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

February 5, 1981

The meeting of the Labor & Employment Relations Committee was called to order by Chairman Harold Nelson on February 5, 1981, in Room 404 of the State Capitol at 1:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL: All members of the Committee were present.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 313: Chairman Nelson called on Senator Aklestad, sponsor of SB 313, to explain the bill to the Committee. Senator Aklestad told the Committee that the main objective of the bill is to allow an individual to be self-employed when he wants to be.

PROPONENTS OF SENATE BILL 313: Mr. David Sward of Gallatin Gateway, Montana, representing Independent Contract Dealers for Kirby Vacuums, stated they support SB 313. He feels it is a person's constitutional right to be able to work for himself, and the bill clarifies the law. Mr. Sward's written testimony is on his witness sheet and is attached to the minutes.

Other proponents who were present at the hearing and rose in support of SB 313 are as follows:

- Mr. Gerald C. Rapp of Fairfield, Montana, representing himself.
- Mr. Howard Bish of Lincoln, Montana, representing himself.
- Mr. Donald Wallace of Lincoln, Montana, representing himself.
- Mr. Gene Wright of Lincoln, Montana, representing himself.
- Mr. Jerry Biresch of Lincoln, Montana, representing Blackfoot Post Yard.
- Mr. Elmo Bowlby of Lincoln, Montana, representing himself.
- Mr. Harold Bouma of Choteau, Montana, representing Bouma Post Yard.

OPPONENTS OF SENATE BILL 313: Mr. James Murry, representing the Montana State AFL-CIO, stated they oppose SB 313 as an attempt to destroy the unemployment insurance system in Montana. His printed testimony is attached to the minutes.

Other opponents of SB 313 are as follows:

- Mr. Joe Bossman of Butte, Montana, representing the Joint Council of Teamsters, stated they oppose SB 313.
- Mr. Jerry Driscoll of Billings, Montana, representing the Laborer's Union Local 98. His testimony is attached.
- Mr. Lonny Mayer of Missoula, Montana, representing UFCW.
- Mr. Gregg Groepper, representing the Department of Labor, stated they have no position on the bill, but want to see workers, employers, and employees treated fairly.

- Mr. Fred Barrett, representing the Employment Security Division of the Department of Labor. Mr. Barrett provided technical information, and Mr. Barrett's printed statement is attached.
- Mr. Randy Siemers, representing Operating Engineers, stated they oppose SB 313.

Senator Aklestad made closing remarks in support of SB 313. He told the Committee that the law had been working well until the last few years--now there is need for some change. There were a small number of independent contractors affected by the prior law, but no one should be affected by this bill. He urged a Do Pass on SB 313.

QUESTIONS ON SENATE BILL 313: Senator Hafferman asked how much would have to be added to the cost of each unit of production to cover for unemployment insurance and related costs. Mr. Bouma stated that he thought about 32 percent.

Senator Keating asked if independent contractors who had been employees because of their interim independent contracting would be ineligible for unemployment because of their interim independent contracting. Mr. Barrett stated that they would not under most circumstances.

Senator Keating asked who determines bonafide self-employment. Mr. Barrett stated that his department applies the law.

Senator Anderson asked what made the law less responsible than it has been in the past. Mr. Barrett stated they have not placed any extra emphasis trying to uncover independent contractors.

Senator Goodover asked if a gyppo logger was considered an independent contractor. Mr. Barrett stated that he would be.

Senator Goodover asked about a post cutter--Mr. Barrett stated that the post cutter did not meet the test requirements for the independent contractor.

Senator Keating asked how many union members are in this work force figure covered under Unemployment Insurance Fund. Mr. Murry stated that he did not know, but probably about 40,000 in AFL-CIO.

Senator Keating asked if there were any independent contractors who are union members. Mr. Murry stated that there were.

Senator Goodover asked if the gyppo contractors are told they cannot be any larger. Mr. Barrett said this is correct.

Mr. Campbell stated that it is the right of control--not actual control that is important in distinguishing employees from independent contractors.

Chairman Nelson called the hearing closed on Senate Bill 313.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 318: Chairman Nelson introduced Senator Bob Brown, sponsor of SB 318, to the Committee, and Senator Brown explained the bill to the Committee. This bill is an act to provide for the posting of security in the form of a bond, cash deposit, or other manner prescribed by the workers' compensation insurance.

There were no proponents of SB 318 present at the hearing.

OPPONENTS OF SENATE BILL 318: Mr. William Palmer, representing the Division of Workers' Compensation, stated they oppose SB 318. The bill would present a burdensome workload on the Division, is unnecessary because the problem rarely arises, and the Division already has authority to carry out what the bill does.

Mr. Larry Huss, representing the Montana Contractors' Assoc., stated that this bill would create confusion, and if this bill is adopted, all businesses are going to be mandated to post this security in such fashion as the bill describes for only one person. Therefore, he would recommend a Do Not Pass on SB 313.

QUESTIONS ON SENATE BILL 318: Senator Aklestad asked how much a \$500,000 bond would cost. Mr. Palmer stated that the minimum cost is \$30 per year, and \$20 a thousand.

Senator Keating asked how much money they were talking about for a premium. Mr. Palmer stated about \$1,000 per year.

Mr. Huss stated they are now making mandatory what has been discretionary.

Chairman Nelson called the hearing closed on Senate Bill 318.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 124: Chairman Nelson introduced Rep. Earl Lory, sponsor of HB 124, to the Committee. Rep. Lory explained the bill to the Committee. He told the Committee that HB 124 is a housekeeping bill and is an act to generally revise the laws relating to workers' compensation.

PROPONENTS OF HOUSE BILL 124: Mr. Norman Grosfield, representing Independent Insurance Agents Association of Montana, stated they are in support of HB 124.

There were no opponents to HB 124 present at the hearing.

Rep. Lory stated that he would find someone to carry this bill on the floor if the bill is Concurred In.

QUESTIONS ON HOUSE BILL 124: Senator Goodover wondered about the increase in the penalty from \$25 to \$75.

Senator Anderson made a motion that HB 124 Be Concurred In.

Minutes--Labor & Employment Relations--February 5, 1981--page 4

Senator Goodover made a substitute motion that the Committee delay action on HB 124. On a voice vote to this substitute motion the only "no" votes were by Senators Anderson and Keating; therefore, no action was taken on HB 124 at this meeting.

ADJOURN: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Senator Harold C. Nelson, Chairman

Mudd a Mileau

mln

ROLL CAIL

LABOR & EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE

47 th LEGISLATIVE SISSION - - 1981 Date Jek 5

IAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
GARY C. AKLESTAD, VICE-CH.	✓		
MIKE ANDERSON	V		
PAT M. GOODOVER	V		
WILLIAM HAFFERMAN	V		
THOMAS F. KEATING	V		
BILL NORMAN	V		
PATRICK L. RYAN	V		
HAROLD C. NELSON, CHAIRMAN	V		
·			

Each day attach to minutes.

NAME: $D_{2(10)}$ C. Signal Date: $2/5/31$
ADDRESS: P.O. 18 GALLATIA GARAGE, MONT
PHONE: 176-26-50 7505.
REPRESENTING WHOM? ///EFET OCKTRAT LETACES FOR MILLES GERMAN D
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:
DO YOU: SUPPORT? \(\sum_{\infty} \) AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: TRELIES THE MITHER F
1211 Sike 513 an aprincipes Bight
18 TO WERK FOR HOUSERS 15
Builty TEMPORD, 2000 Due to the
interpretation of Enounced Security
Commissions Ruling on the FBC Culo
as to who is or is mut an employee,
result in an individual Aling while to
work for himself under control to
mother Defel that 53313 would
return a person constitutional right
to be in Prusines for thomsolver con
un independent continueta.

NAME:	Derelle	7 0-0	DATE:	15-11-1
ADDRESS:	Dorallic Finallic	gnat-		
PHONE:	-13/2277	0 / <u>-</u>		
REPRESENTING V	wном?			
APPEARING ON 1	WHICH PROPOSAL:	district	2010	
DO YOU: SUP	PORT?	_ AMEND?	OPPO	SE?
COMMENTS:	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>Camping</u>	
,				
			·	
		3		

NAME: Adorrard Bish	DATE: 2-5-81
NAME: Adorrard Bish Address: Lincoln montain	
PHONE: 362-4571	
REPRESENTING WHOM? arypulf	
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: Servit Bill	3/3
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	

NAME: DONALS A. Wallac.	DATE: 2-5-81
ADDRESS: PO. BOX 488 Lived NONT. 5	94.38
PHONE: 312-4407	
REPRESENTING WHOM? MY STIP.	
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SersiteBill 3	(3
DO YOU: SUPPORT? VES AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: Ism a selfemployed woodcater	. I have been at
it for gyr. I like being being my	ora boss. Comeing 4
going when I want with we restrice	ton or my More Men 45.

(1.20.00)	2 ~ 51
NAME: GENE WRIGHT	DATE: 2-5-8/
ADDRESS: SINCOIN, Mt. 59639	
PHONE: 362-4681	
REPRESENTING WHOM? Myself	
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: Senate 3/3	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? yes AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: My Name is Gene U	Ingth of Lincoln
Mt. I have been a post	cutting for 3
years. I am self empley on	ed that the
pass thispertiell, 3/3	erge That you
pass thispertiell, 3/3	

NAME:	JERRY	BILESC)		DATE:	5 51
ADDRESS:_	Bix 300	<u> </u>	Tolic Ago	·T		
PHONE:	362-	4250			•	
REPRESENT	ING WHOM?	DEACK:	bot Post	YARD		
APPEARING	ON WHICH	PROPOSAL:	SCHATE	BILL	313	
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?	<u> </u>	AME	ND?	OPF	POSE?
COMMENTS:	LEET	r 125	CUTTERS	SÚF	EMPLOYEL	⁾ .
						,
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			·			

NAME:	:			DATE:	
ADDRESS:_	Line	7			
PHONE:					
REPRESENT	ING WHOM?	<u> </u>	-		
APPEARING	ON WHICH	PROPOSAL: _			
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?	1.	AMEND?	OPPOSE?	
COMMENTS:					
-					
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
					,

NAME: 11 11 11 /11/201	uq.	DATE: 2 - 5 - 8/
ADDRESS: 13 7 Chy-	France Mit	59422
PHONE: 466 2140		
REPRESENTING WHOM? Suind	a rais y	w/s
APPEARING ON WEICH PROPOSAL:	12. 3 Bill	5/5
DO YOU: SUPP(RT?	AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:		
·		

NAME:	lame.	6).	Me	erry	DATE:	2.5-	(F)
Address:	P.O.	Box	117	· L	DATE:	y Mor	+
PHONE:	44a-	1704					
REPRESENT	ING WHOM?	Mos	$n \neq 5$	tate	AFL-C	10	
APPEARING	ON WHICH	PROPOSA	AL: 5/3	3	13		
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?			AMEND? _		OPPOSE?	<u>X</u>
COMMENTS:				······································			
				-			
		7.77					
	-						



JAMES W. MURRY EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ZIP CODE 59601 406/442-1708

– Box 1176, Helena, Montana -

Room 100 "Steamboat Block"

TESTIMONY OF JAMES W. MURRY ON SENATE BILL 313, HEARINGS OF THE SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE,

FEBRUARY 5, 1981

I am Jim Murry, and I am here to represent the Montana State AFL-CIO. As you would expect, we oppose Senate Bill 313 as an attempt to destroy the unemployment insurance system in Montana.

On Tuesday we testified on Senate Bill 226, the tree thinning bill. Senate Bill 313 is more of clear cutting operation. We oppose thinning out the rights of workers under unemployment insurance and we oppose cutting off all those rights at once.

This bill eliminates what is called the abc test of what is an independent contractor. Under present law, an individual is an employee, and is covered by unemployment insurance provisions, unless (a) the individual is free from control or direction over the performance of the services, (b) the service is either outside the usual course of the business, or is outside of the usual place of the business, and (c) the individual is customarily engaged in an independently established trade.

This bill is an attempt to remove that language and replace it with some loophole language. For example, one loophole in 39-51-204, Section lm, is that the service provided by a business entity that is engaged in an independent trade occupation, profession or business is exempt from the definition of employment and therefore from the coverage of unemployment benefits. But this new section adds this qualification "irrespective of the capacity or financial capability of this business entity for a continued independent existence."

Clearly, the intent is to force individuals who are not in reality independent contractors, under the present law, to be excluded from unemployment insurance coverage. Just think of how many employers might want to deny their workers coverage by this method. The results should be apparent. Many workers would have no cusnion during the times w n they are laid off. The unemployment insurance system might teeter toward bankruptcy because of the decreased premium base. Honest employers could face sharply rising premiums to retain the same benefits for their workers. And if a large number of people are denied unemployment insurance, because of their being classified as independent contractors, then we would expect the next move to be to disqualify the same workers for workers' compensation coverage under that law.

When you destroy a good system like unemployment insurance and workers' compensation, the whole state suffers. But the ones who suffer most are the workers and their families.

What would happen if the Anaconda Company had arranged to have all of its employees be declared independent contractors? During a disastrous layoff, those people would be totally without the means even to eat, much less pay rent. There is already too much suffering from large scale layoffs, but to move away from unemployment insurance would be to inflict poverty of the worst kind on people who have been good citizens, productive workers and pillars of their communities. In addition, other businesses would certainly close in places like Anaconda, so that the suffering would extend much farther than it



already does. Presumably our society is not so barbarous that it would simply let people starve to death, so there would be a great burden on the remaining taxpayers to provide public assistance.

Instead of starvation, we currently have a system that provides a small cushion for the worker and the family against the disaster of unemployment, with no burden on employed taxpayers. It would be folly to destroy this humane system for the financial gain of some insensitive employers.

Thank you.

,	17.			- a .
NAME: /	11351491		$\underline{\qquad} DATE: \underline{\qquad} 2-5-$	81
ADDRESS: 3314	Hannibal	<u> </u>	Yc	
PHONE: 494'- 44	141			
REPRESENTING VHOM?	Nort Cin	c.l of troms	ters	
APPEARING ON WHICH	propošal: 3	/3		
DO YOU: SUPPORT?_		AMEND?	OPPOSE	?
COMMENTS:				
	and the second s			
·				

NAME: JUNG C	hicoll		DATE:	2-5-8	/
NAME: ymy C	Stone	It B	ellinge	591	2/
PHONE: 259.	1655				
REPRESENTING WHOM	1? Istori	is Unin	Ford	98	
APPEARING ON WHIC	CH PROPOSAL:	58313			
DO YOU: SUPPORT	r?	AMEND? _		OPPOSE?	<u>X</u>
COMMENTS:					
				- AND PLANTAGE AND ADDRESS OF THE AD	
					
				,	
					7

LABORERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA

Local Union No. 98

Bill McColley Secretary-Treasurer and Business Manager 345 Calhoun Lane Telephone 259-4471

BILLINGS, MONTANA 59101,

TESTIMONY OF JERRY DRISCOLL ON SENATE BILL 313 FEBRUARY 5, 1981

I am Jerry Driscoll from Laborers Local 98, Billings, and I'm here to oppose Senate Bill 313.

This bill would be a disaster for employees in the building trades. Not just union members, but all employees.

Virtually every construction job could conceivable come under the definition of independent business entity mentioned in this bill. Just about every employee on every construction job could conceivably lose their unemployment insurance. Next, we would expect the same arguments to be made regarding coverage under the Workers' Compensation Laws.

Construction is a dangerous business. Workers' comp doesn't make up for a missing arm or leg, but it does help pay the bills. And unemployment insurance is extremely important in construction work because it is seasonal. But during a recession like the present -- it's more like a depression in the construction business -- then unemployment benefits are absolutely essential unless you want men, women and children starving.

If you pass this bill and put unemployed construction workers into poverty and leave injured construction workers with a mound of unpayable bills, what's going to happen to those people? The welfare rolls could double or triple. If you pass this bill, what you're saying is that you want individual taxpayers to be paying instead of contractors.

This bill, in one swipe, could about do away with unemployment insurance and workers' compensation. We oppose Senate Bill 313.

Thank you.

NAME: 2	DIINY	MAY	eR		DATE:	2/5	/8/
ADDRESS:_	170.	BOX	7//2	MSIA	•		
		8561					
REPRESENT	ING WHOM?		1FC	CW			
APPEARING	ON WHICH	PROPOSAL:	5	13 - 31	/3		
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?		·	AMEND?		OPPOSE?	<u>X</u>
COMMENTS:			·····				
			······································				
				······································			
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			سندن بالمراجعات وربي فالسرورية				
		····					
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			and the second s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

NAME: They hvery	DATE: 2/5/87
NAME. July Trougher	DATE: 0 / 1/07
ADDRESS: ESP Bldg m	4/2
PHONE: 449-3799	
REPRESENTING WHOM? DEVI OF O	LABOR AND INDUSTRY
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 583	3/3 /1/8/24
DO YOU: SUPPORT?	-
COMMENTS: 5B - 3/3 - 7/0 po	steen - request that
ang charges not exclude	a gay of workers from
unemployment insurance or	anduly sevaling any
speifi group of engle	
treat workers and employer	
HB-124- Support	the liel with work
the advisory committee.	U
/	

NAME:	<u> </u>	• 27	2 2 2	* /	DATE:		
ADDRESS:_	,	Post		17	25		
PHONE:		2 4 6/1 -					
REPRESENT.	ING WHOM?				Dist.		
APPEARING	ON WHICH	PROPOSAL:		274	3/3	,	
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?			AMEND?		OPPOSE?	
COMMENTS:					tuh	meent	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		out me	<u> </u>	. 7 2 t - 1/2 - 1/2 .
			: ::	Le.	Che E-no	restant.	
							/
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
							
and the state of t							

SENATE BILL 313

Senate Committee on Labor

By Fred Barrett, Administrator Employment Security Division Department of Labor and Industry

The implications of Senate Bill 313 are both philosophical and practical. Philosophical because it reverses the trend, almost unbroken in the last 45 years, toward an unemployment insurance system of the broadest coverage, which helps our state and nation to stabilize the utilization and supply of labor, and cushions the adverse impact of unemployment on individuals, the economy, and the local community. There is likewise a practical implication when we consider the costly and difficult problems which we foresee in trying to administer a tenuous unemployment insurance system which would be the result of passage of 313.

As to cost, we are preparing a fiscal note to show the impact. The effect of Senate Bill 313 would be to place a high proportion of employer taxes collected subject to challenge, and an unknown number of benefit payments subject to redetermination and possible overpayment.

There are ample safeguards in the present law to delineate and determine who is and who is not an employee subject to unemployment insurance coverage. Granted, there is always room for disagreement, and admittedly this is often a sensitive and difficult area to adjudicate. I believe we have been fair in the interpretation of present law, have not been overzealous, and have certainly not been punitive in the application governing covered employment. Where dispute has arisen, and the instances are certainly not numerous, the grieved party, the employer, has access to the appeals process, and if so desired, the judicial system.

In your consideration of this bill, we would hope that this committee will look to the main issues involved; namely, the preservation of a proven system to cope with the very real problem of unemployed workers, and which at the same time deals fairly with employers who have as great a stake in such a system as do the workers.

NAME:				DATE:	
address:_					
PHONE:	2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -				
REPRESENT	ING WHOM?	, r			
APPEARING	ON WHICH PROPOSA	L:			
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?		END?	OPPOSE	
COMMENTS:					
	,				
-					

NAME: NILIAM R. Palmer DATE:	= 2/5/8/
ADDRESS: 815 Front ST	
PHONE: 449-2047	
REPRESENTING WHOM? DIVISION of Workers' Comp	Densation
appearing on which proposal: 18318 18134	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? HB/34 AMEND?	oppose? <u>#83/8</u>
COMMENTS: Will offer verbaltestimony	

NAME:	251119	Alusa		DATE:	(5/5)
ADDRESS:_	Öx 51	4 Kree	1 L		
PHONE:	1-112 - 8	<u> </u>			
REPRESENT	ING WHOM?	1/20,550	= CONTERCINE	Flasoc, AT	030
APPEARING	ON WHICH	PROPOSAL: _	5 R 5 P		-
DO YOU:	SUPPORT?		AMEND?	OPPO	SE?
COMMENTS:					
					-

NAME:	Fort	(him		DATE:_	2/5-/81
ADDRISS:	RTS	M, 11 e	Cred RD	·	/
PHONE:					
REPRISENTI	ING WHOM?	House	District #99		
APPEARING	ON WHICH PRO	OPOSAL:	148124		
DO YCJ:	SUPPORT? Co.	<u> </u>	AMEND?		OPPOSE?
•					
		······································			
				,	

					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

**,*				
NAME:	W. Wh	eny	DATE: .2-5-8	
ADDRESS: PO	Box 1	176	DATE: .2-5-8,	
PHONE: 44	2-1708			
REPRESENTING WHO	M? Mont.	State	AFL- C10	
APPEARING ON WHI				
DO YOU: SUPPOR	RT?	AMEND?	OF POSE?	
COMMENTS:				
-				
		the control of the co	general community and a second control of the second control of the second control of the second control of the	
		ter a territoria de primero de la comunicación de la comunicación de la comunicación de la comunicación de la c		