

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

March 25, 2003      LB 608

employees who receive qualifying healthcare. Well, what if that employee elects not to receive the insurance? Maybe that should read the employee who is eligible for qualifying insurance. But this next point, and this is what I want Senator Landis to listen to and it's one that I just kind of thought of over the weekend as I'm discussing this, and he and I have not discussed this, but I think it should be the policy of this state that everyone has insurance and the state should do everything we can to encourage that. But here's my question, then I'm going to yield Senator Landis my time, if he would like it. It says there in line 18, it says...talks about the minimum qualifying wage for applications shall be \$8.70 per hour for employees who receive qualifying healthcare benefits, and \$9.50 per hour for employees who do not receive. That is a difference of 87 cents per hour. And again, Senator Landis, maybe I'm missing something, but it seems to me that we're actually offering a disincentive to insurance, because I don't believe any employer can purchase health insurance for 87 cents an hour. So what my fear is, is that these recipients of LB 775 might just say we elect not to offer insurance benefits because it's cheaper not to, and, again, I think it should be the policy of the state to encourage everyone to have health insurance, whether they purchase it on their own, whether it's employer sponsored. But I'm afraid that this portion, despite its or in addition to its ambiguities, also might offer a disincentive. And, Senator Landis, if you'd like the remainder of my time to respond to that, and maybe to acknowledge that or reiterate that you had said there might be some ambiguities and perhaps your willingness to work on this language over on Select File.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: There are some administrative difficulties in doing what we've asked the Department of Revenue to do. It would probably be better if we gave them further clarification in how to do it. It would be one way to improve that idea. Is there a disincentive? I think you can argue that there might be. I would acknowledge that that's a possibility. I do think that these are largely companies that have standard practices across the company. My guess is that you're not going to reach in for the 30 employees in an urban area or the 20 employees as