

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members. Senator Bromm, would you respond to a question on the amendment?

SENATOR BROMM: Yes, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Bromm, could you...and I apologize, I wasn't sure if you struck the entire Section 2 of the bill, or was it subsection 2 of Section 2, or what are we...

SENATOR BROMM: No, the amendment proposes to strike Section 2, starting on line 21 of page 2, going to...through line 1 of page 3.

SENATOR HALL: So we would strike the requirement for the interpreter as well as the referral.

SENATOR BROMM: Correct.

SENATOR HALL: Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. President, members, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I see it as basically an effort to gut the bill. The issue of whether or not an interpreter is needed for these folks is probably one that goes without saying. As a matter of fact, I would guess that it's very likely that an employer would have an interpreter, or at least someone in a management or a supervisory capacity who is already bilingual. If they did not, I don't think that they would get the full benefit of those employees if they had a difficult time with regard to communication and what work they wanted done. It would seem that this is probably the portion of the bill that they could most easily comply with, and I would hasten to guess that they probably already do, that that capacity is already there for those individuals. It's a very minor change. All it really does is put in statute or codify what they currently have in place, and that's they've got somebody that can communicate with these workers. I mean that's a given, that's just good business practice, that makes sense. The other portion of it is the portion that I think is of Section 2 that really needs to be in place. And...because if you don't, as Senator Day made it very clear, put some of the responsibility on the employer, then it falls back to the balance of the community and the resources that are drained are the resources of the entire community. And it should not be that significant of a cost that's involved here, because you're talking about a person employed by the employer whose primary responsibility includes serving as a