

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

March 15, 1999 LB 608

idea that someone can collect twice, and that's the reason for the bill and it's also a reason because to protect the integrity of the Unemployment Compensation Fund, to protect against double-dipping, and to protect against the unintended result of the present court opinions, which would be that ordinary employers are just simply going to stop paying their employees for vacations. That's the grave risk here. And if two people get different results, then that's a choice they obviously made as to how they wanted to take their vacations. I don't see that that's a defect with the law. You're never going to get the same result in every case.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Matzke. For discussion on the Beutler amendment or motion, excuse me, Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. Senator Beutler, I'm not going to support your motion to indefinitely postpone, but I think you raise a really significant issue here. I have to admit that this bill has caused me a great deal of concern and worry because I've not been certain that I understood the implications of this bill all along. And I've talked with Senator Matzke at length about it, I have talked with different interested parties and I thought we finally had the bill in shape to pass it. But I think that you have raised something here that we, at least, didn't address in the committee and I'm not certain that I want to vote to advance the bill either unless I have some assurances from the bill's sponsor that he would come back and maybe take a look at this particular section that's on page 10 of the bill. If it's been done like this in the past, then I think that doesn't necessarily make it right; that if you've identified an issue of fairness here then I think that it has been brought to our attention, which it hasn't been before, and we need to address it. So I...I have real mixed emotions. I don't want to postpone this bill because I believe what Senator Matzke is trying to do is beneficial and it will help not only those small businesses but some of the large businesses, too. But I have a serious reservation about the issue that you've raised and I'd also like to know that we are going to go back and address the language in the second part of the committee amendments that we didn't address awhile ago when we rejected that second half of the committee amendments. And I agree with Senator Matzke, it