

April 24, 1981

LB 394

it was inaugurated, I think had a very worthwhile purpose. I think it still does but it has spread pretty thin since then. The idea originally was to sustain an employee in case of poor business, could not keep them on the payroll, depressions, a dozen different things that might happen, no fault of the employee whatsoever. But they could not be employed for financial reasons of the employer, so...and the employer pays those benefits. Now we have spread it so thin that it just doesn't seem reasonable to me if a family decide to make a move, I can see no reason why the employer has to underwrite the family to better themselves. They lose the employee and lots of times they are the ones that spend money training them. They get no good out of it whatsoever. It just doesn't make good sense. And remember this always, it isn't the employer that pays these benefits. It is the consumer, it isn't the state, the employer; the consumer pays it, and as a consumer I don't think they should be paying these extra costs.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Newell, do you want to close on your motion?

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, there has been a lot said about the "balance of this bill", and yet we find that contractors and the construction industry are suggesting that there are many changes that need to be promoted or at least developed into this wonderful, meritorious, well thought out piece of legislation before it should advance. And there was a lot of criticism the first time this bill came up and a lot of discussion about the questions of whether or not we totally understand its fiscal impact, its intentions and so forth, and yet we have a number of people on the floor of this Legislature saying, well, it is precariously balanced, it's well thought out, about 20 minutes in committee, it is a good bill. And while these things may have some merit, say some of these individuals, we have an agreement. Well, frankly, this bill hasn't been well thought out. It hasn't been precariously balanced. There has been no thought in relationship to good cause or the effect of cutting in half the unemployment benefits even after the seven to ten week delay. There has really been no consideration of whether or not good cause should include those people who quit because they are sexually harassed or those people who are quitting to follow a spouse when, in fact, there is little or nothing they can do except if they want to keep their families and their homes together is to quit and follow that individual or their spouse. And, in fact, there is little choice for individuals to make in this decade and