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PRESIDENT OBAMA KEEPS CAMPAIGN PROMISE IN SIGNING FAIR PAY ACT, DRAWING PRAISE AND CRITICISM

by SAMEENA MOHAMMED

In January 2008, then-Senator Barack Obama was one of several co-sponsors of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act (Act).¹ One year later, in his new role as President of the United States, he has signed the legislation that he helped introduce.² The Act was proposed to overturn the Supreme Court’s ruling in Ledbetter v. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., in which the Court held that a timely wage discrimination complaint under Title VII must be filed within
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180 days (or 300 days, depending on the state) of an employer’s discriminatory decision to pay less, not from the time discrimination is discovered. In the year and a half since the decision, over 1,300 courts, including 12 of the 13 federal Courts of Appeals, have cited Ledbetter in some capacity.

When this legislation was introduced in previous terms, President Bush threatened to veto it, and when it came up for consideration in the Senate in April 2008, it fell four votes short of overcoming a filibuster. President Obama often referenced Lilly Ledbetter, the plaintiff in the case, during his debates and campaign stops. On January 28, 2009, Congress passed the Act with a largely party-line vote, and the next day, as promised, President Obama signed the legislation into law, proclaiming that “making our economy work means making sure it works for everyone.”

The Act begins by finding that the Supreme Court in Ledbetter undermined Title VII protections by narrowly construing the statute of limitations period in which plaintiffs can bring pay discrimination claims. Under Ledbetter, a plaintiff would have 180 or 300 days from the time her employer made a discriminatory decision about her compensation to bring a claim. The problem with this, proponents of the legislation contend, is that potential plaintiffs often do not discover until years later that their employer is paying them less than their colleagues, due to the taboo on discussing salaries with co-workers. The Act takes this problem into account by providing that the 180 or 300 day claim-filing period would start anew every time plaintiffs receive a paycheck – every time they are affected by their employer’s decision to pay them less.

Supporters of the Act included Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, Democrat of California, and Senator Barbara A. Mikulski, Democrat of Maryland, the chief sponsor of the bill. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) Acting Chairman, Stuart Ishimaru, also supported this legislation, noting, “The act is a victory for . . . all workers across the country who are shortchanged by receiving unequal pay for performing equal work.” Plaintiff-side labor and employment attorneys in Chicago, including Marvin Gittler and Lori Deem, note that the EEOC and the courts had been interpreting Title VII as this legislation requires for years prior to Ledbetter. Ms. Deem
explains, “The Court [in Ledbetter] really unsettled what was settled law,” and this Act has a restorative effect.¹⁴

A “TRIAL LAWYER GIVEAWAY?”¹⁵

While some praise the Act as restoring the status quo, not everyone shares in celebrating the realization of President Obama’s campaign promise. Senator Jim Inhofe, Republican of Oklahoma, argues that the bill essentially eliminates the statute of limitations on employment discrimination claims.¹⁶ Representative Howard P. McKeon, Republican of California, and a ranking member of the House Education and Labor Committee, has also been a vocal opponent of the bill, characterizing it as an “economic stimulus” for trial lawyers.¹⁷ The U.S. Chamber of Commerce shares his concern about the increase in litigation this legislation could spawn.¹⁸ Ms. Deem, however, dismisses these concerns as “overblown” because of the difficulties that persist in obtaining proof of wage discrimination.¹⁹
Max G. Brittain Jr., an employment lawyer practicing for over thirty years, also believes this legislation is redundant. According to Mr. Brittain, the Equal Pay Act is already in place as “a means by which a female [can] challenge pay decisions,” with a longer statute of limitations. Mr. Brittain further expressed concern at the difficulty employers may face in defending decades-old claims against supervisors who may have left the company or passed away. In response to such fears, Mr. Gittler notes that “courts have always stepped in” when plaintiffs are intentionally dilatory in exercising their rights.

This controversial Act is significant not only as a realization of President Obama’s campaign promise, but because it signals the administration’s commitment to ensuring equal pay for equal work. Pending legislation, such as the Paycheck Fairness Act, which passed the House on January 9, 2009, is further evidence of the commitment by President Obama and his supporters to eliminate wage discrimination. Opponents, meanwhile, wary of increased litigation, will have new opportunities to issue challenges and amendments to the next wave of fair pay legislation.
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