

February 3, 1975

SENATOR MARESH: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Barnett asked about the vote of the committee. I think it was explained that some people wish to carry . . . say like the veterinarians or somebody that is in a corporation wish to carry a family plan and be included in the family plan. They pay a premium and they are able to collect only one insurance, that's the workmans comp. We have received numerous letters. I've received twenty letters from people that are affected by this, saying that we should support the bill. I imagine that had some effect on the vote of the committee. I cannot speak for the rest of the members. It did point out to me, and to clarify a point, last year the Labor Committee had a bill. I had a veterinarian in my district that was complaining about this . . . not being able to collect on two policies and paying on two policies. We agreed to sponsor the bill, but the bill was killed in committee. It ran into opposition. But this year the makeup of the committee is different, so I suppose that's why the bill got out of the committee.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. President, members of the body, the reason the makeup of the committee's different is cause I'm not on it this year. That's the reason the bill got out of committee, probably. There was no reason for the bill last year and there's no reason for the bill this year. Any person can elect themselves out of comp. This provision does nothing but muddle the statute for no good purpose. That's the whole story regarding this bill. That anybody who doesn't want to be covered under comp. when they go to work, can not be covered under comp. It's not mandatory. I'm against the bill for the same reasons. Today I wish I was back on the Labor Committee.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the body, I'm inclined to stand in support of Senator Stull's bill, for the very reasons that Senator Cavanaugh gave. There are many small corporations in the State of Nebraska. There are one-two-three man operations and I have one of them. I had formally opted out because of other coverage, because of the high cost and the lack of need that I felt was presented by the coverage. It's a duplication of coverage for many small corporations in the state, such as my own. We are required to cover those employees. There is no reason why we should need to cover ourselves. I would hope that . . . I respectfully disagree with the fine gentleman who testified in support of the bill. I think it is necessary to cover employees, but I think that as an executive officer, who owns a company, and many times members of his family, who also are officers of the corporation, decide not to be covered. I don't see any reason why we should contribute, because our benefits under the program, I'm sure, would be minimal. I think it's a good bill and I commend the Labor Committee for the wisdom in putting it on the floor.