

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

March 15, 1999 LB 608

you haven't used up that paid vacation that you've earned it's going to be deducted and you can't collect unemployment insurance? That paid vacation, in my mind, is an asset. It's no different than your savings account. Do they have a right to say you have to use up your savings account before you get unemployment insurance? Of course they don't. You have to sell your car, you have to sell your house? Of course they don't. There's nothing about what has to be done with assets, and this paid vacation, which has already been earned, is another of the employee's assets, and how can you say they should use that up before they can collect unemployment insurance? Now maybe I'm not understanding the whole thing correctly, but the responses that we've heard on the floor don't indicate that. I think we do understand it. I think we do understand now that it's a much, much broader bill and I think an unfair and philosophically incorrect bill if that's what it purports to do. I don't agree with this.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Beutler. For discussion on the Beutler motion, Senator Matzke.

SENATOR MATZKE: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, what's in this bill is what the law has been for 40 years in this state. We're going back to where the law was before the Pinzon case. We've just had this verified that this has been the law. Now, of course, in any employer-employee relationship there can be differences. I think it's a matter of choice. Maybe the smart thing to do is use up your vacation if you think you're going to become unemployed, I don't know, but this is the way the Labor Department has ruled ever since the unemployment compensation system has gone into effect. If you're drawing...this is before Pinzon, if you were drawing vacation pay, you were being paid the same as...equivalent of wages and you still remained in an employment situation. The purpose of the Unemployment Compensation Fund is to assist people who are unemployed and not receiving wages or the equivalent of wages, and so I don't see any problem with the fairness of this at all. I mean, you will get different results in different cases depending on different situations and that's a choice, of course, the employee can make, I guess. But I don't see that this is any kind of defect. It's the way the law's been operating. There seems to be a great public problem with the