

it...am I correct that under your amendment you would, in effect, extend it another 30 days, or a total of 60 days after the act, but in order to qualify for that the complaint would have...I assume would have to be able to demonstrate that they did not have knowledge that the alleged act was discriminatory? Is that...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: They would have to be unaware that the act had occurred and that it was discriminatory first, and the reason I say that, you could know that you were turned away but you may not know that it was a discriminatory act because at that time you didn't know that accommodations were available.

SENATOR WARNER: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you'd have to know that the act occurred and that it was discriminatory.

SENATOR WARNER: I don't think I particularly have a problem. Ten days I thought, I think the committee thought, was obviously way too short, even though that was existing law. I don't think I have a problem with this. I assume it puts somewhat of a burden on the complainant to be able to demonstrate that, in fact, they did not have knowledge that such an alleged act was discrimination and I assume somebody would...could allege, that the respondent could allege that the complainant could have known or should have known or did know. I don't...I'm not sure how the complainant would be able to demonstrate that they met this requirement, but I don't particularly have a problem, I don't think, with what it is. I do think that should, as you indicated and Senator Schimek's comments, I do think it's correct that you don't want it too open-ended for the simple reason that people change jobs and it's hard to find...to make a factual finding. In fact, that's one of the problems that occurs with backlog is that people forget or have left and it's hard to find people to substantiate the charge. So I think I'll support the amendment at this time as it seems reasonable, but I think it's fairly restrictive actually.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Any further discussion of the Chambers amendment? Seeing none, Senator Chambers to close.