

have system in our UI law. It is available to hospitals and it is utilized. It is available to other public entities and I suppose an employer can choose if they wish to to self-employ, or rather to self-insure. But, generally, if they don't utilize that mechanism, we use this lumping theory to minimize the costs of what is a universal economic benefit, the UI system. I think to adopt Senator Vickers' approach is to put blinders on and to say, this is not a systemwide or economywide system, it's not a form of shared risk across the economy, but, in fact, it is an individual accounting by each employer for those people that they put on the UI rolls. I think that has some merit but can be drawn too narrowly, and what we have done with 394 is walk the tight rope. The 5 percent maximum says that a season employer who is burdening the UI rolls more than other employers bears a greater cost, but they do not bear every dollar they put on there, that we recognize that they too provide a part of the economic whole. They provide a part of the system that is important, that is valuable, that all other businesses enjoy and utilize and require for the growth of this economy as a system. So I would oppose the Vickers amendment because I think we have sufficiently recognized the responsibility of negative balance employers to give more money to the fund than those who have a good experience account. We now have the variation between .1 percent for the very best experience account employers with positive balances down to a full 5 percent, and that is a fifty times greater responsibility for the negative balance employer than for the best of the positive balance employers. And that spectrum is wide enough, I think, to penalize the negative balance employer without going completely to the system of self-insurance. I think we have walked a very fair line with the language so far. I intend to vote against the Vickers amendment and support LB 394 as written.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Newell. Senator Newell, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, I am not sure I like this amendment. Then I think that we have, in fact, a situation where we have a very delicate tightrope that everybody wants to walk, and we have a bill that, frankly, I am not sure that anybody has well...that is well thought out. But I don't know how you can take one part of it, separate it off and accept the rest of it. I think that is the key question here. As I understand it, Senator Maresh can maybe enlighten us, but as I understand it, this bill has been well thought out, that the provisions here for the multiplier that will be applied now has been thought out, that there are cost estimates and so forth.