

March 27, 1973

(Start of Belt #20)

the alleged unemployment, unlawful employment practice shall be served upon the person who ??? whom the charge is made within ten days after being filed with the Commission. As it works now, when the federal and state government have the same jurisdiction, if someone files a case with the Federal Equal Opportunity Commission, they defer it to action with the State Equal Opportunity Commission. If this bill is not enacted, people who are discriminated against will go to the Federal Equal Opportunity Commission and the cases will be handled there. The only problem that I see is (1) that there is no real state control. Our Equal Opportunity Commission doesn't get to deal with it, and (2) there is a good deal of back log of cases in the Federal Equal Opportunity Commission, so it will take a long time for the case to be resolved which I don't think is either to the benefit of the employee or the employer. That is the intent of the bill. I will be glad to try and answer any questions people have.

PRESIDENT: Senator Carpenter, we will take up your amendment.

SENATOR CARPENTER: Mr. President, this bill, of course, affects fair employment practices which is a coming and acceptable thing, I presume, in our area of responsibility. The original law was 25 and the Senators reduced it to 15. I think there ought to be some limitation in so far as number is concerned and I think 50, anyone who employs less than 50 should not be subjected to this Fair Employment Act. There may be some better compromise between the 15 and the 50. Now, on line 13, it's a little bit...it says, whenever it is charged in writing under oath by, and the new matter is, or on behalf of a person. Now it seems to me that we shouldn't get this in the second degree, for example, the responsibility to filing complaint. Certainly, the employee who is affected by unfair practices situation ought to be able to file his own complaint rather than going through a second person. Then, for example, the fine, it seemed to me to be a little bit unreasonable for example. If you are convicted of this, you are subject to \$1000 fine or be imprisoned for one year. Now, that is a pretty stout penalty, for example, for violating of a Fair Practices Act. I presume that it would be very unusual cases where this might be applied. My amendment cuts the fine down to \$100 and I presume that is for every conviction, and not more than 30 days in jail. Now, it seems to me that that is an ample penalty for those people who might be in the position of breaking the Fair Practices Act. Now, the Federal one, on line 12, for example, you want to increase from 90 to 120, a 180 days, or six months, in which these people can file a complaint. Now after all, they know when they are affected almost immediately by the situation they think they are in, and I don't think that... I think that 180 days is completely unreasonable. I may be that ten days is too short, although that is what we did on the other bill of a similar kind the other day, and then you get down, for example, it says, a notice of a charge including the place, the date and the circumstances of the alleged unlawful employment practice shall be served upon the person against whom such charge is made within ten days thereafter. If they can make the charge within the ten days, it seems that they can bring the complaint within the ten days. I just think the bill is too rigid. I think it's unreasonable in the area of we people who employ people. It may not be for others who are working and who are looking for some type of a complaint, and, believe me, today when you employ people, the first thing they say when you let them go, if you do, you're unfair. You're prejudiced towards this or that, depends on who it is. That's their first reaction. You can't do it, not because they were'n't doing their job because you are offending those people because of class or nine other things and they always use that as an excuse rather