

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

February 24, 2003 LB 226

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR REDFIELD: We've had farmers that have called. We have had widowed grandmothers who've called, that they were worried about whether their grandson was going to be able to get a job in Nebraska. And LB 226 doesn't have anything to do about taking away anybody's right to employment in this state. The constitution stands. It will always be there. So I hope that you are comfortable with this. I'm certainly comfortable with this, and I am probusiness. I couldn't be any more probusiness, because I know we need the jobs. But I'm comfortable with this because I think it's fair and it's responsible behavior, and it's consistent with what we did with LB 29. I hope you don't vote for the IPP.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Redfield. Now it's your turn, Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Senator Cudaback and members. Senator Kruse mentioned that there was no sliver of evidence of a repeal or an upset of the right-to-work laws here in Nebraska. And certainly that might be a perception. But let me just basically say the right to work is based on the premise that no one should be compelled to belong to a union as a term of their employment. And, now, it depends what you mean by...you know, is it membership dues, or is it the fees associated with the grievance process that would be levied in the case of LB 226? And again, I go back to the fact that, by federal law, employers of the private sector, when a union exists in their shop, they can only listen to the one collective bargaining unit. That, I believe, would be consistent with all the contracts around the state of Nebraska in private sector union shops. There's one collective bargaining unit acknowledged. LB 226 seeks to have that collective bargaining unit reimbursed for costs associated with the grievance process...maybe not a wage dispute, but the grievance process is the best example...have them reimbursed for nonunion, or nonmember expenses, nonmember grievances. Now, I hope that that's clear. And hopefully I won't be compelled to stand up and refute another argument. But the basis of this is that Right to Work is nervous, because it would compel someone