

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

April 2, 2003

LB 210

would like.

SPEAKER BROMM: Well, thank you, Senator Beutler. The only thing I was going to say was that I just know that when people are trying to hire employees for a full-time, responsible position of operating equipment like is involved, or taking care of livestock like is involved, you have to have people that are, "A" dependable, "B" have an aptitude that they're able to learn things that are somewhat complicated, and you do not hire those people for a minimum wage because they simply can do better than that in the work place. So, in my experience, you're talking about wages that are starting off 30 and 40 percent above minimum wage. You're talking about housing. You're talking about at least health insurance, if not disability insurance. You're talking about, in some cases, a vehicle, in many cases. You're talking about gas to operate that vehicle. Minimum wage in those kinds of things is not even in the ball park, just to give you an idea of what we're dealing with out there. Thank you, Senator Beutler. I'll give the rest of your time back, and I have my light on if you need some of mine.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Schimek, members of the Legislature, I want to point out quite clearly, because I think perhaps it wasn't well understood, given Senator Baker's comment, that we're not taking out all criteria. We're simply taking out the criteria that has to do with the artificial distinction, in my opinion, as between whether you're farming somebody else's land or you're farming your own land primarily or in whole or in part, whether you have your own livestock or somebody else's livestock. Now one of the things some people made fun of on the court's decision was why did it matter whether it was somebody else's cow or your own cow, and I agree, it shouldn't matter. From the point of view of the worker, they're doing a job. They can be injured just as easily by one cow as the other, and that becomes irrelevant. And I think that this particular drafting also causes that distinction to continue to be a part of the law, the very distinction that the court was criticized for. Should it matter in a case that comes up after we pass this law if we didn't change it, somebody comes in and you argue about whether 40 percent of their land or more was leased out to determine whether they were under workers' comp? This isn't