

before?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Was this in the Judiciary Committee or the Labor Committee?

SENATOR HALL: Judiciary.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (Laugh.) Okay, then...

SENATOR HALL: Senator Chambers, thank you for all your help. (Laughter.) Since nobody from the Judiciary Committee is here, maybe they're having a hearing. I don't know. Mr. President, members, my point is that at least it was talked about in Judiciary Committee it sounds to me. And that's what I thought, based on just looking at the witness testimony sheet, the folks from the railroads did testify in a neutral capacity, and probably addressed this issue, I would think. It did not come out as an amendment to the bill in the committee amendments to LB 1062. And I think that probably the bill did come out unanimously, so there was not clearly a lot of opposition or at least there wasn't much support either for this concept that was brought to the Judiciary Committee in the amendment that Senator Wehrbein has before us. Clearly, I don't think there's a need for it. When you look at the federal statutes, when you look at what we currently have in law, and when you look at the way the bill is drafted to date, there is no question as to who would be covered as it is currently written. If you adopt the Wehrbein amendment, there are all kinds of questions as to who would fall through the cracks, who this bill would apply to, and who it would not. Can I get a hammer, Mr. President, please.

SPEAKER BARRETT: (Gavel.) The house will please come to order.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President. Remember one thing, that as I think Senator Morrissey stated, even though he stated it, I think, in jest, this bill deals with unemployment benefits, and the way you are eligible or ineligible for those benefits. Some of the language that I think Senator Wehrbein offers in his amendment referenced federal statutes that deal with a different type of testing with regard...has nothing to do with unemployment, but yet a standard that we are going to take, transpose and put into our section of statutes that deals with qualifications with regard to unemployment. I don't think that is proper just on its face, let alone the language, the ambiguity that it brings to the bill that we have before us. I