

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
LABOR & EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

February 6, 1979

The meeting of the Labor and Employment Relations Committee was called to order by Vice-Chairman Nelson on February 6, 1979, in Room 404 of the State Capitol at 12:30 p.m. Chairman Lowe was required to testify at another committee meeting.

ROLL CALL: All members were present with the exception of Senator Palmer who was absent. Senator Lowe arrived late after testifying at another committee meeting.

Vice-Chairman Nelson asked that Senate Bill #266 be heard first in Committee. Senator Van Valkenburg addressed the Committee in the absence of Senator Palmer who is the sponsor of this bill. Senator Van Valkenburg explained that Senate Bill #266 was written to exclude musical booking services from the Employment Agency Act. Senator Van Valkenburg then introduced Mr. Doug Brown representing the Good Music Agency in Missoula who stated that musical agencies were totally different than private employment agencies in that they were regulated by the American Federation of Musicians who set their fees and provided licenses. Mr. Brown explained that their agencies were paid by musical groups themselves and not by the employers.

Mr. Dick Kane, Administrator of the Labor Standards Division, Department of Labor and Industry, spoke as a proponent of Senate Bill #266. Mr. Kane testified that as the Administrator of the Employment Agency Act that it was felt that the musical booking services was not compatible with that Act and urged the Committee to pass this bill.

Since there were no opponents to this bill, Senator Nelson closed the hearing.

Vice-Chairman Nelson then opened the hearing on House Bill #42. Mr. Jim Lear, Staff Attorney for the Legislative Counsel presented this bill to the Committee at the request of the Code Commissioner. Mr. Lear's comments on the changes in this bill are attached as Exhibit "A".

There being no opponents to this bill, the hearing was closed. The Vice-Chairman then asked Mr. Lear to get together with members of the Committee to have someone carry this bill in the Senate.

Chairman Lowe then presided and opened the hearing on Senate Bill #8. Senator Dover as sponsor of this bill then addressed the Committee stating that this was a compromise bill to Senate Bill #111 requiring the standard prevailing rate of wages to be consistent with the Federal law and exempting State contracts which were under \$50,000. Senator Dover stated that this bill would set the prevailing wage rate according to the Davis-Bacon Act. Senator Dover then introduced Mr. Charles Chamberlain, Executive Director of the Montana Association of Builders & Contractors.

Mr. Chamberlain testified as a proponent of Senate Bill #8 and his comments are attached as Exhibit "B". Mr. Chamberlain then introduced Mr. Masters of Masters Construction in Billings. Mr. Masters then testified that he felt that the Workmen's Compensation quarterly report could be used to report wages in each area by adding a column to that report and setting the prevailing wage rate for areas without additional forms and reports.

Other proponents of Senate Bill #8 were Mr. Carl Kanson, President Hanson and Kelly Construction Co., Billings, Montana, Mr. Jim Tarr, representing Spilde Construction Company, Billings, Montana.

The following appeared as opponents to Senate Bill #8: Mr. Joe Crosswhite representing the Operating Engineers Union who felt that the meat of the bill had been taken out; Mr. Joe Rossman of the Montana Joint Council of Teamsters who felt that this bill would be taking money out of the pockets of the working man; Mr. Jerry Driscoll of the Laborer's Union Local #98; Mr. Mitch Mihailovich of the State Building & Construction Trades Council whose testimony is attached as Exhibit "C"; Mr. Jim St. Germain; Mr. Sam Silverthore of the Montana State Builders and Trades Council whose testimony is attached as Exhibit "D"; Mr. R. L. Hollingsworth of the Engineers and Teamsters; Mr. Terry Bass, Manager of the Montana Contractors Association; and Mr. Dick Kane, Administrator of the Labor Standards Division of the Department of Labor and Industry whose testimony is attached as Exhibit "E".

At this point, Mr. David Lockie of Lockie Excavating asked if he could speak as a proponent of Senate Bill #8. Because Mr. Lockie was new to Committee Hearings, Chairman Lowe allowed the testimony. Mr. Lockie indicated that he owned a small construction company and was not able to compete with union wage scales in his area and urged the Committee to pass this bill.

After some discussion and questions from the Committee, Chairman Lowe closed the hearing on Senate Bill #8.

Chairman Lowe then opened the hearing on House Bill #62 and introduced Representative Scully, sponsor of the bill, to speak to the Committee. Representative Scully informed the Committee that he had been asked by the Department of Labor & Industry to introduce this bill to permit the department to pay wage claims by State warrants and cancel warrants remaining unclaimed for more than one year. Representative Scully introduced Mr. Doyle B. Saxby from the Department of Administration as a proponent of this measure and Mr. Dick Kane from the Department of Labor and Industry. Mr. Kane's testimony is attached as Exhibit "F".

There were no opponents to Senate Bill #62 at the meeting.

After a short question and answer period on this bill, Senator Severson moved the bill be passed with Senator Dover seconding. The bill was passed unanimously by the Committee. Senator Smith moved that House Bill #62 be placed on the Consent Calendar and Senator Dover seconded and passed unanimously.

Chairman Lowe then asked the Committee to act on Senate Bill #190 and also asked Mr. Larry P. Nachtsheim from the Department of Administration if he had prepared the amendment requested by the Committee at the last hearing. Mr. Nachtsheim's proposed amendment is attached as Exhibit "G" along with the Fiscal Note requested by the Committee at the last meeting. Senator Lowe asked the Committee to vote on the amendments and the bill which passed unanimously. Since the title of the introduced bill had to be changed, Senator Lowe said that he would check with the Legislative Council to see if the Committee could change the title and if this was proper, would pass the bill out of Committee.

Chairman Lowe then asked for a vote on House Bill #42 which was heard earlier in the meeting. Senator Hafferman moved the bill, seconded by Senator Dover and was passed unanimously and unanimously moved to the Consent Calendar.

Chairman Lowe asked for a vote on Senate Bill #266. Senator Hafferman moved the bill, seconded by Senator Smith and was passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.


Senator William R. Lowe

ROLL CALL

LABOR & EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE

46TH LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1979

Date *Feb. 6, 1979*

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
HAROLD C. NELSON, VICE CHAIRMAN	✓		
GARY AKLESTAD	✓		
HAROLD L. DOVER	✓		
WILLIAM F. HAFFERMAN	✓		
JOHN (SANDY) MEHRENS	✓		
BOB PALMER		✓	
ELMER D. SEVERSON	✓		
RICHARD G. SMITH	✓		
BILL R. LOWE, CHAIRMAN	✓		



SENATE MEMBERS
 CARROLL GRAHAM
 CHAIRMAN
 FRANK HAZELBAKER
 VICE CHAIRMAN
 CHET BLAYLOCK
 PAT M. GOODOVER
 DIANA S. DOWLING
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
 CODE COMMISSIONER
 ELEANOR ECK
 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
 ROBERTA MOODY
 DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES



Montana Legislative Council
 State Capitol
 Helena, 59601
 (406) 449-3064

HOUSE MEMBERS
 JOHN B. DRISCOLL
 OSCAR KVAALEN
 J.D. LYNCH
 ROBERT L. MARKS
 H. DAVID COGLEY
 DIRECTOR, LEGAL SERVICES
 ROBERT PERSON
 DIRECTOR, RESEARCH

LC 0560

1979 Legislature
 Code Commissioner Bill - Summary

HOUSE Bill No. 42

AN ACT TO AMEND SECTION 39-3-407, MCA, TO CLARIFY WAGE CLAIM ENFORCEMENT FOR MINIMUM WAGE AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION.

(This summary does not include discussion of routine form or grammatical changes.)

Section 1. 39-3-407. Added "pursued"; changed "parts 2 and 5" to "part 2"; and added "This part may also be enforced in accordance with part 5 of this chapter for the benefit of certain employees in the mineral and oil industry." The amendment is intended to clarify that only employees of the mineral and oil industry are to benefit from the additional wage claim procedures set forth in part 5, chapter 3, Title 39, as to enforcement of minimum wage and overtime compensation.

RE: Analysis of Weekly Summary of NLRB Cases

Union Members Fined for Violent Activity

- 2. In a union violence case involving ABC member, Cross Construction Company of Houston, Texas, a Federal District Court judge has fined the outside union members who took part in injuring non-union employees and destroying Cross Company property a total of \$122,385.44.

At a meeting of the Sabine Area Building and Construction Trades Council a demonstration was planned against Cross Construction because it was bringing "outside" non-union workers into a "union area." Later threats were made by union members to Cross officials on the consequences of hiring non-union labor.

Two days after the meeting violence erupted at the Cross Construction Company work site. Defendant union members drove onto the site and beat the non-union workers as well as burned and destroyed equipment. Threats were made that such action would continue if non-union workers remained employed.

A suit was filed by the Cross Construction Company and its employees under 42 USC 1985(3). These actions are usually limited to racial discrimination cases.

Conspiracy, acts in furtherance of the conspiracy, denial of equal protection, and injury in person or property or deprivation of the free exercise of a United States citizens rights all must be alleged to present a valid case under 42 USC 1985(3).

The Federal District Court in Texas framed the issue as being whether discrimination against employees of a non-union entity is the kind of invidiously discriminatory motivation the court envisioned in the lead case under this statute Griffin (403 U.S. 88, 91 S. Ct. 1790).

The court found the union defendants engaged in a conspiracy. It also stated because of the union members violence the contractor and his employees were deprived of their equal protection or equal immunities. The court further stated that the union defendants actually engaged in the unlawful conduct they conspired to commit.

The most difficult and essential part of the contractor and his employees' case against the union members was to prove non-union employers and non-union employees were protected under 42 USC 1985(3). In the past this statute has been largely limited to racial discrimination cases. Here however the court felt the statute also protects victims of abusive behavior such as the contractor and his employees. The court found the Cross Construction Company and its employees did come under the statute in that they were members of a discernible class (non-union employers and employees) and were victims of union discrimination against non-union operations.

RE: Analysis of Weekly Summary of NLRB Cases

Union Members Fined for Violent Activity (Continued)

The court then awarded \$5,000.00 each to Plaintiffs Paul Scott and James Mathews for injuries sustained during the union members attack, \$10,314.00 to Cross Construction Company for damage to and loss of equipment as well as \$27,089.44 for increased insurance costs and \$49,982.00 for increased security costs. \$25,000.00 in attorneys' fees were awarded to Plaintiffs. The total damages to be paid by union members is \$122,385.44.

This case opens up the possibility of using 42 USC 185(3) as a remedy in situations where unions use extreme violence against non-union contractors and their employees. It shows the stiff financial penalties that can be levied against acts of violence by union members and gives a firm precedent for including non-union contractors and their employees within the protections of this statute. (Paul E. Scott, ET AL Vs. Bill Moore, ET AL, U. S. District Court, Eastern District, Texas, Beaumont Division, Civil Action No. B-75-26-CA, November 16, 1978).

NLRB Regional Office News

Michael F. Walsh has been appointed Regional Attorney in the NLRB Boston Office. Walsh will be the chief legal officer in Boston processing unfair labor practice and employee representation cases arising in Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and seven counties in Connecticut. Walsh received his A.B. and J.D. from Boston College and has served at the NLRB Washington, Boston and New York City offices. He is a member of the Massachusetts Bar.

.....

The NLRB will open a Hartford, Connecticut office which will be operational in late 1979. Hartford will be a subregional office with authority to process unfair labor practice charges and petitions for employee representation elections throughout Connecticut except for Fairfield County which is under the jurisdiction of the New York City office.

On December 8, 1978 we requested that Chapter Attorneys review the "Employment Questionnaire" included in the "Construction Site Security Manual" originally published in 1974, for suggestions to revise in accordance with recent federal legislation and case development. The response to date has been meager. Please send in your remarks today!

S. B. 8

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Mitch Mihailovich and I appear here today representing the Montana State Building and Construction Trades Council.

We in the Construction Trades have several problems with this bill. This bill would take the determination of the prevailing rate out of the hands of the State Department of Labor and leave it entirely up to the Federal Government. Also this bill would exempt state contracts under \$50,000, where the federal law only exempts contracts under \$2,000.

We strongly oppose this bill and would urge you to vote against it.

Thank you!

Exhibit "D"
Silverthorn

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee - my name is Sam Silverthorn. I represent the International Union of Operating Engineers Local No. 400 and we oppose Senate Bill 111.

On page 3, Lines 9 and 10, under the definition of a "Locality". ~~_____~~ If there has been no work performed within a city or town during the past twelve months, then a survey must be conducted to determine the wage rate therein. This could result in two separate wage rates, for like work, if the work performed within the city or town was adjacent to work being performed outside the city limits, in the county, where a prevailing rate may exist.

To conduct the surveys would be very time consuming and using the Department of Labor & Industry's own figures, would cost more than one-quarter million dollars.

Passage of this bill would create chaos in the construction industry and further drain the tax dollars just to administer it.

On behalf of the 5000 members of Local 400, I urge a "DO NOT PASS" for this bill.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, for the record my name is Dick Kane, I am the Administrator of the Labor Standards Division, Department of Labor and Industry.

During the 1977 legislative session the lawmakers recognized the fact that the Labor Standards Division was not properly staffed and was unable to administer several laws assigned to the Division. One of these laws was the law that provides for the payment of predetermined prevailing wages in public works projects.

The legislature saw fit to appropriate funds to be used to hire additional staff to remedy the problem.

Since that time we have put together a program to administer this law and to enforce it in those cases where the required wages have not been paid.

As provided for by the present law, we have obtained copies of as many collective bargaining agreements as we can find. In addition we also use the results of a wage survey made by the Employment Security Division. All of this information is used in determining the actual rates for each county or locality.

At the present time the rates are entered into an electronic filing system from which they are retrieved in printed form. This

filing system allows us to service wage requests in a timely manner.

The changes proposed in Senate Bill 8 would negate the work we have done and a new procedure will have to be established.

I have obtained copies of the Davis Bacon rates to compare them with the Montana rates. As of December 1978 the Davis Bacon heavy and highway rates and the Montana heavy and highway rates are the same in many of the classifications. The building construction rates show a greater disparity in that the Davis Bacon rates are higher than Montana rates in some classifications and less in others. A close examination of the rates will disclose that the rates are not that much different and that the present method of determining rates is really not all that bad.

After reading Senate Bill 8 I obtained copies of the prevailing rates as determined under Davis Bacon provisions. I find that as of December 1978, the heavy and highway Davis Bacon rates and the Montana rates are the same in many of the classifications.

The building construction rates show a greater disparity in that the Davis Bacon rates are in some cases higher than Montana rates and in other cases they are lower. I have copies of the rates for the committee.

For comparison purposes I have taken two of our case files and have computed the amount of wages due under the Montana rates

and the amount of wages due under Davis Bacon rates. The first file, which deals with heavy and highway shows \$74,618.46 due under Montana rates and \$72,771.14 due under Davis Bacon. A difference of \$1,847.32.

The second file, which is a building construction case shows \$2,141.94 due under Montana law and \$2,102.86 due under Davis Bacon. A difference of \$39.08. The Davis Bacon rates and the Montana rates are such that depending on the particular craft there are going to be some jobs where the total wages paid using Davis Bacon rates will be less than the total wage would be using Montana rates and on some jobs the total wages paid using Davis Bacon rates will be greater than the Montana rates.

I would like to point out that the Labor Standards Division will not be able to correct errors made by the federal office that publishes the rates. We are able to correct errors in the present system.

From time to time I have heard that there are changes proposed in the Davis Bacon Act. I suggest that the committee consider what effect changes or even repeal of the Davis Bacon might have on the Montana law. We don't want to find ourselves trying to live with something that is not palatable to the contractor and the workers nor does the Labor Standards Division want to be placed in a position of having to administer an impossible law because of a change in the federal law.

Kane

Madison County Nursing Home

Concrete Wall Co.
Livingston, MT

State Prevailing Wage	\$2,141.94
Davis Bacon Rate	\$2,102.86
Difference	<u>\$ 39.08</u>

Steve Kountz dba/
Concrete Wall Co.
Livingston, MT

Laborers

Steve McKanna

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Amount</u>
State Pre. Wage	7.56	29½	1.00	252.52
Davis Bacon	7.63	29½	1.00	254.58

Robert Szucs

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Amount</u>
State Pre. Wage	7.56	75	1.00	642.00
Davis Bacon	7.63	75	1.00	647.25

David Brockway

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Amount</u>
State Pre. Wage	7.56	72½	1.00	620.60
Davis Bacon	7.63	72½	1.00	625.67

Carpenters

Charles Stoltz Jr.

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Fringes</u>	<u>Amount</u>
State Pre. Wage	8.79	62	1.32	626.82
Davis Bacon	8.06	62	1.22	575.36

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. for the record I am Dick Kane, Administrator of the Labor Standards Division, Department of Labor and Industry. I am here today in support of House Bill 62.

This is a house keeping bill recommended by the legislative auditor.

One of the duties of the Department of Labor and Industry is to collect wages for an employee who hasn't been paid. The wages are deposited in an agency fund and state warrants are used to pay the claimant. Unclaimed funds are forfeited to the general fund after two years.

Sometimes, the Department of Labor and Industry is unable to locate claimants and the state warrants must be cancelled and the money be deposited according to statute. However, the statute regulating the cancellation of warrants is in conflict with the statute that provides for the forfeiture of the unclaimed wages to the general fund.

This bill provides a uniform method of cancelling warrants made payable to those people we are unable to locate.

The claimant would have a period of three years in which to claim the wages. The auditor would issue a new warrant in such cases.

Proposed Amendment to Senate Bill No. 190

Amend Title

Page 1, Line 8, after the word "institutions" add punctuation ",," and words "certain city and county administrators"

Amend Bill

Page 5, after line 16, add the following subsection:

"(15) The chief administrative officer of any city or county
~~which operates under a manager form of government~~ where the chief
administrative officer has filed an election in writing to be
excluded from membership, this election to be filed no later than
July 1, 1979 or 30 days after initial employment by a county or city
whichever is later."

STATE OF MONTANA

REQUEST NO. 202-79

FISCAL NOTE

Form BD-15

compliance with a written request received Feb. 3, 19 79, there is hereby submitted a Fiscal Note
S.B. 190 pursuant to Chapter 53, Laws of Montana, 1975 - Thirty-Ninth Legislative Assembly.

Background information used in developing this Fiscal Note is available from the Office of Budget and Program Planning, to members
of the Legislature upon request.

Description of Proposed Legislation: The major thrust of this legislation is to assist public entities using CETA employees to not be burdened with the payment of employer contributions to the retirement system, brought about by Federal regulation which declared that the employer contributions to a retirement system would not be paid. The other new language and the proposed amendment are housekeeping measures.

Assumption: It is assumed that the CETA employees would not elect coverage under P.E.R.S. which, in turn, would provide the savings of the employer contributions to the P.E.R.S. Should an employee become permanent, the retirement credit can be qualified with the P.E.R.S.

Fiscal Impact: The employer contributions for those employees that become permanent employees will be paid from CETA funds. Should the employee elect to qualify that service, then funding for the employer contributions need not come out of state or local money.

State Fiscal Year 1980

<u>Employer</u>	<u>CETA</u> <u>Wages Paid</u>	<u>Employers' Share, PERS</u> <u>(based on 6.2% of wages)</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Participants</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Positions</u>
State government	\$ 3,444,000	\$ 214,000	1,500	500
Other public employers*	10,384,000	644,000	4,000	1,300

State Fiscal Year 1981

State government	\$ 2,696,000	\$ 167,000	1,200	400
Other public employers*	8,131,000	504,000	3,100	1,000

*Includes city and county governments and school districts.

NOT OFFICIAL

BUDGET DIRECTOR

Office of Budget and Program Planning

Date: _____

NAME: Doug Brown DATE: 2/6/79

ADDRESS: PO Box 4087, Missoula, MT

PHONE: 406-728-5520

REPRESENTING WHOM? Good Music Agency, Inc.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 266

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: Musical agencies are totally different than private employment agencies. We are regulated by the American Federation of Musicians who sets our fees + licenses us. Only the musical groups pay us, not the employers.

NAME: Dech Kone DATE: 2/10/79

ADDRESS: 35 S East Orange Blvd.

PHONE: 449-5600

REPRESENTING WHOM? Labor Standards Div Dept of Labor & Industry

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: S-B 266

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Joe Rasmussen DATE: 7-1-79

ADDRESS: Col Kalla, Mont.

PHONE: 892-5055

REPRESENTING WHOM? Operating Engineers

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: A.B.F.

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Jerry Orinall DATE: 2-6-79

ADDRESS: 345 Calhoun Lane

PHONE: 259-4471

REPRESENTING WHOM? Labors Union Local #98

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: S R P

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Mich M. Harlow DATE: 2-6-79

ADDRESS: 1900 FLM - Bette

PHONE: 992-1944

REPRESENTING WHOM? Mt State Bldg + Const Trades Council

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: S. B # 8

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Sam Silverthorn DATE: 2-6-79

ADDRESS: 226 Nelterwin Rd Plains, Mont 59859

PHONE: 926-3056

REPRESENTING WHOM? Mt. St. Bld. & Trades Council

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 3. B. 8

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: _____

NAME: J. Ross Brown DATE: 5-1-58

ADDRESS: 3114 Hamilton St. Wash. D.C. 20001

PHONE: 477-4141

REPRESENTING WHOM? Board of Directors of S.B.S.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: S.B.S.

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Dick Lane DATE: 2/6/74

ADDRESS: 35 S East Chance Dulch

PHONE: 449-5600

REPRESENTING WHOM? Label Standards Division Dept of Labor & Industry

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 8

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? _____

COMMENTS: Written comments submitted

NAME: W L HALPINE DATE: 1-2-77

ADDRESS: 617-3

PHONE: 442-3185-4423394

REPRESENTING WHOM? IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers)

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SFB

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: David Lockie DATE: 2/6/79

ADDRESS: 37 Lindley Pl, Bozeman, MT 59715

PHONE: 586-7511

REPRESENTING WHOM? Lockie Excavating

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SE 4 S

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: John St Jernigan DATE: 2-6-79
ADDRESS: 4011 David Ave No 9th Field
PHONE: 452-5838

REPRESENTING WHOM? Spending Energy

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 513

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Dick Kone DATE: 2/6/79

ADDRESS: 35 S East Chama Hotel

PHONE: 449-5600

REPRESENTING WHOM? Labor Standards Division Dept of Labor & Ind

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB-42 HB-62

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

NAME: Robert Smith DATE: 2 6 19

ADDRESS: 1400

PHONE: 442-261

REPRESENTING WHOM? dept of education

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB-62

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

.....February 6..... 19 79.....

MR. President:.....

We, your committee on Labor & Employment Relations.....

having had under consideration House Bill No. 42.....

Respectfully report as follows: That..... House Bill No. 42.....
unanimously passed and unanimously placed on the consent calendar.

~~DO PASS~~
BE CONCURRED IN
P.U.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 6 19 79

MR. **President:**.....

We, your committee on **Labor & Employment Relations**

having had under consideration **House** Bill No. **62**

Respectfully report as follows: That **House** Bill No. **62**

unanimously passed and unanimously placed on the consent calendar.

BE CONCURRED IN
EXTRAS

P.A.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 7

1979

MR. **President:**.....

We, your committee on **Labor & Employment Relations**.....

having had under consideration **Senate**..... Bill No. **190**

Respectfully report as follows: That..... **Senate**..... Bill No. **190**
introduced bill be passed as amended:

1. Page 1, line 8.

Following: "INSTITUTIONS"

Insert: ", CERTAIN CITY AND COUNTY ADMINISTRATORS"

2. Page 5, after line 16.

Insert: "(15) The chief administrative officer of any city or county where the chief administrative officer has filed an election in writing with the board to be excluded from membership, this election to be filed no later than July 1, 1979 or 30 days after initial employment by a county or city whichever is later."

And, as so amended

DO PASS

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 6

1979

MR. **President:**

We, your committee on **Labor & Employment Relations**

having had under consideration **Senate** Bill No. **266**

Respectfully report as follows: That **Senate** Bill No. **266**
introduced bill unanimously passed.

DO PASS

J.L.