

PRESIDENT: Senator Labeledz, would you...Senator Labeledz, do you wish to say something on this motion, motion to return the bill to Select File?

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President, yes, I do. I agree and highly support again Senator DeCamp's amendment. I can recall on LB 216 when I stood here before and talked about the unemployment in my district because of the three packing houses closing and also the brewery and Western Electric laying off a couple hundred people. These people are in dire straits now. They cannot pay their property tax, cannot pay their utility bills. It's almost impossible for someone that has worked at a packing house for 15, 20 to 25 years to find another job when the only profession they know is processing at a packing plant. I don't think the increase is unreasonable. I urge the members of this body to return LB 216 and adopt the amendment. It is critical in some cases where we have families that are trying to maintain at least a good life, quality of life in this state, and when they are unemployed, not because of anything that they've done, but because businesses are closing and I think it's time that we start helping those people. They are not on unemployment because they want to be. They are there because they have to be and yet they've got a family to support. I urge the adoption of the...or bring the bill back and adopt the amendment that Senator DeCamp has offered.

PRESIDENT: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President, members, I rise to support the DeCamp amendment because LB 216 is my bill, but as you know and as Senator DeCamp mentioned earlier, the handout that you have before you that I passed out is a letter from the analyst from the Department of Labor to the Commissioner of Labor and we were unable to get this information until just yesterday. That is one of the reasons why this amendment did not come up on Select File and why we are asking for the bill to be brought back from Final Reading so the amendment can be attached. There were a number of people who needed some information with regards to what the cost would be to employers if this increase should take place. This letter, I think, spells out that there would be...that in the past, in 1985 there has been a reduction in the rate charged and that with the increase even up to possibly \$138 there would be no impact on the fund right now. Our unemployment fund