

NEGOTIATING SESSION NO. 19  
January 5, 1979, Rm. 123, Capitol  
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nelsen, B.  
Anderson, B.  
Searle  
Knickerbocker  
Carlson, D.

Patton, A.  
Sieben  
Anderson, I.  
Johnson  
Casserly

Rep. Anderson, I. chaired.

Anderson, I: Attempting to resolve the differences which exist between the two sides. Most willing to negotiate at any time throughout the weekend. We stand ready and willing to negotiate into the next week if that is what it takes. Want to negotiate the differences that exist. Think it's in our best interests to reach a negotiated agreement. I don't think either of us gain by attempting to resolve differences on the House floor. In an attempt to resolve the differences, the DFL has prepared a paper. Hopeful that it will be the paper that leads us to a resolution of the differences that exist between us. Irv Anderson read the DFL paper of January 5, 1979. Indicates where we're coming from. As we stated in our opening paragraph, the DFL strongly feels there was a mandate laid down by the people from the Nov. 7 election. There is no real advantage held by either side. Once you have reached that conclusion -- a firm and strong desire to resolve the differences -- I think that you make every effort in your mind and heart to come forth with a position that is acceptable to the other side. Last night members of our negotiating committee sat for 2 hours attempting to find a solution for this stalemate. Believe the proposal is fair and equitable to both sides. Had the advantage of the staff finding out what the powers are of Rules Committee Chairman as compared with the powers of the Speaker. Slight advantage to the Speaker. Comes about because he is far more visible than the Rules Committee chairman. Have overcome the small advantage by point No. 2. Strong desire to chair committee of Taxes (not Appropriations) resolves the primary and major divisions between us. Urge your strong consideration of this package. Think it's fair to both sides. IR can have first choice of the 2 under the DFL proposal.

Searle: Let me paint a little different picture. First paper you have presented and I think its the first time you have indicated that you even accept the mandate of the voters. We said early on what we thought the voters had said to the IR and we haven't agreed on that. We have a firm and strong desire as do you to conclude this. Bargaining so there is a parity and get along with the organizing of the House (mentioned Freshmen). I would like to remind you that it has only been within the last week that your negotiating team has used what we have been using right straight from the beginning and that is not a definition of parity. Your first offer was 13-9 committees plus speaker and rules. 12-10 speaker and rules (when court case was hanging). We have maintained from the start that we have half of everything and half of nothing. After weeks of trying to convince you that there should be a majority of one on every committee we finally said we would go to your position of having all committees on an equal basis. About 2 weeks ago you said you better go back and talk to your caucus and I have done that. We had a caucus this week and they made it very strong as to what the negotiators on this side should stand for. Because of the mandate that we have was given and handed at a caucus earlier that the even split on committee is a non-negotiable fact at this time, including Rules. I think I would agree with you that the main stumbling blocks are Speaker, Rules, Taxes and Appropriations. We have consistently said there are

other committees that can be weighted very close. Agree with Point III. Consistently said it should be 11-11. Have never deviated from that position. We're still a little concerned about IV. Still hold the caucuse gives the instructions. 2 - would be able to accept your figures. 3.-- no hang-up - OK. 4 -- irritates me. 5 -- OK. V -- OK. We are not going to buy what I would consider the shoe sales approach. We have indicated, since your more reasonable approach of last week, that the speakership belongs with the IR. Willing to accomodate you with the Rules Committee and chairmanship of that committee. We could accept the chairmanship of Appropriations. One thing we have tried to do is save those committees for you in which you have veteran chairmen and also that you have the expertise and experience in those committees. I think what I would do is to, having said that, I have a couple of alternatives that perhaps you may want to chew on a little bit. This would be our alternative to your paper. We would offer you the chairmanship of Appropriations. We would like for the IR to have the committee chairmanship of Taxes but we will offer, as one way of trying to break this impasse, offer that there will be 2 divisions of Taxes and that they will be chaired by the DFL. We will agree with you on the 11-11 split on committees. We have already said we will not buy the Rules Committee with a one-vote majority. We will also break down and offer you the floor leader and back away from the stand that floor leader should rotate. This is our counteroffer. We are willing to meet tomorrow or Sunday to try and resolve what little there is left to negotiate.

IR            Speakership, Tax Committee (2 divisions of Taxes to be chaired by DFL)

DFL           Rules Committee, Appropriations (2 divisions of Taxes), Floor Leader

We have met our obligations of attempting to resolve our differences. Dec. 29 paper gave you a reasonable compromise. Nothing real in the differences between speaker and one-vote advantage on Rules Committee. Let's go forward today with a firm resolve that we can resolve the differences between us. There is equality between us.

Sieben: Getting tired of hearing speeches. I don't care what happened on Nov. 7 or Dec. 27.

Searle: My caucus has said "no deal". After last week, there's been a change in the DFL. I'm talking about the unfortunate position of one of your members. Somebody has got to get this House organized. Going to take 2 to 3 weeks to get the machinery going. One side takes the initiative.

C. Johnson: I feel like Harry feels. I thought it was a couple of shoes that don't fit. I do have a message nevertheless. It's really disgusting to sit here and wonder who are the nice guys. You say that you are and we say that we are and then we admit that maybe we weren't once. That really doesn't solve a thing. It's kind of nice to know that we have both been on both sides of the issue. The problem is that we are only 67-67 and we may make ----- on whether we have power. We ought to look over what each has done this morning.

Patton: We are willing to accept either one of our positions here.

Searle: It puts you at an advantage.

Patton: If we can't resolve our intent here today where do we go as a legislative body who are representing the 4 million people in the state. It will come to rest on all of us. We have a responsibility as individuals. Let's not forget why we are here and how we got here.

Casserly: Would all the bills that come to taxes have to go to the 2 divisions?

Searle: It would be up to the chairman. I would say that they would have to go to one or the other. I can't answer that because I have never sat on Taxes. We would give you those 2 without asking for one in return. It would be 13-11 in your favor. Has a nice sound.

Casserly: With Taxes, it's harder to divide. If you see another way to do this.

Searle: I was talking about the chairmanship of Appropriations -- does not include all 4 divisions.

Anderson, I: What you are proposing here is that one position, either accept it, negotiate .....

DFL desires a caucus.

Sieben: Put everything on the table. Flip a coin. Winner takes first choice and so on down the line.

Patton: Do you think it would be fair to have the administrative powers of the House divided equally?

Searle: Yes, but how you view it only -- your definition or our definition or how you weight it.

Patton: Then define the responsibilities of the Rules Committee and the speakership.

Searle: Maybe we have to go back to the beginning. One point holding this whole thing up. Hard point we were against. That's the one-vote majority on Rules Committee.

Patton: Resolve differences between speakership and rules. Balance or inbalance. Trying to conclude this situation today. We'll be here until May. Determine what the administrative powers are.

Anderson, I: Read the powers of the Rules Committee. The earliest possible time the House can go into operation is by a negotiated document.

Searle: The alternative could be a crass grabbing of power.

Recess to caucus.

Carl Johnson excused. Ray Faricy replaces Johnson.

3:10 P.M.

Anderson, I: The DFL has had some very intense discussions. Do not have any other proposal to lay before the IR.

Searle: Trying to make the time limit. Not quite completed on trying to analyze Under the circumstances if neither side is not ready perhaps we should set a time for tomorrow. Both said we would stay until done. Want to set time for whatever time is convenient.

Anderson, I: 11:00 A.M., Saturday, January 6.

Adjourned.