

Assembly

MINUTES OF MEETING - COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND MANAGEMENT - ASSEMBLY 55th SESSION
MARCH 11, 1969

PRESENT: CAPURRO, WILSON, LINGENFELTER, MAY

PRESENT LATER: MELLO, WEBB

ABSENT: BRANCH

ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT MC ADAMS, MR. FLETCHER, MR. OAKS, JERRY DONDERO
TED STOKES.

CHAIRMAN CAPURRO OPENED MEETING AT 8:15 and asked for a discussion on AB-352 as amended.

Mr. Oakes, representing the General Contractors gave a report on the bill as to agreements and disagreements of the Union to same as follows:

Page 1. Agreed on language line 9 to bottom of page
Page 2. Agreed on all of the language, starting line 8 to bottom of page.
Disagreed on line 1 through line 7.
There was some question on agreement line 34 to bottom of page.

Mr. Dondero commented that there had been suggestions that some deletions be made on page 2 line 34 to bottom of the page but that it had been agreed at a meeting to keep the wording as it is written at present in this bill.

Page 3. All language on page 3 was not agreed on.
Lines 48-49 agreed on.
Page 4. All agreed on
Page 5. Disagreed, especially Line 37- Organized Labor will not pass.
Page 6. Agreed on all, Labor would ask the brackets be stricken from
Line 17.
Page 7. Agreed-except in lines 30, 31, 32 to which they request the
words "shall not be disqualified" be added.
Page 8. Agreed except lines 1, 2, 3, 4.
Page 9. Disagreed to changes lines 1 through 13.
Disagreed to language lines 14 through 20.
Page 10. Agreed (question was raised on lines 24 through 49 referring to
NRS 612.515 sec 24).

Labor and Management

Page 11. Agreed
Page 12. Awaiting Mr. Paley's decision
Page 13. Awaiting Mr. Paley's decision - however Mr. Oakes stated that he
did not feel that Mr. Paley would agree entirely.
Page 14.) No decision - this has been highly controversial and final word
Page 15.) has not been received from Mr. Paley.

612.475 Mr. Oakes said that he did not feel that the Union could accept
this legislation - that it was asking the Union to publicly
accept the raise in rate by 3%.

Labor and Management - 2.

The question was asked just how long he thought it would take for labor and management to reach an agreement on this legislation and Mr. Oakes replied that the final answers would have to be given by Mr. Paley

Chairman Capurro then called for a statement from Mr. Dondero of the Employment Security Department.

Mr. Dondero spoke to the committee detailing the action that had been taken by the Employment Security Department, in effort and time, discussions at the meetings, and the suggestions that had been made. He said that the Department had concluded it had come up with the best legislation that they possibly could in the interest of both Labor and Management. Several changes had been presented but the Department felt the legislation as it was written gave the best package for the interests of all concerned. They felt that the Department must have a firm bill and it was agreed that at a meeting on March 10 that suggested deletions would not be accepted and no changes could be made. They had asked both Labor and Management to express themselves. If this legislation was not acceptable to one or the other or both - then it could not be helped. He would hope that it would be accepted.

Mr. Oakes replied that if the Department took this position he doubted if the Union would accept any of the bill.

Mr. Dondero said that he felt they had submitted the best legislation possible and that the Department would be available for any questions and answers. He further said that they did not feel the department should be in a position to do the negotiating between labor and management and this legislation left it up to the Union to negotiate.

Assemblyman Capurro remarked that on the questions raised he felt the committee had attempted to draw up amendments to clarify some of these points.

Mr. Fletcher then addressed the committee on a written statement which had been submitted on the following:

612.175 Referring to word "signature" - to delete and leave law as is.
Also Part 2 not be changed.
No change in sec. 5.

612.265 Re-wrote paragraph 3, sec. 7 changed language "subject to such restrictions" etc.

Mr. Oakes then intervened with the statement that the language change to his knowledge had not been brought to the attention of either Labor or Management and that Mr. Paley disagreed on this.

It was brought out that the question came up as to why the bill was amended and he said the matter came up in a Las Vegas case where it involved the Department of Justice and the issue of investigation involving private employment records and practices. Mr. Paley made a statement that he wanted to call Las Vegas to get full details on this before he would agree to this language. His objection was the possibility of disclosing private records to the wrong people and even getting to the point of a legal development for the

Labor and Management - Page 3.

March 11, 1969

Department, and the question of whether or not the State Law is in line with Federal law on this.

Sec. 7, Page 3, line 27, not changed due to Mr. Paley's holding off on this.

No change - lines 15 - 25.

Page 5, NRS 612.340 no suggested change in language.

- Bill 580 612.340- there was some change mentioned if this bill passes. line 15, page 5, inserting word "basic".
Sec. 6, line 26, suggested "renumeration" instead of "wages", to which Mr. Paley disagreed, if the word "wages" was used through the bill. The committee thought the word "wages" was a better word than "renumeration". Referring to chapter 612 it was mentioned that "earnings", renumeration and wages were all used and "renumeration" was adopted in the interest of consistency and uniformity.
- 612-345 Suggested this should be changed to insert word "basic" weekly benefit amount augmented.
- 612-365 No changes.
- 612.375 Page 6, go back to the original language.
- 612.445 Page 7, which would amend 612.405 referring to the qualification of a man filing claim and the length of time he is eligible.
- 612.445 Discussion was on the method by which eligibility of claims could be proven and means to collect overpayment to which claimant was not entitled. It was decided that most of the issues were tied in with Bill AB-505.

Mr. Stokes then announced that he felt it was too late in the Session of the Legislature for the members of the committee to make a decision without a more thorough study.

Assemblyman Wilson stated that it bothered him that the committee has talked to Labor and Management and they have been waiting ever since for legislation to be brought in and now it has come up with a package that no one agrees on, and that it might be another week before anything could be worked out at once. It was then suggested that the visitors be dismissed, which Chairman Capurro did and then called committee into a private meeting. It was then suggested that action be deferred until Mr. Paley could once again be contacted and a meeting set to hear final opinions. The committee agreed that he had been contacted several times and had not attended the meetings, in fact, had not attended this one.

Assemblyman Capurro stated that he had phoned Mr. Paley especially on this meeting and that it was his opinion that he did not seem very interested, while on the other hand he had notified several large concerns in the state and had received favorable replies from them.

Assembly

March 11, 1969

Labor and Management - Page 4.

The conclusion of the Committee was that they should take action at this meeting.

Motion to pass AB-352 as amended with "do pass" recommendation was made by Assemblyman Webb

Motion seconded by Assemblyman Lingenfelter

Motion carried by vote - 4 ayes (Wilson, Lingenfelter, Webb, Capurro).

1 naye (May)

1 abstaining (Mello)

AB-580 was discussed briefly.

Motion to pass AB-580 with "Do Pass" recommendation made by Assemblyman Lingenfelter.

Motion seconded by Assemblyman Wilson

Motion carried by 5 ayes and 1 naye.

Meeting adjourned.