

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 6, 2003 LB 95

remembering it right, did exactly the same thing in that area based on a similar kind of premise; that premise being we need to pay these people more and somehow we can't do it within the system and, therefore, we need to get rid of the system and work through the Legislature in a piecemeal and kind of tedious sort of way. Why is it that they cannot take the month of February and attempt to negotiate with the union with respect to be getting these salaries back to where they should be? And it wasn't fair to take those energizing bites of yogurt before you answered me.

SENATOR LANDIS: (Laughing) I'm sorry. I just couldn't tell where the question star...I could tell where it started. I couldn't tell where it ended and I was hungry.

SENATOR BEUTLER: It's done.

SENATOR LANDIS: Okay.

PRESIDENT HEINEMAN: One minute, please.

SENATOR LANDIS: The short answer to the question, Senator Beutler, it could be done. I think that's what you wanted to hear. And let me tell you why, and here I'm going to put on my intuitive hat, why that might not be the preferred method. Number one, the Banking and Insurance Departments would not go off and negotiate the deal as you posit. And the reason is, these employees are part of a much broader bargaining unit. There is no bargaining unit for bank examiners. They're broad-based bargaining units and the Banking and Insurance Departments don't do the negotiating. They're part of the team that the Personnel Department of the administration uses in dealing with large-scale bargaining units from NAPE/AFSCME. Could you reach in and fine tune some classifications of employees? The answer is, in a hypothetical, yes. In fact, not just the hypothetical, there are examples of that. There are some examples...

PRESIDENT HEINEMAN: Time has expired. Thank you, Senator Beutler. The Chair recognizes Senator Connealy.