

us equal to Kansas. We would have still been significantly behind Iowa and South Dakota and Colorado, Wyoming, Missouri. This amendment I am proposing here is just slightly different and I think, in all fairness, is reasonable and acceptable. You might take a look...it's perhaps best explained by the handout that says Maximum Weekly Benefits. In Nebraska, you'll note that in the past in 1985 the maximum weekly benefit was \$200. Then in '86, '87, and '88 it was bumped \$10 from '86 to '87 and 10 more dollars from '87 to '88. That practice of increasing it \$10 each year had been somewhat of a formality. Last year when this bill was introduced in 1989 it was my understanding from the Labor Committee that this bill would get out, that it would...that the recommendation would be to increase it \$10 in '89 and \$10 in '90. Well, the fact of the matter is, is that that bill was not advanced out of committee. It was held for an entire year in that committee and so what should have been an increase to \$255 in 1989 did not take place. Now we are in the 1990 session and I think, had that bill got out last year, it would have had a \$255 increase in '89 and 265 in '90. So what I am proposing is just continue that trend of \$10 increases and even taking into...and even not trying to remedy the fact that in 1989 there was no increase at all, what I believe at a minimum should have been an increase to 255, the logical sequence would be to have the maximum benefit in 1990 to be 265 and in 1991 to be 275. You'll recall the materials that were passed around yesterday, all of the other states in surrounding us have higher workers' comp benefits than this. As I recall, Missouri's was at \$290 a week, South Dakota's was \$289 a week, Wyoming's was \$346 a week, Iowa's was 680 some dollars a week, Colorado's was 300 and some dollars. This amendment would continue, in effect, what should have been a \$10 per year increase in the maximum benefits. Had this bill got out of committee in 1989, had it been enacted, we would have had a \$255 maximum in '89, so this, in effect, this amendment would increase it to...continue a \$10 a year increase, put it at 265 in '90 and 275 in '91. It is not very significantly different from the committee amendments that had been introduced. We were close to the recommendation that I had yesterday as far as the amendments. This is even less than that. This still keeps us at the bottom, I might add. This still puts us behind Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, South Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado and all our surrounding states. I think it is a fair amendment. It would make this bill less unconscionable if these committee amendments are added. So I would urge you to adopt them.