

May 2, 1979

LB 489

person that many of us in this body would feel a high disqualification period would be warranted for. Those are the two circumstances that are covered by this amendment. If this is adopted, these are the only instances that 489 will cover. It will not reduce the weeks of disqualification, and it has these two applications. I would also like to read the last sentence of the amendment, and that is, "through no fault of the employer, benefits for which such individual may be eligible, which would otherwise be chargeable to the employer's account, shall not be chargeable to the employer's account, but shall be chargeable to the unemployment compensation insurance fund". In other words, the employer will not bear the burden of this on their experience account, the account over which their percentage liability is figured. But rather it will be taken out of what is essentially the general fund of the unemployment compensation fund. Lastly I would like to return to the first of these exceptions where a spouse leaves to follow their spouse to another place of employment. I would like to point out to this body that it is my understanding and I would assume that it's the understanding of the rest of us that if one spouse refused to follow another spouse, if they stayed in one place I believe that would constitute grounds for a dissolution of marriage, would it not? This is tantamount to desertion, is it not, when the family will not stay together, but one partner refuses to leave consensually with another, and yet the law in this instance penalizes one spouse for picking up and moving with the other. If, in fact, the law treats these two instances differently, I think it's unfair and puts married couples in an untenable position... stay together and lose what I think is a rightful benefit, or separate and then the state will allow the benefits...

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...they are normally entitled to, but don't be together. I think that's an unfair and untenable position for the state to put married couples in, and I would hope that the body would see fit to adopt these amendments to 489 and to drop the existing contents of LB 489.

PRESIDENT: This is....just might caution that we only have just a little over twenty some minutes left on this bill, so everybody better address themselves strictly to the point or we're going to run out of time. The Chair... before I recognize the next Speaker, I'd like to introduce