

PRESENT:

B. Nelsen	I. Anderson
R. Searle	H. Sieben
B. Anderson	J. Casserly
D. Carlson	C. Johnson
J. Knickerbocker	A. Patton

1st item on agenda -- DFL paper on Rules Committee.

DFL Position -- Equal number of members on committee -- I-R in agreement

Carlson: Rules Committee should have a regular meeting time.

B. Anderson: Could be scheduled. You don't have to meet. -- come back to this question

Nelsen: Would rule changes be incorporated into the negotiated document.

I. Anderson: Amendments should be presented to the Rules Committee and if adopted would be reported to the House Floor.

B. Anderson: This would tie in the Rules Committee on reference of bills.

Carlson: What is your position on chairmanship of the Rules Committee.

I. Anderson: Joint chair. To be negotiated.

Searle: How do you break impasses. Even on Rules Committee. Do you want to break impasses.

I. Anderson: That's why we're here.

Carlson: Who could call a meeting.

I. Anderson: We alternate on the same basis as we are here today.

Carlson: A meeting at a time?

I. Anderson: A meeting at a time.

Searle: Bring up our paper first. Appointments shall be of proportionate numbers. If there is a vacancy the caucus that is vacated would be filled by the caucus vacating. Speaker shall be an ex-officio member and shall vote only in case of a tie. Allow Speaker to handle committee with one secretary and staff. Why have 2 secretaries working with these things.

Casserly: sees nothing partisian about making agenda and doing the minutes. You could put anything on the agenda you want.

Searle: Shouldn't have 2 people doing the work of the Rules Committee.

Casserly: 2 co-chairs.

Knickerbocker: Put anything on the agenda by either chair.

I. Anderson: Co-chairs and either one could call a meeting.

Searle: One more than half in the Rules Committee.

I. Anderson: Suppose you were chair of Rules. How would we get our items onto the agenda. How do you go about getting a meeting called. We should discuss all possibilities.

Searle: Perhaps the chairman should be of the caucus opposite the Speaker.

I. Anderson: Let's get back to getting an item on the agenda.

Sieben: A number of members of the committee could put an item on the agenda.

I. Anderson: Leave the power of calling a meeting to the caucus leaders.

Searle: Should have at least one meeting per week as needed.

I. Anderson: Both sides have to keep records so the question of staffing becomes moot.

Knickerbocker: The work of the rules committee -- special orders, employees. What would be the objection to putting something onto the agenda.

Searle: Tie in a vehicle where we have agreed that the floor leadership responsibilities would go back and forth. Balance out the mechanism of the leadership on the floor with the chairmanship of the rules committee. Either side could call a meeting if there is 1/2 + 1 agreeing. We are suggesting that the rules we negotiate would hold through the end of the regular session when they would be reviewed. Contract would run through the end of the first year of the biennium. Members of the negotiating team would be on the rules Committee.

Cassery: The rules committee has to have a method whereby it could be called into session rather quickly. Need it throughout the session and perhaps for some time after that.

Searle: We have to have agreement on calling Rules Committee meetings. Not hung up on a rigid schedule. Have to have a regular vehicle when the rules committee could be called. Agreement will terminate on such a date with a vehicle to call a Rules Committee meeting.

I. Anderson: What do you see as the duties of the floor leader.

Searle: As you have been doing for the past 6 years. Working with the Speaker on the flow of business. We didn't ask for a recess unless we had a very good reason.

Carlson: This is going to be a session where we're going to have to have a lot of trust.

I. Anderson: One side or the other has the floor leader. We'll have to discuss this.

P. 3

No. 7  
Dec. 11, 1978

Knickerbocker: Are there any advantages in having the floor leader in the last days of the session.

Searle: What about things coming from the Senate.

Anderson & Searle to discuss about how we're going to operate if we're still not organized on January 4.

I. Anderson: I don't see any difficulty with that. Maybe Joan Growe will be in the chair on January 4. No matter what condition the House is in we'll accomodate the Governor. We will write him a joint letter.

Who is going to swear in the House members on the opening day.

Searle: A supreme court justice. We should start the mechanism on that.

I. Anderson: Chief Justice Sherin?

Searle: Sherin would be fine.

I. Anderson: We'll write a letter to Sherin.

Sieben: Part of our agreement should be accepting the results of the courts that rule on the election contests. Do you think it's not a fair procedure.

Searle: Wants to take that under advisement. There's the business in the separation of the powers.

Sieben: Court has to make a decision. We should follow the recommendation if they make one. Court makes a Findings of Fact and a recommendation but not an Order.

Carlson: What about an indictment.

B. Anderson: What about the time.

I. Anderson: Expects that the court would find before the session.

Searle: We'll give it some thought and put it on the agenda for tomorrow.

I. Anderson: If there was an unfair election process we want to assure the citizens that they had a fair chance of voting. We should provide a vehicle by which election contests can be brought to a speedy end. Each should submit a paper on election contests.

Searle: Don't know if it could be ready by tomorrow but will have by the end of the week. Will try to have a paper on this by Thursday.

Knickerbocker: I assume you will have a paper also.

Sieben: Thinks we should accept the recommendation of the court.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

P.4  
No. 7  
Dec. 11, 1978

Searle: Feels that committees should have one-vote majority. On subcommittees, recognizes the value of subcommittees. We could accomodate you pretty much on what you would like to do on subcommittees if the subcommittee structure would be for the session only and reviewed after the session so that they do not become permanent standing subcommittees.

I. Anderson: Just for the first session?

Searle: Would like to curtail work during the interim. Don't want to give carte blanche for subcommittee chairmen running during the interim. We should look at the subcommittee structure and their activities during the interim. Need a chance to review after the first session.

I. Anderson: Jurisdiction of the standing committee should fit into the subcommittee structure we've provided.

Johnson: You will have 2 subcommittees to deal with the issues sent to the committee. Review process at the end of the first year to look at the budgets.

Money does not come from the budgets when the legislature is in session.

Searle: We're suggesting that no money is expended on the subcommittees until we have had a chance to review them at the end of the session.

I. Anderson: How are you going to set up a budget system.

Searle: Budget is set up for the committee -- not the subcommittee. The subcommittee should be under the chairman. I have seen some subcommittees doing things I feel were not appropriate and I would like to see that cut down. Some vehicle to review what the budget is going to be used for in the interim.

I. Anderson: Subcommittee system cuts down the amount of money the standing committee is going to use.

Searle: That was a question I asked last year. Do you feel the subcommittee chairmen are going to be treated the same way as full committee chairmen have been treated as far as staff. How would they operate. Would they have individual secretaries. People who are not going to be here in January should be given proper notice and the I-Rs should be given opportunity to hire proper people.

Cassery: We can't operate Local and Urban Affairs and Governmental Operations with only 2 subcommittees. Too many bills.

I. Anderson: Chairman doesn't have the power to appoint as many subcommittees as he would like to.

Searle: There could be at least 2 in every committee and if they wanted more they would come before the Rules Committee for permission to create more. Not hard and fast. At least 2 for every committee. We would like to see it referred to in a more flexible way. Should be flexible depending on work load.

I. Anderson: The negotiating committee should set the number of subcommittees. Ought to structure.

Knickerbocker: Take the perogative away from the chairman?

I. Anderson: Why can't we do it here?

No. 7  
Dec. 11, 1978  
p. 5

Searle: You created a special Committee on Energy and we agreed.

I. Anderson: As to specific numbers (not fair about this point.

#### SPEAKERSHIP - Duties and Functions

Searle: We will outline duties and perogatives of speaker as you see it now (we talked about it last Thurs.)

Casserly: Are you going to present any further papers.

Outline the duties of the Speaker.

5-minute break.

I. Anderson: Position papers on duties and responsibilities of the Speaker for the next meeting.

Searle: The 15th is breathing down our necks. Tomorrow each side should come in with a document that compromises the entire picture of Speakership, Rules Committee and Committee Structure in its entirety. Put it before each other and see where we are in agreement. Concentrate on areas where we disagree. Asking that we be given the liberty of coming in (paper could be late)

I. Anderson: Paper intended to put into one document all the previous papers we have submitted.

Searle: Those areas where we disagree we could break the impass. Has to be done in contest of the whole picture rather than just one segment.

I. Anderson: Whatever position papers and discussions have brought forth from our perspective.

Searle: We would make some accomodations where we have been hard-headed. Recognize the necessity for compromise. Would have some compromises in the whole gammet broken down in an orderly way.

Searle: Meet right after lunch for 2 hours or so. Give staff and rest of committee a chance to look it over while we're gone.

I. Anderson: Doesn't want to forego the possibility that we can reach agreement. Shouldn't be restricted as to time.

Searle: Each presenting document tomorrow so tht by Thurs we have a final position as to where we ought to be.

I. Anderson: Would like us to have enough time to get into a hard bargaining session. Should we consider the matter of floor leadership?

Searle: Yes. Speaker, floor leader, rules committee and all committees. Important that we have an overall document that we can work from (no matter whose).

I. Anderson: Perhaps we should present a paper tomorrow and come back on Thurs. to discuss it.

No. 7  
Dec. 11, 1978  
p. 6

Searle: We lose 2 days and would like to discuss it tomorrow.

I. Anderson: Meeting when? What time?

Searle: 1:30 P.M. Tuesday. Would like to get one document that says where our differences are. Let staff make the comparisons on Wednesday.