

SENATOR LANDIS: ...you're...then you're maxed out at two-thirds of your wage and this increase of maximum would be in irrelevancy to you,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...unless you, some day, trip that higher amount.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, how is an employee benefitted by a restriction on choice of a physician and being funneled into a managed care program, which will also place limitations on the type of care and treatment that may be available? How is an employee, who is not currently faced by that, benefitted by those requirements?

SENATOR LANDIS: I will tell you that whatever argument I might give there it's very tertiary in its impact. The other benefits I would find in the bill do not lie in this area. I know that you characterized it as a direct loss, and there is a loss of option opportunity, freedom of choice...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Um-hmm.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...in the bill. I will say that I do find a tertiary benefit in that I think if you make workers' comp affordable for employers to pay, they will add to their workforce, they will expand the number of jobs, they're likely to settle here as compared to other places. But those are pretty tertiary benefits, and I don't think they're the kind you're talking about very directly.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, and even if they expand their workforce, that doesn't help the worker who's not making nine ninety-five and has been restricted in his or her choice of a physician and the benefits, the medical treatment and care that might be available. So, if those employees are experiencing what I refer to as a loss, based on these restrictions in the realm of obtaining medical treatment, what is the benefit, other than those tertiary ones you mention, that these unaffected employees are going to derive from this bill?

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. I've got my light on and I'd like a chance to answer that fully, if you will. I know that you're