

SENATOR WILL: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ..ruining the effort that is before us.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But you're on my time. Senator Brashear, isn't it true that by doing this you want to foreclose any leverage the union may have in wanting to participate in a determination of how this money is spent? The very few words that I'm talking about will in no way encumber this bill. It has nothing to do with the amount of money that can be withheld or how it can be spent. You list those items. All it does is ensure that these employees who happen to be unionized are not going to be denied the opportunity to participate in determining how this money is spent which those who are not unionized are guaranteed the right to do under LB 829. If you're not trying to foreclose this collective bargaining then I don't see how the words that I'm offering can encumber this bill and create any problem. But I think what Senator Brashear...

SENATOR WILL: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I was.... Okay.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I'd like to yield to Senator Chambers.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Schimek. And, members of the Legislature, remember earlier when real situations are projected. Senator Brashear always says we shouldn't deal with that now, but the situations are created by 16...by 1368, the bill that he brought, so I ask the question, after Senator Wickersham opened this field for us to consider and we should because it's serious, if a company holds back that money and makes money off that money and it's greater than the amount that the state can recapture under the law, why shouldn't we say that all of that must be paid over to the state and take away any incentive from the company to find a loophole? Senator Lynch was asking about a loophole. Where here's one right here that Senator Brashear has to admit exists. It's there. But he is unwilling to say that a company which has tricked the state and