

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

February 24, 2003 LB 226

Tyson, to open on your motion.

SENATOR TYSON: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Members of the body, ladies and gentlemen, and that's meant to be a redundant salutation, I passed out a copy entitled why Section 1 of LB 226 would be "invalid"...invalid against...under federal law. I did this in the belief that you had already gotten a copy of this in your office earlier. Its origin is from the National Right To Work people. And accompanying it was a letter, a memorandum, which I believe you also had a copy, but I didn't bother to replicate that or to copy that and pass it out. I don't want to spend a lot of time on this. I believe you have the material in front of you and I hope that you read it and that you understand it. Article XV, Section 13, which dates back to 1946 and was put in the Nebraska Constitution as a result of the Taft-Hartley Act, forbids a union shop in the state of Nebraska in that no one can be compelled to join a union. Every year since I got here in 1997 there has been an attempt something like LB 226. As a matter of fact, it was that bill closest to the heart of Senator Lynch. And each time it died, as I believe this should die. I say that because in the last speaker's subject matter, Senator Redfield stated that she was really unsure of the language in this bill, but we could take it on to Select and we could get confused again. This language is unsuited to the statutes of Nebraska, period. Why would we pass something that is in direct defiance of the Nebraska Constitution? Are we doing this as...is this fun and games time? This is a bad bill and it deals directly with something that is against the welfare of employees in the state, all employees. The way the bill was originally drawn would call for a pro rata share of the actual costs of representation, and I believe that pro rata is still you take the number of people represented and add the employee or employees being represented and you divide by that number into the actual costs. That's pro rata. I'm not too sure how that would work in practice. I did have an amendment up, which I asked to be pulled, that would define that, but I decided that the best thing to do is to attack this like you would attack crabgrass or thistle--you have to get to the roots. This gets to the roots. This kills it. I'm sure it will be back in other sessions because, if you'll look at the committee report, you can see who was the proponents of this. The union was. And I