

this amendment, as it would be, I suppose, under \$49, for a person to make...have a larger income under worker's compensation than what they might working in part-time employment. So I would ask the members of the body when they address this particular amendment to the amendment to keep that in consideration, that as the system works out and with the large number of part-time employees, we need a floor, we need a floor. I don't know that \$88 is a magic floor beyond the amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hefner, please, followed by Senator Morrissey and Senator Chizek.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, I would rise to oppose this amendment. This...an amendment like this was never brought up at the committee hearing. I believe what this would do, this would certainly increase the premium on workmen's comp, especially those people that hire part-time employees, because here we're saying, if you only work one day a week and say you'd earned \$50 a week, this employer, or the carrier whose carrying the workmen's comp for this employer, would have to pay \$88 a week. And that looks to me like that would be real excessive. I know that that \$49 minimum was put in there for a purpose, but I believe here...if we go up to 88...Senator Hall, I'd like to ask you a question. Senator Hall, where did you pick up the figure \$88?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Hefner, as I explained in my opening, there was...my rationale for it was I took the minimum wage, which is currently the state minimum wage is \$3.35, took it over a 40-hour work week, divided it by two-thirds, and that is where the 88, actually the \$88 is a little less, I rounded it down, and it would be two-thirds of a minimum wage job.

SENATOR HEFNER: Okay, okay, what about the employer that hires quite a few part-time people, and say that he only hired this employee for one day a week, then if this employee got injured on the job then he'd be liable for that \$88?

SENATOR HALL: That's correct. Clearly, as I mentioned to Senator Coordsen, the individual who was a part-time...on a part-time basis would...I guess if you can get injured and be benefitted, if that's possible, that would happen in this case. Clearly, an employer hires part-time people because they don't then have to pay benefits for that individual in terms of health