

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

March 22, 2005      LB 739

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If he had said no, he would have opened a whole new field for me. Senator Cunningham, based on the language on page 26, and it continues on to page 27, about state average weekly wage, maximum weekly benefit amounts plus \$10, and then a maximum amount not to exceed \$288 per week in a certain set of circumstances, if a person's income...first of all, let me ask this question. This formula is based on what the person earns per week, not on a yearly basis, but per week. Correct?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, to make it simple, if a person earns \$100, if everything comes to pass that this bill is talking about in this part of Section 5, what is the maximum amount in dollars that that person could receive after all this stuff has been put into play?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Well, Senator, right now it's \$280 a week. There would be a freeze for two years and then...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Wait a minute. You mean to tell me somebody who makes \$100 a week could wind up getting \$288 benefits?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: I'm sorry, I must not have heard your question.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, here's my question. The person earns \$100 per week. Now, if all of these contingencies came into play, what is the maximum amount of benefits that person would receive under this language?

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: I'm not sure, Senator. It would be a percentage somehow, and I'm not sure how that works.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: A percentage some...well, this is your...

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: If \$288 would...or \$280, and then after two years it could go to \$290, and then the...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you mean...you mean I could make \$100 a