

May 3, 1995

LB 856

SENATOR CROSBY: Okay.

SENATOR HALL: ...prohibit anyone from...

SENATOR CROSBY: That's what I wanted to be sure that they're not...

SENATOR HALL: No, they would not be prohibited from...

SENATOR CROSBY: I still may vote against it but I just wanted to be sure. Thank you.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Hall, a question, please.

SENATOR HALL: Yes, sir.

SENATOR VRTISKA: On the original bill, you didn't have this section in there and I guess my question is, what...what is...what was the time frame based on the original bill when it was introduced?

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President and members, Senator Vrtiska, there was no time frame.

SENATOR VRTISKA: That's what I was...

SENATOR HALL: And the reason, this really is a...it's a...I'm putting the body on notice and I tried to on General File to say that this is a substantive change, but it's something through...when we work through the process of the complaint which was the first one under the act that we dealt with, as an Exec Board, we learned where the problems were and at the time that I introduced the bill this was something that we had talked about but it had not been introduced as part of the green copy of the bill. So you're right, it is a new section that deals with a different subject matter but only to the extent that it puts this statute of limitation in place for purposes of the retaliation issue. I believe it's a good change. Again, if the body feels that it's something that they don't want to adopt here on Select File, I understand that, that's fine. I would