

CLERK: 29 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on motion to adopt.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: The amendments are adopted and the Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'll try to be as brief as I can. The bill did not generate any controversy in the Committee. The Judiciary Committee is somewhat of a strange collection of different personalities and individuals. To the shock of everybody on the Committee this bill was, especially myself, this bill was voted out of Committee 8 to 0, without a dissenting vote. Right. Somebody asked what is wrong with the bill. This is one of those bills which has no hidden land mines. It does exactly what it says. It would allow a person with a grievance to go into court. All that does is not require a person to get behind a two year backlog before having a grievance solved. If you go into court all of the issues can be presented at that time and the entire issue resolved once and for all. Under the EEOC procedure now if you wait for two years and they finally begin to work on your complaint, and they can find everybody, they go through a period of what they call conciliation, or reconciliation and you try to talk it out. That is if they find cause in the favor of the complainant. If it is talked out and an agreement is reached, fine. But if either party disagrees with the recommendation then they wind up going to court anyway. So this would cut through all of that and those people who want to go to the Commission can still do so. Those who would want to go to court have that alternative. That is what the bill does. If you have any questions then I'll answer them. I say again, it generated no opposition.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Any discussion on LB 66? Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: I wonder if Senator Chambers will yield to a question.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Senator Chambers, will you yield?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Chambers, this is really informational. You suggested, I thought, in your comments that there may be cases that would be filed now before the Equal Opportunity Commission and not handled as rapidly as perhaps they could, which is true. This might assist in relieving their workload. Is that, essentially, true?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, but the main thing I'm concerned about is the aggrieved individual who does not have to plow through that workload. But anybody who would go to court would reduce the workload of the Commission.

SENATOR WARNER: Would you visualize any possibility that this might reduce their workload in terms of a need for appropriation? I think they have something like a thousand or so cases backlogged two to three years. They were projecting 1400 by the end of next year unless considerably more funds were appropriated. I do not argue the need in terms of the back-log. What I'm trying to arrive at, is there any possibility that this kind of legislation would reduce the requirement for the Appropriations Committee to consider that requested increase?