

think it is something that helps business. I think it is the proper way to go. To leap from that premise to this legislation, however, is fatal because this would be like saying, water is good, water is necessary, water is healthy, therefore, let's cover the State of Nebraska with 50 feet of water from every border to border. Let me try to explain the relationship between the two concepts. The courts have repeatedly said, you can agree to arbitrate. Party A and Party B agree that on this particular point or that particular point we will, if we can't reach agreement, arbitrate. They have also specifically said, you can't blanketly agree to arbitration without knowing what the issue is or where the disagreement is, or what. You can't just blanketly agree that any time there is a disagreement or somebody says, well, I don't like that, "pfft", that takes it out of the hands of the governing body and immediately is an arbitration. Now, think about it. Think about it. Arbitration is a form of compromise settlement. Put it in the context of the Legislature. What if we had a rule that said that any time there is a disagreement on the floor, any time there is a disagreement, it is immediately removed from the calendar and we go settle it with a joint meeting, or whatever. Who does that give power to? It gives unreasonable power to a minority. It removes bargaining power. It removes the normal process of management and labor. How does it do it? Well, let's assume I have 48 votes for my particular proposal but there is one person disagrees. He knows because of that rule, all he has to do is say, well, I don't agree, "pfft" it is out of here and it is out in arbitration. As opposed to a specific amendment, both sides are negotiating and finally they both say on this particular point we think it should go back to committee, we should negotiate and see what the committee says or see what the panel says. You are agreeing in advance without even knowing what the issues are that any time one disagrees, basically, it goes into this arbitration. Net effect, you are creating a whole new court system, court systems, by whatever name you want to call it, on top of the existing court systems. Now I do believe there is a reasonable compromise. I do believe most fervently that absolutely we need to develop arbitration whenever we can to settle disputes. You don't use arbitration, however, as a tool to simply destroy the ability of either side, management or labor, to work things out. And if you adopt it, I think in the present form that is effectively what you are doing. You tell, "labor", if