

the philosophy of the solvency fund is going to be used, then I see no reason to have a limit on at this point in time and particularly when it is going to take three years for it to take effect. If it looks like it is going to be a problem, we can certainly put a limit on it two or three years from now. Secondly, I would like to point out that there are some other things in 394 that I believe will help the drain on the fund sufficiently to not cause that percentage to go up a great lot, which a lot of people seem to think will happen. First of all, we have got the 50 percent reduction on voluntary quits. We have got the section of the bill that says the last employment is the only employment that is going to count. Now how is that going to affect the construction industry or the seasonal worker? Now, we have indicated that it is the construction industry all the time and actually there are other employers that are seasonal also that are not construction, perhaps, but the fact of the matter is that many of these employees that are laid off during the winter right now draw unemployment even though there might be some part-time jobs available, because if they take that part-time work and then go back to their...and then quit that part-time work to go back to their regular employment in the spring, then the next time they are laid off because they quit a job in the base period or that last year, then they have to go through the disqualification period, the 7 to 10 week period because they quit a job. I believe truly that there will be a number of people that will take part-time work during the winter rather than draw unemployment compensation to start with, which is a benefit to that type of an employer, which will probably not cause the rates to go up nearly as much as many people are saying that it will. Again, because it is a three year period to take effect, I think it is not incumbent on us to put a limit on at this point in time operating under the assumption of the solvency rate. So I urge this body's adoption of this amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, the motion is the Vickers-Wiitala amendment to the committee amendments. All in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote no. This is the motion to approve the Vicker-Wiitala amendment to the committee amendments. Have you all voted? It is a simple majority.

CLERK: 15 ayes, 9 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the Vickers-Wiitala amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion carried. The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, we now need to consider the committee