

February 1, 1982

LB 115

a very simple technical amendment to the committee amendments. You will notice that the word "two hundred" was inadvertently left in the committee amendments. The bill drafter should have changed it to "ninety". It will simply make the one hundred and ninety dollars consistent with the other four spots that that particular number is found in the committee amendment. I urge the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment as explained by Senator Barrett. All those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote no. Record.

CLERK: 18 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of Senator Barrett's amendment, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is carried. The amendment is adopted. Senator Barrett, you are recognized for the adoption of the committee amendments.

SENATOR BARRETT: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, the committee amendments submitted by the Business and Labor Committee last year reduced the proposed weekly maximum benefits under Workmens' Compensation from the originally proposed \$200 to \$190 per week. The committee also amended the bill to retain the current minimum weekly benefits for Workmens' Compensation related accidents to \$49 per week. Once again, the amendments, maximum \$190 per week, minimum \$49 per week. I would move the adoption of the committee amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the committee amendments. The Chair recognizes Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I would oppose the committee amendments and urge their rejection and that we go to the original bill at this time. This is a bill that was carried over from last session. It deals with the question of the maximum for Workmens' Compensation. Obviously, it is an issue that every couple years we have to debate due to the impact of inflation. It would seem to me that in light of the fact the bill has been held over a year, that inflation has continued at about a 9 to 10 percent rate that we ought to go with the higher number, the number in the original bill, and for that reason I would oppose Senator Barrett's committee amendment.