

May 11, 1981

LB 95A, 257A, 389A, 396A,
477A, 506A, 541A, 556

Mr. President, your Committee on Enrollment and Review respectfully reports that they have carefully examined and reviewed LB 95A and recommend that same be placed on Select File; 389A Select File; 396A Select File; 477A Select File; 506A Select File; 541A Select File and 257A Select File, all signed by Senator Kilgarin as Chair.

SENATOR CLARK: LB 556.

CLERK: Mr. President, with respect to 556, the bill was introduced by the Speaker at the request of the Governor. (Read.) The bill was read on March 30 of this year. It was referred to the Appropriations Committee for hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by the Appropriations Committee, Mr. President.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner, on the committee amendments.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, LB 556 is the bill that reflects the increased premiums when the health insurance that is provided for state employees, other than higher education, when those new bids were opened and those dollar amounts will be explained. The committee amendment that is offered merely, well, back up. The amendment was offered at the committee hearing requesting that the legislation require that coverage for abortion be made available at the employee's expense and the presentation was based upon the testimony by those who appeared that the prohibition or the requirement for this, for an abortion to be paid for by the individual employee had been suggested when the legislation that prohibited state funds was being considered and enacted and they wanted some assurance that, in fact, that would occur. If you look on page 1877 of the Journal there is a letter which I requested of the Attorney General requiring two things relative to the amendment, first, whether or not whether it would be constitutional and I think you can summarize the response on that, that if the original legislation prohibiting it is constitutional then this is probably constitutional or if LB 125 is not constitutional then neither would this be either. So that seems to be a draw. The other request for an opinion, however, was whether or not we would jeopardize by the adoption of this amendment the coverage that the state might have for its employees under the new bid and it would be my understanding from the Attorney General's letter that if the amendment is adopted, that then it would be expected that the state would find someone who would provide that coverage for those who wanted it and provided they could find some company of some kind that would provide this kind of coverage then the conditions would be met and