

Abboud has put in a lot of effort in this bill and I respect him for that, but we simply disagree about the need for the special master in these types of disputes and we've talked about this at length and he knows my feeling and I certainly understand his and I respect his as I'm sure he does mine. I contend that the addition of a special master is the addition of another layer of bureaucracy which is not needed to resolve these disputes in an efficient, fair and economical manner. There are actually very few cases between schools and their teachers going to the CIR, Court of Industrial Relations, and I also believe that the real purpose of the bill is to provide a mechanism which can be used to limit the issues which can be brought before the commission, possibly giving one party or another an unfair advantage in resolving a dispute. Be that as it may, however, I'm willing to try to work with the supporters of the bill and offer this amendment in a way to do that. I have a couple of problems with allowing only one party to bind both parties to take the case in front of a special masters. First, under the bill the conclusion reached by the special master becomes binding unless one of the parties goes on to take the case to the CIR. I have a problem with offering the special master as a way to resolve these disputes without sending the matter to the CIR and then saying that the decision of the special master is binding unless someone takes it to the CIR. To me, if we were going to offer this alternative and make a decision potentially binding, it should be an alternative that both the parties agree to taking the risk and entering into. But more importantly, the bill offers a method by which one of the parties can effectively limit the issue which will be considered in resolving a dispute. Currently, if a dispute is taken before the Court of Industrial Relations, the Commission is not limited to only the issues which are discussed during the negotiations between the parties. However, the way the bill is drafted, after one of the parties requests a special master, the special master can identify and limit the issues which will be considered for resolution. Once a conclusion is reached by the master, if one of the parties decides they disagree and wish to have the matter brought before the Court of Industrial Relations, the issues which the commission can consider are limited to those which were brought by either party to the special master and those which the master recognized were as industrial disputes. So by allowing one party to request the special master you can basically provide a way for one party to narrow and limit the scope of issues which may be considered in resolving a dispute. If we're going to provide a mechanism to resolve these disputes outside the CIR,