

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

February 25, 2004 LB 1049

this amendment, you may recall, called into question the whole idea of just cause, and I thought that it illustrated a situation where somebody would not have collected any...or would have been prohibited from collecting in the first weeks their unemployment compensation because, under the current definitions, they would not have been...they would not have had just cause or good cause. So what this amendment does is to define that situation and to explicitly say that it is good cause if you fall within the definition that is the amendment. So what would happen would simply be that there would be one more situation where good cause was defined. And the reason that I want to do that and the reason that we probably should do more of that, if we're going to start disqualifying people for a longer and longer period of time, then we need to be extremely careful about what situations are included in good cause and which situations are not. So that's all this amendment does. We discussed it at some length last time around, although we didn't have a very detailed discussion of it. So I would just leave it at that and leave it open for people to have further discussion on it.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Beutler, there are no lights on, Senator Beutler. With no lights on, I will recognize you to close on your amendment, AM2553. Senator Beutler, to close.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, this is not, in any way, a filibustering amendment. This is a legitimate suggestion that I am making to the body. If you are going to extend these disqualifying weeks, then I would ask you very sincerely to consider this specific situation. Again, the situation, to remind you a little bit more because I didn't describe it specifically last time, but the situation is essentially this. Where you have a husband and wife and the husband is given a job in a different geographic location, came...he was given a job in Nebraska, for example, but lived in Iowa, obviously, you want to keep the family together and, obviously, the spouse is going to move with the husband. Well, in order to do that, the spouse is going to have to lose her job in order to accompany the husband who has a new job elsewhere. When the spouse loses her job, that's not just good cause under