

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

April 2, 2003

LB 210

before, but it seems to me that all of that...that one of the problems that the court had with what they said before is that they didn't think that was a very meaningful distinction but one that they were required to make because of the nature of the history and the material that they were given. I understood the court to say, let's do this on different terms; Legislature, make some rational distinctions. Because from an employee's point of view, it doesn't matter whether you work for the owner of the farm or ranch, or whether you...or whether you're dealing with some piece of business that he is leasing or under contract with. It's irrelevant to the employee and, to a certain extent, it's irrelevant to the ability to pay. Because what you're saying with this amendment is, no matter how large, no matter how large the operation is, no matter how large the feedlot is, no matter how large the confined hog operation is, as long as you own the feedlot, as long as you own the hogs, as long as you own the land, no matter how much it is, there's no requirement for workers' comp and you're exempt. And that, to me, is not drawing any line at all. That, to me, is saying there is no line as long as you own the land or own the hogs or own the means of production. I keep wondering what this Legislature would do if some other business that was having a hard time came in here and wanted exemption from the workers' comp law based on their current inability to pay or exempting out small operations, because small operations in most industries are hard-pressed and oftentimes have trouble surviving. The bankruptcy rates in a large number of industries are very high. So would we then just peel off, one by one, all the protection of workers' compensation and just decide we're a society that doesn't believe in or can't afford to protect workers in the most basic way? That's what we're doing, unless you strike this provision in this amendment. You're saying, no matter how well the operation is doing, they can choose not to have workers' compensation. I wanted to emphasize again that if you strike this portion of the test or the standard, not only are you reestablishing a balance but you're not giving up the protection of the small operator, of the small operation, because you will continually...you will continue to have the protection that there must be six or more employees. There must be six or more employees. Most farm operations do not have six or more employees. A vast majority of them do not have that many