

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

April 28, 2003 LB 210

making sure that their employees are protected. The employee gets hurt, and they still have a situation where they can be litigated. We want to make sure that we get rid of that. This bill hopefully, LB 210, will allow agricultural producers to know who should be covered and who isn't. Thus, those employees won't get caught in that midground. So they'll have their own protection if they need it to do on themselves, or the employer will be covered. And with that, I'd end my comments.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Connealy. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I appreciate what Senator Beutler is doing with the amendment, and support the concept of it. I think when the bill was introduced, the goal was to provide some clarity based on a court case. However, I think the reality of the percentage that's in this bill goes beyond that. If an operator has 40 percent of the operation, which is currently in the bill...originally it was 50 percent...if 40 percent of their operation is for their own livelihood, is, in effect, their own farming-ranching operation, according to the language in this bill, they could have 50, 60, 70, 80, 100 employees, and they would be exempt from having workmen's compensation for those employees. That goes far beyond the scope of what was originally intended, and I believe is much broader than anyone wishes to do, or at least certainly broader than I do. I think our goal in the Legislature should be to ensure that people are covered by workmen's comp. And under certain rare circumstances, or very limited circumstances, those operations would be exempt. That was the intent of the bill, to create some clarity so that a farm operation that had a certain number of employees, small operations, would be exempt. But when we put this factor into the bill, and that percentage factor comes into play, I think the reality of that goes beyond what was originally intended. And certainly it goes beyond what we as a body, I think, should intend. To exempt out that large...potentially, that large number of employees, I think is a discredit to the workers, and is not good public policy. We should be concerned about what happens with the employees. We should be concerned that there is some coverage. And remember,