

March 26, 1996

LB 829, 1368

SENATOR HUDKINS: Senator Will, I'd like to give my time to Senator Chambers.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Hudkins, and, Senator Will, I'd like to ask Senator Brashear some more questions.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Brashear, would you respond?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, here's why I'm asking you the questions. I want to be sure that you understand that I'm talking about 1368 now and we know that there'll be some spillover from 829 because the two things tie in, but these questions that I want to ask you relate to 1368. Does 1368 deal only with unionized workers?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if these workers don't have a union and we don't ensure that they have a right to participate in determining how this money is spent as we've done under that procedure in 829, those nonunion workers are just out in the cold as far as 1368. Isn't that right?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: They have the...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ..why do you think we put that language in....? Okay Thank you. Members of the Legislature, during our earlier discussion I think Senator Brashear acknowledged that we put the language in 829 because these are workers who are just out there and the reason he doesn't want to put it in 1368 is because he's talking about unionized workers and the company cannot make a bargain with only these workers, an individual worker. Earlier on when we were talking about the merger or the nonmerger, he was saying this would apply to any company that qualifies, not just Union Pacific. That's what he said. So then he can't just say it's only dealing with a unionized company. It's dealing with companies that are unionized or not unionized as far as the workers. So the