

NEGOTIATING SESSION NO. 12  
2:00 P.M., Room 15, State Capitol

PRESENT:

I. Anderson	R. Searle
C. Johnson	B. Nelsen
D. Kostohryz	B. Anderson
J. Casserly	J. Knickerbocker
L. Carlson	

Rod Searle chaired the meeting.

Searle: What we have attempted to do here today is review what happened last night in your failure to accept a method of breaking the impasse on committee structure and in your challenge to us to come back with the big picture - the whole thing and tell us where our hard spots are. This what we are doing today. You can either read it or I can read it. All those on our Dec. 12 papers that we have agreed upon set those aside. Contract should be valid for the '79 portion of the legislative session except if it remains divided it would remain that way through the 2-year period or if either caucus gets a majority the contract would terminate. If something happened and one obtained a majority by 30 days before the end of the session only the speaker and chairman of the Rules Committee would change. All committees would be equal. Majority of committee members may force action on legislation. Still suggest that workers compensation stay with Gov. Op and should have 2 subcommittees per committee. Suggesting breakdown of standing committees (Ex. A.) Second proposal (Ex. B)

Irv: I don't understand 2c of your proposal.

Searle: This was your language.

Irv: 2b then.

Searle: If we have a tie going into the last 30 days. All we're saying if there is a chance in the last 30 day--period the only change would be in speaker and chairman of rules. We're trying to keep the continuation of House work in an orderly manner. We have to agree that if there had to be a re-organization somewhere along the line....if it came before the 30-day deadline.

Kostohryz: I don't understand 3c. Why should it go to Rules Committee.

Irv: I don't understand what this extra wording in here is. Both b and c.

L. Carlson: b and c seem to contradict themselves.

Searle: I see you point and we can eliminate c. STRIKE C.

Irv: If a majority could come before the end of the session, if in their wisdom they saw fit to change a chairman then its their responsibility. They are the majority group of the House. No agreement would be valid at any point where one side or the other got the majority. If something were bogged down in some committee and we got the majority, I wouldn't hesitate to change that chairman so that the business of the House could get on with. No. 4. I think we ought to discuss it.

Knickerbocker: Put an item on the agenda.

Irv: I don't want it to mean that a vote has to be taken on the bill. You want a vehicle whereby a bill would get a hearing on a bill in committee.

Searle: A majority of members can force a hearing on a bill. We are not trying to say every bill has to pass out and go on the floor of the House. Only those bills that can get a majority.

Kostohryz: Your wording says that a vote has to be taken. Our original language says that the thing is to get a bill before the committee.

Searle: Against a chairman's wishes a bill can be brought before his committee for hearing. If it passes or fails, willing to change the language in no. 4. We'll REWRITE THAT.

Irv: What if there are 5 motions made on 5 different bills and as a result hearings have to be held on 5 different bills within a committee's jurisdiction. Committee has possession. Only 2 weeks of the session left. How would we accommodate the wishes.

Searle: By changing the rules. We always change the rules on motions and resolutions. The same could apply here. This is for the main part of the session. The last 2 or 3 weeks the types of things are the ones that die on General Orders anyway.

Irv: Until the last month of the session?

Searle: Not that broad. Some sort of modification for the last part of the session when we cut off House bills coming from committee. We might not even need the rules. All the people on the committees are going to be good.

Irv: I think we ought to think about it.

Casserly: Don't have it apply the last 3 or 4 weeks of the session.

Irv: No. 9 previously agreed upon.

Searle: STRIKE NO. 9.

Knickerbocker: How about NCSL

Irv: Speaker appoints.

Casserly: You should design a catch-all.

Searle: Can't find anywhere where there's a method of appointment to NCSL.

Discussion regarding NCSL.

Irv: We could put it in as a separate item or whatever you want.

Searle: Including Minnesota representation to NCSL.

Irv: Question on No. 12

Searle: The weight you have given to a floor leader is a lot more important than it should be. We came out originally that there would be 2 floor leaders. We're saying that floor motions should be handled by one caucus or the other.

No. 12

p. 3

Irv: Is there something there that we don't see.

Searle: No. One of your problems is that you don't know how to deal with honesty. We gave you first pick and you don't take it.

Irv: Where is No. 13

Casserly: It's coming.

Irv: I think we ought to wait for No. 13 to come. Recess until it comes.

Knickerbocker: Jim and I worked up some language and we have to make sure that what we put together is right.

Irv: Numbers on the committees.

Casserly: Approp. should probably have - don't have to have same number on each division.

Searle: Are you saying that it should be a full Division -- Semi-State.

Casserly: The people who serve on it normally serve on other Divisions. Before we clean up. You could easily have 12, 12 and 10. Not significant.

Irv: What do you mean by this second paper here?

Searle: We've explained it twice and we'll try again.

Irv: We have been asking you your hard priorities. Now we're beginning to believe. Tell me once more about your second paper.

Searle: We anticipated you would reject out of hand the committee chairing on the first document. So we listed all the committees and you take either column.

Irv: Either one?

Searle: That's what we're suggesting.

RECESS

Searle called the meeting back to order at 4:20 P.M.

Irv: The DFL has some problem with the election contests going to committee. We would urge that we adjourn today. Come back Thursday A.M. and DFL would be in a position to respond to IR's proposals of today.

Searle: Let's make it 11:00 A.M., Thursday.

Meeting adjourned.