

April 24, 1981

LB 394

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Maresh.

SENATOR MARESH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to this bill that we thought we worked out a balanced bill for both sides and we are going to go weighing towards one or the other side, I think we will need to have adjustments on the opposite side. So if this passes, I will have to ask the body to adopt the longer disqualification period from 8 to 12 weeks instead of 7 to 10 weeks, and I think this is something we should consider that the committee worked hard to work out a balanced plan, and by inserting amendments like this we are going to get it out of balance and I think we should reject this amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vickers, do you wish to speak to the Newell amendment?

SENATOR VICKERS: Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and members, I would rise to oppose the Newell amendment for a couple of reasons. First of all as outlined by Senator Maresh, there are some agreements with this bill that we discussed in committee and it was discussed about making the disqualification period longer, and it was agreed not to. Secondly, it seems to me that what Senator Newell is doing is to some degree opening the door considerably to more abuse perhaps of the system. Let's think for a minute, if we will, about the problem, if there is a problem, of a spouse following her husband or a husband following a wife and not being able to get a job in the next town or the next city, it would seem to me that that would be part of the family decision to be made when an opportunity to move came up for one or the other. If it happened to be for the husband, it would seem that the wife's ability to get a job in a new town would be part of the decision that the two of them would have to make in determining whether or not to make the move, and I would think... I would assume that once the move was made or once the decision was made to go ahead and take the new job, then the spouse, the wife or husband, should be in a position, it seems to me, to attempt to get a job in the new community and not be guaranteed of a job. As I say, I think that... or guaranteed of unemployment compensation if they moved because of the fact that it is a family decision at that point in time. Also, I would rise to oppose and point out to the body that the sexual harassment language, as Senator Newell has in here, although it is a very noble language and noble cause, sexual harassment already would not be a reason to disqualify somebody that left a job. If it was proven that they had left a job because of sexual harassments, there is a law against that and it wouldn't be any