

April 24, 1981

LB 394

be willing to take care of them. I think this weakens the bill, and I would certainly urge you to vote against it.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Landis. Is Senator Landis in the room? Mr. Sergeant at Arms, will you see if Senator Landis is out in the rotunda, please? Do you wish to be recognized on 394?

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I intend to support the concept of the Newell amendments but not in the form offered to us right now. I support the policy that Senator Newell suggests to this body in this form, however, because LB 394 is in a delicate state of equilibrium right now, and I understand that to influence or to affect on one side or the other that balance, is to column the question a carefully arrived at coalition. I am going to oppose its adoption to this bill. However, there is an accompanying bill. It is the next one on General File. I believe the number is 470, and it has to do with unemployment compensation as well. It is a vehicle without which there has been delicate negotiation and for which there exists all the potential in the world for changing the public policy with respect to UI or unemployment insurance. What is the public policy switch that Senator Newell suggests with this amendment? Well, he attempts to breathe into that cold legal phrase "good cause" some very personal relevant meaning for individuals who oftentimes find themselves between a rock and a hard spot. What do they do? They have got some manager who is indicating that their future assignments, that their promotion, that their livelihood is dependent on their submission to some kind of sexual exchange. They have that on the one side, or if they quit their job because they don't want to put up with that, they face 10 weeks of disqualification. That is the kind of law that we have right now, as I understand it. You either have to submit on the one hand, or you quit and you find yourself without means of support for 10 weeks because we don't tolerate quitting under those circumstances. That is apparently a personal reason. That is a reason for which the individual should suffer a denial of benefits. I think Senator Newell calls us up short in an area that we are short. I don't think our public policy should say that an individual has to choose between sexual harassment and a denial of benefits. That should be considered good cause and I intend to support that policy when offered to another bill. What is the other one that he suggests to us? Well, he suggests to us that where an individual is a part of a family, the family is going to make a change, they are going to move, they are