

April 11, 1973

in these terms in a Legislature like this, you should begin to understand why students have contempt for the so-called system. Here sit men who won't have to have a hungry day, who can mooch and sponge and leech a meal off of lobbyists every day, very few men will leave this Legislature weighing the same amount that they came down here weighing. You have everything at your disposal, the horn of plenty, the bounties of nature are yours and you can say that somebody who has to work for a living, work harder than we do in this Legislature, is not entitled to \$1.60 an hour for his labor and then you want to pontificate about the sacredness of the so-called free enterprise system. Yet the man who made that statement didn't criticize the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is public production and ownership of electricity in competition with privately produced power. You didn't say anything about that. You weren't upset because the government wants to underwrite the Arrow Space Industry, even Frontier Airlines in this area is getting money from the federal government and you don't talk about that being a perversion of the free enterprises system. Supply and demand? Who's supply? And based on who's demand? The oil depletion allowance, you all know about that and yet you don't bring it up. You want to ignore the multi-billions of dollars which are given to the industrialists and the large scale capitalists. Then you're going to be penny foolish when it comes to an individual making a \$1.60 an hour. This is what's known as straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. I think this amendment ought to be defeated. A lot of things were exposed to me during the discussions of this amendment that I speculated about in the past but which I know for a certainty now and when we want to talk about a body being representative of the people, concerned about the interests of the people, going to talk about people like Senator Snyder's bill, you ought to take women out of the home and put them to work--after doing away with the ERA because you want to keep women in the home, you do away with the ERA. Then when we come to welfare you say, put them out of the home and make them go to work. Then we come to a minimum wage bill and you don't want to pay a salary, a wage high enough to justify anybody working. That is a shall game, that is the musical chairs. These are the funnies that are played in people's lives and I think we ought to stop and remember this, the rise from \$1.00 to \$1.60 an hour is not going to be in that traumatic jump which some of you seem to think. It's going to be stretched out and if Senator Kelly really wants to pay minimum wage legislation in Nebraska to the federal law, then look at this headline which says the administration proposes a \$2.30 an hour minimum. Is that what you have in mind? It's a rhetorical question because I know it's not.

SPEAKER: Senator Stahmer. Passes. Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DE CAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I wasn't going to talk on this but the evidence has been that the minimum wage is going to make a lot of poor people and people that aren't getting adequate money now all have an adequate living and this is quite contrary to the facts, quite contrary to the history of minimum wages and quite contrary to what would happen. What the minimum wage historically has been--it has not been proposed or sponsored or supported by poor people. The minimum wage, the whole concept, came out of the textile industry in Massachusetts. A fellow named John Fitzgerald Kennedy and those who were concerned about the textile industry being damaged in the New England states because of the cheaper labor in the South decided to force the minimum wage upon the South so that the textile industry in the North would not be damaged. In other words, it was the very wealthy, the very rich, that developed the whole concept of a minimum wage. Now I have never myself understood