

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
TRANSMITTAL OFFICE
FLOOR DEBATE

February 24, 2003 LB 226

Bourne, followed by Senators Preister, Redfield, Smith, Vrtiska, and Senator Don Pederson. Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, I rise in opposition to Senator Tyson's motion. I appreciated Senator Schimek getting up and speaking about this, and it just seems like the longer we go on the more confusion is created. And I don't know if some of it is deliberate or not. I'm not certain. But I'm very comfortable with the language that Senator Redfield has put forth here. Let's just kind of review it: If an employee who is not a member of a labor organization, as defined in 48-218, chooses to have legal representation from the labor organization in any grievance or legal action, such employee shall reimburse the labor organization for his or her pro rata share of the actual legal fees and court costs incurred by the labor organization in representing the employee in such grievance. That is so clear and straightforward, I don't understand. It doesn't require anyone to join a union. It just simply says that if the individual decides to use the union's grievance procedures, they have to pay their costs, their pro rata share of doing so. I don't see why this is an issue. What I find really interesting though is Senator Tyson hands out a handwritten, I was going to say a hand-scribbled document, a three-page document talking about why Section 1 of LB 226 would be invalid under federal law, and all of a sudden we have opponents to the bill holding this up as if it's some sort of gospel. We don't even know where that document came from, the National Right To Work organization, wherever or whoever that is. The only correspondence that I've received from this in opposition is from an organization in Virginia. Why on earth would someone in Virginia care about what we do with our laws? Look at the committee statement. There was no one that testified in opposition to this bill. Do you think that if this bill was the nemesis or the great harm that the opponents are saying that the state chamber of commerce or some other organization would have come in and testified in opposition? Certainly they would have. There was a neutral testifier from the chamber and I assume it was for clarification or perhaps, and Senator Redfield can correct this or clarify this, I assume it had something to do with the amendment that they suggested and to clarify the language. So again, if there was a great