hensive change should be made. In my earlier remarks I mentioned that there was not another state here in the United States that had a similar system. I will adjust that and correct it by saying that the State of Kansas did at one time but it was not functional for them, and for that reason they no longer have this solvency rate which incorporates the multiplier. So, ladies and gentlemen, I would again cautiously request that you look at this particular amendment and make the decision as to whether or not it is necessary at the present time with all the information that has been provided for us to go from a tried and true formula which appears to be meeting the needs relative to unemployment to one that is virtually untried. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Goodrich, do you wish to add to what you have already said?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Yes. It has been, well, a couple of things have been said on the floor here but let me take a specific company in mind. This specific company has a $26,000 positive balance in this fund that being charged at the rate of 2.7%. This solvency rate would add 3.4 to the 2.7 for a total contribution of 5.74%, 5 and 3/4 percent which means that we are doubling, a little more than doubling the contribution rate. Now remember I said that the firm in Grand Island, for example, had a $19,000 premium cost each year. They are now going to pay close to $40,000 and every single employer, just take an employer that has the best turnover rate of any employer in the State of Nebraska. That is a one tenth of one percent. You add to that this solvency rate of one point...one point eleven percent, a little over one percent for a total of two tenths, two point one tenth of one percent or another twenty-one hundredths of a percent. Even the best employer is going to get increased by 112%. When you get down to the negative employer, negative balance employer, the worst category we have, that is 3.7%, they would get a 4.16 increase for a total of 7.86%. Now the total wage base, now this is the assessable wage base, this is $6,000 times the number of employees that any firm has. That is the base, the taxable base. That is $3,212,000,000 for the year 1980. When we get down a little further in this amendment, we will have an amendment up there to amend it to instead of drawing $90 million out of the economy over and above the claims, cut it to 1% over and above the claims, that will still produce $31 million or $32 million over and above the claims. So consequently there is no way in the world you can justify going over 1% over and above the claims. Consequently, for example, what we have been asked to do here is to force the employer, for example, to keep