

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 9, 1999

LB 608

and we've always got what I felt was a fair decision for employees. And most of the time I represented employees.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: In the example I gave, though, the department would rule against the employee under this language, wouldn't it?

SENATOR MATZKE: Well, you have a right of appeal to the Appeals Tribunal of the Department of Labor. They have their own hearing officers. Then you have a right of appeal to the district court. I think the Pinzon case went through all of these steps, through the Appeal Tribunal, the district court, the Court of Appeals, and finally the Supreme Court, or maybe the Supreme Court took jurisdiction rather than the Appeals Court,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR MATZKE: ...I don't remember.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Matzke, you're recognized to speak.

SENATOR MATZKE: I'd like to ask the Chair how many times I have spoken on this issue? Have I exhausted my three times?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Matzke, this will be your third time.

SENATOR MATZKE: I don't want to repeat myself, but I think that our discussion here and our debate between Senator Chambers and myself has laid a good basis in the record and built a legislative history on this. One of the problems may be that these two sections are separated by six pages, but that's very true in many legal matters. And quite clearly, the law involving unemployment compensation is more complex than most people realize, and it has to be to assure its fairness and the equity under it. And the Department of Labor does really an excellent job of protecting the rights of employees. They certainly cannot rely on one paragraph of the statute and ignore another paragraph of the statute. I'm sure Senator Chambers knows, as I do, all lawyers learn this in law school that, if you're going to interpret a law, you've got to...and you can