

April 2, 1984

LB 880A

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, LB 880A is the funding. Obviously it would need to go along with the enabling legislation. Actually it is \$741,000 that affects 880 as far as state agencies. Also included in the bill, however, was a portion of \$90,000, the health insurance covering the University. I should point out that they had requested or their bids have not been received, but it was indicated that based upon anticipated increase in insurance that it was going to be substantially more than we approved. We reduced it...what they expected the bids by, if I remember correctly, about \$300,000, between \$300,000 and \$400,000, at least \$300,000 on the basis that we didn't want to see appropriated an amount that might encourage bids to be higher. In the case of state colleges, the position is slightly different. In the case of state colleges, historically they have been at a 50-50 rate where the employees paid half and the state paid half of the insurance. For a number of years they have requested that the employees of the state colleges should be put on the same par with the rest of the state employees and so what we did we only split the increase for this year, 80-20. We did not adjust the total insurance that is paid, but the \$26,000 would represent approximately the amount that would split the increased premium for '84-85 at that 80-20 split, the same as other employees. I move the bill be overridden.

SPEAKER NICHOL: You have heard the motion, all those in favor...Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, again I want to reiterate, I guess I was surprised, Senator Warner said he was surprised, several others were surprised that the last motion override was in fact carried. It was a tremendous mistake. I am sorry to see that happen. I didn't really emphasize the different fiscal facts involved with it. I figured you had heard enough of it, and you probably already have. You are tired of discussing it but, nevertheless, that was a mistake. If you will look at the handout that I passed out earlier, you will see that if you would have voted to sustain that veto the premium cost to