

take away somebody's job or what have you is substantial authority and that person won't be in the bargaining unit and that is what we are saying, the line is a clear one. If you are out there working with the other employees and you have just a little bit more direction to give to them than they have, why shouldn't you be part of that bargaining unit? Why not? Because the key is that you are basically the same type of employee and you ought to be in the same bargaining unit. But we agree with the fact that if you have substantial authority, if you have that disciplinary action that you can take...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: ...you have a different role to play and you won't be part of the bargaining unit. The language is clear. If you look at the Gradwohl letter, I will quote him directly. "On balance I believe that LB 213 will result in more consistency and less uncertainty than under the present rules. That should be less litigation by the Commission and better administration of the statutes under this standard than under the present NLRA definition." We are trying to bring consistency. We are trying to mesh the definition in with the Nebraska statutes and that is what the bill does in its present form. I am sorry there is so much misconception, so much misinformation about the bill. We are trying to bring the NLR definition into practice but we need that last sentence to make it operable or it isn't effective and that is why we ask that it continue in the bill and that you do not support the kill motion and that you do support the bill because it is a clear situation that I don't think will cause the problems that the opponents have raised and I think the bill is good and ought not to be killed.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Morehead, then Senator Barrett.

SENATOR MOREHEAD: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to support the kill motion and I support the kill motion for two reasons. First of all, I think we were hoodwinked on the first round. We were told just to advance this bill because there would be a compromise worked out. Now I propose to you that in order for there to be a compromise, there has to be a dialogue. It has to take two people discussing and willing to give and to reach that compromise. But as reported to me from this March 12th