

of it is, of course, to provide the injured workman with some compensation, while he is unable to perform his employment, as a result of injuries which were received while in the course of his employment. Now the present rate in Nebraska for a totally disabled workmen, employee, is 69 dollars. What this bill would do, would entitle that employee to a maximum benefit, this is if he is totally disabled, completely unable to perform any work, he would be entitled to a maximum of 66 2/3% of the average weekly income in the state of Nebraska, which under the present computations of the average weekly income, the average weekly income presently in Nebraska is \$133.50, so his maximum entitlement, if he were totally disabled would be \$89.00 at the present rate. Now, this formula or this alters our present legislation in that formally we have always gone with a flat, maximum rate. We have moved this thing up from \$54.00, \$60.00, \$69.00. Now what we are going to do upon the recommendations of the federal government of a federal study that was done pertaining to workmen's compensation in which there is an attempt to make all workmen's comp laws in the United States uniform among all the states is to tie this maximum benefit to the economic conditions of the individual state by providing 66 2/3% of the annual, of the average weekly income in each individual state. Senator Clark seems to have some questions as to the validity of the average weekly income, and that is, the average weekly income is confused by the department of labor from the unemployment statistics. I don't know what his specific objection is to its validity, but I think that it is fairly reliable and I have discussed this with people in the department of labor. I think it is a fairly reliable estimate of what the average weekly income is. Now since we are trying to provide some meaningful form of compensation so that an injured workman can maintain himself and his family and remain off the welfare roles during the period of his disability, I think that it is entirely reasonable that the compensation have some relativity to the economic factors of this state and certainly half of the average weekly income isn't an excessive amount of money to give to anyone. It is also been computed that the cost, the additional cost of LB193 to the employer an insurance premium would be, I believe, \$2,000,000 something along that order, which breaks down to something along the line of \$4.55 per employee, per year, that is going to be the cost of the employer. Now, I think \$89.00 is certainly a reasonable and not an excessive amount of money to provide an employee who is totally disabled from his job, and the cost of the employer for providing that reasonable amount, is \$4.55 a year, which certainly isn't unreasonable burden relevant to the benefit that is going to be dispensed to the employee. I think Senator Kelly also has some objection and I wish he would state his objections to this bill so that we might explore them before we move onto the other bill, but he has suggested to me that he has some reluctance as to who, what other

End of tape #8...

Start tape #9...

dependents are going to be entitled to compensation under LB193, he seems to think that it would be a great broadening from the present law. In fact, I believe it would be more restrictive under the present law, a dependant is entitled, any dependant is entitled to a portion of the compensation. Under LB193, only those dependents who have demonstrated up