

March 15, 1982

LB 765

receive it because you quit without good cause. "Good cause" is only defined as arising out of a contract in the place of employment and frankly that is far too narrow. Picture this scenario. A sheet metal worker in Lincoln finds out that because we have difficulty here he can't find a job, he goes down to Kansas, gets a job, and that is 400 miles away from his home. He finds out that the market in Lincoln opens back up. He quits his job in Kansas even though he has been down there working contributing to the welfare of his family. He quits that job, comes back to Nebraska but the job which he has been promised simply isn't there. What has he done? He has quit without good cause. He has quit because he was trying to come back to this working area, to get back with his family and to stay with them in hopes or contemplation that there was a job when in fact there didn't prove to be a job. And under the law, he has quit without good cause.

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute limit left.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. My point is this, requalification is far too high a standard for the limited range of good cause that Nebraska law identifies and accepts. There are many genuine personal reasons for which people should be able to apply for unemployment compensation benefits and to pass this we will simply foreclose them from receiving UI. It is far too harsh a rule to apply to many people. There are roughly 1500 women a year who would be cut off from UI because of the rule, that they couldn't follow a spouse and continue to be available for UI. The standard is too high. I oppose LB 765.

SENATOR CLARK: We have five minutes left on this bill. We have got five speakers. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. I would like to ask some questions of Senator Barrett if he would yield please.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Barrett, will you yield to questions?

SENATOR WESELY: Senator Barrett, Senator Landis raised pretty much the issues I was going to raise about the question about the legitimate leaving of a job and in a sense trying to gain a better opportunity for oneself and having that opportunity foreclosed unexpectedly and then the situation they would be placed in as a result of this bill. Has your committee considered the points that Senator Landis just made and the concerns there and is this really the only alternative we have? Is there any other alternatives we might have that more legitimately might recognize some of these situations and help them a little bit? Could you talk about that for a minute?