

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

March 29, 2006 LB 489

that has been presented to us from Workforce Development is dated March 1, 2005, and is not representative and is not reflective of this amendment. Again, we have compromised. We have bent over backwards. We're attempting to include two things, essentially--consumer protection for primarily churches throughout out state, primarily churches but also corporations and companies; and safety. And we've had a compromise, and my discussion and dialogue with Senator Hudkins alluded to one of the things we gave up and that was these personal residence lifts, because of issues like the Dignity League had. However, I still did that reluctantly, in the sense that if this is a safety bill, like I said, as soon as someone breaks their neck on one of these things, I guarantee you, you'll have state senators down here wanting these things inspected by the department. Now this letter from the department says our current system is kosher, it's good, there's no problems with it. And again, this relates to a former version of this bill. However, the safety inspector for the state of Nebraska has testified as a proponent of this bill, so how to you reconcile that? How do you reconcile the department, the bureaucrats in Lincoln saying everything is fine, but the guy out there working in the field, the guy looking at this stuff--who, again, I have to disclose testified on his own time; he was on vacation so there's nothing going on there--the bureaucrats in Lincoln will tell you everything is fine, but the guys out there looking at this stuff, evaluating this stuff, inspecting the work of some of these elevator mechanics comes to the committee on his personal time and testifies in favor of the bill. So you got conflict...who you going to take at their word then? The bureaucrats in Lincoln at the Department of Labor, or the guy out there looking at this stuff who does this for his job and has done it in excess of 25 years? Yeah, it is...to regulate something that's not currently regulated, to improve and enhance safety, yeah, it's going to be a little bit burdensome there, but it's not going to impact the consumer. The burdensome part of this will be the hoops that the licensed mechanics will have to jump through. They'll have to prove, they'll have to prove some level of competency to work on these things. And Senator Baker, wiring and changing a light bulb is two different things. To wire an elevator, right now I could do that, by the way, under our current statutory scheme. I could come out to your