

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 7, 2001

LB 397

bill, I hope you will pass my amendment. It simply makes it mutually agreeable between the two parties that if they're going to bypass the Special Master and go to the CIR, it cannot be done unilaterally. It must be both parties must agree. Otherwise, I think we're going to introduce an area of unfairness in this situation in that one can unilaterally, one party can unilaterally decide, in this case, only the law enforcement bargaining unit, specifically the law enforcement bargaining unit can decide not to go, not to bypass the Special Master and go direct to CIR and the other bargaining party has nothing to say about it. If it's good for one, it ought to be good for both. They ought to both be agreeable to going to it. But I think it puts an unfair advantage to a bargaining unit in this case to be able to unilaterally decide that we're not going to talk. What is it going to do to good faith negotiation if they simply don't want to go to Special Master? What's wrong with the Special Master process? It's worked well up until this point except for one time...I shouldn't say isolated, but at least one highly volatile political situation that has since been resolved. So I don't think we need LB 397 in the first place. But if you're going to adopt this amendment so that at least it's fair to both sides and we continue the fairness issue to both sides that we have in the process at this point. Why would you not want to allow...make both parties agree? Why would you want to allow one party to unilaterally decide that we're not going to go to the Special Master process and go right to CIR? I don't understand why you would want to bypass it. Why should one have veto power? Why should one party have veto power totally over the other? Why not have them both agree, then let them do it? I still believe that this violates the process that we've set up quite successfully so I'm still going to be opposed to LB 397. But if this amendment is adopted, in the sake of compromise I might accept LB 397. But I think this amendment is very important if we are to continue the integrity of the system. Why allow one party to unilaterally decide whether they're going to go to Special Master or not? I urge support of this amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. You've heard the closing on AM0715 to LB 397. The question is shall that