

considered. But at the present time those people in support of LB 213 haven't had enough time to look at them and really feel most comfortable with the bill in its present form with the present language and so they have requested that we not amend the bill and that we go on its present form. Now does this mean that they are unwilling to compromise? No, it isn't. What it means is that there is a line that is drawn and to cross that line doesn't accomplish the goals that they have in mind which is to clarify in their estimation of who and who should not be included in a bargaining unit. Let me make one thing clear. In the end, everybody can agree to this that a supervisor ought not be in a bargaining unit if that supervisor has substantial or significant authority and duties, responsibility. The question is, what is that sort of substantial or significant authority? Where do you draw the line? Just because you have a group of ducks and you say one of them is a goose, does that mean that that duck has to be brought out of the group even though they really are part of that group of ducks? That is what is happening here. They have a group of employees. They call them a supervisor, pull them out of the bargaining unit and, in fact, do they really have those supervisory authorities that you would normally attach to the position? We are saying, no, that isn't the case and so the definition that we are seeking to LB 213 is to make it clear that if you are not going to be in a bargaining unit because you are a supervisor, at the very least you ought to have significant authority as a supervisor to warrant not being part of that bargaining unit. If you don't have that authority, if you are just pretty much another employee with slightly more responsibility but not significantly more, then why should you not be part of the bargaining unit. That is what it comes down to. Like the LES situation, you have three people that go out, they are all working together. One guy kind of says, well, why don't you get up there and do that and I will handle it down here and kind of you have to have a leader. But he doesn't have the disciplinary action that I know of. He can't hire and fire. He is not really the kind of supervisor you would normally associate with that position. Now in the other case nursing homes have opposed the bill because they don't want their charge nurses to be included in the bargaining unit. And in my estimation they wouldn't be under this bill because those charge nurses have a lot of authority, disciplinary authority. They have got authority, all kinds of responsibility over those people. Instead of just telling