

SOS workers, shows here that as of ninety...July 1st of '94 it started going down dra...well, leveling out and probably going done, as well as the risk of running the workers would not get their check at this point.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Wehrbein, I appreciate that very much, especially on the paper trail. Another question, if I could, in the following years one of the ways, obviously, that we can limit the use of the SO...we can limit the use of SOS by not putting as much...many dollars in there that they have to work with, what has the committee done as far as what your projections are of what you've put in for SOS for the budget coming up and for this next year as well?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Next year is just the same as it is this year at this point, 3.1 million dollars, so it's essentially the same. And I would remark, if I may, just a little more on that. You know, I think the committee agrees pretty well, responsible use of temporaries is legitimate and bringing as many under that pool rather than having agencies hither and yon hiring workers from private enterprise, bring them into the SOS, our state-sponsored unit, organization, and it gives you a better trail, a better understanding of what's going on as well as it's economical and it's efficient. So it doesn't say it might not need to grow a little bit. I mean I think that that's something we'll look at and see, but we want to understand where the abuses were, which we found in some agencies. We have found some of that, so if that's...I think the...I think that the...the dollars will be adequate into the future if it's used responsibly, I mean for the near future, because with so many of those workers or some of those workers will obviously go permanent. Some will probably go away, will not have a job.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: No, I...and I thank you, Senator Wehrbein. I appreciate that. And, Senator Wehrbein, one final question that I'm a little bit confused on.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Do you think there was any attempt in hiring people just so that they don't have to pay benefits? I know that was brought up a couple times, at least to me, by constituents who were concerned that it was simply a way to get around paying benefits to workers at the state. My sense was that was not necessarily the case, it was not done for