

to believe that this would even be germane to the bill or would fit into this bill. I think we ought to let the normal progress take place here. We have a system that works fairly well, I believe. I think we need to let the legislative process work this particular way. So I would just say let's not suspend the rules. What his amendment does is provides an \$8 per week increase for two years, which would be a \$16 total increase. I don't think this is that much out of line, but I want to be sure that we have the workmen's comp bill amended into this so that the two will go hand-in-hand. Right now we are very fortunate to have a low unemployment rate. We have, in Nebraska, created a lot of new jobs, and this has helped. The economy is real good at the present time. Also, we want to remember too that unemployment benefits are not taxed, not subject to social security tax or to the federal or state withholding. So, in order to preserve our valuable time that we have left with only 30 days remaining, I would urge you to vote against suspending the rules in this case.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Wesely, please, followed by Senator Haberman.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I'll just take a couple of minutes, then I'm going to give the rest of my time to Senator Lindsay. I think Senator Hefner and Senator Coordsen are trying to make the point about let the legislative process work. I, frankly, think that's deceiving. The legislative process, as it would work under this issue, would not have any chance at all of having the bill come up until next year, and even under that circumstance it's not completely sure that we would have that bill come up, it's not a priority bill, it has no chance of being enacted on this session. This amendment is the only chance we have to deal with the problem. This is the lowest, best offer type of a situation where the business community has come back with minimal effort in response to a \$40 increase, they're saying we'll take an \$8 increase this year and an \$8 increase, next year a \$16 increase. It's a compromise that I think is very reasonable. The business community did say they would go for this. I can't understand why there is opposition at this time, other than I understand there is a desire on the part of some to amend, to add a further disqualifying provision under our statute when we already have the most people anywhere in the country being disqualified from unemployment comp completely. In addition, this wonderful benefit at \$150 a week, you're talking about \$7,500 a year, not