

April 5, 1993

LB 124

SENATOR VRTISKA: Do you know how they would go about determining what the difference in rates would be?

SENATOR WILL: I assume that it would be based on actuarial studies that are done, but I could not answer it specifically.

SENATOR VRTISKA: But there has never been an...but up to this point, as far as you know, there has been no actuarial study that would determine what the difference would be?

SENATOR WILL: As far as I know, that's correct, but I am not well versed in that field.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay, well, I am not either, but I wanted to get those things on the record because I think they are important because I guess what I'm trying to say in bringing this issue up, I just don't think that I want my insurance rates adjusted accordingly because somebody is, and I don't know that I should use the word "encouraged" but maybe perhaps allowed to participate in smoking and drinking as a part of their lifestyle, and I guess in some instances, from what I've been able to learn, people are deterred from that because of their job at the present time. And in actuality, I would understand that this then would be done away with, is that correct?

SENATOR WILL: Yeah, they could be discouraged, Senator Vrtiska, but they could not be told, no, as a condition of this job, here is a list of lawful products that you cannot use or consume. That is what this amendment would prevent.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Do you still think it is a good amendment?

SENATOR WILL: I do.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I appreciate that, thank you. I don't. I will vote against the amendment based on the reason or nonreason that you've given me. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Beutler. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. Speaker, members, just briefly, I think I'm supporting the Chambers amendment, but I will oppose the amendment by Senator Will, and I thank Senator Chambers for