

in this bill than the other one. It has the same money right now, but we know what the money is going to be, a tremendous increase from 20 to 25%, now you wait till you get your bill on Workmen's Comp and find out if it's going to be that \$4 per employee that you think it's going to be. You take anyone with a \$2 rate today and increase it 20%, or get \$2.40 and you're going to get a tremendous increase in Workmen's Comp, believe me. I would think that this bill is much more preferable than 193, and I would certainly agree with the kill motion on 193 and accept 342 even with the \$89 to be a definite figure instead of a percentage figure and certainly not giving it to anyone else that does not deserve this Workmen's Comp. We have to remember that this may not be his only benefit. It may not be his only source of income. He may have other income, such as medical insurance or wage continuation plan, in addition to Workmen's Comp, are absolutely tax free and I would urge you to accept 342. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. Chairman and Members of the body. Would Senator Clark yield to a few questions?

PRESIDENT: Will you yield, Senator Clark?

SENATOR CLARK: Very simple.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Senator Clark, do I understand you to say that you don't object to the dollar amount of \$89; you prefer \$80, but your primary objection with 193 is the formula, is that correct, rather than the actual dollar figure?

SENATOR CLARK: Right.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Other than that, what objections do you specifically have to 193?

SENATOR CLARK: I don't like the formula we have in there, we don't even know what it's going to cost, Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Well, if the formula were eliminated, if the formula were eliminated in 193 and a specific dollar amount were imposed, would that make 193 more acceptable, do you know?

SENATOR CLARK: I don't think it's ever going to be acceptable to me.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Well my point is, I, I feel that 193, with the exception of the formula, is probably a lot more restrictive bill and I don't understand why you do not feel that way.

SENATOR CLARK: Why would it be restrictive?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: In the area of dependents, for example, your bill does not put any requirement on the amount of dependency. Under 193 an individual has to prove that he's more than 50% dependent in order to qualify in the case of death, for the benefits. Under your bill he doesn't have to prove any dependency.

SENATOR CLARK: I think Senator Kelly has an amendment to do just that on 342.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Well, we already have that in 193. Now, I don't understand; if your only objection is the formula, we could