

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

May 8, 2003

LB 143, 143A, 160, 210, 255, 305, 358, 367  
500, 667, 667A, 724, 735, 735A

ASSISTANT CLERK: (Record vote read, Legislative Journal page 1728.) Vote is 46 ayes, 0 nays, 1 present and not voting, 2 excused and not voting.

SPEAKER BROMM: LB 735A does pass. And, members, while the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign the following legislative bills: LB 143, LB 143A, LB 160, LB 255, LB 305E, LB 358, LB 367, LB 500, LB 667, LB 667A, LB 724, LB 735, and LB 735A. Next bill, Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, with respect to LB 210, I do have a motion, that motion being to return LB 210 to Select File for specific amendment. That amendment is AM1804, offered by Speaker Bromm. (Legislative Journal page 1681.)

SENATOR CUDABACK PRESIDING

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bromm, you're recognized to open on your motion to return for specific amendment.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. LB 210, of course, is the agricultural workers compensation bill and after the bill was amended on Select File we found a couple of things that really ought to be corrected in order for this to be implemented the way it was intended. The first thing and the primary reason I'm asking the body to bring the bill back is that in the amendment, which would require notice to be given by an employer who would not be providing workers' compensation insurance, in this amendment, which was I believe AM1584, that amendment, I think Senator Beutler would agree, inadvertently included a reference to the section that includes domestic servants. So that if an employer...if a person were to hire someone to simply work in their home briefly or perhaps even to baby-sit, they might be required to give this notice or, if they didn't and that person were somehow injured, there could be a liability for not carrying workers' compensation. So we felt that was definitely an unintended consequence and we didn't want to have that trap out there. Then the Workers' Compensation Court, in reviewing the bill once it hit the Final Reading stage, found