

do have an amendment which would reverse, somewhat, the action for the '88...excuse me, '87-88 fiscal year. The bill as currently introduced, as I indicated, would require, if legislation is enacted next session, to structure bargaining. The bill would require that we would repeal this portion of this bill at that time. What we have for committee amendment, offered as a committee amendment is to change that so that the language would read, and it's been passed out to you, so that the language would read that in the event that legislation is not enacted during the '87 session to provide some structure for bargaining units. Then the bargaining units would be free to go to the Commission of Industrial Relations upon adjournment of the Legislature and take no further action, or would require no action by the Legislature to make that possibility after the '87 session has adjourned. That removes, or at least it ought to remove some of the concern that on an ongoing basis that bargaining units would be prohibited from going to the Commission of Industrial Relations in the...after the '87 session. I do want to point out that there was a copy of an amendment passed out to you. If you looked on line 14 there were some words dropped out of the amendment as it was passed out, following the year 1987-88, should have inserted "each fiscal year thereafter", and a period. So you need to add those words. Those words have the effect of having CIR orders not to be retroactive, that they would always be prospective rather than retroactive to a previous fiscal year. Is our amendment up next? Having explained both the bill and the amendment, I'll move adoption of the amendment. There is an additional provision in the amendment that has been passed out. On page 2, currently under statute those negotiations that are conducted by bargaining units with agencies by statute, those agreements, contracts are to be approved by the Legislature. They are normally reviewed by the Committee on Business and Labor. Then by resolution, as I recall, Senator Barrett, we confirmed those agreements which have been accomplished. The language here, because there has been delay in some of those agreements, contractual workings this year would waive the requirement for the legislative approval for this year, for '86-87, of these noneconomic issues that they have been bargaining on for a number of years. It simply is for the reason that in, at least some of them will not be able to be addressed before the Legislature adjourns because the negotiations have not been completed. I do not believe that portion would be controversial. But it would be appropriate to