

February 10, 1995 LB 216

rational way and in a way that makes some sense. And I mean bringing the bill and the issue is fine. Last year the bill didn't get out of committee. It's out here on the floor, I wasn't going to say much, but I...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Hillman has guests in the north balcony, Sharon Carter (phonetic) is the leader of a group of 18 Girl Scouts who are representing the Panhandle and are here today. Will you please stand and be recognized. Senator Janssen, followed by Senators Schimek, Hall and Maurstad.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Mr. Speaker, members, I haven't really made up my mind on this bill yet, but I have some concerns. Senator Hall, maybe you could help me on these. What about an employee who is on-call. Let's say an engineer in a factory that gets called at any time of the night to take care of some problems at a plant, and he shows up fairly intoxicated or dizzy from smoking too many Camels or something like that. Now, would this . .

SENATOR HALL: Or from driving a Chevy. (Laughter.)

SENATOR JANSSEN: All right, okay. Could you elaborate on that a little bit and clear me up on that. Firemen, policemen, things like this.

SENATOR HALL: Sure, those people would be, Senator...Mr. President, members, Senator Janssen, that's a very good question because it goes to where the bill allows for those types of employers to continue to say, look, you cannot use those products, you are on call. The example I used yesterday, I think, was the airline pilot, for example. Okay?

SENATOR JANSSEN: Right.

SENATOR HALL: Same would hold true for a train engineer, truck driver, the on-call example that you give. And it says, in Section 4 it says, nothing in Sections 1 and 2 of this act, which are the prohibitive sections of the act saying that you cannot refuse to interview or hire or discharge on basis of