

to then go out and do an injunction. Following the Bromm amendment, there should be an amendment to make clear that injunctive relief is appropriate here because that is a genuine, valuable form of relief where workers can organize. But I think Senator Bromm raises a fair question, and that is that if you place on the worker, who is supremely disadvantaged in this set, the responsibility of going forward with only a damage-based private cause of action, frankly, it will be easier to pack up and go home than to fight the injustice, which this body genuinely agrees is wrong. We need to make sure we fashion a fair remedy. The first thing to do is to pass the Bromm amendment. The second thing to do is to make sure the injunctive relief is there, and if that is there, then I think Senator Matzke has raised some pretty valid points about the bill. Those two things should go forward in fashioning a fair remedy for a problem we all agree exists. Damage-based lawsuits alone is not...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...a genuine relief that will really solve the problem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers, followed by Senators Matzke and Dierks.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, is Senator Bromm's amendment up there? All right. Senator Bromm, did you explain what your amendment would do?

SENATOR BROMM: Senator Chambers, my amendment reinstates lines 20 and 21 on page 4 through the word "misdemeanor" so that would read: Any employer who violates any provision of Sections 1 to 3 of this act is guilty of a Class IV misdemeanor, period.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. That's what Senator Bromm and I've discussed and I agree with that. I would like to ask Senator Dierks a question. Senator Dierks, have you looked at the committee report on this bill?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes.