

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

March 15, 1999 LB 608

anyone. I am trying to understand this issue, though, and there are several things that confuse me and I may want to ask some questions. It seems to me, from what Senator Matzke said, it's a common arrangement that I might make with an employer that, in effect, I'm...say I work...I get a month vacation for a year's work. In effect, I am agreeing to work 12 months for 13 months' pay. That's more or less the basic agreement that I've agreed to. Now, if I would happen to get fired at the end of 12 months without having taken any vacation, then if the arrangement is common, that I am simply...get a lump sum payment for my vacation, then the way I could beat the arrangement of 12 months work for 13 months pay would be if I got another job, so that 13th month, instead of being on vacation, I am actually working at another job. Apparently the arrangement has been, with unemployment compensation, that we are not going to allow...unemployment compensation can't, in effect, substitute for my getting another job. Unemployment compensation is simply going to maintain that base level of 12 months' work for 13 months' pay. It's not going to allow you to get beyond that by, say, working 12 months, getting my vacation lump sum payment and then getting employment which...unemployment which would, in effect, make a better deal for me than 12 months' work for 13 months' pay. So I guess philosophically it seems to me that's...that's the way it's been...been handled. Now with unemployment we're sort of trying to maintain that base arrangement. We're not allowing someone to go beyond that. Now, you know, the rest of it may get into specific deals. For example, if, for some reason or another, I was...I was...I had a company car while I was working and I was fired and didn't take my vacation. Well, I might get my vacation pay. What if...what if the employer told me, well, look, this car's pretty well worn out, you can just have it. Now would this also get counted against my future unemployment draw? I don't know. I don't know how that...it seems to me it could get very complicated, but at least it...the philosophy that Senator Matzke described would suggest that we simply try to maintain that base level of compensation and not going beyond that. I hope I didn't confuse you more, if you weren't already confused, by sharing my confusion. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Beutler, you're recognized to close on your motion to