

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 22, 2005 LB 739

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler and Senator Schimek. Senator Schimek, your light is next.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I would give my time to Senator Beutler, and Senator Cunningham maybe, to finish this discussion.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Cunningham and Beutler, whichever.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Senator Cudaback and members. And thank you, Senator Schimek. So I guess I can agree with you on that. It's just a matter of, what's the right answer? It's somewhere in between those two, I believe. But I'm not certain what it is and how to do it fairly. So I guess I am open to ideas on that.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, if it were not a flat 3.4 percent, but indexed to inflation, so at least they were able to keep up with one of the two measures of increased prosperity, would that be a satisfactory compromise?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Well, Senator, it might be. But here's the problem. We've talked about the fund itself and how the fund has gotten into trouble. And we've talked about how we had the four step drops, and that's the real cause of the problem, that along with 9-11. But they're also...the fund was changed back in '97 or '98, and it was indexed for...I'm not sure what...which inflation factor they used, but it was indexed. And back in...at that time, it was about \$180, was the average weekly wage, and it's \$280 now. So we have a combination of a large increase in a short time, of the weekly benefit amount, plus the four drops, plus the 9-11. And so, you know, I would be cautious to, without studying it, trying to figure out what it would do, and running numbers for the out years, I'd be cautious in agreeing to something. But I do agree with you that maybe what we have in the bill isn't exactly right, either.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schimek, did you wish to use the