

PRESENT:

I. Anderson	R. Searle
D. Kostohryz	J. Knickerbocker
C. Johnson	D. Carlson
J. Casserly	B. Nelsen
L. Carlson	B. Anderson

Rep. Searle chaired the 4th meeting of the negotiating committee.

Rep. Anderson indicated to the negotiating committee that alternates had been named for the DFL negotiating team. The alternates are: Lynn Carlson, Ray Faricy, Carl Kroening, Al Patton and John Sarna. The alternates will not vote and will not be signers of the final negotiated document.

Rep. Searle indicated that Bill Dean, who is the 5th member of their negotiating team, is being represented by Bruce Nelsen.

Rep. Searle presented the I-R position paper. The first item on the agenda was time frame of the contract. I. Anderson replied that the time frame is subject to negotiation.

Rep. Searle presented a copy of a letter he had written to Secretary of State, Joan Growe (Ex. A).

Casserly: There should be two committees -- one on criminal law and one on civil law. Searle: Doesn't want a lot of new chairmen or subcommittees. Can keep it about the same size we have been operating under. Doug Carlson: could be divisions called "Criminal Law" and "Civil Law". Discussed.

Searle: Does not agree to a Claims Division? Subcommittee?

Anderson: Claims does not require division status.

Searle: Maybe that's something we could agree on later.

Anderson: Do not agree with "D" on page 3 of I-R position paper (Ex. B). Seniority.

Searle: I-R caucus agreed that when it comes to making a decision on committees, some may be on seniority and some on other factors.

Anderson: Is it your caucus position that you are going to elect those people?

Searle: Possible. We'll take that up at the proper time. We're asking for your key to an impasse.

Anderson: We're making a major concession in giving you Appropriations.

Searle: We're trying to split these so that it is fair.

Anderson: If the IR thinks that the DFL is such a great spender, then the IR should take all the Appropriations Committee.

Dec. 4

p. 2

D. Carlson: Are you offering a 1-vote majority of the committee so that we can control the spending?

Anderson: We are offering the Republican caucus the chairmanship of the spending committee. DFL deserves the Committee on Taxes. A major concession is the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations and all four divisions.

Searle: We should lay them all on the table instead of doing it piecemeal.

Anderson: We would like the chairmanships of 3 committees of our choosing for the committee on Appropriations.

Searle: Which ones?

Anderson: Subject to negotiation -- Financial Institutions, Judiciary, Local and Urban Affairs.

Searle: Very generous. You started in left field.

Searle: Gov. Op. not to have workmen's compensation. Agreed to Criminal Justice in addition to a Judiciary Committee.

Anderson: Offering the Appropriations Committee with the Divisions. You ought to accept the responsibility we have offered you.

Casserly: Call it Commerce, Economic Development and Housing.

? Commerce, Housing and Economic Development.

Casserly: The Senate has an Energy and Housing.

? That was going to be my question. Has that worked well? Why not put it with Energy to be comparable to the way the Senate handles it.

Anderson: It apparently has worked well in the past even though they might have had their Housing with Energy. It should not cause us any problems to have our Housing with Commerce and Economic Development.
I think there is more

? Is there any reason not to put it after

Casserly: I don't think it makes much difference.

Anderson: No.

Casserly: I think there should be some attention give to

Anderson: We also believe there ought to be a standing committee of Criminal Justice and then we go on to the next item which is the creation of a committee of Education and Higher Education and one subdivision of School Aids which has the status of a full standing committee. Committee of Energy, a Committee of Environment and Natural Resources

Anderson: That is our position relative to what we feel are the appropriate number of committees to be established by the 1979-80 legislative session. Going further into our paper you will find on the first column to the right that the committee of Agriculture should be chaired by a DFL member

.....further into the paper membership on all committees, division and subcommittees will be evenly divided between the two caucuses. We retain our position in that regard even though we discussed it at length yesterday. Where the chairmanship of one committee is assigned to one caucus the vice chairmanship be assigned to a committee member of the same caucus. We indicated yesterday that it is our feeling that we will concede to the IR request in that regard and hope that you would yield to our request that the membership on committees shall be evenly divided. The chairmen of all committees shall retain their present powers as defined by the rules and no. 7 allotted subcommittees shall be designated by the chairmen with the advice and consent of the caucus leader or speaker; the chairmanship of the subcommittees shall be assigned to a committee member of the same caucus as the committee chairman. The committee jurisdiction shall be the same as in the last session except that modifications made in no. 3 above and that is the list of committee assignments that worker's compensation shall be assigned to the Committee of Labor/Management Relations Committee. That is our paper for today.

Anderson: If there's any questions, we'll attempt to answer them.

Searle: First, I think I'd want a silent prayer and your generosity overwhelms me really. Although it looks, it looks quite even on the surface, when anyone who has been around here long enough views this you'll see that it is quite heavily loaded in your favor and I guess we'll have to go through point by point, Irv, and at least suggest to you that we do not right out of hand do not agree that we should be assigning subcommittees to even brand new committees that we don't know what kind of a work load they're going to be and I notice that you ah, you were very generous in giving the only two committees that have four subcommittees to the IR and maybe we wouldn't even want any subcommittees so apparently that would throw your parity figures out the window. You made a gracious gesture as far as Appropriations Chairman is concerned but the real meat and heart of the Appropriations process, you've gathered to your own bosom. That doesn't go unnoticed. I'm not sure that we're going to agree with you on that fifth State Buildings/Claims although it looks like you can put the two together there is no compatibility with the the jobs that those two subject matters would bring. As we said yesterday, we think that the system that was created since you people took charge 6 years ago even over the objections to our wanting to do away with the Building Commission at that time has worked well so that the chairmen of the different divisions have not only the programs, for instance, in Education where I'm used to working with Mr. Faricy and it makes it very easy after you've viewed the programs, the budgets, to look at the buildings or renovations that need to be done to carry on those programs and I think that we can, although we have not, we have not talked about this, I don't think that we're going to buy that 5th Division Chairmanship there. Ah, one thing we notice that you have done really is that you created more committees. That isn't necessarily the way we want to go. We want to hold to the, pretty close to what has been in effect the last few years. I don't want to get into individuals. I think that I'll let some of the other members of our team chew on this a little bit. These would be just some opening remarks plus the fact that I think we should allow flexibility on the size of committees that you have specified precisely how many you want. Again, at this time no one knows what the workload is going to be. We'll have some questions to ask as to other then Workmen's Compensation with the creation of several new committees where certain pieces of legislation, in your estimation, would be housed and I think that's all I'd say at this time. Jerry, do you have some observations?

Jerry: A couple of things. When we were talking ..to the agenda we had yesterday ah, we covered most of the points, I was wondering if you were going to include, and you haven't mentioned it here anywhere, that if indeed, the caucuses split evenly, the membership of all committees, divisions and subcommittees how we go about resolving impasses. We talked about that yesterday. Ah, you didn't mention any method in presentation this morning.

Anderson: Well Jerry if we have to then what we might consider doing is listening to a tape of the previous day's meeting because I list here, here's my notes, on what the agenda consists of and it does not include how we overcome impasses.

Jerry: Well, one of the things that we talked about yesterday was

Anderson: We talked about many things yesterday, Jerry.

Jerry: and if it's your intent to handle that in the permanent rules, you know, that's fine, or some modification of the existing rules, that's fine, I

was just wondering if that is your intent.

Casserly: That was at least my intent. I thought that was what was my intent. I thought that what was expressed we had to deal with that problem not only in that situation but the other ones we talked about and so we're going to have modification in our rules and it's got to be particle. I just think that's going to come and part of the problem of doing this is that ;you have to do it by section and so you know when we get this somewhat accomplished we can go on to the next section.

Jerry: I just wanted to make sure that wasn't something we overlooked and that will be something we take up take that up when we get to the part on the rules committee or the permanent rules.

Is there some specific reason that workmen's comp. would be assigned to Labor/Management Relations Committee? You know, you singled that out specifically, ah, is there some special need there or problem that the rest of us aren't aware of?

Anderson: I don't think there's any specific problem except that, ah, the DFL feels very strong about workmen's compensation and

Searle: Don't think that we don't

Anderson: Well, I'm sure that you do. I have personally felt for a long time that that both the questions of workmen's comp. and unemployment comp. ought to be in Labor/Management Relations Committee so I know that in the history is that it has always been assigned to Government Operations Committee. This is a step in that direction.

Searle: Would you be willing then to change leadership -- we'll give you Government Op. and we'll take Labor and Management Relations.

Anderson: Are you suggesting that we exchange the chairmanships of the two committees?

Searle: If you're going to put workmen's comp. there.

Anderson: You ought to remember that unemployment comp. remains with Government Op.

Searle: I'm just making a suggestion.

Anderson: Are you making that as a proposal?

Searle: Anything that's on the board.

Anderson: Well, you have not said that it's a hard proposal that

Searle: That's what you were doing yesterday. You were putting them out, taking them back, will 'o the wisp type of thing. Anything goes.

Anderson: I don't think that we laid anything on the table that ah that any time you want to ask if it's a hard proposal we'll give you a direct answer.

Searle: We didn't get it yesterday.

Anderson: Well

Searle: Today is a new day?

Anderson: You have to ask the question first.

Searle: We asked them but we didn't get an answer.

Jerry: Where does that go at the present time in Government Operations? It probably goes to a subcommittee.

Anderson: I would imagine that that's one of the subcommittees.

Jerry: Well, you have 4 if you're going to do away with 1 which one are you going to do away with?

Anderson: I don't know what the existing subcommittee structure is but some of our standing committees had as many as 5 subcommittees in the past session.

Jerry: I think that was one of them.

So your intent would be to do away with the subcommittee that probably was hearing workmen's comp in government op.

Anderson: I don't think we're saying per se that do away with that subcommittee because it probably also handled unemployment comp. I don't know. Harry's not here and he probably could answer that question more intelligently than I can.

Jerry: Government administration and structure internal state government Six of them last session.

Anderson: We've cut that down to 4.

Jerry: And you're giving 4 to Local and Urban Affairs. What would be your intentions in creating new subcommittees. Let's say you've got 2 standing subcommittees as general rule of all the committees and you have some new problem that crops up. Ah, how would the chairman go about addressing that problem? A number of bills come in relating to that new subject let's take the power line because that's pretty recent. Would it be your intent to then put all of those legislation, proposed legislation, workload into one of the existing subcommittees? Or, would the chairman have some option of coming to the rules committee and say, we got this special problem, special need for the specific period of time to take a look at this and we need to create a new subcommittee is there some sort of vehicle there to react to you know, a unique situation?

Anderson: Well, there are a number of alternatives that would be available to that chairman. One of which would be of some significance he might come to the rules committee and say let's establish a select committee on the issue or he could assign the question to one of his existing subcommittees. I would doubt that the rules committee would look kindly towards the creation of one individual subcommittee but it's a possibility so I think there's 3 options there available to him right there and if he's done a good job of selecting the people on his subcommittee, he's got no problems with

the assignment of something that just might be a little bit foreign to his committee but still within the jurisdiction of that committee but a little bit something new to one of those subcommittees.

Remember, the duties of a committee chairman are very important and he has to deliberate to make certain that the people he has assigned to a subcommittee, are the right people and he should know the temperment of each of those subcommittees. Did you want to say something?

Casserly: Yes, I guess we haven't talked about this much ourselves but I...but there should be a procedure where additional subcommittees would be created. It's one of those continuing things that we're going to have to try to resolve. Maybe we'll have to have something like a division of rules or a continuation of the negotiating committee or something I don't know what the answer is going to be but we're going to have to have some procedure where we can resolve things like that. Let me just make a point on the subcommittees since that's where most of my experience happened.

334

470

Searle: It would seem to me in looking at the direction that you're going in that you geared your whole bargaining process to take care of the political appointees that you have to make in your caucus because you have more veterans than we have. You came out with the seniority system yesterday which we, for 6 years, haven't had a seniority system and haven't needed it. You all your assumptions on seniority yesterday. That was where we got into it and we have said ...

Anderson: Let me ask you a question, Mr. Searle. You have not exerted your seniority within the House of Representatives to gain new status within this legislative body?

Searle: Not any more than was given to me by the majority of the House of which I was not a part.

Anderson: But I also think that there was some status given to you because of your seniority.

Searle: That could well be -- custom and usage of

Anderson: Well, you use only different terminology rather than seniority to gain you those positions when in fact it was seniority that provided you with that.

509

Jerry: I'd like to get back to one of the items on the presentation this morning. What were you thinking of No. 7 where you have a lot of subcommittees shall be designated by the chairman with the advice and consent of the caucus leader or speaker. Would it be necessary for an individual to go to both or either or or

558

Searle: The amount of time that Claims takes and I'm sure that Mr. Faricy can tell you - he's been the chairman of that - and the the intricities of personal problems and even state department problems that he gets into needs consideration. I feel that the state building programs are being handled very well right now under the divisions and we're just saying that we don't like the tie up of the two.

Anderson: Are you saying then, Mr. Searle, that you might consider favorably a new division of Approp. of only Claims?

Searle: Either that or a subcommittee. It has to be addressed that's true.

Anderson: Which would you prefer? A subcommittee or a division of Approp of Claims. Yesterday you proposed it as a subdivision.

Searle: A subdivision either a division or a subcommittee. They're either divisions or subcommittees.

Anderson: Presently there are no subcommittee of Approp. Yesterday,

Searle: There is no such thing as a subdivision.

Anderson: We call them subdivisions.

Searle: We call them divisions.

Anderson: Well, Ok. I guess we're talking about the same thing but using your terminology, do you believe that there should be a division of Approp. established as Claims or a subcommittee of Claims established.

Searle: It could be a division.

Anderson: I guess I'd like to know what your proposal is in that regard. Yesterday you said

Searle: Your proposal. We don't like it because you've taken buildings and put it with claims.

Anderson: Well, I guess what I'd like to know is whether you're backing off from your proposal of yesterday in that regard or are you still of the belief that it is of such importance that there should be a division of claims.

Searle: There could be a division of claims.

582

Searle: What you've done here, Irv, is you've taken the 3 great big divisions that handle most of the dollars of the state budget and given them to your people and you've thrown us the crumbs.

Anderson: Mr. Searle.

Anderson: You mean to tell me that to have the chairmanship of the Committee of Approp. is a crumb?

Searle: I was talking about divisions where the bulk of the work is. I'm not talking about the chairmanship of Approp. I'm talking about the divisions. That's what we were addressing ourselves to.

Anderson: We were talking about the Approp. Comm.

Searle: The overall but I'm talking about the divisions of Approp-. and the amount of work and responsibility that they have because I've wandered through that maze over 20 of my 22 years. That's true. But I would not give the same weight of importance to the claims as I would for instance to ~~the~~ Education or to Health and Welfare, that's all. And that's the same way with any of the other committeess that we're going to have to justify or you're going to have to justify to us how you weighted these things so that all of the so called, I won't say all but that isn't fair most of the goody ones are weighted to your side and that's the thing we're going to have to

Anderson: You see we took your words of advice yesterday and when you people said that it's most important that we have people of most ability, experience

Searle: I can't think of anybody more experienced and with better ability than Fred Norton for Appropriations.
and

Anderson: wisdom in regard to the various committee chairmanship assignments and we said now who should really be the chairman of committee of transit and we said, well it looks to me the people with the most experience in that regard are democrats and so therefore we should have a DFL chairperson. You see, we took you

Searle: Funny you should bring that up I sat next to poor Bernie Brinkman last night and this guy really really killing because you've eliminated his committee.

Anderson: No, we didn't eliminate his committee.

Searle: You eliminated him as the chairman of his standing committee which he's had for a number of years but he said, "don't worry, Rod, because I'm going to get Taxes."

Anderson: Is that right?

Searle: That's what he told me. He said, I got seniority. I said, "wait a minute, Bernie, maybe what I could do is to relinquish my position. under seniority, I could, heck I could go up for Taxes.

Anderson: You know what? I sat next to Joe Niehaus and he said, you know I'm not so awfully sure that I'm not even going to get a chairmanship and I said, "don't worry, the Rep. caucus will take care of you Joe."

Searle: We haven't made any promises to anyone.

624

Anderson: Well it wasn't easy, I'll tell you that, it wasn't easy to give up the chairmanship of the Committee of Appropriations.

Searle: I'll have to talk to Fred.

Anderson: Is that a promise?

Searle: To talk to him?

Anderson: No. that he's going to help me get it back.

Searle: Sure we can help you get it back. Actually, what we have done is to continue to put out those things that we think are important -- we won't bore you with a written contract and all those things. We've been through that before. And I'm not sure that we made any changes under No. 2, Committee Structure, we still feel that there has to be an impasse breaking situation of some kind and then but I think that we should go through No. 3 because we've never really addressed ourselves to it and it does relate to some of the things that we've been discussing this morning. In order to balance what we think are the authority the real authority in the House, when it comes down to the weighting of importance of committees and the types of legislation. We appreciate that you're moving from your position that perhaps the chairmen and vice chairman should be of the same caucus but we feel very strongly that that chairman of approp. should be opposite that of taxes. That you have addressed. We felt that the divisions of Approp. should be more evenly divided and you've shown a willingness to make here this morning. We feel that the chairman of Education/Higher Education, should we buy that concept, which isn't all that bad, should be a member opposite the caucus that would handle school aids. In trying to divide the responsibilities of the House the reasons that we're suggesting these things we still would like to pursue No. E or letter E that in order to expedite the business of the House committee system or subcommittee system there should be placed in the chairmen's and the committee's responsibility the right to have a majority and that cuts down both party lines equally with their chairmanship. F we've addressed ourselves to as have you except for the second part of it where we think that it might be well for a majority of committee members to be able to force action on legislation. We have talked a great deal about that again, that addresses itself Jim to what you brought up perhaps some kind of a rule change or it would be handled somewhere else and that I think that you came up with the same thing on G that subcommittee chairmen would be of the same caucus as the chairman. That's in agreement. H we've already addressed ourselves to this morning that there should be no more than 2 subcommittees unless agreed to, say, the rules committee or some appropriate committee that would handle that and then what we've done is to show our committee organization structure and with a more flexible figures of that I think is needed for instance, you go down the ones that we suggest for the IR's, Commerce and Econ. Dev., 25 and 29 members, Fin. Inst. the same, Genl. Legis. and Vets Affairs 17 to 21 and these believe all go so that the number that you have given all fall within those flexible numbers in all cases of Gov. Op. 27 to 31, Judiciary, Local and Urban Affairs and Taxes. And then for the divisions, we've tried to divide those up to what we think is a more fair distribution where there would be two of the major ones on our side, H, W & Corr., State Depts., and we would suggest that you keep the one on Educa. because of the very fine chairman that you have there and also the Semi-State. We've given you one more standing committee if you notice and we've

balanced off with the School Aids division on the other side so that it cuts right down the middle so that very briefly, Mr. Chairman is where we're coming from this morning.

Casserly: It looks like 10 divisions

Searle: Committee chairmen and divisions. Yes, 10 on each side.

Casserly: You feel that this is a very fair split.

Searle: I think it's a lot more fair than we've seen on the other side of the table. At least they're judgment decisions, Jim, you've got to understand that you may place more weight on a committee than we do and we understand that and that's one of the reasons we're here.

Casserly: What if we were to reverse these two things at the top here and put DFL on the left hand side and IR on the right hand side.

Searle: Of course the same thing could go on your list too.

Casserly: We're not talking about your list right now. We're talking about your list.

Searle: We have 2 lists so what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

Casserly: We were talking about doing that yesterday as a matter of fact. It took me 24 hours to figure it out and today what if you were to agree that the DFL had the left hand side and IR had the committees on the right hand side. Just a hypothetical.

Searle: I understand that. In answer to your question, I don't see any way that we would divide it down and automatically switch. You know, you can play that game all day. We have to go down and say

Agreed: Agriculture
Appropriations (5 divisions and split the responsibility -- caucus that
Education chaired Approp. would have 3 of the
Health, Welfare & Corrections remaining divisions -- create a 5th div.)
Semi-State Searle: possible but at this point we're
State Departments not ready to go on a 5th)
Commerce, Economic Development and Housing
Education