

February 15, 1995 LB 20

recruit will be defined by the Department of Labor, but we did want to make it clear that the company is going to have to place some affirmative act before it can be considered to have done any recruiting. That's to get away from the notion that the company could passively receive benefits of people coming to work here. If that occurs, the company has not recruited. So we want the Department of Labor to know that as they define this term there has to be active participation by the company which can be established clearly. There is another item which was handled by an amendment offered by Senator Bromm, and I'm trying to locate exactly where it is in the amendment so that when you get it you will be able to find it. It will be on page 3 of the amendment. In the existing bill there was language relative to the necessity of the employer explaining or detailing all of the hazards or problems that could be associated with the work, and I forget exactly what the language was, but it was very broad. It could require a very extensive list and Senator Bromm quite correctly pointed out that if these things are going to be required to be listed, a person could wind up with some kind of a problem that implicated one of these factors but it would have not necessarily been caused on the job. I said all of that to say this. Senator Bromm came up with language which is much narrower and focuses on what my concern is. That would be found, if you have a copy of the amendment, on page 3, lines 10 and 11. He is using the language, "The occupational physical demands and hazards of the position of employment which are known to the employer." That means that whatever the job entails in terms of work that is to be done would have to be laid out to the employee. If there are hazards that are associated directly with this particular duty, that is what would need to be stated and disclosed, but not every possible ailment, illness or whatever that could result from working in this capacity. The Chamber of Commerce who have muddied the water, have even got a fingerprint on this bill. There are a couple of places in the bill where it refers to the native language of the worker. They felt for their reasons that instead of saying the native language, it should be the identified language of the worker. To me, this is an amendment of the kind that Senator Schmidt used to talk about, it doesn't help anybody, it doesn't hurt anybody, it doesn't cost anything, it doesn't do anything, so I'm completely for it. It makes it clear even with this term that we're talking about the language that the non-English speaking person speaks.

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.