

these things out, but I don't think Senator Brashear would want to do that and I don't think Senator Withem would either. So I will take up my amendment. It is on page 1579 of the Journal and Senator Brashear and I had talked about this, but we reached, I believe after our last conversation we had reached what would be termed an impasse. He understands what it is that I'm talking about, but he doesn't agree that it should be done, and here's what I mean by that. If you look at the green copy of the bill, LB 1368, the amendment that I would be proposing would be found on page 3 of the green copy and it would be in line 9, but I'm going to read the paragraph that my amendment will affect and that starts in line 5 on page 3 of the green copy of LB 1368. This is subsection (3): "The wage benefit credit shall be paid or applied by the company for company training programs, employee benefit programs, educational institution training programs, or company workplace safety programs, or any combination thereof, as determined by the company." And I would add these words: "and the employee or employees pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement." To explain the amendment, in LB 829, the bill that currently represents the law on this subject, there is a requirement in this area that I'm speaking of that the determination of how this money that is withheld will be spent will be made by the company and the employee. There is that assertion in the law. What Senator Brashear is telling us about this bill, since it's for Union Pacific and other companies similarly situated, is that the employees are unionized. A single employee cannot be dealt with by the company because they would have a bargaining agreement, so rather than put something in the law that might intrude into that area of collective bargaining, he does not want the assertion in this bill that exists in 829 which says the determination shall be made by the company and the employee. He also told me, however, that what is offered in this bill could be offered to a company that is not unionized. So what my amendment would do is to cover both situations, that of the employee who happens not to be in a company where a union exists and a situation such as Union Pacific where there is a union. So by adding the term "and the employee" that would cover the same situation that exists in LB 829 where the determination, if a person chooses to use 1368, the employee would have the same protection that exists under LB 829. But I add this additional language for the situation where a union is involved and that language would be "or employees pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement." And what the language would then say is