

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

May 10, 2005

LB 614A

first place. I believe if we do this for this small group within the collective bargaining unit that we open the door to other collective bargaining units coming to us individually, and I don't think that we want to encourage that. But secondly, I'm not even sure if it's legal for us to do this. The unions and the state did collective bargaining on wages and other terms of employment, and we, in essence, I believe, may be helping to break that contract, and I'm not sure that we can do that. And I hope to have more information on that aspect of it tomorrow. But I just wanted to say, let's be careful what we're doing here. Is this really what we want to do? I know it was late the other night when we discussed the bill. I didn't hear anybody else express those same reservations, but I've dealt with this issue for a number of years now and I know that it is possible for the state and the union to go back into negotiations and solve this problem if there's a request from one side or the other. I don't believe that request has been made (recorder malfunction)...and unilaterally try (recorder malfunction)...

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: (Recorder malfunction)...which is the implementing portion of this that provides for the funding for the...for the bill of Senator Pahls', and this is funding that is coming from cash funds. The workers pay into the (recorder malfunction)...to have this done. This is not coming from General Funds of the state. It's coming from the cash funds of the people that work with the electrical union. So with that, I would ask you to pass LB 614A.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Pederson. Senator Chambers, on LB 614A.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, when the bill itself was being discussed, I was involved in something else and did not follow carefully what was going on. And to be quite frank, I didn't have time to get into the discussion. But Senator Schimek is raising an appropriate caution. Suppose the state decided to go the other way (recorder malfunction)...state is acting illegally, so that is not likely to happen. But when you talk about a policy determination, as is being done here, there's no need in saying