

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 2, 2003

LB 210

think that we need to address it. I think that this bill may not be as bright a line as I would pick. But I think that we need to address who is covered and who isn't. We've had cases where people believe they're doing the right thing, and they got caught. We need to try to give as much direction as possible. I would like to put everybody under workers' comp. I would like to be where Senator Beutler wants us to go. There's not enough revenue in agriculture right now to do that. To put this kind of burden, you know, on the agricultural sector is just an impossibility at this time. If we had the profitability and if we had the way to do it, you know, I'd probably be closer to where Senator Beutler is. But I think that we need to make sure that we address this problem, that we allow the agricultural exemption to stand at this time, and to give the courts some direction on how we handle it. And we give insurance companies and these employers some idea on where the line is. I applaud Senator Bromm's effort on this, and I rise in opposition to the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Connealy. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, following along a little bit on this court decision, I think there's one comment that's made by one of the dissenting judges that probably really reveals both the majority feeling and the feeling of this particular dissenting judge. And what this dissenting judge said, he said, I join in the dissent. He didn't think the majority opinion was correct. But he did say, the problem, of course, is that the lack of workers' compensation coverage for such an obviously hazardous activity goes against every intuitive bone in a judge's body. That is why I write. He agreed that the law would be...it would be helpful if the law were more clear. But clearly what he's saying is, this doesn't make any sense in terms of the workers. Because here are a whole set of workers, numbering more than 10,000, who are in a hazardous...the most hazardous occupation in the state, and who are not covered. The whole point of this...you can almost call it a right that we extend to every other American worker, is not extended to workers who are in the most hazardous profession. And he goes on to quote a statement