

answer, I reserve the right to lie profoundly so I will, in this case, respond in that manner. It would be my understanding that in order to commute under this section, we would do it by the substituted formula, that by paying them two-thirds of the total amount of such future installments of compensation, would have been in compliance with the formula that is struck in this section.

SENATOR MURPHY: It does not say so anywhere in that section.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: No, but I think that--

SENATOR MURPHY: Yeah.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: --that would be my interpretation of what the effect of that would be and I could be wrong. The other one pertains to the--

SENATOR MURPHY: --Begging your pardon, but if you compute, you certainly can't extend that formula, can you? There is no provision in your formula to commute. This is a shortening if I understand it properly and I probably don't.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: It may be a problem with the bill--

SENATOR MURPHY: I would defer that till later if you--

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: O.K. --

SENATOR MURPHY: But I also would like an answer to how we determine the number of insured. It would seem if we're going to use the State Employment Division payroll, we could also use the State's declared number of employees because that same card carries the employees per month. If you get into a field of insured, I don't know where that figure is coming from, or, nor, as they say, does it include the self-insured employees. If you don't, then you've, you've kept your payroll high and reduced the number of people you're dividing by and are going to inflate your annual pay--your annual wage figure. I'd like the answers to both of those at your convenience.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: O.K. I'll have to answer those privately, I think, Senator.

SPEAKER: Senator Whitney.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Mr. President and Members of the Legislature. I would like to say

(End of Belt #8)

(Start Belt #9)

that I'm in support of this motion to indefinitely postpone and I'd like to point out some reasons why. You can have too high a costs for employers, such that they will not hire men to be employed and increase the rate of employment. Now, for example, in my little home town they had a young man who had been a plumber as an employee. He decided to become an employer. After he had been in business a little while here came first one person and then the other insisting upon him doing more and more and more with reference to his employees and he told me if they're going to force me to do this, I'm going to quit and he did quit, and why, because he had too many responsibilities as an employer. He just couldn't take it. Now then, over the weekend, I went home and here was an auto repair shopman. He does a beautiful job repairing automobiles and has in the past and once the more requirements for employers came out, what did he do? He had to let his men go and so, I can't get my