

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

February 24, 2003 LB 226

concern, well, this could be construed as a fee, but this whole Section 2 is about your being denied employment, and LB 226 should have nothing to do with being denied employment. That was not the intent of LB 226. It was not the intent of LB 29 and, no matter how you feel about the bill, I would suggest that you vote green on AM0381 because, in fact, it corrects the error that is there. I think it's erroneous...or, not erroneous, it is extraneous to the whole argument. It has nothing to do with the argument here today. Thank you, Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Redfield (Visitors introduced.) On with discussion of AM0381. Senator Hudkins, followed by Senator Smith.

SENATOR HUDKINS: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to ask Senator Redfield a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you respond, Senator Redfield?

SENATOR REDFIELD: Certainly.

SENATOR HUDKINS: Senator Redfield, if an employee, that is not a member of a union but there is a union in that particular place of employment, has a grievance and chooses to hire an outside attorney to work through that grievance, then would that employee be subject to having to pay for the in-house services?

SENATOR REDFIELD: Senator Hudkins, actually, what this would do is it gives them a choice. There is an amendment coming up that clarifies that, that the employee would have...it clearly states that they would have a right to choose outside legal representation and they would pay whichever one they chose to use. So they could not...they would not be required to pay the union attorney if they did not choose to use them.

SENATOR HUDKINS: Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Hudkins. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Redfield, a couple questions pertaining to the amendment. I'm a little