

April 24, 1981

LB 394

going to change their sites of location and the spouse quits out of deference to the occupational advantage to the other spouse with the new job. They leave the working area, the community, they quit and follow their family, that they also not be faced with the denial of benefits. I think a lot of people in 1980 regarded those election results generally in this state and nationally to be pro family, but you certainly couldn't tell it by Nebraska law because in the Nebraska law we put people in the very interesting position of either having to choose between following the spouse and being denied unemployment benefits, or not following the spouse and committing an act which under our divorce laws is grounds for irreparable dissolution of marriage. Whichever way you go the state penalizes you. If you keep your family together, the state will penalize you for moving by denying you benefits. They will say that you don't have good cause to quit your job. If you don't follow your spouse, then the divorce law covers the situation and you have quite possibly broken the bonds of the marriage irretrievably and have given your spouse the cause necessary to establish a case for divorce. I can hardly consider the existing predicament that an individual finds them in to be pro family. And I would suggest that Senator Newell offers us one of the first real pro family opportunities this session to make a gesture to keep families together and to reduce the deterrence and the disincentives for families to stay together. We have built into our law a penalty of roughly I would say six, seven, eight hundred dollars to a family to stay together under an unemployment insurance law, and I would hope that this body would see fit to change that policy and to bring into conformance with what I think is the trend in this state and this country, to make sure that the government fosters as best as possible an attitude in the law that encourages families to stay together. I will support the policies urged on us in the Newell amendment but not as they are applied to 394.

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have about 15 seconds.

SENATOR LANDIS: I hope they will be offered to LB 478, in which case I intend to support them in that context. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President and members, I would have to oppose the amendment. I am thinking particularly of the part where the person and the family moves continues to receive unemployment benefits. Unemployment benefits, when