

all the deals that they're making here, that we're going to have major consolidation and savings on money. This is...we are supposed to be protecting the people in the state of Nebraska. We're supposed to be representing the people, not the union. This woman is a taxpayer. The state withheld seven hundred and some dollars out of her paycheck after she told them not to. That is beyond my comprehension that you would be thinking that this should be allowed, that we should allow the state, because she works for the state, to withhold money out of her paycheck after she told them not to, and give it to a union. I don't understand what's going on on the floor here, but I am...I am going to be real curious on this next vote on the Dierks amendment as to who opposes and for any good reason. I haven't heard any good reason on this floor to not give this woman back her \$750. If, if...because Senator Schimek stands up and says because this is a negotiated part of the union deal, well, who's out there making these kind of deals with the union? And for what reason? I mean I can see in the health care areas where it's very disruptive to have people joining it and dropping out. But in the union, I mean, is it because it's disruptive to the...to the union money? I mean, to say that somebody can only join the union or leave the union once a year, it's...it's beyond me because that, to me, is not...not what the freedom of this country is all about. And you are legislators, you are lawmakers, and if you are upholding this agreement to take money from workers in this state when they want to leave a union and to keep it for up to a year's time, and continue taking that out of their paycheck against their wishes, I don't understand where your thinking is coming from and how you can think that that would be the right thing to do. It is beyond my comprehension...

SENATOR WESELY: One minute.

SENATOR WITEK: ...that there are legislators, lawmakers upholding, upholding an obviously, in my opinion, wrong deal, to force people to stay in a union when they don't want to. And not only to force them to stay in the union, but to take their money every, every month or whenever they take it. They take \$750. That might not sound like a lot of money to you, but that sounds like a lot of money to me. Seven hundred and fifty dollars away from this woman when she didn't want it taken out of her paycheck, only because DAS can do it. Something's not right here. And I'm glad this came to the floor of the