

NEGOTIATING SESSION NO. 20  
January 6, 1979, 1:20 P.M.  
Room 123, Capitol

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dean, B.	Johnson, C.
Searle	Casserly
Knickerbocker	Anderson, I.
Anderson, B.	Sieben
Nelsen, B.	Patton

Rep. Searle chaired the meeting.

Searle: Thank the media for being patient. In order to be honest and candid, there was an informal meeting this morning in which the negotiators met to resolve differences that have they have not been able to resolve across the table. No apology. Were not able to reach accord in our discussions. Wanted to come back. I have not been with Mr. Anderson since 10:30 although I understand some of the members lingered on to try and resolve some of the points in disagreement. Willing to meet today, tomorrow or early Monday morning. Both agree that a negotiated settlement would be the best way to go if we can do that. I have no offers to make. Don't know what transpired after I left this morning's meeting. Willing to listen if there are some suggested ways from the other side of the table. Willing to set a time later in the day or tomorrow to see if we can come back later to reach agreement.

Anderson, I: Thanks to the press for waiting. True about the private meeting. Apparently not any more successful than public meetings. Express desire to resolve differences that exist. Suggest recess to the call of the opposing party at any time they wish a meeting. Thought deliberations were very sincere and expressed a strong desire that they wanted to resolve the differences. Both sides sincere desire to negotiate an agreement that is agreeable to both parties. Seem to be unable to resolve a clear-cut definition between the 2 sides. Equal balance that is satisfactory to both sides. (Proposal -- 4 major factors -- (1) Speakership and Chairmanship of Appropriations; (2) Chairman of Rules with 1-vote majority + chairmanship of Taxes) that apparently has been unacceptable to our counterparts. Would like to add one other alternative that we might consider.

Searle: We're not going to play that game.

Anderson, I: That offer is on the side the alternative dealing with Rules Committee - 1 vote edge. We would offer taxes a 1-vote edge with the chairmanship.

Rules -- 1 vote; Speaker Pro Temp + Rules with 1 vote edge; Floor leader + Speaker.

Searle: What about a 68 vote majority?

Sieben: If it's put under a total package.

Nelsen: You're offering us an A or B. Let's not establish the ground rules.

1:40 P.M. Recess to 4:00 P.M. What we have tried to do is study the A and B proposal you gave us and trying to come up with some alternatives. I want to preface it by reminding the other side, I will speak for myself, I'm long on patience; I've got a long fuse but right now, they're a lot shorter than they have been at any other time. We could have stuck it to you on Wednesday -- we could have done it on Thursday. We feel we are coming from a position of more authority than we were a week ago. We're trying to accomodate the problems your caucus inherited. There has been some

bluffing -- perhaps on both sides, some bottom-line, hard-line things. They are negotiable. We will go through it one more time and see if we can find some accommodations and after a reasonable discussion, we may be able to break off and discuss things. That's our attitude. If we're not able to reach a conclusion at this sitting, we will be available in the morning. I will feel a lot fresher in the morning. With that, we would like to respond to your proposal and I would like to go through and explain it. Subcommittee on Rules would have authority to make any changes from the Rules as they now stand at the end of last session.

Anderson, I: I have no questions but some of the other committee members might.

Sieben: Would you take either side?

Searle: Either alternative?

Sieben: We offered you either side.

Patton: Tax Committee with a one-vote margin.

Searle: Possible. I would have to check with my team. We are trying to find some ground.

Anderson, I: Is there a one-vote majority on Taxes or not?

Anderson, B: The 2 divisions would have a 1-vote also.

Patton: What do you envision those divisions to be?

Searle: 1/2 of the members would be on each division.

Patton: How would we determine the divisions of Appropriations?

Searle: On the 2 divisions of Appropriations, you would get the one where you have the incumbent chairman and one other. You take one and we would take one.

Anderson, I: What about subcommittee on Rules?

Searle: In order not to be completely stymied in the operation of the House that there would be 5 members from each caucus who would be put on a special subcommittee of rules. -- to deal with rule changes so that they could not be changed in full rules with the one vote majority -- anything to do with House rules, Joint rules, etc.

Knickerbocker: 2 Divisions of Taxes -- Special Tax - Inheritance; Property Tax and Natural Resources and Local Government Financing.

Anderson, I: Is that your proposal?

Searle: That's our proposal.

Anderson, I: One vote edge of rules -- proposal the other day. You haven't done very much research on that. Are you going to expect us to do your research in this case?

Searle: None of us have sat on Taxes. We would have to sit down with Levine's people. We're trying to find a place that we can agree on.



Anderson, I: Answer to our proposal this morning.

Searle: You wouldn't cross hatch. It would have to be "NO".

Dean: 2 divisions of Taxes. Sincere desire on the part of the IR caucus to participate in the process of building the tax bill for this session. It was clear that this was the major issue of this past summer and fall. If you're going to have the chairmanship of that committee, we want an opportunity to balance and build those bills. Input on constructing those bills. Desire to participate.

Anderson, I: You have given us a one vote edge on the standing committee.

Searle: It's on the table for negotiating.

Anderson, I: My point is you have lost it by giving us the one-vote edge. You can have input at the subcommittee level. Trying to find out what you're seeking.

Searle: It also means that we're going to have the ... of legislation coming out of committees. That's where we have banked. There has to be great cooperation and understanding in this session. One vote edge on taxes and then we would like a one vote edge on both divisions. At this point the speakership is not negotiable. We feel this is a pretty hard point.

Sieben: Is it negotiable or not?

Searle: No, it's not. It balances off on Rules.

Sieben: Scratch off Speaker and Rules. Rules (1 vote); Taxes (1 vote); Appropriations (DFL). IR -- Divisions of Appropriations and Government Operations..

IR

DFL

Rules (1 vote)  
Taxes (1 vote)  
Choice of 1st 2 divisions  
of Appropriations

Appropriations - chairmanship  
Speakership  
2 divisions of Appropriations  
Floor Leader  
Speaker Pro Temp

12 of 16 left.

Anderson, I: Further explanation. Proposal withdrawn.

Searle: Was it possible? I have been overruled. We go by a democratic process. IR does not want to bargain on Speaker. On Divisions of Appropriations -- the one - Education (chairman). We would take the next one. You would take 3rd and we would take last one. If you don't want Education we would take the first choice.

Anderson, I: What if we don't want the divisions?

Searle: That would be negotiable.

Anderson, B: Both sides should be responsible for raising money and also spending money.

Searle: page 14, 3d and 3e -- returned to document. page 17, omit No. 1. Education, Higher Education, School Aids,

No. 20

p. 4

More members on Higher Education. Should be more people on Education Committee.  
Smaller division on School Aids. No big hang-up on that.

AGREED -- Go back to DFL paper where they will do nothing with election contests.

Session Adjourned.