

subject that benefit to the other types of taxation because it is to compensate them in the fact for their injury and to try to give them some kind of income to sustain themselves until they are rehabilitated. The fact of the matter is that it doesn't and there are many, many people who earn over \$19,000 a year and who get injured and yet have house payments and doctor bills and car payments to meet just like we do and they have children to send to school and sometimes children in college and yet they are devastated when an injury occurs because they are restricted to the maximum amount that is allowed under Nebraska law. Teachers are subject to this law, for example, and there are a lot of teachers that aren't exorbitantly paid, but they are in the 25, \$30,000 area, supporting a wife, children. If they get injured on the job, and I've represented some teachers who have been injured on the job, one that slipped in a hallway and hit her head, that is a tremendous loss of income. This amendment does not make the system fair, in my view, but it makes it less troublesome than the committee amendments. I would like to just explain that last year when this bill was submitted to the committee, the Labor Committee, Business and Labor Committee, there were some assurances made to me about how this bill would be handled. Those assurances have not been kept. The first assurance I had was that this bill or the unemployment bill would come out in 1989 and then the other bill, the remaining bill of these two bills, either unemployment or workers' comp bills, would come out in 1990. That was my understanding. That was what I expected to happen. I trusted the committee with that particular assurance. Then I found out that some kind of meeting had been held to negotiate what would be an adequate increase in the weekly maximum benefits. Unfortunately, even though it was my bill, I was not invited to that negotiation. I don't think that is the customary procedure in this body.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR McFARLAND: I don't think that is the customary way we treat one another courteously. In any event, that meeting occurred and I was assured that the bill was going to come out. It didn't come out in 1989. And now here we are in the midst of the 1990 session and suddenly it comes out, but the increase, the usual \$10 per year increase is delayed one year and we pretend like 1990, 1989 went past and we don't have to even take that into account. This amendment simply would, in effect, make the law as if the bill had come out in 1989, as it assured, it would have had the usual \$10 per year increase that had been the