

lid on the amount that can be called...or any employer can be called upon to contribute to the fund. Right now a negative balance person, a negative balance company can be called upon for 3.7 percent. I put it up 25 percent to 5 percent. That is a 25 percent increase. If the employer, for example, who is asked to budget for his company and to manage his company in such a way he can stay fiscally sound needs a lid, he needs a way to say, okay, at least the maximum I can get hit for on this one is 5 percent. Let's try 5 percent, like I said before, let's try this 5 percent for a while. We can always change it if there continues to be an increased drag. If the 25 percent increase that we are giving them already, going up to 25 percent, isn't enough, we can always come back and change that. But let's wait for a year or two until we have got some experience with this thing at the rate of 5 percent and see what that will do for the fund, and at least the employers that are in the negative balance category will have some maximum that they can depend on not having to budget for more than that amount. I would strongly urge that we do not adopt this particular amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Before we go to the next speaker, underneath the south balcony is guests of Senator Nichol, John Harms, Herschel Baird, Robert Hyde, David Groshans, all of Scottsbluff. Will you please stand so we can recognize you? Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I urge your support of the Vickers amendment largely because the amendment returns the bill, 394, back to its original form as introduced to the floor. I have heard all kinds of commentary on 394 and I just want to speak to the body largely in respect to the history of this piece of legislation as best as I can because it incorporates some very difficult features. 394 incorporates about three bills that were seriously looked at in committee, looked at by the business community and the labor community, and compromised into one bill. It is the kind of bill that if you look at it through the lenses, through the spectacles, of the business and employer world, you are not going to see all that you desire and want in it, because there are some parts that represent the employee. If you put the spectacles on the employee when he takes a look at it, there are some portions of it that bother him also because they represent the world of the employer. I want you to understand that. But this is a very good bill. It is a very good bill because very seldom is a bill referred out of committee where competing pieces of legislation are looked at seriously and where you bring in the whole economic