

March 26, 1996

LB 829, 1368

as it applies to 1368?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: It has...it truly has no impact on 1368.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then why, counselor, don't you...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: But it vitiates 829.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Counselor, if we are conducting the Nuremberg Trials and Ribbentrop is sitting there and Kaltenbrunner is sitting over here, why are you worried about Ribbentrop when the evidence I'm bringing relates to Kaltenbrunner and, whether I convict or acquit him, Ribbentrop still sits over there to be dealt with? So here's what I'm getting to by using that example. Your bill is what's before us. Your bill is amenable to amendment. Senator Wickersham is offering an amendment that your bill can accommodate. It will not hurt your bill, yet you're opposed to it and you're saying you're opposed to it because it will affect something else some place else that has no bearing on your bill. Having said that, let me back up and ask you a question now. If LB 829 were not in existence but LB 1368 were enacted, would Union Pacific gain any benefits?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, but...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, if you're taking care of your client...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...but every...but every collect...every employer not collectively organized would lose this opportunity.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you're worried about the...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: I'm worried about economic development generally and specifically.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask you a question then 'cause you came right down into my territory where I was asking you about these employees having something to say. Now, if the employees are not collectively organized, they can have something to say in conjunction with the company about how this money is spent. Do you agree?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Correct.