

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

March 23, 2000 LB 936

Beutler's amendment. A point has to be reached where we're going to address these problems of the kind that I'm talking about this morning. We let these bills slide through without ever addressing it and it's always put off. When Senator Tim Hall was here, he and I and others were always trying to figure a way to get something in those bills relative to wages, and also benefits for workers. I'd like to ask Senator Matzke a question, so that I won't have to comb through the bill to get an answer here.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Matzke.

SENATOR MATZKE: Yes, certainly.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Matzke, is there any requirement that these companies provide minimum benefits to employees?

SENATOR MATZKE: No, that's not a part of this...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Insurance, and so...

SENATOR MATZKE: ...bill or any of the other incentive bills.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we're more enlightened in the year 2000 than perhaps we were in the year 1988, would you agree, or we should be more enlightened?

SENATOR MATZKE: Well, I hope we are, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Here's the next question. A business to qualify under the terms of this bill, if it offered no insurance, no health care, no life insurance, no dental, none of those, no pension, retirement, however it's phrased, just a business that pays a wage, such a company could qualify for breaks under this bill, isn't that true?

SENATOR MATZKE: That...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The way it's written now.

SENATOR MATZKE: Yes, you're correct.