

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

February 24, 2004 LB 1049

should be considered doing that with just cause. Now, in this situation if, for example, he needed a couple of weeks of unemployment compensation in order to make that job change, in other words unless...if he wasn't immediately employed but had a job, he would be able to collect because the principle is, if you're working up to a better job in another place, that's what we want people to do, and that's good for employers because they're able to get better workers. And I would argue that you don't want to split up the family unit. You shouldn't...you shouldn't put additional pressure on family values. You should encourage that man to go work in Nebraska and use his better skills, and if that's the policy you want to have then you shouldn't, in a sense, punish and disqualify the spouse because they're not simultaneously able to both acquire work in Nebraska. You want to encourage them to come to Nebraska; you don't want to disqualify her from the benefits, and that's all this little example is about. It's a situation that I think becomes more and more common, and it's a situation where we should not be disqualifying people because it's a situation that we want, basically, to encourage by how we structure the law. And that's all this amendment would do. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Cunningham.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise up in opposition to this amendment. As I stated earlier, we talked about this very situation and when this...when this...I think Senator Beutler was talking about a wife that goes with her husband, her husband gets a new job, the husband is already collecting unemployment because if he qualified for a higher-paying job he would get unemployment, but she wouldn't. And I guess the question I have is, why is it right for that employer to have to pay for an employee to leave when he needs that employee, he values that employee? He has a job and yet they leave. Why should he pay? So I do...I do rise up in opposition to the amendment. And I'm going to talk a little bit about some of the other issues now. In the papers I handed out earlier, it tells a little bit about what good cause is, and I'm going to read some of that to you. And it says the statutes address briefly what constituent...what constitutes good cause. For example, in number 48-628, if an individual who has made all