

NEGOTIATING SESSION NO. 14
Dec. 27, 1978
7:00 P.M.
Room 15, State Capitol

Rep. Searle chaired the meeting.

Searle: The initial part of the program is supposed to be a presentation from the DFL negotiators in response to the I-R's suggestions of last week.

Irv: We do have a paper ready to present. It comes after a great deal of thought and consideration.

Paper passed to committee.

Irv read the entire paper to the negotiating team.

Irv: The paper comes with a great deal of thought as to what areas there should be compromise. The DFL would have 11 chairmanships and the I-R would have 12 chairmanships. This paper equally divides the strength and power of the House of Representatives.

Searle: We've had a chance to go through as you read it. It's enticing. I recognize some delicate changes which have to be taken in all seriousness. Still some things not reconciled. Perhaps further honing will be needed. Don't know if it would be quite fair to react in completeness to the whole 7 pages. It's something we should be able to come back here with a give you some final refinements that we feel might make it a little bit better and comment on your document with some changes that are significant. Not sure without having a chance to bat it around whether we feel it is completely within the toning range of parity. Would request privilege of responding after due consideration. Anyone else have any further suggestions or questions.

Bruce: Define majority.

Irv: Joan Growe said that her definition was that if either side gets a majority of the vote. To Searle: Do you wish to consider further.

Searle: I would like to be able to sit down and analyze some of the changes and weigh them as against the complete document.

Irv: Would you expect to be able to do that tonight and be able to respond?

Searle: It might take a while.

Irv: This was not drafted in 15 minutes. Very difficult move for us. This proposal places all of the obligation to spend the state's money. All the IR candidates had concern for spending. You ought to assume the responsibility. (Read an article from Gil Esau's paper). The DFL offers complete control of the spending committee. You have an obligation to fulfill the responsibility of assuming the chairmanship of this committee (Appropriations). Serious proposal before you. We are at the bottom of the barrel. 11-12 in the IR favor. You're playing the same game. The article in today's paper was in error. At a loss as to where to turn next. You should take this proposal and run with it. Take it back to your caucus and ask for their consideration. The DFL has had a caucus during this period of negotiating. Let your caucus see and act on this proposal.

Searle: Can appreciate the time you spent putting this together. Don't want to respond to you in 15 minutes. We're at a parity with Claims back in there. Our caucus is more

interested in knowing whether they are going to have a place to operate at all. You're doing a great disservice to members of both caucuses by not having a committee schedule set up. You're the one that doesn't want to get the organization done before the 3rd. The 5 of us must decide. We can either caucus or recess and come back when we have had a chance to study it.

Irv: "Old Claims" was your proposal at the beginning.

Searle: As you discarded them we have discarded them also. We have to have a chance to study this.

Irv: A place to operate! I know that before you can find a place to operate you have to know what you're operating with. How can we ever expect to find a place for people to reside. You're trying to put the cart before the horse. This document has to be done with before we can make any agreement on space or staff. Once again, let me tell you to take this back to your caucus and let them act on this.

Doug: You've come to party at last -- number-wise. Concerned about leadership. You're requesting both Speakership and floor leader. Isn't there a little imbalance in that.

Irv: Your paper said that the floor leader isn't important and so if it wasn't, we'll take it.

Doug: The Speakership and Rules Committee. Would you agree to flip-flop?

Irv: No, we wouldn't.

Searle: We got hopeful after that election last week. We certainly ran on taxes.

Irv: We ran on taxes but not spending.

RECESS (45 minutes)

Searle: (going through DFL paper) Organizational Majority 67 or 66 majority in the House. It doesn't stand to reason. It takes 68 to unseat a Speaker. It should take as many votes to elect a Speaker as to unseat a Speaker. Can think of times during the session where it may be possible where the speaker were in disfavor. Could upset a speakership. This is an area to look at very carefully. No. 4 -- What agenda should be for the first day. What will be the orders of motions, etc., on the first day. Some things we have agreed on previously should be stated in the contract and all documents presented. Need time to review and look through the documents on points we have agreed to previously. 10-12 with Speakership and balance off with the Rules Committee. Might be well on the opening day we suggested that we get Joan Growe to meet with us. She should come and answer questions. Would like to make a request that Joan Growe come in to our next meeting.

Irv: We're not requesting it. You're making a sham out of the negotiations. "The DFL is unfair with a 10-12 split". Call me when you want the next meeting. Read the newspaper article on state spending. Piece used consistently throughout the state. You wanted to check state spending and taxes.

Searle: First time you have come in and said 11-11. Let's bargain in good faith.

Irv: When you're ready to negotiate, call me.

Searle: You said this took a great amount of time. I am disappointed that you're going to walk out. We still feel we have made concessions. There are unanswered questions here.

Sieben: Why do you want Gov. Op and not Appropriations.

Searle: We have come in, we feel, you have the right to preserve the chairmanships of those coming back in your caucus. It's fair. We're not getting greedy. Approp. -- We do not have the experience to run the Approp. Committee.

Sieben: Who has the vast experience in Taxes.

Searle: Taxes has no incumbent chairman.

Irv: You have said 'We have no great experience in Approp'. Where is your experience in the field of Taxes. You're using that as a criteria about giving us Approp. The DFL has the more senior members on the Tax Committee. If we're going to have a Tax Committee we would have a couple of members who could chair that. (Eken, Johnson, Brinkman.

Searle: I would just as not deal in personalities.

Irv: You asked for names.

Searle: Trying to protect your caucus members who are coming back and trying to protect them.

Sieben: Why do you want to give up Education Div. of Approp and the chairmanship of Approp.

Searle: We have no objection to serving underchairmen from your caucus who have served admirably.

Harry: How is this going to get resolved.

Jerry: Have to put some weight on the type of committees the other caucus has.

Searle: Staffs should go over all the papers on these two areas.

D. Carlson: Is a co-speakership not possible by law. This whole thing could fall in place if we could agree to a rotating speakership. Co-chairmen of Rules Committee. Can't we take a look at it from a constitutional standpoint.

Irv: We're willing to meet with you on Jan. 3.

Searle: Might be well for member of each staff to get together and put together whatever is in disagreement. What we would like to do is go through our papers and put together the entire picture.

Irv: Agreeable to meeting on Jan. 2.

Searle: Answer back tomorrow - tomorrow night or Friday. Before the end of the week. Friday morning. Both sides are adamant about who should have the speakership. Maybe that will have to go on the floor on the third. Parts of negotiations can be signed, sealed and delivered. Committee structure should have been settled before speakership and rules committee.

Kostohryz: 12-10 split now and you want speakership also.

Searle: You might be willing to negotiate on the speakership.

Kostohryz: I am wondering where you are coming from. You said that you came up with your proposal from our proposal.

Casserly: What advantage is it to you in to settle this. Is it advantageous that we don't resolve this so that you can have people standing outside saying "let me in".

Searle: No. not me.

Casserly: Our position has gotten a good deal more realistic. You seem to want to take more time. It seems like there's a very slight subtle change here.

Searle: We have nothing to gain by delaying it. Within the last 5 days it has really come down to really who will have the speakership.

Johnson: Are we kind of giving up on resolving that.

Searle: It seems to be not negotiable. Apparently that's not negotiable.

Johnson: What is the next choice as you see it. Don't we have to resolve it. I hope we can get that down this week and that neither of us gets the feeling that we ought to quit at this point and we ought to be concerned about the 3rd or the 4th. I hope we keep struggling with it.

Searle: I've never spent New Year's in the Capitol. Some suggestions as to how we can resolve this?

Johnson: Some more talking. I don't have the answer.

Doug: How many committees is the speakership worth? You wanted the 2 plus the Speakership and the Rules Committee also.

Searle: Willing to meet tomorrow evening.

Next meeting -- Friday, December 29, 1978, 10:30 A.M.