

federal definition, they will now as a compromise accept that. And that is what I tried to get done right here and, of course, you saw it was rejected. I want to read you some quotes...I want to read you some quotes from individuals. You then make your own conclusions as to whether that was about the fairest offer of a settlement you ever heard. Starting back...now I am going to use individuals, when the bills first came in, we go to Senator Wesely, March 23, 1984, page 10,527. It is the NLRB, National Labor Relations Board definition of who is and who is not a supervisor. It is not an attempt to broaden who can be included in these bargaining units. So that is what it is claimed it is intended, to be the NLRB definition. Page 10,531, we are using language from that NLRB statute, the federal statute that applies to all private employers. Senator Landis, page 10,535, "It simply keeps in place the standard federal language which is applied throughout the nation." LB 213 hearing, March 12, 1985, Senator Wesely, page 3. "We are trying to use the definition from the NLRA, National Labor Relations Act." Gordy McDonald, page 5 and 6. "This is the same language that the NLRB over the years has taken to define what constitutes a supervisor in many other industries. This language that is in LB 213 is the same definition that the board has used to define what supervisors are in other industries." Sam Scarpello, page 9. "LB 213 contains the definition of a supervisor as set out in the National Labor Relations Act as amended. This act has been in existence for approximately 50 years", blah, blah, and so on and so forth. Larry Boye, LES employee, page 16. "This bill will define just exactly what a supervisor is, using the same language that has been in existence for some 50 years by the NLRA and has worked just fine." What proponents then have claimed repeatedly and what they have said the bill does is to incorporate the NLRA definition of supervisor. In fact, with that last sentence the bill does not do that at all. It does far more than that. It is for that reason because it would completely change things that I would move to kill the bill and reluctantly because I am one of those, as everybody in here knows, who believes if you can work out some middle ground, work out an accommodation, you should try to do it. Though the NLRB definition was opposed for years and is still quite opposed by the opponents, they would now accept it if, in fact, that is the definition that was in there, and it is not. What is the difference? Under the NLRB definition you have all the case law, all the decisions, all the things