

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

April 1, 2003 LB 210

in good faith covering them with health insurance, just like the case that was in the Supreme Court, where the employer was covering the employee with health insurance, and unbeknownst to you, you have an accident, health insurance company says, oh, if you're covered by work comp, we don't pay, so guess what, it comes out of the farmer-rancher's pocket. Now, if you're going to do that, you better have a lot of warning to the industry, not only to the agricultural industry, but the insurance industry. Because it would be a radical departure in policy that has been our policy for well over 100 years. It at least merits a bill and a public hearing, if we're going to do that. And so I rise in strong opposition. I don't necessarily take issue with everything that Senator Beutler pointed out in the University of Nebraska Extension specialist's article. But the practicality of that article is...leaves a lot of questions to be answered. Yes, in an ideal world, I would cover everybody with workers' compensation. And I would do it yesterday. But that is not the case. We're not talking about an ideal world. We've got a lot of small family operations that, in order to supplement their income and try to keep the business afloat, are either doing some custom farming or they're doing some custom feeding to supplement their income. Now, if that is going to trigger a workers' compensation requirement, we need to have them know when and where that happens. We have a problem out there, and it is...it will come up to bite people when they least expect it. And I think we have a duty and an obligation to establish the line that you can rely upon, where you say, yes, I do need workers' compensation, here's what it costs, and I'm going to have to have it, and by the way, because of the cost, I may not be able to also purchase health insurance coverage. Now, that may be something that you have to cover for yourself. Or it may be that if they can't afford that, it may be that we'll have some people who once again may come to our Health and Human Services System that we have in this state to get their medical care paid for. So those are actions. And this amendment would create a chain reaction that I don't think Senator Beutler could even tell us what the end result of that would be. If we're going to do that, it needs to be done deliberately, in a thoughtful way, and it needs to be done with a bill and a hearing, and over a course of time. So I strongly oppose the amendment. I don't fault the intentions of Senator