

have a better chance of getting their salary bills if they will rule in a way that Mr. Kalmanovitz wants but there is a greater threat to the courts than the Legislature not giving the salary increase that is wanted. Mr. Kalmanovitz may bring out his pen and write a letter about the courts and about the judges and you know how much harm that can bring to the judiciary of this state. So if you are going to bring this bill back and bow down at least to the knee level, I think you ought to lean forward in the completely prostrate position and offer him the things that I am saying. Oh, I know he is chuckling wherever he is. He probably has somebody on the telephone here with a hotline. I don't know if they put a red telephone in here straight out to California or not, but somewhere near the Capitol there is one and they are probably not just telling him what is happening, they are holding his receiver right up to the little box that lets him hear what we are talking about. So the next letter that he writes, even if what I am offering does not succeed will, I am sure, include praise for me for trying to get him what he is entitled to from this Legislature. There is one point that Senator Schmit raised and I think it is worthy of consideration and that is the impact that something like this might have on the court case that is pending. Now, the man was not fined anything. Nothing was done to him at all. Of his own volition he decided to tell Omahans that he was going to close the plant. So I don't know what other issue remains for the court to determine if the Legislature makes legal that which the Liquor Commission has voted is illegal and I wish one of the other lawyers might consider this. I don't practice law, so I am not that conversant with how this kind of bills will impact on a court decision or a case pending before the court but it seems to me that if the issue is whether or not the agreement that Falstaff has with Safeway and any other store violates the law because it is giving something to a retailer which is not allowed by the law and you pass a law that makes that legal, I don't know what point there is for the court to look at. There is no question of law anymore because the law has been changed. There is no question of Mr. Kalmanovitz seeking damages because he was not fined and was not made to lose anything. The only ones who lost were those poor people who work at his plant and call him "Uncle Paul" when "Uncle Paul" told all his nephews and nieces, I am going to kick you right out on the street and close this plant to show you how much I care about you. This thing is so confusing to me. That is why I am offering this amendment, I haven't offered it as an amendment but I wish you would consider it. Don't vote to bring the bill back with the way Senator Labeledz has her amendment and if you fail to bring it back, then I will offer a substitute