

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

February 8, 2006 LB 875

Islands or Africa, and I wonder if that would be confusing to the public, and if it would alarm them unnecessarily, that this might not be a legitimate company in an adjoining state, if you could respond.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, I'm not sure that it matters, with respect to their exact understanding of that, because it goes on to say that no assurance can be given that there are adequate reserves. So whether they think it's in the Cayman Islands or whether they think it's in Iowa, the important piece of information is...it's the same, regardless of where they are, and the fact is, there...no assurance can be given as to adequate reserves.

SENATOR REDFIELD: I understand what you're saying, but I think that's because we have a little more understanding about adequate reserves and what kind of protections we have within the states. But how would this apply to a policy that might actually be outside of the United States, and how would the public differentiate between the two?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, what I'm saying, Senator, is that they don't need to differentiate, because whether it's in the Cayman Islands or in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the situation is the same. The same warning pertains; that is, that there's no assurance of adequate reserves. So even if their impression is mistaken, the warning is true. If it's a domestic company, then they don't even have to have that in the notice. In lines 19 through 21, it says the second paragraph of the notice is not required,...

SENATOR REDFIELD: If they're domiciled in Nebraska.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...if it's domiciled in Nebraska.

SENATOR REDFIELD: I saw that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: And I'm trying to create a situation where a company will domicile in Nebraska, hopefully, or will operate