

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. When we talk about this particular amendment to the amendment one thing we need to be aware of again is that the intent of worker's compensation, not only in Nebraska but in the rest of the states, is to provide for injured people who cannot work two-thirds of their compensation up to a cap. And I would assume, I've never looked this up, in most cases there is a bottom limit. I'm going to assume also that Senator Hall's calculations on the \$88 are right in that person working at 3.35 an hour for 40 hours a week would, if they were injured, not able to work, have a weekly benefit of \$88. I'm going to assume those are correct. So the question here is whether we cover at the minimum wage rate part-time people who are injured in work in which two-thirds of their wages would be, under the current system, something less than \$88 down to the current floor of \$49. I don't know what the magic formula \$49 is, but it is an interesting concept that if you work for whatever amount, 1 hour, 5 hours, 39 hours a week as a part-time employee, and if you're injured that you will be compensated for an amount almost as much, equal to or greater than what your take-home pay is, and maybe in some cases even your gross pay before deductions. If we were interested in being equitable, I suppose we would go two-thirds of salary, which would get us down to, for some people, almost nonexistent weekly benefits. But I think we're asking our system to bear quite a burden if we're asking that all people who work part-time, if they're injured, be covered with the same amount of money as if they were working full-time, minimum wage. So I think is something that may well be the topic for another bill. But we shouldn't adopt it as part of the committee amendments this morning. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator McFarland, on the amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you very much. I'm in favor of Senator Hall's amendment. It's a different aspect of the problem. And he makes several good points about it and how it has not been changed. I certainly support it, going to vote for it, think it's good. Philosophically, this bill is very interesting, it is very interesting the reaction that we've had to it on the floor today. We're dealing with a bill that affects working people. And it affects them at a very crucial time when they are injured on the job. I'm reviewing the vote