

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

March 1, 2000

LB 953

come to the rescue of some of these people who otherwise would have no defense. But here's what I'm getting to. He said, in working with these people, he realized that nobody is beyond redemption, nobody. He said he's against the death penalty because when you kill somebody the person you kill is not the same person that committed the crime or who was initially put on death row. Well, now, if there can be redemption for one who murders an individual, literally, there can be redemption for anybody, one who merely broke a heart if there were a heart to be broken. So I'm not going to cast the little fella away. I'm going to give another opportunity for redemption. But in the meantime when a bill as good as this bill is comes along I cannot take my name off this bill; I cannot oppose this bill just because I may have a little grievance with the person whose name is on it as the chief introducer. This is a good bill and, as I was mentioning to Senator Beutler off the mike, no activity of this kind in terms of what this fund will be used for can be effectuated without coming before the Legislature, and it has to come through the Business and Labor Committee first. So those who administer the fund cannot just decide that this problem over here or that problem over there is one that ought to be a basis for granting benefits even if the statute does not authorize it. We know that those who pay into this fund would have a lot to say against that, and it's only proper that the Legislature be the one to be required to give specific authorization for money to be taken from this fund. If we thought, on the Business and Labor Committee, that there would be so many draw-outs from this fund on the basis of this bill, first of all, all those employers would have been there, but even had they not come because maybe they didn't understand the full impact of it, the bill may not have come out. Because our responsibility on that committee is to make sure that the fund remains solvent and it would be unfair, as well as unwise, for us to approve of draw-outs from that fund based on things that the employer is not directly responsible for. So I don't think you have to worry about this setting a precedent. Somebody may use this to try to argue that it's a precedent, therefore, other matters involving conduct for which the employer is not directly responsible should allow benefits nevertheless to be obtained by an employee who voluntarily leaves employment, but I assure you that the business committee...I don't know what all it is, but I know what it isn't.