

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Bromm. We are now debating the Bromm amendment to the Matzke amendment. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to support the Bromm amendment. I think it is an attempt to step in the right direction. Senator Dierks made a point that I am sure is on a number of our minds, and that is, won't costs like this get passed onto the consumer, and isn't this really trying to assess a responsibility that the companies won't feel because they will just pass it on to us? As a consumer of meat products, I am not asking for the lowest possible price of my meat products to be exacted on the backs of these kinds of workers under these conditions. When I go to the service...when I go to the supermarket and I buy meat, I am not asking for the lowest possible price at this kind of a cost. This is not a kind of cost of doing business and to getting the lowest possible price that justifies these behaviors, it is not justifiable. And the capitalist marketplace is not the justification for these kinds of actions. If we agree, as I think I hear most of us saying that there is a body of practices out there we agree is wrong, and we can go too far in trying to attack it, we can bring too much into the tent in trying to attack it, but we agree there is a body of practices that are wrong, and I hope this body agrees with that. I hope Senator Dierks is saying, yes, there is a body of behavior that we know is occurring that is wrong. And that we are now trying to fashion the remedy. If we are committed genuinely to that, then we need to think about what are appropriate remedies to stop the behaviors that we think generally are wrong. Senator Bromm makes a good point. Imagine yourself a person in a foreign land, in a language you do not speak, here for 30 or 60 days, in wildly different circumstances than what you were led to believe, how well would you be able to use the mechanism of going to a lawyer, a gringo-English-speaking lawyer making your case, giving evidence, knowing the system and going forward with a damage-based lawsuit in civil remedy. It is a remedy but it is not a remedy that people will genuinely be able to use. Now Senator Matzke offers us another remedy. I think by his language he confirms that he would support that remedy. Senator Chambers says he doesn't think it is in the bill, I think we ought to get it in there ASAP, and that is the injunction. Why? Because if you have a labor force of more than 100 people, which is what this bill applies to, it is quite possible that they are unionized, and while the individual worker will not know to defend themselves, it is possible that the union would be able