

FEPC

REPORT

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965



FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Report: July 1, 1964–June 30, 1965



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Clive Graham, *Chairman*

DIVISION OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Edward Howden, *Chief*

... *The simple and inescapable fact is that we have promised our citizens—Negro and white, alike—that in this country all might have, and are by law entitled to, freedom and the equal opportunity for a better life.*

I have always believed that California held the greatest promise among all states . . . because of its tradition of temperance, tolerance and moderation.

Edmund G. Brown
Governor

San Diego
August 11, 1964



FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Clive Graham	Chairman
Elton Brombacher	Commissioner
C. L. Dellums	Commissioner
John Anson Ford	Commissioner
Louis Garcia	Commissioner
Mrs. Audrey M. Sterling	Commissioner
Dwight R. Zook	Commissioner

DIVISION OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Edward Howden	Chief
Cruz Reynoso	Assistant Chief
Charles E. Wilson	Legal Counsel
Lloyd Zimpel	Education Officer
Donald K. Henry	Area Supervisor, Northern California
Lawrence Lucks	Area Supervisor, Southern California
Ralph Vega	Community Relations Officer

In October 1964, Clive Graham became chairman of the commission, succeeding Mrs. Carmen Warschaw, who resigned. Shortly after the end of this reporting period Mr. C. L. Dellums was named chairman. Mrs. Audrey Sterling was appointed as a new commissioner. When Mrs. Aileen Hernandez resigned in June 1965 as assistant chief to accept appointment to the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, created through Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Cruz Reynoso was appointed FEPC assistant chief.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

455 GOLDEN GATE AVE., SAN FRANCISCO 557-2000

Address reply to: FEPC, P. O. Box 603, San Francisco, Calif. 94101

EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor



C. L. DELLUMS
Chairman
ELTON BOMBACHER
JOHN ANSON FORD
LOUIS GARCIA
CLIVE GRAHAM
AUDREY M. STERLING
DWIGHT R. ZOOK

EDWARD HOWDEN
Executive Officer

December 31, 1965

To The Honorable EDMUND G. BROWN
Governor of California

Sir:

A report for the 12-month period from July 1, 1964, through June 30, 1965, of the California Fair Employment Practice Commission and the Division of Fair Employment Practices in the Department of Industrial Relations is herewith submitted, pursuant to provisions of Section 1419(j) of the Labor Code of California.

Respectfully,

C. L. Dellums
C. L. Dellums, Chairman
Fair Employment Practice
Commission

INTRODUCTION

As the California Fair Employment Practice Commission entered its fifth year, many gains could be counted, yet discriminatory treatment in employment and housing continued to limit the lives and opportunities of many of the state's Negro, Mexican American and other minority group citizens.

Progress toward the goal of assuring equal opportunity for all included such forward steps as the entry of minority group workers into fields formerly closed to them; the increased percentage of Negroes, Mexican Americans and other ethnic groups employed by many major corporations, particularly those with government contracts, as higher levels of management adopted non-discrimination policies; and the willingness of many employers at least to begin the process of achieving an integrated work-force.

Problems still existed, however, in persuading some areas of both private and public employment and unions to disregard race, color, creed or national origin in hiring workers and in transmitting non-discriminatory policies to the lower management and supervisory echelons where personnel selection begins. As state and federal measures against discrimination became more effective, unfair practices in employment appeared to take on more sophisticated forms, less open and often more difficult to correct. Also, even where new job opportunities did open up, the disadvantaged minority groups often found themselves unable to qualify because of inferior education and job skills. Thus, unemployment for such groups continued high, with the rate for Negroes frequently nearly twice that of the white community.

During this 12-month period, from July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965, the commission continued its emphasis on the affirmative action approach in cooperation with willing employers, and also gave increased attention to its career motivation program for young people of minority background. These objectives were pursued in addition to the handling of individual complaints of discrimination in employment.

Cases of discrimination in housing also accounted for considerable efforts by commission and staff, although some portions of the Rumford Fair Housing law were fully effective through only the first half of the report period.

Advisory Groups

Formation of three new advisory groups was authorized this year by the commission, under its powers to create such agencies to study problems of discrimination and to foster equality of opportunity through education and community effort.

The area of employee screening as a problem for Negroes and other minority groups, along with increasing interest in the question of possible "cultural bias" in pre-employment tests, led to the formation of the Technical Advisory Committee on Testing—TACT—to advise FEPC in industry's use of employee tests and related job screening practices. Membership consists of representatives of industry, labor, universities and government, as well as testing specialists. From a nucleus of seven Northern California testing experts, it was expanded to include state-wide representation of 30 at its first full-scale meeting in June.

The Committee's purpose, as outlined in its first year, was:

"to develop and recommend policy and guidelines for personnel selection practices which are nondiscriminatory and free from bias;

"to seek by means of education and information to make known pertinent facts concerning cultural factors in testing and personnel selection;

"to identify the need for more knowledge in the area of testing and employment of individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds; and

"to encourage research and demonstration projects that will contribute to fair participation of all cultural groups in the economic functions and rewards of the community."

As FEPC broadened its knowledge and communication with the many Californians of Hispanic ancestry in the State, commissioners and staff were made increasingly aware of the necessity to develop further approaches toward removing the inequities in employment and housing that affect this group. To achieve this goal, through greater involvement of Mexican Americans and other Latin Americans in FEPC activities, the Advisory Council of Californians of Spanish Surname was created.

The Council consists of several local committees comprised of members from specific geographical areas. By June 30, 1965, over 150 persons had been named to serve on these committees, which performed effective liaison functions for FEPC and the local communities.

The third new group was an FEPC advisory committee in Palo Alto, authorized by the commission at the request of citizens in that community and serving also as a city human relations council. The five-member committee began functioning actively late in 1965.

FEPC's first two advisory groups, the Women's Advisory Council and the San Mateo Area Advisory Committee, continued their activities through a variety of projects. Over 50 new members were appointed to the former organization and over 60 more women were re-appointed. Both statewide sessions and regional meetings were held in the northern and southern areas of the State.

Long Beach members of the women's council undertook a survey of that community which covered population characteristics, the general job opportunity and training picture for minority workers, and other statistical data.

Council members were among community volunteers who conducted tours of the Los Angeles Museum of Science and Industry for young people, and engaged in a project to increase participation by minority group children in the performing arts.

Among activities of the San Mateo committee was direction of a job skills survey among people in the San Mateo minority community, conducted by 40 volunteers, mainly college students. Results of this study and the Long Beach survey were published and distributed, as was an FEPC booklet of suggested programs for advisory groups.

Expansion of Services

The single consultant in each of the Fresno and San Diego district offices, in addition to handling increasing caseloads, continued affirmative involvement with their communities. Much of the groundwork for the broad and effective human relations activity that took place in these areas was laid by FEPC staff, who maintained relationships with civic leaders, educators, civil rights organizations, interracial committees, farm workers, and other community groups.

Between the opening of the San Diego office in the fall of 1963 and the end of fiscal 1965, 58 employment cases were docketed and 44 closed. Twelve housing cases had also been received there, and 10 closed. In Fresno, during that period, 62 employment complaints were received and 51 closed, as well as two housing complaints opened and resolved. Broad scale compliance programs were also initiated in both cities and consultants frequently provided assistance to the public in terms of counseling and guidance in finding other jobs or homes.

First of several sites for FEPC's "visiting consultant" service were selected during this period, with East Los Angeles and San Bernardino chosen for the initial operations. Part of the continuing program to assist minority group citizens who are unable to bring complaints of discrimination to one of the regular FEPC offices, this on-the-scene

service provides for a staff consultant to be available twice monthly, on a regular basis, in outlying communities.

Berkeley Project

Concern and discussion about the possibility that written employment tests may discriminate against minority group applicants and invalidly prevent them from obtaining jobs, as the Illinois FEPC contended in the Motorola case, led to establishment of an advisory group on employment testing. Additionally, FEPC granted to the City of Berkeley a one-year exemption from the FEP prohibition against asking for racial identification prior to hiring job applicants. Purpose of the exemption, requested by that city's personnel department in December 1964, was to permit undertaking a year-long study to establish whether its civil service tests are culturally biased against Negroes and other minority groups. In May 1965 a similar exemption, permitting participation in this research project, was granted to the City of Fresno, which has large numbers of Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surname job candidates.

Assistance in the early details of the project was provided by FEPC staff and members of the advisory group. Purpose of the study was fourfold: To determine to what degree test performance differed for members of different racial or ethnic groups; to ascertain if individual test items were relatively easier for one group than for another, and to analyze each such item; to determine the relationship between test performance and socio-economic status; and to identify needs for further research.

Legislation

During the 1965 session of the California legislature, the FEP Act was amended to delete the exemption of agricultural workers who live on farms where they are employed, with this provision operative until September 1967.

Several other bills were passed which, for the most part, had minimal effect on the procedures already followed by the commission. One called for service of a complaint on a respondent when he is first contacted, or within 45 days, whichever occurs first; another for the Commission to proceed to conciliation "where warranted by the evidence," and a third requiring that respondents be informed whether a particular discussion about a case is classified as a conciliation effort, which is privileged communication, or as investigation, which is not so protected.

Other amendments passed were designed to assure accordance with the State Administrative Procedures Act; to prohibit a commissioner

who has investigated a case from giving his opinion at a public hearing on that case; and to place in law the commission's longstanding procedure of notifying complainants and respondents when an investigation is closed.

Additionally, a bill was passed to amend various sections and laws to include prohibition against "national origin" discrimination where such a category was not previously covered.

INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

FEPC objectives are carried out both through compliance endeavors and an information and education program. The latter program is directed toward many different publics including employers, labor organizations, minority workers, employment agencies, job seekers, communications media, educators, parents, students and others.

These various groups are reached by several methods, such as publications and news releases, audio-visual displays, educational programs for minority youth which stress the importance of acquiring marketable skills, a speaker service in which both commissioners and staff participate, and special events to publicize anti-discrimination projects.

An extensive reference library containing material on civil rights in the fields of education, employment, housing, law, and intergroup relations, in addition to general and sociological source material, is also maintained by the information and education staff. This data, as well as pamphlets, booklets and reports on other states' FEP agencies, civil rights organizations and human relations units throughout the county has proved valuable as a reference source for many groups and individuals.

Publications

In addition to reprinting and revising publications produced in previous years, FEPC prepared and distributed such new material as the following:

Californians of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino Ancestry: Third in a series of reports about ethnic or racial groups in the State, containing statistics and analyses by the Division of Labor Statistics and Research based on the 1960 census. Population, educational attainments, areas of residence, industry distribution, occupation, unemployment, income and size of family are covered in the booklet, as in its companion pieces, *Negro Californians* and *Californians of Spanish Surname*. A reprint of the former, issued in June 1965, contains a 15-page supplement based on additional census data made available in 1963.

Report on Los Angeles City Schools: A 22-page study of the Los Angeles Unified School District which shows an imbalanced propor-

tion of minority group teachers, their concentration in schools with large minority group enrollment, and the lack of promotional opportunities for these staff members. A similar report, published earlier, deals with the Oakland Unified School District, in regard to its recruiting, hiring, assignment and promotion policies.

Bank of America Employment Practices: Two reports on FEPC's affirmative action with this banking firm. The first contains complete documentation of steps leading up to the program as well as personnel data on the composition of the bank's work force according to racial or ethnic breakdown. The second describes improvements in the bank's equal employment practices and how these were achieved.

Employment Practices, City of San Diego: A 10-page record of current civil service hiring procedures, investigated by FEPC at the request of city officials, with recommendations on methods of improving job opportunities for minority group workers.

Affirmative Actions in Employment: A special FEPC report that includes six case histories of affirmative expansion of minority work forces by large California employers working cooperatively with FEPC.

Action Programs for FEPC Advisory Committees: Keyed to FEPC advisory groups and similar volunteer citizens' organizations, with specific suggestions for projects to promote fair employment and open housing.

Survey of Private Employment Agencies in California: Results of a survey of the state's 1,100 private employment agencies and their practices in respect to referring and placing minority group job applicants.

San Mateo Area Minority Job Survey: Details of a survey designed both to provide data on the location, availability and skills of this community's work force and to assist those in that category to obtain jobs commensurate with their skills and training.

Community Survey, Long Beach: Prepared by members of the Women's Advisory Council to FEPC, this 22-page report covers population characteristics; training and employment opportunities for minorities; community agencies, and statistical information on different ethnic groups.

Guidelines for Realtors: Ten specific suggestions to assist realty brokers in the promotion of nondiscriminatory housing opportunities.

Fair Practices News: Published on a bi-monthly basis and distributed to a circulation list of about 14,000 individuals and organizations.

In addition, a variety of earlier publications continued to be requested and widely circulated, including the FEPC *Poster*, *Pre-employment Inquiry Guide and Fair Employment Checklist*; *You Have The Right* and its Spanish version *Usted tiene el derecho*; *Memo to Management*; *Promoting Equal Job Opportunity: A Guide for Employers*; *Annual Reports*; three editions, covering the period from September 1959 through June 1964; *Directory of City and County Human Relations Commissions*; the text of the Fair Employment Practice Act and a *Digest* of the statute; FEPC publications relevant to the fair housing laws, as well as topical news releases and similar data directed toward increasing public knowledge and understanding of FEPC goals and accomplishments.

Motivation for Youth

Increasingly, FEPC's education program has concerned career motivation of young people, both by reaching them directly and by advising counselors, teachers, and parents. The aim is to provide students, especially those in minority groups, with information about the changing employment picture and the importance of adequate preparation for the good jobs potentially available to minority youth. Several booklets, such as *Si—Se Puede!*, *Success Story* and *Whoever You Are* were well received by such groups across the state. Steps were taken during the year to expand the list of motivational publications through cooperation with the State Department of Education.

Other positive steps taken by FEPC in this direction include participation in career guidance conferences and job fairs for young people.

Speaker Service

Speaking engagements by Commissioners and staff added further effectiveness to FEPC's information and education role. During the year, over 450 such appearances were made. Audiences included business, labor, civic and fraternal organizations; church, school and temple groups; federal, state and county employees; lawyers, nurses, realtors, educators, police officers, bankers, and members of study clubs, interracial groups, and human relations committees.

Through such appearances, FEPC speakers dealt with explanation of the fair employment and fair housing laws, federal civil rights legislation, opportunities and problems of minority workers, career motivation, training programs, and related areas.

Audio-visual material made available for use by schools, community groups and other organizations included a 50-frame filmstrip, *Opportunity For All*, based on FEPC's 1960 publication, *Success*

Story, keyed to minority young people and the importance of training for jobs. Two prints of the sound film, *To Find A Home*, which portrays the difficulties one Negro family encountered in renting a suitable home, were also available on a loan basis.

Two photomural exhibits, *Manpower for the Future*, and *Equal Opportunity—Employment and Housing*, were displayed extensively throughout the state at conferences, schools, libraries, public buildings and special exhibitions. Similarly used were two portable tabletop display panels, frequently as background for a supply of FEPC publications offered to the public.

COMPLIANCE THROUGH INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYMENT COMPLAINTS

Investigation and resolution of individual employment complaints continued as FEPC's primary activity, although broad-scale programs for achieving equal job opportunity received increasing emphases. Total number of individual cases docketed in this period was 783. The number closed was 1,041, with 504 in the process of investigation on June 30, 1965. Overall number of individual cases received since the agency began operation in 1959 was 4,199, and the number closed 3,695.

Table 1
SUMMARY OF EMPLOYMENT CASES FILED,
CLOSED, AND IN PROCESS

<i>Status of cases</i>	<i>Total cases</i>	<i>Individual complaints</i>	<i>Investigations</i>
<i>July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965</i>			
In process, July 1, 1964	820	762	58
Filed	802	783	19
	—	—	—
Active in period	1,622	1,545	77
Closed	1,061	1,041	20
	—	—	—
In process, June 30, 1965	561	504	57
<i>September 18, 1959-June 30, 1965</i>			
Filed	4,319	4,199	120
Closed	3,758	3,695	63
	—	—	—
In process, June 30, 1965	561	504	57

In 635 cases, or some 80%, race or color was the alleged cause of discrimination; of this number, 608 of the complainants were Negro. Discrimination because of national origin was charged in 111 cases, and about 80% of these concerned persons of Spanish-speaking background. Of the 19 cases based on religious creed, most were filed by persons of Jewish or Protestant faith.

Caucasians lodged complaints in 18 instances charging discrimination because of their marriage to or association with non-whites, or because of opposition to an employer's racial bias.

Table 2

EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: ALLEGED BASIS
OF DISCRIMINATION IN INDIVIDUAL
COMPLAINTS

July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Alleged basis of discrimination</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
Race or color	635	81
Negro	608	78
Asian	7	1
Caucasian	20	3
National origin or ancestry	111	14
Spanish surname	88	11
Other	23	3
Creed	19	2
Jewish	9	1
Catholic	1	a
Protestant	8	1
Atheist	1	a
Opposition to discrimination	18	2
Total	783	100

^a Less than 1/2 of 1 percent.

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Refusal to hire and job termination continued to be the types of discriminatory act most often charged, involving almost three-quarters of all individual complaints in this period. In Table 3 which summarizes the various discriminatory acts alleged, "unequal work conditions" may include discriminatory discipline or layoffs, harassment on the job, discriminatory job or shift assignments, denial of permanent status, change of days off, reduction in work week, or refusal of admission to employee organizations or participation in employee activities.

() ()

Table 3
EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: ALLEGED
DISCRIMINATORY ACT
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Act</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
Refusal to hire	258	33
Dismissal from employment	324	41
Refusal to upgrade	47	6
Unequal work conditions	153	20
Employment agency or business school referral withheld	7	1
Union membership withheld and other		
union discrimination	41	5
Reprisal for filing complaint	3	a
 Total b	 783	 100

^a Less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent.

^b Detail adds to more than total since more than one discriminatory act may be alleged in a single case.

Private employers were named as respondents in most of the cases—75%—as has been true in previous years. Public employers were charged in 19%, labor organizations in 5%, and employment agencies in another 1%.

Table 4
EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: TYPE OF
RESPONDENT
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Type of respondent</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
Private employer	590	75
Manufacturing	244	31
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	59	8
Construction	38	5
Wholesale and retail trade, except restaurants	99	13
Hotels and restaurants	46	6
Finance and insurance	34	4
Business services	54	7
Other	16	2

Table 4—Continued

Type of respondent	Number of cases	Percent of cases
Public employer, except hospitals	124	16
City, except employment agency	26	3
County, except employment agency	23	3
State, except employment agency	36	5
Schools	31	4
Employment agency	8	1
Public hospitals	25	3
Private employment agency	5	1
Labor organization	39	5
Total	783	100

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Occupations most frequently involved were service, operative and clerical. The proportion of male complainants to female complainants was about two to one.

Table 5
EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: OCCUPATION INVOLVED
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

Occupation involved	Number of cases	Percent of cases
Clerical	138	18
Crafts	119	15
Laborer	92	12
Managers and foremen	10	1
Operative	208	27
Professional and technical	73	9
Sales	38	5
Service	105	13
Total complaints	783	100

() ()

Table 6
**EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: SEX OF
 COMPLAINANT**
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Sex of complainant</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
Female -----	224	29
Male -----	559	71
Total -----	783	100

Cases are under jurisdiction of either the Northern or Southern area office. The following table shows distribution by geographical area.

Table 7
**EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: LOCATION
 OF RESPONDENT**
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Location of respondent ^a</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
1. San Francisco-Oakland area -----	265	34
2. Northern and central California except Area 1 -----	111	14
3. Los Angeles area -----	360	46
4. San Diego and Imperial Counties -----	27	3
5. Southern California except Areas 3 and 4 -----	20	3
Total -----	783	100

^a See map on page 19 for counties included in each area.

Determination and Disposition

Of the 1,041 individual employment cases in this fiscal year, a determination as to whether discrimination had occurred was made in 923 cases. In the other 118, either FEPC had no jurisdiction or else the complainant did not proceed with the charges.



() ()

Table 8
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED: DETERMINATION
REGARDING DISCRIMINATION
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Case disposition</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>	<i>Cumulative total September 18, 1959- June 30, 1965</i>	
			<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Determination made as to whether or not there was discrimination	923	89	3,325	90
No determination made because of lack of jurisdiction or failure of complainant to proceed	118	11	370	10
Total	1,041	100	3,695	100

Evidence supporting the charge of discrimination was found in 233 cases, and all of these were closed by satisfactory adjustment. The other 690 complaints were dismissed on the basis of insufficient evidence or no evidence of discrimination. In those cases satisfactorily resolved, corrective action by the respondent including hiring, reinstatement, back pay, promotion, and other remedies. In most cases, even those where specific charges of discrimination were not upheld, employers agreed to put in effect or strengthen a policy of non-discrimination, to increase promotional opportunities for minorities, or to improve recruiting methods in order to achieve a balanced workforce. More than one term of compliance was often required of respondents.

Table 9
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED: DISPOSITION
AFTER DETERMINATION REGARDING
DISCRIMINATION
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Case disposition	Number of cases	Percent of cases	Cumulative total	
			September 18, 1959- June 30, 1965	Number
Discrimination found	233	25	996	30
Closed by satisfactory adjustment	233	25	993	30
Public hearing held	—	—	3	a
Dismissed because of insufficient evidence or no evidence of discrimination	690	75	2,329	70
Total cases in which deter- mination was made as to whether or not there was discrimination	923	100	3,325	100

^a Less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent.

Satisfactory adjustment was reached in 159 cases against private employers, and in 41 cases involving public employers. Labor organizations were concerned in 24 closed complaints, and private employment agencies in 9.

() ()

Table 10
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION: TYPE OF RESPONDENT

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Type of respondent</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
Private employer	159	68
Manufacturing	72	31
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	18	8
Construction	3	1
Wholesale and retail trade, except restaurants	24	10
Hotels and restaurants	18	8
Finance and insurance	10	4
Business services	13	6
Other	1	a
Public employer, except hospitals	35	15
City, except employment agency	6	3
County, except employment agency	2	1
State, except employment agency	18	8
Schools	8	3
Employment agency	1	a
Public hospitals	6	3
Private employment agency	9	4
Labor organization	24	10
Total	233	100

^a Less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent.

The following three tables show in detail the geographic location, the occupations involved, and the type of corrective action agreed on by respondents in conference with commissioners in the 233 cases closed satisfactorily during this period.

In nearly half of these cases, immediate hiring, reinstatement or promotion was offered by the respondent. In most cases, the respondent agreed to put into effect or strengthen a policy of equal employment opportunity or to eliminate illegal pre-employment inquiries and other undesirable practices. In many instances more than one term of compliance was required of the respondent.

Table 11
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION: LOCATION OF RESPONDENT

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Location of respondent^a</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
1. San Francisco-Oakland area	113	48
2. Northern and Central California except Area 1	48	21
3. Los Angeles area	55	24
4. San Diego and Imperial counties	8	3
5. Southern California except Areas 3 and 4	9	4
Total	233	100

^a See map on page 21 for counties included in each area.

Table 12
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION: OCCUPATION INVOLVED

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Type of occupation</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>
Clerical	35	15
Crafts	37	16
Laborer	7	3
Managers and foremen	6	3
Operative	70	30
Professional and technical	20	9
Sales	22	9
Service	36	15
Total	233	100

() ()

Table 13
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED BY CORRECTIVE ACTION: TYPE OF ACTION TAKEN
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Type of correction</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Percent of cases</i>	<i>Cumulative total</i> <i>September 18, 1959-June 30, 1965</i>	
			<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Offer of immediate hire, reinstatement, or promotion of complainant	105	45	470	47
Offer of immediate hire or promotion of person other than complainant	35	15	123	12
Commitment to hire or promote at first opportunity	21	9	85	9
Commitment to consider hiring or promoting at first opportunity	23	10	111	11
Working conditions corrected	33	14	100	10
Back pay granted	10	4	67	7
Fair employment policy promulgated or strengthened ^a	186	80	816	82
Labor union practices corrected	24	10	81	8
Employment agency referral agreed to	10	4	56	6
Recruitment sources broadened	115	49	267	27
Total	233	100	993	100

^a Includes promulgation of fair employment practice order, ceasing unlawful pre-employment practices, etc.

Note: Detail adds to more than total since more than one type of corrective action may be agreed to in a single case.

EMPLOYMENT CASE SUMMARIES

Improved Recruitment and Hiring

A Negro job-seeker, refused the privilege of filing an application for work in a Northern California bottling plant, lodged a complaint with FEPC and also informed a local citizens' civil rights organization of the discrimination. At first the employer, who had no Negroes among his work force of 110, refused to discuss the issue with either FEPC or the civil rights group. Later he turned the matter over to an associate who was more willing to correct the situation. The company's practices were changed so it not only began to accept applications from nonwhites, but soon hired four Negroes. Plans were also made to work closely with the civil rights group in recruiting more minority employees.

Qualified But Not Interviewed

Although a Negro applicant was apparently qualified for a stock room job with an aircraft company, he was rejected without an interview, while a Caucasian who applied later was interviewed and then hired. When FEPC investigated the complaint, it was learned that the complainant excelled in regard to education, physical capability and experience. These facts were pointed out to the employer, resulting in an interview for the complainant and his employment by the company within 10 days.

Complaint by Union Gets Results

The street department of a Northern California city was charged with racially discriminatory job practices by a union local and subsequent investigation by FEPC staff disclosed that the charges were true. As the result of several conferences with FEPC personnel, the department altered hiring practices, conditions of employment and promotional opportunities so that all minority employees were offered more equal treatment.

Company Policy Clarified

A Negro applicant referred by the State Department of Employment for a job as inspector trainee at a testing laboratory was told by the manager that it was "company policy" not to hire "you people." During conferences with FEPC, the manager admitted these

statements and disclosed that he discriminated against Negro applicants. Consultation with executives of the firm showed that the manager had misrepresented the company's policy. As a result, he was demoted and replaced by a new manager.

A Question of Holidays

A truck driver alleged he was fired for observing the Jewish holidays, although he said he had given adequate advance notice that he would take time off. Inquiries by FEPC revealed that he had been reinstated in his job when the employer learned a complaint had been filed with FEPC.

Missouri Firm Complies With FEPC

FEPC was told by a Negro complainant that questions about race and religion were part of the pre-employment process used by a hotel supply company. Investigation revealed that the allegations were true. Correspondence with the firm, which has headquarters in Missouri, indicated they would delete the unlawful inquiries and comply with California's fair employment practices laws.

BROAD COMPLIANCE AND COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

I. SECTION 1421 INVESTIGATIONS

Although the processing of individual complaints necessarily requires the greatest part of FEPC effort, increasing attention was given during the year to two broader types of compliance activity: Section 1421 investigations, and affirmative action programs.

In the first, the commission is authorized under Section 1421 of the FEP Act to undertake an investigation when it appears probable that the act has been violated even though no individual complaint has been filed. Correction of such violation is possible only through conciliation in these instances, without recourse to enforcement or public hearings. Requests to initiate such investigations come, as a rule, from an organization, agency, or individual that can show evidence that unlawful discrimination is being practiced.

The considerable expenditure of time and attention required by these broad scale inquiries is directly reflected in the comprehensive results achieved—in terms of increased job opportunities, improved employment practices, and other desired objectives.

During this period, FEPC began 19 such investigations and closed 20 that were begun earlier. The total number initiated since the program began was 120, of which 63 had been completed, and 57 were still in progress at the end of the fiscal year.

Table 14

EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: ALLEGED DISCRIMINATORY ACT: INVESTIGATIONS UNDER SECTION 1421

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

Act	Number of cases
Refusal to hire	8
Dismissal from employment	0
Refusal to upgrade	5

Table 14—Continued

<i>Act</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>
Unequal work conditions.....	5
Employment agency or business school referral withheld.....	1
Union membership withheld and apprenticeship discrimination or practices	8
Total ^a	19

^a Detail adds to more than total since more than one discriminatory act may be alleged in a single case.

Table 15
EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: TYPE OF RESPONDENT: INVESTIGATIONS UNDER SECTION 1421

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Type of respondent</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Cumulative total</i> <i>Sept. 18, 1959— June 30, 1965</i>
Private employer	4	47
Manufacturing	1	18
Construction	—	1
Wholesale and retail trade.....	2	11
Transportation	—	4
Finance and insurance.....	1	4
Hotels and restaurants.....	—	2
Business services	—	3
Other (entertainment industry).....	—	4
Public employer	7	40
City	1	10
County	1	3
State	2	9
Schools and colleges.....	3	18
Public hospitals	—	1
Private employment agency.....	—	9
Labor organization	8	22
Other (trade association).....	—	1
Total	19	120

Table 16
EMPLOYMENT CASES OPENED: LOCATION
OF RESPONDENT: INVESTIGATIONS
UNDER SECTION 1421

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Location of respondent^a</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>
1. San Francisco-Oakland area.....	9
2. Northern and central California, except Area 1.....	2
3. Los Angeles-Long Beach area.....	5
4. San Diego and Imperial Counties.....	0
5. Southern California, except Areas 3 and 4.....	1
All of southern California ^b	1
Statewide.....	1
	—
Total	19

^a See map on page 21 for counties included in each area.

^b Investigations covering respondents with branches throughout 3, 4, and 5.

Table 17
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED: DETERMINATION
REGARDING DISCRIMINATION: INVESTI-
GATIONS UNDER SECTION 1421

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Case disposition</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Cumulative total</i> <i>Sept. 18, 1959—</i> <i>June 30, 1965</i>
Determination made as to whether or not there was discrimination	13	52
No determination made because of lack of jurisdiction or failure of complainant to proceed, or transferred to affirmative action program ^a	7	11
Total cases closed.....	20	63

^a Three cases.

() ()

Table 18
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED: DISPOSITION
AFTER DETERMINATION REGARDING DIS-
CRIMINATION: INVESTIGATIONS
UNDER SECTION 1421

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Case disposition</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Cumulative total</i> <i>Sept. 18, 1959—</i> <i>June 30, 1965</i>
Discrimination found, closed by satisfactory adjustment	9	41
Dismissed because of no discrimination	4	11
Total cases in which determination was made as to whether or not there was discrimination	13	52

Table 19
EMPLOYMENT CASES CLOSED BY SATISFACTORY
ADJUSTMENT: TYPE OF RESPONDENT: IN-
VESTIGATIONS UNDER SECTION 1421

July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

<i>Type of respondent</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>
Private employer	5
Manufacturing	1
Wholesale and retail trade	2
Finance	1
Business services	1
Public employer	3
State	1
City	2
Labor organization	1
Total	9

San Francisco Housing Authority

An investigation of the San Francisco Housing Authority, requested by that body and by the San Francisco branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, covered both em-

ployment and placement of tenants in the Authority's many projects. In a public report on the inquiry, FEPC recommended that the Authority discontinue its practice of coding pre-employment applications according to the race of the applicant; hire more minority group employees in headquarters positions and as project managers; recruit minority craft personnel from other sources if building trades unions fail to provide such workers; and explore the establishment of apprenticeship positions which could sometimes be filled by minority workers.

In regard to placement of tenants, the Authority was advised to discontinue the racial coding of pre-tenancy records, lessen concentration of minorities in certain areas and eliminate those policies that tend to intimidate minority project residents and create tension.

Employment Agencies Survey

A statewide survey of 1,100 licensed employment agencies in California was undertaken as part of a Section 1421 investigation. Responses indicated that only minimum efforts were being made by most of the agencies to provide equal opportunities in referral and placement for minority job seekers. Two favorable conclusions emerged from the survey: Over half the agencies that do handle minority group applicants experience no difficulty in finding jobs for them, and most agencies serving these applicants found them much easier to place than was true a year previously. In reviewing the survey results, FEPC recommended that agencies improve their image in the minority community to keep pace with other industries in providing full opportunity for all citizens.

Report on City of Pasadena

A two-year examination of employment practices of the City of Pasadena revealed that while Negro and Spanish-surname employment is in about the same proportion as each group's percentage of the general population, both groups rank well below other city employees in pay and job status.

Recommendations made by FEPC for continuing improvement of the city's employment policies included aggressive recruiting of minority applicants, inclusion of minorities on oral interview panels, increased human relations training for supervisory employees, a strictly-enforced nondiscrimination clause in contracts made by the city, and close cooperation between the city's Human Relations Committee and the personnel department.

San Francisco Police Department

An appreciable increase in the number of minority group officers employed by the San Francisco Police Department was shown in the report on a long-range FEPC study of its hiring and recruitment policies.

During this period the department also established the Police Community Relations Unit, which carries on an officers' retraining program in human and racial relations. The department also made greater efforts to direct its recruiting efforts to the minority community.

Other Investigations

Racially restrictive policies of labor organizations affecting both union membership and apprenticeship programs were investigated in several instances. Such cases sometimes arose during the course of processing individual complaints against an employer, such as the study of a garage and service station employees' local that stemmed from FEPC investigation of employment practices in a division of a large automobile manufacturing and distributing corporation.

In another instance, an investigation by FEPC was instigated by a church body hopeful of assuring that all ethnic groups were fairly represented in the workforces that built facilities used by the community. Labor groups investigated in this period included plumbers, ironworkers, sheet metal workers, electricians, glass workers and operating engineers.

II. AFFIRMATIVE ACTIONS

A second type of compliance activity geared toward broad results is designated as an affirmative action program. It differs from a Section 1421 investigation in that the project does not originate from an allegation or supposition that the FEP law has been violated, and the action is wholly voluntary on the part of the employer or other organization concerned.

The willing cooperation of the employer, his commitment to the policy of equal employment opportunity, and his use of FEPC's advice and assistance to achieve this goal are key features of the affirmative action process.

Recognized by other state and federal fair employment agencies as a highly effective method of increasing the utilization of minority manpower, the affirmative action approach has attracted large industrial and commercial employers, utilities, banks, educational institutions, government agencies and labor organizations.

Well-planned programs of this type, carried on over an extensive period, also permit the commission to concentrate on the more crucial problems of discrimination and on employment situations most likely to yield good results, rather than relying only on a random selection of target areas made apparent by the individual complaint process. An employment complaint comes, in its nature, after the fact of alleged discrimination; the affirmative action builds employment situations which become less likely to cause the filing of complaints. Essentially, this approach is a means of preventing discrimination in recruiting, hiring, assignment and upgrading. Frequently, FEPC has employed it in the earliest planning stages of a new industry or business, thus aiding employers to prevent problems before they begin.

Bank of America

Extensive public attention was focused on FEPC's affirmative action with the Bank of America, which began after the Bank, one of California's largest employers, informed the commission of its equal employment policy and its intention to report periodically on personnel statistics in this regard. The subsequent cooperative agreement provided for continuing consultation, inspection of practices and independent public report by FEPC.

In May 1965, FEPC embarked on a long-range affirmative action with the component employing powers of a billion dollar project to provide a rapid transit system throughout three counties in a metropolitan area. Scheduled to provide employment for thousands during the next seven years, with peak employment set at 8,000, the system is expected to have a roster of 1,000 permanent employees when the completed system is in operation. In cooperation with several local human rights groups, FEPC worked with directors of the project, the joint venture corporation carrying out engineering and contract assignments, and the many unions involved.

Military Installations

Discrimination in employment of military dependents as well as in off-base housing for servicemen was studied in another program, which covered all military installations in the state. Suggested by the Department of Defense, the affirmative action project included two areawide conferences attended by base commanders or their deputies, who were urged to exert their influence on bettering community attitudes toward minority group families. These efforts and others were instrumental in generating future programs which include a nation-

wide census of equal opportunity in the rental of off-base housing to military personnel, conducted by the Department of Defense.

Los Angeles Hotels

An affirmative action with some 20 Los Angeles hotels had as its prime purpose the opening up of non-traditional public contact jobs for minorities, previously restricted in the hotel industry mainly to lower-status, lower-paid jobs such as janitors and maids.

When the program opened in mid-1963 after the hotel employers had agreed to furnish FEPC with personnel statistics, one hotel, for instance, had no Negro bartenders. At the end of 1964, four were working there regularly, as was a Negro telephone operator. Another hotel during this period hired a Negro desk clerk, the first among the 245 such clerks employed by these hotels. The number of Negro waiters among the 549 regularly working for these hotels increased from about a dozen when the program began, to 28 at the end of 1964. The program continues, with contacts by the FEPC staff on a regular basis, and includes work with new hotels to encourage equitable hiring practices at the outset of their operation.

Other Programs

Extensive programs were also undertaken with the statewide systems of the California State College and the University of California to improve hiring and placement of minority employees on the 27 different campuses in the State. Consultants and commissioners visited all the locations and also called a conference of top level school administrators to implement the program. In addition, FEPC advised these institutions on methods of attracting more minority students, making financial aid available to them when necessary, and assuring equal housing opportunities.

Continuing efforts with all employers involved in operations at a large metropolitan airport showed particular progress in hiring minority workers in public contact jobs.

Table 20
TYPES OF EMPLOYERS INVOLVED IN
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Programs Opened</i>		<i>Programs Closed</i>	
Restaurant	1	Restaurant	1
Newspaper	1	Newspaper	1
Manufacturing	1	Manufacturing	4
State Government Agency	2	State Government Agency	1
Finance	2	Retail Trade	4
Military Installation	2	Port Facility	1
Airport	2	Entertainment	1
Public Transportation	1	Labor Organization	1
Public Utility	1		
County School District	1		14
Group of 8 principal metropolitan employers	1		
State higher educational institution	2		
	17		

FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

As California became the country's most populous state, it also drew nationwide interest because of the controversy over its fair housing laws.

The Fair Employment Practice Commission is responsible for administration of the Rumford Fair Housing Act of 1963, which declares that discrimination in housing accommodations because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry is against public policy. It prohibits discrimination in housing sales, rentals, leasing or financing and covers public and redevelopment housing; publicly-assisted, single-unit homes; and apartments in structures of three or more units. The act applies to all activities of real estate brokers and salesmen as well as activities of persons or firms engaged in the business of housing or mortgage lending, and establishes methods of preventing and remedying violations. It does not apply to housing operated on a non-profit basis, duplexes, or privately-financed single family homes.

Soon after the law was passed its opponents undertook measures that eventually resulted in the mounting of an initiative campaign for an amendment to the state constitution which would nullify enforcement provisions of the fair housing law with respect to owners of residential property, and would also prevent the enactment of such laws in the future except by further constitutional amendments.

Enough signatures were obtained to qualify the measure on the November 16 ballot as "Proposition 14" and the amendment was subsequently passed by the voters.

Throughout the campaign period, as well as after the election, FEPC was called on for information about the provisions of the housing act and how it was administered. Such information was provided through publications, the speaker service programs and other means, reaching varied groups such as property owners, realty boards, apartment house associations, voters' study groups and the numerous fair housing organizations soon established by citizens throughout the state.

After Proposition 14 went into effect, FEPC continued its information and education program in this respect, as the public sought interpretation and clarification on the changed status of fair housing legislation.

Since the new amendment did not change the law against discrimination with regard to realty brokerage offices, lending institutions,

and state or local units of government involved in housing, FEPC responsibilities for processing complaints that involved such entities remained the same.

In January 1965, the commission issued a statement on the status of the Rumford Act as modified by Proposition 14, which detailed its remaining authority to engage in a broad range of educational, advisory, research, conciliatory and affirmative activities to promote equal housing opportunity. (See FEPC Report, January 1, 1963-June 30, 1964).

The Rumford law had little more than a year of fully effective operation, which covered the first four months of this fiscal period. Statistics reported thus include those four months and the following eight months after Proposition 14 was passed but under review as to its constitutionality.*

During this period 108 individual housing complaints were filed, in addition to the 51 already in the investigation process. By the end of the period, 124 cases had been closed, with action still pending on 35. From the effective date of the housing law, September 20, 1963, 243 cases had been filed, and 208 of these closed. (In addition, two affirmative action programs were in progress during this period, one of which was closed.)

Table 21
**SUMMARY OF HOUSING CASES FILED,
CLOSED, AND IN PROCESS**

<i>Status of cases</i>	<i>Total cases</i>	<i>Individual complaints</i>	<i>Affirmative actions</i>
<i>July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965</i>			
In process, July 1, 1964	52	51	1
Filed	109	108	1
	—	—	—
Active in period	161	159	2
Closed	125	124	1
	—	—	—
In process, June 30, 1965	36	35	1
<i>September 20, 1963-June 30, 1965</i>			
Filed	245	243	2
Closed	209	208	1
	—	—	—
In process, June 30, 1965	36	35	1

* In May, 1966 the California Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional and in June, 1967 the United States Supreme Court gave a similar decision.

Discrimination because of race or color was the alleged basis for complaint in 94 percent of the new cases filed. National origin or ancestry accounted for 4 percent and religious creed for 2 percent.

Table 22
HOUSING CASES OPENED: ALLEGED BASIS OF DISCRIMINATION
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Alleged basis of discrimination	Northern California		Southern California		Total No.	Pct.	Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.			Sept. 20, 1963- June 30, 1965	No.
Race or color	38	95	64	94	102	94	230	95
Negro	35	88	60	88	95	88	220	91
Asian	1	3	1	1	2	2	5	2
Caucasian	2	5	3	4	5	5	5	2
National origin or ancestry	2	5	2	3	4	4	10	4
Spanish surname	2	5	2	3	4	4	7	3
Indian	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	— ^a
East Indian	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	— ^a
Greek	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	— ^a
Creed	—	—	2	3	2	2	3	1
Jewish	—	—	2	3	2	3	3	1
Total	40	100	68	100	108	100	243	100

^a Less than 1/2 of 1 percent.

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

As in the first nine months of the law's operation, rental units were the accommodations most frequently involved in complaints, since "refusal to rent" was the alleged discriminatory act in half the cases. "Refusal to sell" accommodations was alleged in 19 percent of the year's complaints, and conditions of housing in 26 percent. In 6 percent of the complaints filed, the discriminatory act charged was aiding and abetting discrimination.

Refusal to rent or sell as used in the following tables in many instances includes refusal to answer inquiries or to show the available units, as well as requiring different procedures of application from those normally asked. Conditions of housing include eviction, higher rental rates, and differential treatment in the use of building facilities. Frequently, such conditions were imposed because of the complainants' social relationships with persons of minority ethnic or religious backgrounds. When aiding or abetting discrimination was a cause for complaint, this usually involved other tenants or property managers.

Table 23
**HOUSING CASES OPENED: ALLEGED
 DISCRIMINATORY ACT**
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
 July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Act	Northern California		Southern California		Total	Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.
Refusal to rent accommodations	21	53	33	49	54	50	142 58
Refusal to sell accommodations	4	10	16	24	20	19	42 17
Conditions of housing	13	33	15	22	28	26	49 20
Aiding and abetting discrimination	2	5	4	6	6	6	8 3
Loan withheld	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 1
Total	40	100	68	100	108	100	243 100

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Apartment owners or managers were named in 65 cases and real estate firms in 20 complaints. In only four instances were complaints lodged against an individual home owner, while in eight a real estate firm and home owner together were charged with discrimination. Tract developers were respondents in nine cases.

Table 24
HOUSING CASES OPENED: TYPE OF
RESPONDENT

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

<i>Type of respondent</i>	<i>Northern California</i>		<i>Southern California</i>		<i>Total</i>		<i>Cumulative total</i>		
	<i>No.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Sept. 20, 1963-June 30, 1965</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Apartment owner or manager	20	50	45	66	65	60	154	63	
Tract developer ^a	3	8	6	9	9	8	17	7	
Individual home owner	1	3	3	4	4	4	7	3	
Trailer court owner	1	3	—	—	1	1	4	2	
Real estate company	9	23	11	16	20	19	32	13	
Real estate company and home owner	5	13	3	4	8	7	20	8	
Public housing authority	1	3	—	—	1	1	5	2	
Mortgage company	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	
Apartment sublessor	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	
Total	40	100	68	100	108	100	243	100	

^a One case also involved a lending agency.

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

In 75 complaints (69 percent), apartments were the type of accommodation sought. Single-family, non-tract homes were represented in 21 cases and tract houses in 9 complaints. Homesites, public housing and trailer space accounted for one complaint each during this period.

Table 25
HOUSING CASES OPENED: TYPE OF
ACCOMMODATION
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Type of Accommodation	Northern California		Southern California		Total	Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		Sept. 20, 1963-June 30, 1965	No.
Single family, non-tract house	6	15	15	22	21	19	35
Apartment	29	73	46	68	75	69	179
Homesite	—	—	1	1	1	1	2
Tract house	3	8	6	9	9	8	18
Public housing	1	3	—	—	1	1	5
Trailer space	1	3	—	—	1	1	4
Total	40	100	68	100	108	100	243
							100

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

Table 26
**LOCATION OF ACCOMMODATION IN
 HOUSING CASES**
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
 July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Location of accommodation ^a	Number of cases		Cumulative total	
	Opened	Closed [*]	September 20, 1963-	June 30, 1965
1. San Francisco-Oakland area	36	26	91	46
2. Northern and central California, except Area 1	4	4	11	6
3. Los Angeles area	52	18	113	36
4. San Diego and Imperial counties	7	3	12	4
5. Southern California, except Areas 3 and 4	9	3	16	7
Total	108	54	243	99

^a See map on page 21.

^{*} Closed with corrective action.

Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding.

A determination on whether or not discrimination had occurred was made in 91 of the 124 individual housing cases closed during the year. In the other 33 cases, either FEPC lacked jurisdiction or the complainant failed to proceed with the charges.

Table 27
HOUSING CASES CLOSED: DETERMINATION
REGARDING DISCRIMINATION
INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Case disposition	Northern California		Southern California		Total		Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Determination made as to whether or not there was discrimination	46	79	45	68	91	73	167	80
No determination made because lack of jurisdiction or failure of complainant to proceed	12	21	21	32	33	27	41	20
Total	58	100	66	100	124	100	208	100

Of the 91 cases, 54 were closed by corrective action and 37 were dismissed because of insufficient evidence or no evidence of discrimination. There were no public hearings held during the period.

Table 28
HOUSING CASES CLOSED: DISPOSITION AFTER DETERMINATION REGARDING DISCRIMINATION

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

Case disposition	Northern California		Southern California		Total	Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.
Correction action effected	30	65	24	53	54	59	99 59
Dismissed because of insufficient evidence or no evidence of discrimination	16	35	21	47	37	41	67 40
Public hearing held	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 1
Total	46	100	45	100	91	100	167 100

The terms of conciliation in cases closed with corrective action included 28 offers to rent accommodations and 4 offers to sell. Monetary settlement was offered in 3 instances. In 28 cases there was also correction of "other discriminatory practices," which can include inquiries about race or religion on an application form, failure to rent or sell to other persons of minority backgrounds, or imposition of differential conditions of housing.

Table 29, covering terms of conciliation, includes 14 offers to rent that were rejected, indicating that when the complainants eventually were given an opportunity to inspect the accommodations in question, these units were often found unsuitable for various reasons. Usually this situation occurs when a case was opened because the complainant was denied opportunity to inspect the lodgings or to make an application for rental.

Table 29
HOUSING CASES CLOSED WITH CORRECTIVE
ACTION: TERMS OF CONCILIATION

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS
July 1, 1964—June 30, 1965

Terms of conciliation	Northern California		Southern California		Total	Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		No.	Pct.
Offer to rent							
accommodation	14	47	14	58	28	52	56 56
Offer accepted	7	23	7	29	14	26	24 24
Offer rejected	7	23	7	29	14	26	32 32
Offer to sell							
accommodation	2	7	2	8	4	7	11 11
Offer accepted	2	7	2	8	4	7	6 6
Offer rejected	—	—	—	—	—	—	5 5
Monetary settlement	3	10	—	—	3	6	5 5
Correction of other discriminatory housing practices	13	43	15	63	28	52	36 36
Total ^a	30	100	24	100	54	100	99 100

^a Detail adds to more than total since more than one type of corrective action may be agreed to.

Note: Detail percentages may not add to total because of rounding.

Nearly 70 percent of the 54 cases closed with corrective action involved apartment owners or managers, while real estate companies were involved in 15 percent and tract developers in 7 percent.

Table 30
HOUSING CASES CLOSED WITH CORRECTIVE ACTION: TYPE OF RESPONDENT

INDIVIDUAL COMPLAINTS

July 1, 1964-June 30, 1965

Type of respondent	Northern California		Southern California		Total	No.	Pct.	Cumulative total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.				Sept. 20, 1963-June 30, 1965	No.
Apartment owner or manager	16	53	21	88	37	69	70	71	71
Home owner	1	3	—	—	1	2	3	3	3
Real estate company	6	20	2	8	8	15	10	10	10
Real estate company and owner	2	7	—	—	2	4	7	7	7
Trailer court owner	1	3	—	—	1	2	2	2	2
Tract developer	3	10	1	4	4	7	5	5	5
Public housing authority	1	3	—	—	1	2	1	1	1
Tenant	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1
Total	30	100	24	100	54	100	99	100	100

HOUSING CASE SUMMARIES

Realtors Convince Owner

Shortly after occupying a San Leandro apartment, a Negro couple received an eviction notice, based on the owner's apparent racial bias. After an FEPC complaint was filed, investigation revealed that soon after the couple moved in, a tenant had moved out, alarming the owner, who foresaw an exodus. However, the realtors handling the property pointed out that the tenant who had left had been rated as undesirable, and convinced the owner to change his mind. He informed the couple they could stay in the apartment as long as they wished. FEPC also learned that the realty firm had often referred minority group tenants to suitable housing in integrated areas.

Effects of an Accent

A young Jewish teacher in Los Angeles County, after inspecting some apartments with her husband, made a second visit to complete rental arrangements. She was accompanied by her grandmother who has a pronounced accent. At this point, the manager showed a change of attitude, acted in an unfriendly manner and said a deposit had been made on each of the two available units. Later, the Jewish couple was told the alleged depositor would rent both apartments. A complaint of religious discrimination was filed with FEPC, which began an investigation. When the manager was interviewed she again told of the alleged deposits, but could produce neither records of them nor the depositor's name. After conferring with FEPC, she agreed to offer an apartment to the couple. However, in the meantime, they had found it necessary to rent an apartment elsewhere.

Homeowner Opposes Restrictions

A realty firm, retained as agents for a Caucasian couple with a home for sale, later asked the owner if she wished to sell only to Caucasians. Although she replied that she wished no restrictions of any kind, they subsequently asked her to sign a paper with a "Caucasians only" limitation and pointed out that as a property owner she had that right, while they, as brokers, did not. When the owner refused to sign the statement, her realtor said he would not keep the listing, or if he did, would not work on it. As he left, he removed the firm's "For Sale" sign from the property. The owner filed a com-

plaint with FEPC charging the firm with soliciting a discriminatory listing and when an investigation sustained the charges, FEPC conferred with a representative of the local realty board. As a result, the offending broker was counseled to provide the usual services in selling the property and to cease soliciting discriminatory restrictions.

A Realtor Intercedes

A Negro college student—seeking an apartment—was informed in a phone conversation that certain rental units in a building were available. During a personal visit later she was told there were no vacancies, although a friend who inquired was told that several units were open. A Caucasian realtor offered his services and placed a deposit on a specified apartment, saying that he was acting for a friend. However, when the student later identified herself as the friend, the deposit was returned as unacceptable. She then filed a complaint with FEPC. During conciliation proceedings, the president of the firm that owned the apartment building was most cooperative and stated his opposition to his employee's discriminatory actions. The student's deposit was accepted and the apartment was redecorated for her occupancy.



printed in CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING

95522—357 5-67 4M