

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

March 1, 2000

LB 953

SENATOR VRTISKA: Yes, I will.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Vrtiska, this language is talking about the various perpetrator of this violence. Is that true?

SENATOR VRTISKA: No, this is talking...we...we're talking about domestic abuse in the...I mean, abuse in the workplace and not in the...by the members of the household, which is what this would include. And it really was not necessary to be in there.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Suppose these people worked where this person worked. Would this mean...is the language broad enough, without this language, to mean any person who is committing this abuse in the workplace? Well, let me back up. We're talking only about abuse that would occur in the workplace, is that true?

SENATOR VRTISKA: We're talking, for this particular purpose we're...for the unemployment compensation we're talking about people who are abused in the workplace, that's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is the language that would remain broad enough to include abuse by a spouse...

SENATOR VRTISKA: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...to be...okay, because a spouse doesn't necessarily mean that the people are living together. They could have been working at a place, gotten married, things messed up, they still worked there and while at work they're still spouses but they're coworkers.

SENATOR VRTISKA: The bill is broad enough to cover that. That's why we took that out, because it's somewhat repetitious, and that's why we took it out. But it wasn't for the purpose of letting somebody, a spouse or relative, abuse somebody, even if, you know, as you indicated, in the workplace...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR VRTISKA: ...it would still cover...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I wanted us to get that into the record