

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

April 2, 2003 LB 210

step up to the plate on this issue. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm, for that review. We will now continue discussion on AM1113 to AM0926 to LB 210. Continue with discussion. Senator Beutler, on your amendment. (Legislative Journal page 1128.)

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I think, generally speaking, what is most objectionable about this particular bill is the fact that it takes a court-drawn line, albeit, at this phase, somewhat less than perfectly clear, and one, it substitutes statutory rules, which in my opinion are even less clear, one; and two, worse, as a matter of public policy, they basically put into a place a policy that says even the very largest hog operations, cattle operations, those who have a large number of employees, 10, 15, 20, that those operations too will not be required to cover their workers with workers' comp policies. And these are the policies that protect workers, of course, against huge medical expenses, and protect workers if they happen to have some kind of permanent disability and they're not able to work and support their families anymore. So the court rule, even though it lacked the advantage of being perfectly clear, at least drew a line and recognized that when operations got big, that they were no longer the old family farm idea, and that they're really a business like any other business. And every business in this state, regardless of size, is currently required to protect their workers with that basic, fundamental piece of American protection that we give all workers, workers' compensation. All businesses, regardless of size, except agriculture. So it seems to me that if what we want to do today with this bill is to draw a bright line of some sort, then this bill is badly in need of amendment, because it does not provide that bright line. And we can get in... we will get into the details of exactly how this bill functions, because we all need to understand it. And I probably need to understand it better. But I know, just from reading it, that it's going to involve litigation and a whole large number of questions that, again, would have to be resolved by the courts before you could effectually use this set of rules as a guiding principle. So it doesn't serve the purpose of clarifying. And to the extent that it does clarify, it draws the line so far in the direction of