

April 12, 1983

LB 319

sure between now and the end of your close. Senator Labedz, will you check in please. Senator Haberman. Senator Landis. Senator Fenger, would you push in please, thank you. Senator Chambers. Senators Kahle, Haberman, Chambers, Newell, Withem. We are looking for Senators Kahle, Haberman and Chambers. Looking for Senators Haberman and Kahle. Senator Chambers, would you check in please. Thank you. Senator Barrett, I understand Senators Kahle and Haberman are on their way. Would you like to go ahead and close now? Thank you.

SENATOR BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislature. Just two or three quick points in closing and then I would yield any time I might have left to Senator Johnson for any choice and provocative comments that he might like to make. The comment regarding a middle ground position and perhaps the Business and Labor Committee could and should look at this matter this summer. I would be delighted. I think the committee will look at this issue this summer. I think it is ridiculous to pass this bill with this amendment in anticipation of a hearing. Perhaps the middle ground solution that Senator DeCamp refers to is in fact raising the qualifying wages. That is an issue that my committee has considered for the last two or three years, an issue which has not gotten to this floor, much to my chagrin. The present qualifying wage hasn't been increased since I believe 1963, the present base is now \$600 and it should be raised. Had that minimum been raised we would perhaps not have been faced with this problem that we are facing today. There has been a suggestion, I believe by Senator DeCamp today and others in previous debate, that the Labor Department has in fact changed its position on this issue. That is erroneous. I again refer to the letter from Commissioner Sorenson, which I shared with you in the opening. The Department of Labor has not, in any way, changed its position in recent months as to whether or not homeworkers are eligible for unemployment benefits. In 1978 the agency ruled that the homemaker working for a company providing the same services as Donnelley Marketing was eligible for unemployment insurance. The Department's position on whether or not such an employee is covered, whether or not he meets the ABC test has been consistent over many years and is supported by previous appeal and court decisions. A suggestion was made, I believe by Senator Higgins that we would be opening a can of worms if the amendment is deleted. Not true. Not true. The Donnelley amendment as I have been trying to tell you is limited to a very narrow special interest group. This amendment is designed for the Donnelley workers, the homeworkers, no one else. I don't see it as opening a