

Senator Dworak was up there. He visited the prison. He visited with those corrections officers. He has visited with Mr. Bolin. I have many times. It is patterned as nearly after the Minnesota program as we can do it. It does not have any impact upon the work release program. It does not have any impact upon the other programs that you have expressed some concern about. The bill is patterned after the Minnesota plan. Minnesota is working. Isn't it far better to allow these people to work inside the prison at a meaningful wage than for the present dollar to \$2.70 which they receive? I think we have a good program. I think we ought to give it a chance to work, and I hope that we stop trying to abuse the bill. I am against the Chambers amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dworak. Okay, all right. Thank you. That will conclude then the.....we are ready then, Senator Chambers, for you to close on your motion to return.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, to try to clarify the record, if nothing else, you are talking in 319 about a contract between the state and private business, not an individual going out on work release. Senator Schmit has stated that on work release an inmate must be paid a competitive wage which I presume means the going wage in that particular line of work. So you are setting up an additional classification within the labor force of the penitentiary. Some must be given a prevailing wage, if you want to use Senator Goodrich's term, and he doesn't object to that for the purposes of work release, but if you are trying to create a large pool of convict cut-rate labor, then whatever whoever hires the person is willing to pay, and I think that is not right. The ox...muzzle not the ox that treadeth out the corn, Senator Schmit. The workman is worth of his hire, regardless of whether he is incarcerated or otherwise. Now, when Senator Goodrich talked about plumbers' wages, I have to tell a joke. I don't tell many of them, but when I tell them they are pretty good. There was a doctor who called a plumber to do some work for him and the plumber worked about fifteen minutes and charged the doctor \$97.00. The doctor told the plumber why...and he calculated how much that would be per hour. The doctor said, do you realize that I am a doctor and I don't make that much an hour? And the plumber said, when I was a doctor I didn't make that much an hour either. So the point is this, you can mention any highly unusual situation and try to establish a principle or rule on that basis, but rule based on a principle like that is a bad rule because it doesn't cover the generality that you are trying