefit was basically appropriately negotiated between the employer and the employee without the state telling us what to do but I lost that fight. Tonight, being asked to pass that law a second time with no difference, no exception, you've heard the language, it's absolutely patently clear. It seems to me that the real purpose here is a political purpose to divide us along the divisive lines that we have fallen into in the last several years. Now, the source of this does not come from NSEA who has been a traditional opponent to the bill. Talked to Herb Schimek after Select File, before Final Reading, talked to him about this amendment. He said, I'm not pushing it, we don't like the bill, Dave, you know that, but we're not fighting it on that basis. The other traditional opponent of this bill has been Blue Cross-Blue Shield. I don't know what their current status is of support or opposition to the measure. But I would suggest that if you have a concern along the lines as Senator Lynch indicated that there is a more appropriate way than to simply vote for the amendment. Why? Because the amendment is absolutely superfluous,...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...unnecessary, and if you agree with me that it has, as a motivation or, if not a motivation, at least an effect of dividing us, I would suggest that you join me in not voting for or against the amendment so that it's not a question of whether we're for or against a particular piece of language, it's existing law. What I think we should reject is the notion of triggering this knee-jerk reaction between ourselves on the issue of abortion when it is absolutely independent of the question before us, unnecessary because the law is clear, and the law clearly already states that which the proponents want to say a second time. I would suggest that we simply not vote for or against the amendment,...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...that it would fail for lack of 25 votes and proceed with the reading of the bill and make...and understand, as Senator Kristensen has, by looking at it...