

mine is dealing with two individual claims for \$750 each. These are claims against two corrections officials. In a court case before Judge Urbom, a judgment was rendered against these two individuals in their individual capacities, making them responsible personally for the wrong that they had done. It involved sexual harassment or discrimination. They had made improper statements to a female employee, had engaged in improper conduct, some types of touching, I don't mean of a sexually arousing nature but the fact that hands were laid on, and she was denied a promotion that she should have been entitled to. This claim came before us last year. At that time, Senator McFarland had handed out a copy of Judge Urbom's opinion. I don't have a copy of it with me today, but it stated in detail the reasons the judge for finding against these two individuals personally. We denied the claims. They were prevailed upon by somebody in the Attorney General's Office to bring it to us again. My personal belief as to why it was brought again, after I listened to the testimony, is that the individual who represented them in the first place had said that the case should be submitted to the judge on the basis of the record that had been established before the EEOC and some other agency. I had asked why the case was submitted on the record to the judge instead of taking it to trial. She stated that the Corrections Department, the representatives of these two individuals, had put together the best case that they could. Nothing new would be developed by virtue of a trial. So with the record that had been compiled in earlier hearings on these matters, it was submitted to Judge Urbom. Judge Urbom reviewed the record, ruled against these individuals and assessed damages against them in their personal capacity. We had rejected the claim once, and I think we ought to reject it again. When I was asking why it was brought back again, the person from the Attorney General's Office had said that she thought that those personal damages would be reimbursed by the Legislature. Had she known that they would not be, she would have recommended that they go to trial. So I asked again, if you said that you compiled the best record that you could, why would you have gone to trial? What would have been gained by going to trial? What evidence did you not present earlier that you would have presented then? Well, none. Did you mean it when you say you made the best record at those earlier hearings? Yes. So then going to trial would not have achieved anything as far as producing a record? The acknowledgement had to be made that it wouldn't. But assume that they went to trial, presented the same evidence, Judge Urbom was looking at the same record, but