

May 2, 1979

LB 489

homes, which is pretty expensive. After being down there six to eight weeks working steadily his old employer called him up and said, come back we've got work for you. He came back and went to work up here and after six months the guy ran out of work again. There is no work. The Kansas job is over. There is no work to be done. He goes down and files for unemployment compensation. He's disqualified for 10 weeks. What he's being disqualified for was not being lazy. He's being disqualified for not taking unemployment comp when he could have had it, and I think this is an inequity. We've got cases right....a case that came up not long ago in the CETA program in Omaha. There was a man that was in the program and he became so proficient at welding that he became an instructor. In the course of events a welding job opened up that was very high paying and more constructive work. He took that job. He left town to take the job, worked at that job for nine months before he was laid off again. He came back to a job in Omaha that was no longer open but he was disqualified for 10 weeks from collecting unemployment compensation. I think it's an inequity, and I think rather than what Senator Lamb said, I think it's inclusive enough so that the tribunal of the Labor Department can use the language that's available and show some discretion at times. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President and members, I would oppose Senator Landis' amendments. Very briefly, workmans comp was started some years ago for one reason and that was protection of the employee in case of layoffs where it was no fault of the employer or employee, and that's I believe how it should remain. Now, the first item that Senator Landis made was when a spouse accompanies the other spouse to a different location. I think that's something that the family, the two people have to decide before a change is made. I can see no reason why the employer who is satisfied with the employee's work, and the employee was happy, should have to pay unemployment compensation for that person. Now, that's one of the faults, of course, of both the spouses working, but that's something I think they must work out between themselves. Number two is where the employee will have to....where the employer pays for the second item that Senator Landis made. It just isn't right. These are costs that have to be passed on down to the consumer, and no matter what we say, they are. They are a cost of doing business. For this reason I would oppose these amendments that Senator Landis offered.