

responsibility was to serve as a referral agent. What my amendment would do is strike the Bromm amendment, which means Section 2 would be reinstated. So look on page 2, and I will tell you what the amendment will do. In line 25, I would add this language: In order that information is given and questions answered relative to the terms, conditions, and daily responsibilities of employment. That's the new language. Now let me read the entire provision as it would stand if this is added. Starting in line 24: An interpreter available at the work site for each shift during which non-English-speaking employees are employed, in order that information is given and questions answered relative to the terms, conditions, and daily responsibilities of employment. The language tracks that which is found in lines 19 and 20 relative to terms, conditions, and daily responsibilities of employment. I will tell you why this should be done. What would happen, if the Legislature by its action, would tell these companies they don't have to have an interpreter, you are creating strict liability on those companies. That's the effect of it. Because as Senator Janssen pointed out, there is no easy work in packing houses, there is no work which is not dangerous, even writing checks, Senator Janssen, because if somebody doesn't get what they think they ought to have coming, maybe they would take a little action that could add a little danger to that. But when we, by definition, are talking about people who do not understand the language well enough to comprehend the terms and conditions of employment, if they are placed in one of these jobs where there is hazards, danger, and even a likelihood of injury but there is nobody on the scene to explain the danger, to explain the job, to warn about the precautions to be taken, then the Legislature, by saying no interpreter needs to be there have really exposed these companies to a greater liability and there is no way the Legislature can say that you're going to excuse the companies of liability by not having anybody there who can explain the danger, and then say, well since nobody was there to explain the danger, there was no way for the person to know the danger, the company is not responsible the person was hurt and that's tough. No, the company is responsible. The company will be liable. If one of these large companies has any judgment or sense, not only would you have an interpreter, you'd probably have several. Right now in companies where English-speaking people work, they have safety officers, don't they? Let me ask Senator...is Senator Landis here? Oh, I see. Well I don't have...Senator Hall, I can ask you. Senator Hall, did we pass a bill that had some language relative to safety committees and safety officers?