

March 9, 1983

LB 319

to its Appeals Tribunal. If Donnelley doesn't ask that, they can take that to the District Court like any other employer. I don't think that we should, through an amendment particularly, this wasn't even a bill as has been pointed out, through amendment be sidetracking a whole series of processes and structures that we have set up simply to respond to the blackmail of a certain corporation.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: I will call the question.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. The question is, shall we cease debate? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 7 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Debate is ceased. Senator Schmit, do you wish to close? Senator Wesely, are you going to close? Okay.

SENATOR WESELY: That would be fine. Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I understand the concerns expressed by Senators Fowler and Johnson and some other people. Let me keep it simple. The question before you is one of a business that has been operating in the state thirty years under a system of home workers that has worked very well until recently there was one person that felt that they should have unemployment compensation coverage, went to the Department of Labor. They looked at it and decided against the business and now that firm that has been here all these years with a \$750,000 payroll for these home workers is put in a situation that they didn't anticipate. Obviously they have got to make some choices. They feel that this is an unfair situation. These home workers are not regular employees. Keep in mind what they do. They take home with them some telephone books and take home some mailing lists, they compare them, and it is at their own leisure, it is on their own time, and they have these jobs from time to time. It is not like going down to a job and it is a 9 to 5 job and they are not getting unemployment compensation coverage. This is not a typical employee-employer relationship. It is not something that you would normally want to have under unemployment compensation and should not be covered under it and this change and decision of the Labor Department has now led