

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

April 15, 2003 LB 435

purpose of the minimum wage that has not been accomplished by a minimum wage being in place? I'm just curious.

SENATOR BURLING: Well, I was just speculating because I, you know, don't remember when it was first started and now that we started it we have it. I'm just assuming it was...the purpose of it was to...so that people would earn more for their work and have more money to buy things with that they need to buy.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you there are people who, because of the minimum wage, did earn more than they would have earned had there not been a minimum wage?

SENATOR BURLING: I would imagine that there were and are. My point was it doesn't increase the purchasing power.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So in those cases, it accomplished its purpose. Wouldn't that be true?

SENATOR BURLING: If it doesn't increase a person's purchasing power, it doesn't accomplish its purpose.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If it gave them more money that they could spend, that's all the minimum wage could do. Isn't that true? If inflation comes along, like with us, and we don't get more than the same dollar amount, even though the purchasing value of the dollar has diminished, that has nothing to do with what you and I are talking about because that's not controlled by us, is it? There are market factors that come into play there. Isn't that true?

SENATOR BURLING: There are market factors that come into play and one of those factors is salaries.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Burling, do you think that if we left it up to the market, meaning these employers, that we would not need workers' compensation because the employers automatically would provide the coverage that workers' compensation provides?

SENATOR BURLING: It would be nice if they would, but they probably wouldn't.