

with and that is the 50% cut for those people who leave to quit employment. Now I have some amendments because I think that that whole area really needs to be clarified. One of the things that Nebraskans, that Nebraska has done has been very strict in terms of what is good cause, a good cause quit. We have not recognized some of the key areas that many in fact, most of the states have done. Unless we deal with these issues, good cause like sexual harassment or good cause being quitting to follow a spouse or other general categorical sorts of similar situations. Then what we have done with this 50% cut is really create a burden and a difficulty for the department to administer because frankly then you argue two or three other associated arguments in terms of good cause. You also encourage people to appeal unless we clarify these. Legally you allow for a great deal of appeals and frankly some of these areas have not been very clear. Now I urged earlier that the committee look and analyze this and also some other areas in terms of seasonal employment, as Senator Higgins was talking about and the committee basically I understood the committee was going to do an in depth study on this whole area of unemployment comp during the summer. Now then something happened and they didn't do the study, they decided they would put out this "compromise bill" which I'm not sure has been as thought out as it ought to be. One of the key arguments, and I mean it is real simple to understand a 50% cut in terms of voluntary quits, it is not very simple to understand just how that effects those people who may be but are not yet authorized in terms of good cause or justified in terms of good cause and we really haven't done any clarification in this bill it leaves everything as it presently stands, not analyzing whether sexual harassment or quitting to follow a spouse or quitting to better oneself are good cause or not. Frankly those are some questions I think the committee should have looked at with a little more depth, should look at at least, which they did not. But it seems to me that the central issue here, that many people are asking about is the whole question. This whole question of the multiplier and how in fact that is going to impact on certain key industries in this whole question. It seems to me, and I may be incorrect and I'm not real positive, but it seems to me that what is happening here is that we are going to an untried system which really kind of defeats the whole question of unemployment insurance and creates a brand new question of user fees and it does so in such a way there is no maximums, there is questions about the impact in terms of the fund, how much additional revenues would