

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

February 25, 1999 LB 27

developed, everybody who works for that company, of course, receives those benefits. One of the most important aspects of a right-to-work law is that joining a union should not be and is not a condition of employment. This bill has nothing to do with that. It doesn't change that at all. You don't have to join a union in Nebraska to be able to be employed by any company. In most cases, there are union and nonunion members. There are construction companies that have union and nonunion divisions. I could go on and on and on. Nobody wants to change that at all. I just passed out to you something really, really interesting. It's the three first pages of letters written in '99, if you'll look at it, '97, and '95 from the Right-to-Work people. Just glance at them; they're all the same. This is a form letter that might have been put together 30 years ago, I don't know, to react to legislation such as this. What's interesting is that the only thing that is halfway correct is the number of the bill, when it says; RE: Legislative Bill. Notice, three different numbers, 398, 124, and then 27. But if you look down at the bottom of the page, please, where I circled LB 225 (sic), the people that send this letter out to you folks that will tend to believe what they tell you should be concerned because at the bottom of the page on all the letters is LB 255, which was introduced in '93. I wonder what's...don't you get a little concerned about that when people send out letters to tell you how you should vote and think you're so dumb that you just do what you're told and don't try to understand or read what the legislation is all about. It's a pack...well, I shouldn't say it, but it is not...it's less than the truth, and, unfortunately, if you read through these letters, it has always been less than the truth except in one occasion. There was a legitimate concern on the part of the Attorney General about how language could affect the constitutionality of this particular bill at the time, and of course in violation of the right-to-work statutes, and we agreed, and we took that section of the bill out. That no longer exists. It's interesting that a couple of editorials, even outstate in papers, that read the right-to-work letter and simply editorialized against it. To be completely frank, I'll share with you the reactions I sent to those newspapers that did that. All I would like to say is that this has no effect on the right-to-work status of the state of Nebraska. It was never our intention of doing that at all. What this simply provides for is that when and finally the