

NEGOTIATING SESSION NO. 2

11-28-78

9:00 A.M., Rm. 15

Present: Searle, Carlson, D., Anderson, B., Knickerbocker, G., Nelsen, B.  
Anderson, I., Kostohryz, D., Johnson, C., Casserly, J. Absent -- Sieben, H.

Searle chaired the meeting.

Searle presented the agenda to the committee.

Searle: Irv, have you thought about the length of the contract.

Anderson: It is proper that we have a written contract.

Searle: Whatever negotiable paper is presented to the body should stay in tact for 2 years so that the whole ordinary process of state government is not disrupted. All 10 should sign in good faith. Those who do not choose the speaker will support the candidate for speaker so that there will be a clear majority for the speaker. IR's do not want a person in their caucus who would switch caucuses and members of the negotiating team will supply the votes for the speakership.

Anderson: The constitution does not require 68 votes for speaker.

Searle: How would the Secretary of State rules on that question? (Searle says he will ask Joan Growe)

Anderson: We could not ratify an agreement until a speaker is chosen. Discussion.

Johnson: Is it necessary to agree on Point No. 1 at the present time?

Anderson: The term of the contract is one of the most important points to be negotiated. The term is very important to one side or the other. The length of the contract should be taken up at a later date but should be part of the contract. We are not ready to make any kind of a commitment. Have no objection to it being on every agenda. Would Searle be satisfied with a term of 3 months?

Searle: No. But some kind of term should be agreed to before we sign the document.

Anderson, I: It could be written in that at any time one side clearly has the majority the contract could be terminated.

Searle: If there were a change-around we would have to change the whole machinery. Would be willing to stand by the bargain if something happened to members of either caucus so that the other side would have a majority. You're more interested in the political power than serving the people of the state.

Johnson: If we don't get anything done, then perhaps a one-seat majority would serve the state better.

Casserly: We cannot bind those who are in either house today.

Searle: AGREED that length of contract is a negotiable item.

Anderson, I: When either side has a clear-cut majority (68) we are willing to agree that there should be a term to the agreement but it has to include all possibilities that might exist.

Searle: Can you come back with your possibilities. The matter remains before us and subject to negotiation.

Knickerbocker: Agreement should be ratified by all members of the House and published in the House Journal. Committees -- 15 committees plus 1 select committee (Energy). Majority of members on a committee, they can work on any bill that is assigned to that committee whenever a majority of them desire a hearing.

Searle: Any questions as to committee structure? Agreed that we should split committees 8 to 8?

Anderson, I: We would like an opportunity to present our paper. It would be in our best interests to have a committee on Judiciary and a division in Appropriations called "Building Division". (Irv read letter from Searle) (Irv presented a committee list according to seniority list)

Searle: Strict seniority system? (not afraid to go back to their caucus and spell out responsibilities -- feels that talent of people whether they are first-termers or 8th or 9th termers is irrelevant. Seniority is not hard and fast on their side. AGREED that size of committees is negotiable. AGREED that each member would have 3 committee assignments. Building division has no counterpart in the Senate. Thinks Claims committee is much more important and doesn't agree with DFL chairmanships. Subcommittees should be left flexible.

Anderson, I: If chairman wants more than 2 subcommittees, then he should come to the Rules Committee.

Searle: The speaker should not appoint the chairmen. No objection to IR caucus appointing their own chairmen.

Anderson, I: We could amend the rules by the agreement.

Cassery: We should have expiration dates on everything.

Cassery: Not everyone who has 5 terms or more would be chosen from the pool of people from which you will assign chairmanships.

Searle wants Tax Committee.

Break.

Searle: Should agree on the number of committees and names of committees. Should agree on numbers.

Anderson, I: Should not agree on the number of committees and allow the flexibility of creating a number of committees. We should deal with the number and chairmanships in one writing.

Next, down the list of committees (Searle agrees to:

Agriculture; Appropriations (Divisions of Education, Health, Welfare and Corrections; Semi-State, State Departments (will slide by State Buildings and Claims for the time being); Commerce and Econ. Dev.; Education (School Aids Div); Env. and Nat. Res.; Fin. Inst. and Ins.; Genl. Legis; Govt. Oper; Health and Welfare; Higher Education; Judiciary (should probably have a division of Criminal Justice); Labor/Management Relations; Local & Urban Affairs; Taxes; Transportation.

Casserly: Could a division of Env. & Nat. Res. be Energy, or perhaps one on Solid Waste.

Searle: How adamant are you as to having the vice chair from the same party as the chair? Members of each caucus can make it work. Chairman should have a one-vote control in the committee.

Anderson, I: We should indicate to the general public that we are going to work together.

Searle: Do you want to come up with a method that will allow the floor of the House matters to go in an orderly process. Discussion followed about duties and responsibilities of the chair and if a bill is not good, it should not be allowed out of committee.

Casserly: Could have co-chairs. People are concerned about having bills heard. Makes more sense not having committee chairmen but committees have got to reflect the structure of the House.

Searle asked Irv if he would be agreeable to co-chairs.

Johnson: Give and take ought to occur within committees instead of between committees.

Searle: Need some way to settle matters when an impasse occurs.

Anderson, I: Our present position is that the DFL cannot move from its position that all committees should be equal.

Nelsen: Chairman and vice-chairs of the same party -- equal committee members?

Knickerbocker: Each caucus shall choose committee members and chairmen?

Recess for lunch.

2:30 P.M.

Searle: We have been busy trying to go over our positions. They have agreed to 16 committee titles on our list with 2 minor exceptions. Put Energy under Env. and Nat. Res. Delete State Buildings and Claims from Approp. and add Criminal Justice to Judiciary.

Anderson, I: We should discuss entire makeup of the House on Wed. morning along with Rules and Legis. Admin. and the Speakership.

Searle: We did not agree that the seniority system is best. We will elect committee chairmen from the caucus. If the caucus wants to elect they are going to elect chairmen they are going to have. Once we agree on the number of committees there might be accommodations.

Johnson: Do you just want a list of committees or some sort of divisions?

Searle: We would want the number of committees. We ought to lay the groundwork first. One side or the other may have to give up some committees. We have to know the committee system and how it's going to work.

Anderson, I: When we conclude the meeting, we should have a proposal for what we are going to discuss in the morning. AGREED that we should discuss:

1. Names of Committees
2. Party of the Chairman
3. Approximate size
4. Subcommittee structure

Anderson, I: Subcommittee chairmen should be at the same level as they are now and are more important than a vice-chairman.

Searle: Can't we agree on how many subcommittees there should be?

Casserly: There should be a limit on the number of subcommittees for each committee.

Anderson, I: Willing to talk about vice chairmen being of the same party as the chairman.

Searle: Agreement that each caucus would chair the equal amount of committees? Membership of committees being split equally would not work.

Anderson, I: Remains adamant on the 50-50 split.

Searle: Good legislation should not be stymied in committee. It should get to the House floor. DFL should choose their own committee chairmen that they want. IR would elect their chairmen. Are you so adamant on this part that you wouldn't consider any committees where there wasn't an even split.

Anderson, I: We will listen to your arguments.

Johnson: If legislation is tied up in committee, then it is lost. The majority of the group should recommend the passage of legislation.

Searle: We feel there should be a one-vote margin on Approp., Education, Genl. Legis., Gov. Op, Health and Welfare, and Taxes. Don't need a one-vote margin in Appropriations Divisions.

Anderson, I: Position is that we would have even distribution of committee memberships and it's my position that I will not accept a 2-year contract.

Discuss A-F No. 3 (on IR proposal) on Wednesday morning.

Anderson, I: Would be willing to amend the rules so that a bill can be pulled from committee at any time during the session. Agenda for Wednesday -- 1. Names of Committees; 2. Party of chairmanship; 3. Subcommittee structure; 4. Approximate size of committee; 5. Discuss election contests and reports from the District judges -- set up some procedures on how the House will act in relation to election contests. House Rsch. Dept. will put together our responsibilities (under statute) and the procedures to be used by the House in election contests. Some of the questions to be answered: route that the election contest would follow -- comes to the House; assigned to a committee; come back to the floor; which contest has priority over the other -- unfair campaign practices has priority over those that are votes only -- if the contest goes to a committee that election contest would come back before the House floor no matter what the committee recommendation would be. What are our responsibilities under the present system. WE should bring in a position paper (details as to the procedure to be used.)

Carlson, D: Objects to election contests being an official part of the agenda.

Next meeting 10:00 A.M., Room 15, State Capitol.

Meeting adjourned.

Republicans agreed to the following committees:

Agriculture

Appropriations (1 vote margin)

Education

Health, Welfare & Corrections

Semi-State

State Departments

Commerce and Economic Development

Education (1 vote margin)

School Aids Division

Environment and Natural Resources

Financial Institutions and Insurance

General Legislation & Veterans Affairs (1 vote margin)

Government Operations (1 vote margin)

Health and Welfare (1 vote margin)

Higher Education

Judiciary

Criminal Justice

Labor/Management Relations

Local and Urban Affairs

Taxes (1 vote margin)

Transportation