



Legislative Council

63rd Montana Legislature

SENATE MEMBERS

JEFF ESSMANN--Chair
DEBBY BARRETT
ROBYN DRISCOLL
CLIFF LARSEN
JON SESSO
CHAS VINCENT

HOUSE MEMBERS

CHUCK HUNTER--Vice Chair
BRYCE BENNETT
MARK BLASDEL
KRISTIN HANSEN
MARGARET (MARGIE) MACDONALD
GORDON VANCE

COMMITTEE STAFF

SUSAN FOX, Executive Director
TODD EVERTS, Legal Division Director
FONG HOM, Secretary

MINUTES LOG

RULES SUBCOMMITTEE
Room 335, Capitol Building
Helena, Montana

September 3, 2014

Please note: These minutes provide abbreviated information about committee discussion, public testimony, action taken, and other activities. To the left of each section in these minutes is a time designation indicating the approximate amount of time in hours, minutes, and seconds that has elapsed since the start of the meeting. This time designation may be used to locate the referenced discussion on the audio or video recording of this meeting.

Access to an electronic copy of these minutes and the audio or video recording is provided from the Legislative Branch home page at <http://leg.mt.gov>. On the left-side menu of the home page, select *Committees*, then *Interim*. Once on the page for *Interim Committees*, scroll down to the appropriate committee. The written minutes summary, along with the audio and video recordings, are listed by meeting date on the interim committee's web page.

Hard copies of the exhibits for this meeting are available upon request. Legislative Council policy requires a charge of 15 cents a page for copies of the document.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

SEN. JEFF ESSMANN
REP. CHUCK HUNTER

SEN. CLIFF LARSEN
REP. MARK BLASDEL

STAFF PRESENT

SUSAN BYORTH FOX, Executive Director
TODD EVERTS, Legal Director
FONG HOM, Committee Secretary

AGENDA (Attachment 1)

VISITORS' LIST (Attachment 2)

COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee approved the following:

- eliminate JR 10-90 regarding legislative interns;
- strike subsection (2) and (3) from Rule 30-60;
- strike the language “or by suspending or otherwise changing the allocation of revenues” on page 33 of LC4333;
- sync up revenue and appropriation bill transmittal deadlines in JR 40-200, part c(i);
- clean up the archaic heading in S50-210;
- reclassify certain House committees; and
- leave the cloture process the same.
- The committee voted to add a sentence in the Montana Supreme Court ruling, Issue No. 2, subpart 4, that sections of the Code that are repealed or amended in a referenda be in the bill draft.
- The committee approved for drafting, a rule of general application that a bill, whatever classification it might be, must be introduced a minimum of seven days prior to the transmittal deadline, and to bring the draft to the September Legislative Council meeting for further discussion.
- The committee approved for drafting, a rule that the minority leader can only be empowered to designate a ranking minority member from those members appointed to the committee by the Committee on Committees.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

00:00:20 Sen. Essmann called the meeting to order at 2:11 p.m. The secretary called roll. All members were present. **(Attachment 3)**

LEGISLATIVE RULE ISSUES AND OPTIONS TABLE

00:01:53 Mr. Everts gave a presentation on the Legislative Rule Issues and Options. **(Exhibit 1)**

- **Issue No. 1: Cleanup of JR 10-90**

Motion/Vote

00:04:58 Sen. Larsen moved to approve eliminating JR 10-90 regarding legislative interns. The motion passed unanimously.

- **Issue No. 2: The Montana Supreme Court ruling that repealed and amended sections count as words in bill titles of Legislative Referenda**

00:05:50 Mr. Everts gave an overview of the Montana Supreme Court's ruling that repealed and amended sections count as words in the title.

00:06:14 Rep. Hunter asked about the referendum process and would there be a section that would delineate what sections in the bill are being modified.

00:06:52 Mr. Everts said that there is a section that has been drafted in the Bill Drafting Manual that includes a “section affected provision” within the bill, not in the title, that outlines or lists all sections that have been amended or repealed.

00:10:51 Sen. Essmann discussed adding a sentence to subpart 4 that would create an affirmative duty to have the sections of the Code that are repealed or amended in a referenda listed in the bill.

Motion

00:11:26 Rep. Blasdel moved that the committee move forward with the addition of a sentence that lists sections of the Code that are repealed or amended in a referendum.

00:12:02 Rep. Hunter said that he liked the idea of the additional clarity and supports the motion.

00:12:11 The motion passed unanimously.

- **Issue 3: Update revenue estimating process rule changes made during the 2013 session**

00:13:32 Mr. Everts said that last session the Revenue and Transportation Interim Committee was not able to introduce a revenue estimating resolution, therefore, new language was added to the rule specifically tailored for the 2013 Session only regarding the revenue estimating process.

Motion

00:13:35 Rep. Hunter moved to strike subsections (2) and (3) from Rule 30-60.

Committee discussion

00:14:27 Sen. Essmann discussed giving RTIC a nudge by leaving in language in Section 2 beginning with “in the event that RTIC has not caused a resolution to be introduced...”, leave subsections (2) and (3) so the RTIC would know the consequences if they failed to observe their statutory duty. He would propose that as a Substitute Motion.

00:15:24 Rep. Hunter said that he would oppose that motion. He would like to just have the expectation that is written in code that they do the revenue estimate in a timely fashion and that is what the expectation ought to be.

00:15:55 Sen. Essmann said he will withdraw his motion with Rep. Hunter’s assurances.

Motion/Vote

00:16:15 The motion to strike subsections (2) and (3) from Rule 30-60 passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Issue No. 4: Clarify classification of revenue bills for transmittal deadline purposes**

00:17:02 Mr. Everts gave an overview of Issue No. 4.

00:18:45 Sen. Essmann said that the language at the end of subpart 3 was added in 2011. He asked about the origin of the inclusion of that language.

00:19:25 Mr. Everts said that this was added in the Rules Committee.

00:19:36 Rep. Hunter said that he had opposed the inclusion of that language because it seemed to him a departure from the traditional way of looking at a revenue bill.

00:21:57 Mr. Everts said that if you want flexibility, this being broader, then that's a policy decision for you as a legislature to make.

00:23:42 Sen. Essmann said that rules serve an important function: a) inform the public of how we will operate; and b) inform us as legislators how we will operate so that all legislators understand the process that they will have to follow.

Motion/Vote

00:25:46 Rep. Hunter moved to approve the striking of the language "or by suspending or otherwise changing the allocation of revenues" on lines 5 and 6, page 33, of LC4333. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Issue of deadlines**

00:26:15 Sen. Essmann discussed the issue of deadlines.

00:28:54 Marilyn Miller discussed the difficulties for the Senate Office when people come in and say that they want to introduce a bill so close to a deadline.

00:29:49 Rep. Hunter asked Ms. Miller about having a seven-day prior to transmittal deadline as an example for getting general bills across and would she see a burden on the office developing around that timeframe.

00:30:31 Ms. Miller said there are very few of these incidents.

00:32:25 Rep. Blasdel said that it would be nice to come up with some kind of a timeframe to tell members so that staff is not put in a bad spot.

00:34:02 Rep. Hunter said that the deadline might also be useful for the budget office in order to do a thorough job on a fiscal note.

00:34:25 Sen. Essmann asked if there is agreement with the members to ask Mr. Everts to draft a rule of general application that a bill, whatever classification it might be, must be introduced a minimum of seven days prior to the transmittal deadline for that category of bill.

00:35:56 Ms. Fox discussed JR 40-50 regarding bill introduction deadlines and said that on page 20, there is a schedule for drafting requests and bill introduction where we could explicitly outline the request deadline and the introduction deadline that would be prior to whatever your transmittal deadline is.

00:36:48 Mr. Everts commented on any rule that the committee decides to impose, always think about it within the context of what's going to happen if you have to suspend the rules in order to get around the rule.

00:37:45 Rep. Blasdel asked if the timeframe could be shorten to five days if it is a general bill with no fiscal note.

Motion

00:38:59 Sen. Essmann moved that staff draft a rule of general application that a bill, whatever classification it might be, must be introduced a minimum of seven days prior to the transmittal deadline for that category of bill, and to bring the draft to the full Council meeting on September 4th for further discussion.

00:40:07 Rep. Hunter said that he will support his motion.

00:40:39 The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Additional list of rule changes from the House Democratic Caucus**

00:40:46 Rep. Hunter discussed the issue that arose last session regarding the referenda process dealing with bills that were vetoed. The timeframe that had the bills introduced early going through the regular process was a process that worked for everybody. The 62 days is a way to get the second bite of the apple. He made a motion to return back to that date of 45 days regarding the referendum process.

00:43:09 Sen. Essmann said that the current rule permits the legislature to place bills on the governor's desk and through the amendatory veto ability, he can continue to negotiate on the policy in those bills. From his perspective, this is more of a safety relief thing than a refusal to negotiate. For that reason, Sen. Essmann said that he supports the continued presence of that rule.

00:45:43 Rep. Hunter said that having watched the legislative process for over 30 years, that the time-honored schedule has served us well in the past and has preserved the expected checks and balance between the legislative and the executive branch.

00:48:02 Sen. Essmann said that the referendum rule change was used for four referenda in the 2011 session. We forwarded to the voters four referenda, all of which were adopted by a large margin of the Montana voting public. They signaled their agreement with the policies in those referenda. He is sorry that the Montana Supreme Court chose to interfere with the enforcement of those referenda.

00:49:13 The motion failed on a tie vote.

- **Issue No. 5: Sync up revenue and appropriation bill transmittal deadlines**

00:49:42 Mr. Everts discussed changes in draft bill LC4333, pages 32 and 33. He said that this was generated out of Legislative Council's previous discussions.

- 00:50:15 Ms. Fox said that there had been some debate on whether the deadlines should be an earlier date.
- 00:51:19 Sen. Larsen said that this suggestion flows out of a number of different sessions where this process has been ineffective. He asked for more background and where this issue emerged from.
- 00:51:52 Ms. Fox believes that the dates that we currently have come out of the 80s when we were in financial difficulties. The philosophy was that you need to find out what your expenses are before you need to know how much revenue you have to raise.
- 00:53:16 Sen. Essmann said that whether or not you agree with a certain tax increase or tax decrease policy, from a fiscal standpoint, it makes sense to have everything on the table so that House Appropriations and Senate Finance look at all the spending decisions at the same point in time.
- Motion/Vote**
- 00:57:21 The motion to sync up revenue and appropriation bill transmittal deadlines in JR 40-200, part c(i) passed unanimously by voice vote.
- **Issue No. 6: Proxies/Absentee voting -- improve accuracy of recorded absentee votes -- excused absences -- limit scope of absentee votes**
- 00:58:01 Mr. Everts said that there has been some issues with the proxy and absentee voting and improving the accuracy of those votes.
- 00:59:33 Ms. Fox discussed the rules for using proxies that are contained in the "Draft Rules of Procedure".
- 01:01:49 Sen. Essmann discussed the issue of presiding officers' appointments to standing committees. He did some research and discovered that the custom in the Senate had been that the President never served on a standing committee. That policy was not followed in the 2005 session and thereafter and he thought it would be wise to return to that in terms of administration of the body. He suggested having a joint rule that prohibits the presiding officers of each body from serving on standing committees.
- 01:06:00 Rep. Hunter said that we don't need a rule that says presiding officers shall not serve on committees but understands the Speaker's comments that sometimes to balance the numbers, you need to appoint people that might not be there much, yet the other side of that is, there are members of our committee who are never at meetings and proxy votes each and every time there is executive action. It is a disservice to a committee to have people you know who are not going to be there and voting proxy.
- 01:09:04 Sen. Essmann said he is not sure that the joint rules by their nature are meant to be focused on the process of the relationships between the houses which would leave house rules and senate rules the opportunity when they meet to decide

whether to return to the previous custom.

01:10:32 Ms. Fox said that the recommendation is to have written proxies in committees in the session draft rules of procedure.

01:12:00 Sen. Essmann proposed to deal with how complicated and complete must the proxy record issue be by striking the language "in any committee" on page 8.

01:16:15 Mr. Everts said that Article V, Section 11, subsection (2), the language in 10-150(1) is a restatement of that subsection (2) of the constitution.

01:17:28 Ms. Fox discussed recording votes with those in attendance and having a proxy vote, if it's written, signed, and dated, would be in compliance. It's not the quality of the proxy that's the problem, it's the number of proxies that are happening in committees and that's more of an attendance issue than a proxy issue.

01:20:06 Sen. Essmann said that a review of committee size is something to discuss with the full Council tomorrow.

01:22:48 Rep. Hunter discussed another proxy-related request regarding allowing legislators who cannot attend second reading on bills during floor sessions to be able to vote by proxy or by weighing in by phone, and the request to extend that to third readings. He discussed the situation during session when Rep. Squires was ill and hospitalized.

01:25:10 Mr. Everts discussed the potential issues associated with Rep. Hunter's request. Article V, Section 11(1), where third reading is the actual final passage. The provision "no bill shall become law except by a vote of a majority of all members present and voting...", is interpreted to mean that you can't have absentee voting on third reading from a legal perspective.

01:26:23 Rep. Hunter said that he is confident that that issue has been explored and he is satisfied to leave it at that.

BREAK

01:40:42 Sen. Essmann asked if the committee wanted to take action on the proxy vote issue.

01:40:46 Rep. Blasdel said that he would like to discuss how to train the chair if we are planning on going with the proxy form that is to be signed and dated and not have anything set in rules.

01:41:37 Sen. Essmann said that he plans on pointing out that committee members are expected to be at committee meetings to do their work and how the chairs should conduct the meetings and making the committee members understand the proxy process and recording the votes.

- 01:43:10 Rep. Hunter said that we need to have some ability in the session for leadership to get together and talk about issues that arise during the session.
- 01:44:19 Sen. Essmann said he would second Rep. Hunter's suggestion and try to encourage the next leadership teams to agree on periodic meetings to keep those issues at a minimum.
- **Issue No. 7: Establish rules for proper use of electronic devices and transmittal of electronic communication during committee public hearings or executive action.**
- 01:46:02 Mr. Everts referred to pages 19 in the Senate Rules and House Rules regarding establishing rules for the proper use of electronic devices.
- 01:46:06 Ms. Fox discussed the results of the Electronic Device Use Survey. **(Exhibit 3)**
- 01:49:15 Sen. Larsen asked if the committee chair has the authority, written or otherwise, to prohibit the use of electronic devices in a committee meeting.
- 01:50:38 Sen. Essmann said that the chair of a committee has the obligation to the committee and members of the public to maintain public decorum.
- 01:50:42 Mr. Everts discussed H30-20.
- 01:52:44 Rep. Hunter discussed the need for consistency on what is allowed and not allowed in committee meetings. He is concerned about the potential for ex-parte communication that manipulates a dialogue in a committee and said that he would not adopt this language without more discussion.
- 02:02:45 Sen. Essmann asked Mr. Everts if the committee is charged with reviewing the rules of each chamber or just the joint rules.
- 02:03:31 Mr. Everts said that it has been the tradition in the past that Legislative Council, because it is jointly made up of Senate and House leadership, review each individual chamber rules.
- 02:05:26 Rep. Hunter said that in reviewing page 2 of the guidelines, adding language in the draft about the fact that anything that is legislative business that says "in conducting that business, you are creating a public record and need to be aware that it is open to the public at any time".
- 02:06:55 Sen. Essmann said that would involve drafting a joint rule that interprets our public record statute that any communication on the subject of a hearing, whether it's second or third reading, would be part of the public record and that emails are public documents and must be transmitted to whoever maintains the public records within certain timeframes.
- 02:08:03 Rep. Hunter said that Mr. Everts has repeatedly said that anything we do that is related to us in our official role as a legislator, including communication with people about bills and otherwise, is a public record. He thinks it is information for

people to understand that these things are not necessarily in the private domain anymore.

02:10:03 Ms. Fox said that you still have a right to privacy and at some point you get to invoke your right of privacy if in fact it wasn't legislative business.

02:11:52 Mr. Everts said that the Electronic Communications Subcommittee made a decision regarding public record retention of emails and that decision was supported by the Council at the last meeting. One of the recommendations was that during Legislative Orientation, training would be provided to legislators regarding public record laws and management.

02:14:16 Rep. Hunter said guidelines should be issued to committee chairs for purposes of consistency on how the institution is run and what should or shouldn't be allowed.

02:15:26 Sen. Essmann said that the committee will proceed with Rep. Hunter's suggestion to be reviewed at the full Council meeting.

- **Issue No. 8: Designate ranking minority member for Senate and House standing committees**

02:16:17 Mr. Everts referred the committee to page 12 of both the Senate and the House resolutions. There were statutory issues in terms of appointments that came up after some legislation was passed.

02:18:10 Ms. Fox said that there were a few people from the last session who were upset that a minority member would be called vice chair because that assumes ascension to chairman if the chair is unable to perform his duties. Ms. Fox asked that if leadership could designate who that presiding officer is, who the vice chair is, and who the members are of both the majority party and the minority party, then staff would know who all those people are.

02:21:23 Rep. Hunter said that he likes the designation of someone in the minority in the committee structure. He also said that he prefers having the title of "Minority Vice Chair".

02:22:45 Sen. Essmann asked about the issue in SB175 and any clean up of the mistake in the Code Commissioner's bill.

02:23:06 Mr. Everts said that that would be a substantive change and the Code Commissioner is not allowed to bring forth substantive changes in a bill. The Legislative Council could request a bill to clean that up.

02:23:31 Ms. Fox said that there is no need for clean up because that group met once to choose members for the K-12 Data Task Force.

02:23:52 Sen. Essmann said he could support a change that uses a ranking minority member designation in the Senate.

02:25:34 Rep. Blasdel said that there were concerns regarding the terminology and session order, if the chairman left the room, if the majority vice chair was absent, the who took over the gavel, etc. It wasn't that anyone was actually assigned that role but more that the concerns involved the terminology and the question of where did they fall if that happened.

02:26:34 Sen. Essmann said that if issue no. 8 moves forward, he would like any rule or changes that Mr. Everts drafts to say that the minority leader would only be empowered to designate a ranking minority member from those members appointed to the committee by the Committee on Committees.

Motion/Vote

02:27:21 Rep. Hunter moved that the minority leader can only be empowered to designate a ranking minority member from those members appointed to the committee by the Committee on Committees. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Issue No. 9: Make the Senate rule regarding scheduling bills for second reading consistent with the House rules.**

02:29:38 Mr. Everts discussed making Senate Rule 40-60 consistent with the House rule. Mr. Everts said that the Senate and the House have always guarded their traditions in terms of rule differences, but the tendency over time has been to try to make them more consistent.

02:35:15 Sen. Essmann said that the committee does not need to act on this at this time. He discussed the topic of bills before a committee and asked where in the rules, either joint or house, is it provided that every bill must have a hearing?

02:36:14 Mr. Everts referred to page 19 of the Senate rules, S30-80, testimony from proponents and opponents, informational witnesses must be allowed on every bill or resolution before a standing or select committee. In S30-60, there is a provision that says something in effect that the bill has to have a hearing before action can be taken on it.

02:38:42 Sen. Larsen asked if that would give the majority who assigns bills to committees.

02:40:05 Sen. Essmann said that his personal opinion is that it would be a power that should be used exceedingly sparingly.

- **Issue No. 10: Clean up archaic heading in S50-210**

02:43:27 Mr. Everts said that issue no. 10 is striking language in the heading of the rule that no longer deals with provisions on the Committee of the Whole. It now only deals with pairing.

Motion/Vote

02:43:42 Sen. Larsen moved to approve the clean up of archaic heading in S50-210. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Issue No. 11: Streamline the confirmation process in the Senate**

- 02:44:29 Mr. Everts said this issue is for streamlining the Senate confirmation process that was discussed at the last Council meeting.
- 02:48:57 Marilyn Miller said that this change is a good move towards changing a system that is murky at best and chaotic to a system that puts this process back in the Senate to get a bill going that can remove people from confirmation if there are questions about that person.
- 02:50:48 Sen. Essmann asked if any Senate rules have been changed to deal with the Senate nominations.
- 02:51:35 Ms. Miller said that it always been that way and that last session individuals were put on individual bills instead of having a bill coming from a committee with names.
- 02:51:38 Ms. Fox gave a brief background on how nominations were handled in the past and how that process was changed.
- 02:54:03 Sen. Essmann suggested that a senator should have the ability to make a request to the committee chair for segregation rather than wait until it comes out of committee and to the floor.
- 02:56:02 Mr. Everts said that he would envision a process that would be the committee executive action process in terms of amendment to take the individual out and then a request for a committee resolution for that separate individual.
- 02:57:32 Sen. Larsen asked about the statement “a senator should be able to segregate a nominee, so a senator could ask to segregate any nominee to any committee or just to the committees where they are serving. Sen. Essmann said the practice has been under the current rule, any nominee that goes to any committee.
- 02:58:11 Rep. Hunter asked if Mr. Everts has worked with the executive and have they seen this proposal for a chance to weigh in on how this might affect the process from their perspective. Mr. Everts said that he has not.
- 02:59:04 Sen. Essmann said that he has made some drafting requests of Mr. Everts, and will defer a decision and discussion for the next meeting.

- **Issue No. 12: Reclassify certain House committees**

- 03:00:10 Mr. Everts discussed H30-10, reclassification of FWP, Local Government, Federal Relations, Energy, and Telecommunications and Transportation committees.

Motion/Vote

- 03:02:18 Rep. Blasdel moved to approve the reclassification of certain House committees. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Issue No. 13: Clarify House rules regarding co-sponsor forms**

03:03:08 Sen. Essmann asked Rep. Blasdel what the issue was in the House for co-sponsors.

03:03:16 Rep. Blasdel said that the biggest issue was the legibility of the co-sponsors' signatures on the bill. He said that there will be a form with the representative's printed name and if you co-sponsor a bill, you would need to sign on the line next to your name.

Motion/Vote

03:04:02 Rep. Blasdel moved to approve clarifying the House rule regarding so-sponsor forms. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

- **Issue No. 14: Cloture House rule and clarify the 30-minute timing requirements**

Motion/Vote

03:06:27 Rep. Hunter moved to approve leaving the cloture process the same. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

OTHER RULE CHANGES

- **Call of the Senate**

03:07:18 Sen. Essmann discussed the situation of the Call of the Senate that happened last session. Sen. Essmann said that he would like to move forward with the rule change that was proposed by the Chairman of the Rules Committee at that time. He referred to S50-220. **(Exhibit 4)**

Sen. Essmann said that the proposal is to strike subpart (2) of S50-220 in its entirety which would conform the Senate rule to the House rule; and change subpart (3) to provide that the Call could be removed by a majority vote rather than a 2/3 vote.

Sen. Essmann would move to adopt that rule change in S50-220.

03:10:11 Sen. Larsen said that this change is complex and he will not support it.

03:10:40 Rep. Hunter said he would need time to compare the House rule with the Senate rule.

03:10:56 Sen. Essmann discussed keeping this on the list for discussion at next meeting.

03:11:09 Mr. Everts said that he will make copies of the proposal and distribute it to the members of the Rules Subcommittee.

- **Complaints to Ethics Committee**

03:11:34 Sen. Essmann discussed a complaint that was raised by a member of the public about the behavior of a senator in a House committee. That individual followed proper procedure and complained to the House committee chairman who

reviewed the actions and said that he didn't feel that any action is warranted. The matter was brought to the Speaker and the Speaker said that he reviewed the matter and found that no action was warranted. The individual then brought the complaint to the President of the Senate but it was late in the session and no action was taken. After the session was over, the individual renewed his complaint. Sen. Essmann said that in his opinion, the Ethics Committee was the proper venue to hear the complaint. Sen. Essmann said that ethics committees are really "on call" committees and they don't need to be on the Standing Committee list and that it is appropriate that the presiding officers of both bodies should have the ability to respond to a complaint concerning an action made by a member that had occurred during the session to the Ethics or Rules Committees for review. He would like to have the on call committees be called that and that be a separate rule from Standing Committees.

- 03:17:22 Mr. Everts said that the Ethics or Rules Committees are just committees. They should not be the final judge just like other interim committees aren't. They could make a recommendation for resolution potentially to the President or Speaker, but ultimately it is the body of the whole that holds the authority in terms of dispensing whatever action on an individual member.
- 03:19:10 Sen. Essmann said that that is a policy decision to think about but in his opinion, a member of the public should have the opportunity to have a validly placed ethics complaint pursued.
- 03:20:28 Sen. Larsen said, when we are in session, the public has an opportunity to go through a process of hearing, but when not in session, the same public member doesn't have the option to go before a committee.
- 03:21:18 Sen. Essmann asked Mr. Everts to bring a draft rule dealing with that issue for the next meeting.

- **Withdrawing a bill from a committee**

- 03:22:36 Rep. Hunter said he had a suggestion from the House caucus to have a House rule regarding withdrawal of a bill from a committee to conform to the Senate rule. In the Senate, withdrawing a bill from a committee is a simple majority vote while in the House it is a 3/5 vote.
- 03:23:48 Rep. Blasdel said that he would resist that suggestion. He said that is something that can be brought up with the makeup of leadership in the House.
- 03:24:11 Sen. Essmann said he would defer to the Speaker on this one.

- **S30-70: Hold hearing on a bill**

- 03:25:59 Mr. Everts said that S30-70, 3(b) is the language that allows the sponsor 48 hours prior to the schedule of a hearing to dispose of it without a hearing, and that's the exception to that rule on terms of reporting out.
- 03:27:43 Rep. Hunter said that he had an occasion where he had a bill that he wanted to

not hold a hearing on and what he was told is that you had to hold a hearing anyway.

03:28:09 Sen. Essmann said that part of this issue about legislative log jams, etc. revolves around the number of bills, the timing of the introduction of the bills.

ADJOURNMENT

03:29:49 Sen. Essmann adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

CI0425 4303fhxa.