

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 23, 2000 LB 936

of the Legislature. Philosophically, Senator Chambers and I agree. I agree that one of the problems economically in this country and this state is the disparity in wages. That's a serious problem. I don't know exactly how we can address it at the state level because the minimum wage is largely a matter of federal legislation. We have the same problem in Sidney as Omaha has. There simply is too much of a disparity in wages paid to working people, and I agree 100 percent with Senator Chambers' alarm at that fact. That's one of the reasons why I agreed to handle this bill. If this bill had dealt with jobs created to pay a minimum wage, I would not be interested in it. One of the advantages I see in this bill is that it sets a higher standard for smaller communities and smaller counties where the wage rates are lower on an average, and Senator Chambers is absolutely right, we're dealing here with averages. But when you come to a community that has a 1,000 people or 8,000 or 15,000 people, there simply are too many minimum wage jobs, and I would not have touched this bill if this bill had said that to qualify you pay the minimum wage. This bill says you have to pay, it isn't even related to minimum wages. The 125 percent of the average wages, in other words it upgrades these jobs. This is not support for average jobs. This is going to set a standard of good paying jobs for smaller communities and I hope that it addresses the same issue that Senator Chambers is concerned about because it is going to set a goal, a standard that people in smaller communities can look to and employees are going to say I won't work for minimum wage. I want a job like Joe's got at 125 percent of the average wages paid in that community. Now I want to change gears here and address Senator Beutler's amendment. His amendment would strike out of Section 13, which is the sunset provision of this bill, would strike out of that the phrase "without further authorization of the Legislature." And I think Senator Beutler is absolutely right, that raises a question of ambiguity and is really not necessary. The amendment, which was the Revenue Committee's amendment, it was not in the original bill, sets a sunset of July 1st, the year 2004. That does not need any modifying language. Obviously, it raises some...the language in there "without further authorization of the Legislature" which comes from prior statutes of this kind, raises some issue as to what type of authorization the Legislature would have to enact. And I think Senator Beutler is right, is that a reaffirmation by