

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

April 9, 1999

LB 608

And when you take that lump sum separation amount and divide it by the total number of weeks claimed, you are not going to have anywhere near the amount of that person's base salary. And that person then could go back and recover for those first five weeks.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And, if that is not what is intended, why don't they just craft language to say what is intended? I had asked some of these questions of the lobbyist for whoever is pushing this bill, and he had said they were questions he hadn't thought of. Maybe after he went back and they discussed it, they decided that the language is all right as it is. But I wanted those things in the record, to show that we had discussed these items, and that pursuant to the discussion it was felt that the bill should stay in the form that it exists now and roll the dice. But I don't see any need to do that.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Matzke, followed by Senator Hartnett. Senator Matzke.

SENATOR MATZKE: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I know what concerns you, Senator Chambers. The same thing concerns me. I would not want any interpretation that allowed an employer to spread out a lump sum settlement of vacation pay over a longer length of time, like 17 weeks. Let's take the...our original hypothetical case of the employee that has accrued \$2,500 in vacation pay and is making \$500 a week. It would certainly be unfair and I think illegal to prorate that over more than five weeks. Now I think there is protection in the law. I think the law is actually clear. First of all, going back to page 4, the definition of "paid vacation", it's paid vacation that disqualifies an employee from unemployment compensation. It isn't paid vacation unless each week's vacation pay is equal to or exceeds his or her weekly wage. So I think there is, first of all, a protection there against the kind of manipulation that both you and I would object to. And then going back to page 10, to the phrase "to each week claimed". Now I can see that you consider that troublesome, but I don't think that you can look at that phrase alone, you have to look at the language that is in the first part of that