

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

April 2, 2003 LB 210

rise in opposition to the amendment. I think this is something we need to do for those small, just maybe three or four employees and their family members in this case with...and they may be feeding a few cattle but...or farming something for another person who's not related, but it still can't be more than 40 percent of their gross revenues. If it's over 40 percent, they're going to be subject to workmen's comp. So I think this is a fairly narrow exclusion here to workmen's comp and I would like to maintain it in the bill and, therefore, would oppose Senator Beutler's amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Baker. Senator Bromm, on the Beutler amendment.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Beutler's amendment certainly focuses on the crux of the bill and for that I thank him for providing the opportunity to look at that and have some discussion on it. I do oppose the amendment and I want to make sure that I'm clear about that. I think if that amendment were adopted, it would subject a lot of businesses, ag businesses, to the worker comp requirement, that would find it very difficult to find coverage and to afford coverage. The two-prong test that's in the bill, one being number of employees and the second being the character of your business, whether it be more family oriented or beginning to encroach upon a significant commercial flavor, is a...it's a very delicate balance, I think, for the bill. And I would never say that we will never change that test after a bit more experience or observing how things work, but it maintains, I think, the consistency of what the court has tried to emphasize. No matter what we say in our statutes, the court seems to want to require workers' compensation when it takes on a commercial flavor, and that seems to be the one thing that I can identify in that most recent decision. I also think that it is a natural place to probably draw a line because, as I indicated in a prior statement on this bill or on an amendment, agriculture has changed and will continue to evolve and change. Your smaller operations, in order to survive, have to take on other enterprises and other means of generating revenue. If that involves taking care, on a custom basis, of other people's land or ranch, if it involves a rancher trying to supplement his