

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

April 2, 2003

LB 210

continue? And we were told at a late date that they were in fact out of money. That bothers me. It bothers me to put money into another program that has been so badly managed that they weren't able to provide the service they could with the money that they were being provided. So I'm not too sure I can support continuing on a program in this manner unless we can get some assurance that the management is going to be at the level where it can continue to provide the services that it's set out to provide. The other problem that I have is that this is a tax increase without a public hearing. And I'm not too sure that this is a proper way to provide funding for an institution without having a public hearing and input from all those involved in the process of providing this service. So I have those questions. I'm not questioning the need for a program to provide safety for the workplace. That's not my intention. It's just that the method we're going about it I have some problems with. And I think we need to look into the program closely before we go this direction. Because as I said, I don't feel we need to pour more money into a program that somehow has not been able to manage the money in the manner that I think probably it should be properly managed. So given that set of circumstances, I'm not too sure I can support this amendment, based on the fact that I'm not sure it's a proper amendment. With that, I'll return my time back to the Chair.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Landis, on the Connealy amendment to the committee amendments.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, look, I was there years ago when this LB 757 came up and this whole program was worked into workers' comp. And I'm going to give you a piece of advice on that score. That's been so long ago that whatever the understandings or agreements were, they've run their course. I don't think we get to mark this down as some kind of breach of faith, a broken word, a broken promise. I think we ought to do it on this basis: should there be a safety program for workers in place to see that their workplace is safe? And I come out saying, yes, there should be. There ought to be. It's a good idea. I don't do it...I don't say it because we're now somehow obligated or it's an implied promise. I say it's just a darn good idea to have an inspection program