

and so the changes involving the two-year period, the 300-day or 300...or the two-year period was the result of the federal laws based upon the Civil Rights Act of 1964, under Section 2000E5, subsection (706), subsection (b), in the charge of notification, investigation, and determination. And the language that was pulled out there for the type of proceedings and how these actions were to take place were all pulled out of the federal law. So what we tried to do was mirror the federal law in this area, as well as deal with the constitutional problems that were raised by Senator Hohenstein. And that's...any changes that were in there were just to try to mirror the federal law. So that was the reason behind the amendment. Senator Hohenstein added some additional language, which I think he has explained. Serving on the Appropriations Committee, he saw some areas involving investigation which he felt could further improve the bill, which I thought were fine, and so that's the position we are with this bill. We just tried to make it constitutional as well as following the federal laws so we wouldn't ruffle any feathers about this particular bill. That's it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Abboud. Senator Hohenstein.

SENATOR HOHENSTEIN: I just want to respond briefly to a couple of issues Senator Wesely raised, and I understand his concern, and I agree with it. And this is not my bill, but this is my amendment and it makes some substantial changes, and that's why I was trying to get the attention of the body as we milled around after lunch and let our food digest for about 20 minutes. I think maybe we've got your attention now. And I think, Senator Wesely, you could probably ask Senator Landis this, or I could, but I do think there needs to be some time from now, if we adopt this amendment and move it ahead, and I will give Senator Landis just a minute on this, but so that we can let this sink in and get some input on it because there was not a public hearing on this particular change. It is a substantial change. I want to make sure that it is right also. I feel that it is, and I think what you are going to do is you're going to eliminate unnecessary investigations that do two things. First off, they give employees false hope that there is something that this agency can do for them. I mean, they could go on for six months thinking that, okay, something is going to happen, and then at the end of six months the agency comes back and says, you know, we really shouldn't have done that. They need some other rights. And the second thing it is going to do is those businesses that are getting investigated, they have to expend