

Submitter: Joseph Tjaarda

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Labor and Business

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB916

I am writing in opposition to SB916 which would allow striking union workers to collect unemployment insurance benefits. I feel that this shifts the burden of striking from the unions to the tax payer. Based on what I understand of this bill, it would basically allow unions to strike at the taxpayer's expense. I'm not sure how that would impact unemployment funds or if it would be necessary for businesses would need to pay more to cover that expected cost. As far as I understand it, the entire purpose of a union is for the collective bargaining units to take care of their members and not the taxpayer. In the cases where a union is striking against a govt contract; that seems to be like we the taxpayer would be paying not only for any guarantees but also for how long the strike lasted. In effect, we'd be paying to work against ourselves and I don't see how that makes any sense. I understand that people without an income and bills are often worried where their next paycheck will come from; I've been there myself. However, I also can't understand the point of a union if they shift the burden of taking care of their members to the taxpayer. Please vote in opposition to this bill or revise it to severely limit who may collect UI during a strike