

committee amendments.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The committee amendments are adopted. May I introduce a guest of Senator Elroy Hefner, please, under the north balcony. He is Mr. Art Anderson of Bloomfield, Nebraska. Would you please rise. Thank you. Senator Wesely, do you want to explain the bill to us, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker, members, LB 213 is a revival of a bill that we had last year, LB 829, to deal with a problem that came up, particularly with the LES System, in terms of defining who was and who was not a supervisor for bargaining unit purposes under the Commission on Industrial Relations. That issue was litigated between LES and the I.B.E.W. Local. The decision was to go to a definition that was not what was thought to be the case law, at least from the I.B.E.W.'s perspective over the years which was to be similar to what the National Labor Relations Board definition is in terms of a supervisor. And so the I.B.E.W. came to me and said, we want to go to the definition we thought was in the statutes all along and this is the bill that we introduced last year and again the bill we introduced this year. Now last year's bill was advanced out of committee. It was advanced all the way up to Final Reading and by, I believe, one vote twice lost on Final Reading. So we came awfully close and feel pretty bad about it and so here we are again asking for your support. Now what is the concept between LB 213 and what are we trying to accomplish? Essentially we want some uniformity and some clarity in the definition in who is and who is not a supervisor. There is some confusion right now as to who is and who is not a supervisor. You'll hear from the management side that it is all very clear and they don't see any problem. You'll see from the labor side that it definitely is not very clear and they want a change and so this is a labor-management fight clearly. And it does affect only public employers and public employees dealing with the Commission on Industrial Relations. It doesn't affect private employers whatsoever or private employees. But, the definition we would like to put in our statutes for public employees is virtually exactly the same as the statute that is now applicable to private employees. We're saying if this definition of what a supervisor is is good enough for private and has been there for years and years and years since the NLRB started, why can't it be good enough for public employees? Now that is our position. We