

SUBJECT: Requiring certain cities to make payroll deductions for union dues

COMMITTEE: Urban Affairs — favorable, without amendment

VOTE: 7 ayes — Hill, Bailey, Burnam, Clark, Ehrhardt, Shields, Wohlgemuth
0 nays
1 present, not voting — Garcia
1 absent — Hodge

SENATE VOTE: On final passage, Local and Uncontested Calendar, April 3 — 31-0

WITNESSES: For — Ken Bailey, Texas Association of Fire Fighters
Against — None

BACKGROUND : Cities with populations of more than 10,000 may deduct union dues when requested in writing by full-time, active employees who are members of a bona fide employees' union. Cities making such payroll deductions may assess an administrative fee to cover the cost of collecting, accounting for, and disbursing the dues.

DIGEST: SB 823 would require cities with a population of more than 50,000 to make payroll deductions for union dues if they were already allowing deductions for purposes other than charitable donations, retirement plan contributions, deferred compensation, insurance premiums or tax payments, or garnishments.
SB 823 would take effect September 1, 1997.

SUPPORTERS SAY: SB 823 would provide an additional convenience for employees participating in labor organizations and at no cost to the municipality. The bill would only affect employees in larger cities; smaller municipalities that might not have the computer technology to provide automatic payroll deductions would not be required to do so. Furthermore, it would exempt municipalities that do not already allow automatic deductions for other

reasons. These cities would not have to start up a program just for union dues. All cities would be allowed to assess administrative fees to cover the costs of making the payroll deductions.

**OPPONENTS
SAY:**

Current law should remain permissive. A city should have the flexibility to decide whether or not to allow automatic payroll deductions for certain items.

NOTES:

During the 74th session, an identical bill, HB 2325 by Naishtat, was reported favorably by the House Urban Affairs Committee and placed on the General State Calendar, but the House took no action on the bill.