

April 16, 1982

LB 672, 115

SENATOR CLARK: A Call of the House has been requested. We are on Final Reading, I don't know why we would need that, but everyone can check in. Has everyone checked in please? We have two excused. Did you want a roll call vote? The Clerk will call the roll if we can keep it quiet enough to hear the response please.

CLERK: Roll call vote. 29 ayes, 19 nays, 2 excused and not voting. Vote appears on page 2010 of the Legislative Journal.

SENATOR CLARK: Motion lost. The next motion is on LB 115. The Call is not raised. We are on Final Reading.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wiitala moves to reconsider 115 on Final Reading.

SENATOR CLARK: What I am trying to do, Senator Vickers, is hold them in their seats. Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, I am asking you to reconsider LB 115. It was considered a few short days ago and failed on Final Reading, largely I feel because people, at least it was communicated to me by several colleagues that workmen's compensation was misunderstood, that it was confused with unemployment compensation. So I would like to have it get a clear hearing today if I could. As you understand probably, if you know anything about labor history, workmen's compensation came out of the difficulties of the job experience where employees sometimes encountered injury on the jobs a lot of times due to their negligence, a lot of times the negligence of their employer. These injuries a lot of times resulted in endless litigation between employer and employee. The workmen's compensation program really is a truce, it is a truce between employer and employee. In some respects it is a two-edged sword. Basically it establishes a limited liability policy for the employer so that in cases of accidental injury that "humongous" law suits are not launched against the employer and thereby putting him and the employees out of work. But it also recognizes the needs of laborers, employees, that when they are injured irrespective of how they were injured that compensation would be given. This bill is close to my heart, at least the \$10 increase that it proposes, an increase in the maximum level. It does not mean that each employee who is receiving benefits gets a \$10 increase. It simply means that at the maximum level possible that it be increased \$10. The reason I said it is so close to my heart is because I had a close relative, my brother, who was in a management position but an employee nevertheless

11009