

provision is consistent with other statutes that deal with...well, I think labor relations, quite frankly, Senator Hall mentioned labor relations is a good analogy. We have LB 661, we have the Commission of Industrial Relations legislation and dealing with contracts between employer and employee groups and the parties cannot abrogate those provisions by contract. Obviously if we put into statute public policy, those provisions should not be abrogated by contract. As far as the second sentence, nothing in these sections shall be construed to limit or prohibit good faith dispute settlements, is a very important provision. I think the language speaks for itself. It just...it simply...and I would hope that, and I favor arbitration generally. I was a co-sponsor of the arbitration act and of LB 661 last year. I think that this provision simply emphasizes that the parties deal in good faith. It's just that it is hard to argue this point because it is so obviously a good provision, so I would ask that the amendment not be attached. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Hall. (Gavel.)

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members, again, I go back to the issue of the arbitration procedures and the act that we adopted as a body. Senator Landis authored that legislation. We had, as I stated, LB 661 before us, the Employees Bargaining Act that dealt with all the state employees and we had that included in the bill. And Senator Barrett, Senator Warner co-sponsored that bill as principals, and it came to the Business and Labor Committee and we struck that provision from the bill specifically because of the passage of that act that was intended to be the procedure by which all types of contracts were to be measured. It was supposed to be, in other words, the rules that these contracts played by and as a body it was unanimously adopted. And Senator Landis worked long and hard to see that that came to fruition, and what we are doing now by leaving Section 20 which is Section 19 in the green copy, what we are doing now is we are heading back down the path of saying that except in this case. And I think the body clearly needs to understand and know full well what they are doing because this is not something that I was aware of or it is not something that was made clear to me in the committee hearing. It is an issue that needs to be addressed, agree with it or disagree with it, you need to know what you're voting for. And what you're doing here is you're saying we're setting these folks out away from the system or the rules that we provide for everyone else who