

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

February 24, 2003 LB 226

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Don Pederson.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this discussion reminds me of reading a mystery novel and it's just too simple, so it couldn't have been the one that you think did it. And I'm having that kind of a problem with this particular bill. I...if you look at this on its face, it seems to say that if you choose to do something, that that's a right that you have. But there seems to be so much apprehension in this body as to the effect of what is being proposed. I think that there is an inherent desire of people on this legislative floor to be fair to all parties, and I think that appears to be what is at issue. The issue seems to be that if you choose to have someone represent you, that you would pay your share of that representation, and that...that's the way it looks on its face. Now I'd like to ask Senator Tyson, who I know comes from an employment-type industry and has, I'm sure, experience in this regard, realizing that I've received, as you have, countless items of information from the union saying go for this, and cards from lots and lots of people saying that this is a bad thing, Senator Tyson, I would like, if you would please, to have you explain what it is that is inherently wrong with the proposal that is being submitted by Senator Redfield and..

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you respond, Senator Tyson?

SENATOR TYSON: Certainly. Senator Pederson, actually, sir, you have an advantage of me because you have the legal training. You are a practicing attorney. You have many years experience. I have to take some things on faith. I will tell you that during my working life I have had volumes of material sent to me by the National Right To Work Council, Reed Larson. I look at what I was sent, and I believe you have a copy of the same material, and what that says is, this law is, on its face, unconstitutional. And there are court cases, and they cite one, San Diego Building Trades Council v. Garman, a 1959 case, that this bill is in direct conflict to. I have to believe that. I don't have a case for or against any particular party, but I think we all have a dog in this fight, as the cliché goes. I