MINUTES OF THE MEETING
STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

February 8, 1983

The twenty-sixth meeting of the Senate State Administration Committee was called to order on February 8, 1983 at 10:30 a.m. in Room 331 of the State Capitol by Chairman, Senator Pete Story.

ROLL CALL: Roll was called and all members were present but Senator Stimatz who was held in another committee.

The meeting was opened for hearings on SB320, SB324, SB327 and SJR11.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO 324.
"AN ACT TO CREATE A MONTANA YOUTH THREATMENT CENTER FOR THE CARE AND TREATMENT OF MENTALLY ILL YOUTHS BETWEEN THE AGES OF 12 AND 18 YEARS: AMENDING..."

SENATOR TOWE, Senate District 34, introduced the bill saying that this is a bill which will outline the statutory authority and restrictions for the Montana Youth Treatment Center which was funded in the last biennium for the mentally ill children between the ages of 12 and 18 years of age. Decision was made to build a new structure in Billings, Montana to put these children in the care of more experts for better care. The original bill did not outline who would be sent there and where authority would go and how the matter would be handled and this bill would do that.

Senator Towe reviewed the sections. Section 1 shows that there is a Montana State Youth Treatment Center located in Billings, Montana, (See page 1, line 15) for children between the ages of 12 and 18 years; one that has been found seriously mentally ill, and two, who have been appropriately evaluated and committed to a center. There are two ways people can get into the youth treatment center. One, by a commitment pursuant to the Montana Commitment Act; two, judged a delinquent and the judge has received what is similar to a commitment. Section 2 spells out that there is no voluntary admission to this center. Children are not capable of voluntarily committing themselves.

This is a department bill and most of the suggestions are theirs.

At the top of page 2 it describes the commitment time. The first commitment time is 3 months, then 6 months and then no more than 1 year at a time.

The question is, if they cannot be committed to the treatment center in Billings, can they be committed to Warm Springs, and the answer is "no".

Section 4 shows the other ways those can be committed. If they are brought under youth court action and upon the finding of a serious mental illness, the court can commit them. They can also receive after-care treatment. These children must be in need of supervision as well as being seriously mentally ill. The key is, upon the findings of a seriously mentally ill the court can commit a delinquent youth to the department of institution until he is 21, and that treatment will be at the Montana Youth Treatment Center.

Section 5 is a rule making procedure. Section 6 provides for reimbursement. Section 7 deals with transfer of legal custody. Section 8 provides evaluation. If it is done in the treatment center, the provisions here must be followed. They cannot be evaluated at Warm Springs. They may be sent there only if dangerous to themselves or others but the requirements here must be met first.

Section 9 is related to notification of fire marshalls when in which case a patient is released that may be or has been an arsonist. Section 10 list the institutions within the Department of Institutions. Section 11 relates to reimbursement, Section 12 relates to voluntary admission of a minor and this leaves the language alone and it says it cannot be in a state institution. Section 13 complies with section 2. Section 14 is special provisions. Section 15 amend another section regarding transfer from one institution to another.

Applicability is 30 days after the treatment center is ready for occupancy.

PROPONENTS:

CURT CHISHOLM, Director of the Department of Institutions, presented a Statement of Intent (EXHIBIT 1). This is an enabling act to create a new institution for the department of institution. He stated that they do need this facility and one that is separate. This has been a difficult bill to put together. He stated that in going over the bill found they have precluded themselves from the 10 day emergency transfer.

Mr. Chisholm presented EXHIBIT 2 which is an amendment which corrected this. This precludes us from transferring a youth that might go through a serious psychotic episode in maybe Pinehills school to transfer them into their psychiatric care facility in Billings until they are able to stabilize the

youth or return him or her to the youth facility where they have come or proceed with the commitment procedure that is presented in the act. This takes care of that.

JOY MC GRATH, representing the Mental Health Association of Montana, stated that they advocate better mental health in Montana. They support this bill but would want to make one comment.regarding section 5 on rulemaking authority. This is only four lines and stated that they are concerned about the rulemaking. They are not opposing it but they will be watching.

GLENN HUFSTETLER, representing the Probation Officers Association, stated that they are in favor of this bill but stated that they have two concerns; one is on page 2, lines 1 and 22, and stated that they hope that this does not lock us in.

Senator Towe explained this to Mr. Hufstetler's satisfaction.

There second concern he said was in Section 4. He commented about page 3, line 5, 6 and 7 regarding after-care and stated that they are wondering about the courts restricting them to Warm Springs. He stated that the mental health kids need alot of help,and many of the case loads are 19 or 20 year olds and they are seen about every 6 months.

There were no other proponents.

OPPONENTS: None

QUESTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE:

SENATOR MARBUT asked who makes the determination of the mentally ill.

SENATOR TOWE stated that the courts do this.

SENATOR MARBUT told Senator Towe that he spoke that there would be no evaluation in these centers and that these children would be prohibited from being in Warm Springs, where is the evaluation going to be done?

SENATOR TOWE corrected the misunderstanding by saying he meant that there would be no commitment for the purpose of evaluation only. If after being committed for being mentally ill they can be evaluated but not only for the purpose of being evaluated.

Senator Towe referred this question to Nick Rotering, attorney for the Department of Institutions.

NICK ROTERING said if you are dealing with the youth court with children the department will do evaulations for a late review at Pinehills, Mountain View or what is called youth evaluation program in Great Falls, but what they were hoping for in the bill is the evidence to the court ahead of time. If the court wants further evaluation it could be done at the new center, presently Warm Springs also does evaluation, but since you are moving the function to Billings that is the place.

SENATOR MARBUT said that he believed the evaluation to be the most important stage and why eliminate it from the center this way.

SENATOR TOWE related that evaluation has been abused. Judges seem to send juvenilles to institutions for evaluation not for the senctence but for the experience of the instituional life.

SENATOR MARBUT referring to section 18 asked about the timing. What is the completion date?

CURT CHISHOLM said that they are not sure but are hoping for 1 to two years.

SENATOR STORY asked if the regional mental health centers have beds for like a 250 pound psychotic.

CURT CHISHOLM said that they could under emergency get him to the treatment center for evaluation. The Deaconess hospital in Billings has beds with retraints to use until emergency procedures are available. They also have the same facilities in Great Falls and in Missoula.

The meeting was closed on S.B.324.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 327:
"AN ACT TRANSFERRING THE FUNCTIONS RELATING TO TREATMENT FOR ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG DEPENDENCY UNDER TITLE 53, CHAPTER 24, MCA, FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES; AMENDING..."

SENATOR KEATING, Senate District 32, introduced this bill by saying that there are six alcoholic treatment centers in the state and they fall in the Department of Institutions. This is a transfer bill. The people in this business feel it would be better served in the Department of Health.

PROPONENTS:

MONA SUMNER of the Rimrock Foundation in Billings, testified as a proponent and handed in written testimony shown as EXHIBIT 3.

DICK BASENBERGER, representing alcohol programs, stated that he is a proponent of this bill.

There were no other proponents.

OPPONENTS:

CURT CHISHOLM, Director of the Department of Institution, said that they rise as an opponent simply because various facets of this program has been recommended by the governor's counsel on management and say they do not see any benefits to moving this around. He stated that they have consolidated all these programs and feel that they are doing an adequate job. They share services but they administer the mental block grant money and if split up it could cause some problems. This is funded out of an alcohol consumption act but alcohol comsumption has not kept pace.

DR. DRYNAN, Director of the Department of Health, stated that he opposes this because of the splitting of the funds also.

QUESTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE:

SENATOR MARBUT asked what about the split between the drug and alcohol and criminal procedures.

CURT CHISHOLM said that they are on the receiving end and must attend to the programs.

SENATOR KEATING stated that they believe alcohol treatment centers are voluntary, except where the court determines it like in drunken driving charges. This does not remove Galen from the department of institution.

SENATOR TOWE asked MONA SUMNER her thoughts of splitting the block grant.

MS. SUMNER said that the federal program is very clear with the amount spent for drugs, alcohol and mental health and that they should have no problem with the split.

DR. DRYNAN stated he was under the understanding that there was a transfer clause.

SENATOR TOWE asked Dr. Drynan if there were other functions in his department that was a kin to this kind of function?

DR. DRYNAN stated that quite a few are direct service programs. but not at treatment centers or halfway houses. These are not free standing facilities.

The hearing was closed on S.B.327.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 320:
AN ACT INCREASING THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF A SERVICE OR DISABILITY PENSION THAT MAY BE PAID TO A VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER BY A FIRE DEPARTMENT RELIEF ASSOCIATION; AMENDING SECTIONS...."

SENATOR GAGE introduced this bill to the committee as its author and said that the total affect of this bill it to allow firemen to pay out in pension payments in an amount not to exceed $150 per month. This is a volunteer program. There are places in Montana now whose have funds are built to the point where they feel those that have served in that volunteer capacity and are eligible should receive those funds.

PROPONENTS:

ART KORN, representing the Montana State Volunteer Firemen's Association, who said that the purpose of the bill here is coming down to section 12. He said that they feel that if a volunteer fireman has served his length of time and becomes disabled he should be able to receive the $125 if the funds are available in the third class city league association. They also incorporated on the first page to show from $100 to $150. There are several departments now paying in full for disability, pension and retirement so rather than coming back later we decided to incorporate this into the bill. He stated that they support this bill.

DAVE FISHER, representing the Montana Fireman's Association, stated that if it was noticed in the bill this is permissive legislation..if the funds are available they will pay it, if not they can't. They do endorse it.

CLEM DUANE, president of the State Volunteer Firemen's Association, said that he would like to go on record in support of this bill.

There were no other proponents.

OPPONENTS: None.

QUESTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE:

SENATOR MARBUT asked when the $100 set.

DAVE FISHER said approximately two or three sessions.

SENATOR TOWE asked how the disability and retirement fund works and if there is contribution from the state insurance program.

ART KORN referred Senator Towe to section 19-11-504 provides for a special levy for the volunteer firemen's disability and pension fund. The law requires that if the balance in the fund is less than 3% of the taxable valuation of the city the council shall levy an annual special tax of not less than 1 mill or no more than 4 mills for this special pension fund. The only other funds available for this comes from the insurance premium tax and the city receives an amount equal to 1 1/2 mills tying to the taxable mills of the incorporated cities. Unincorporated areas just get the insurance.

SENATOR TOWE said that if it is an unincorporated area, you do not know what property is in that area until 5 1/2 mills do. How do you handle that?

MR. KORN said that under the unincorporated funding act, we only see 5% of the contengency of the fire insurance rated throughout the state, they get no taxable value out of the unincorporated pension act. In addition to the 1 1/2 mills they get as much of the premium tax money that will match that.

SENATOR TOWE asked if the funds were in good actuarial condition so the county will not have to levy that extra millage.

MR. KORN stated that they do.

SENATOR TOWE questioned the word "shall", in regards to the statement that if funds are not available the county "shall levy an additional tax up to 4 mills".

MR. KORN said they cannot levy an additional mill levy He said that they have a bill in now that will correct that question.

SENATOR HAMMOND related his concern about this bill forcing many places into an additional mill levy.

MR. FISHER stated that these people usually belong to other departments and do not want to raise their taxes.

SENATOR TOWE questioned the voluntary service and then the remarks to "pay".

MR. FISHER said that they can pay $1 a year to the firechief according to statutes, then through legislation the county or city commission can pay each member fighting such fire, $1 plus $1 for every hour, if they so chose to pay.

He said that the Relief Association Board defends this as well as the county Commissioners.

SENATOR GAGE CLOSED on S.B.320 by saying that they would like this flexibility.

The meeting closed on the hearing of S.B.320.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO.11.
A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF MONTANA RATIFYING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONGRESS.

SENATOR BERG, Senate District 21, introduced SJR11 and distributed a handout titled "D.C. Rights" and shown as EXHIBIT 4. This is the same resolution passed by the 95th congress back in 1978 and must be ratified by 38 states by 1985 in order for it to become an amendment to the constitution. This paticular resolution is referred to as the Washington D.C. right-to-vote.

He said he does not take lightly any amendment proposed to the congress. Although the amendment may be new to you it is not a sudden brainstorm. Congress has considered how to give district residents their full rights since 1800. Since then congress has debated this issue 24 time. The 94th and 95th congress have held extensive hearings, had much research and spent many hours of debate on this amendment and after deliberation congress finally ruled out the other means of granting the district representation and adopted this amendment.

SENATOR BERG distributed a phamphlet that he prepared with information that surrounds this amendment. EXHIBIT 5.

PROPONENTS:

JOY BRUCK, representing the League of Women Voters, read written testimony, EXHIBIT 6; and also submitted a letter from a former resident of Washington D.C., shown as EXHIBIT 7.

JIM MURRAY representing the AFL-CIO, testified as a proponent. Written testimony was presented shown as EXHIBIT 8.

JOHN HEFFERNAN testified in support of SJR 11 and offered written testimony, EXHIBIT 9, which also is attached to a phamphlet titled "The District of Columbia".

There were no other proponents.

OPPONENTS

BEN EVANS, representing himself, from Helena, Montana, spoke to the committee as an opponent of SJR 11. His testimony is shown as EXHIBIT 10.

ROSEMARY RODGERS testified as an opponent and presented her written testimony as EXHIBIT 11, newsclippings attached.

BEVERLY GLUECKERT testified as an opponent and submitted her written testimony as well. EXHIBIT 12.

STEVE REESE of Helena, Montana stated that he was in full agreement with Rosemary Rodgers.

There were no others testifying.

QUESTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE:

SENATOR TOWE said as this is drafted by congress we have no say in how it is drafted. What does not bother me is "we are not making District of Columbia a state". The phamphlet passed out says the reason we are not making it a state is because the original concepts of our founding fathers, of the constitution, was to make the seat of National Government as independent as possible. If Washington D.C. is given two senators, the only area that is not a state, that will be in violation of that concept.

SENATOR MARBUT said that the District of Columbia was designed and by the time it was moved to its present location it is not what's there. A good share of that was given back to Virginia. Perhaps these people should be included as part of the 690,000 plus voters in Maryland, just like it was in Virginia.

SENATOR BERG said he believes Senator Marbut is talking about Alexandria. That particular portion of the city has a larger percentage of federal employees than District of Columbia itself. Article 5 of the Constitution says that no state without its consent should be deprived of its equal sufferage in the Senate. Senator Berg said this should not be based on the fact that the coal tax bill may be voted against or any other outside reason.

SENATOR TOWE agreed to this statement, but he could not see giving them two Senators but did agree to the Representatives

SENATOR BERG stated that would be giving them only half of their rights.

The meeting closed on SJR 11.

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Pete Story

CHAIRMAN, Senator Pete Story

DATE February 8, 1983

COMMITTEE ON _____

VISITORS' REGISTER

NAME	REPRESENTING	BILL #	Check One	
			Support	Oppose
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
		[illegible]	✓	
[illegible]	League of Women Voters	SJR 11	✓	
				✓
		SJR 11		✓
[illegible]	[illegible]	SJR 11		✓
[illegible]	[illegible]	SB 324		
Jay McGrath	Mental Health Assn of MT	SB 324 SB 327	✓	
Beverly Blueckert	Myself	SJR 11		✓
[illegible]	Myself	SJR 11		✓
	[illegible]		✓	
Laura Nicholson	League of Women Voters			
ART KORN	MT. ST VOL FIRE ASSOC	SB 320 SB 327	✓	✓
[illegible]	"	SB 324	✓	
[illegible]	[illegible] Office [illegible]	[illegible]	✓	
	[illegible]	SJR 11	✓	

(Please leave prepared statements with secretary.)

ROLL CALL

STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

47th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1983 Date 2/8/83

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED	SENATE SEAT #
SENATOR PETE STORY, Chairman	X			45
SENATOR H. W. HAMMOND, Vice Ch	X			34
SENATOR REED MARBUT	X			44
SENATOR LARRY TVEIT	X			33
SENATOR R. MANNING	X			48
SENATOR LAWRENCE STIMATZ			X	7
SENATOR THOMAS TOWE	X			26

Each day attach to minutes.

EXHIBIT 1
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

SB 324

LC Number 914: An act to establish the Montana Youth Treatment Center, its location and functions, the creation of the necessary laws for commitment operation discharge to the Center, amending and repealing certain sections and providing an effective date.

Under Section 6 of the proposed bill, the Department of Institutions is granted appropriate rule making authority concerning the operation of the Montana Youth Treatment Center. A statement of intent is required for this bill because it grants rule making authority to the Department of Institutions for the purposes of admission, treatment and discharge of youth committed to the Center. It is the intent of the legislature that the Department of Institutions under the Montana Administrative Procedures Act be given the authority to adopt rules setting the admission, treatment, transfer and discharge requirements consistent with court commitment requirements to the new Children's Unit. It is contemplated that such rules, if adopted, will address the following:

a. The types and severity of psychiatric disturbance that may be appropriately treated at the Center;

b. The types and severity of behavioral problems that may be appropriately treated at the Center;

c. Procedures for admission to the Center that are consistent with the due process protection of the Mental Health Act;

d. Establishment of standards for treatment and care that are consistent with the Mental Health Act and currently recognized professional principles of therapy;

e. Procedures for discharge, transfer, or conditional release from the Center that consider the treatment needs of the youth and are consistent with the Mental Health Act.

EXHIBIT 2
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS - AMENDMENTS TO SB 324

P. 13, line 6, the wording that reads "Except as provided in subsection (2)" is deleted.

P. 13, lines 21-23 as subsection (2), all of it is deleted.

P. 15, line 6, after However, insert the words "except as provided for in section 53-21-130 MCA",

EXHIBIT 3
State Admin.
2/8/83

Rimrock Foundation®

P.O. Box 30374 Billings, Montana 59107 (406) 248-3175

February 7, 1983

TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL 327

By

Rimrock Foundation
David Cunningham, Executive Director
Mona L. Sumner, Associate Director

The bill you are considering today has the endorsement of the Alcohol Program Association of Montana and that of the Long-Range Planning Task Force appointed by Carroll South, Department of Institutions. While seemingly not a major bill, your adoption will provide for the future of the alcohol/drug service system in Montana.

We urge you to pass this bill so as to allow all alcohol/drug community programs to become part of the mainstream of health. Our ability to collect private third party funds and to be licensed as medical facilities dictates we come under the department that currently provides these functions for other health problems.

This bill is for the future -- it represents a major opportunity for alcohol/drug programs to maximize non-government funds -- a necessity if the service system is to meet the demands of Montana's #1 health problem -- alcoholism!

D.C. Rights

EXHIBIT 4
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article*; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Italics indicate matter superseded or modified by amendment, or by the elapse of time.

Research Reference: Am Jur 2d, Constitutional Law

U.S. CONSTITUTION—Cont'd.

Amendment 23

(Adopted April 3, 1961)

SECTION 1

The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

Exhibit 5
State ad.
2-8-83

You face a decision. . . .

on ratifying the Constitutional amendment granting the men and women of the District of Columbia full voting representation in the U.S. Congress.

In the words of Senator Robert Dole:

> The District of Columbia is not just a plot of land full of big white buildings and people who have come here temporarily to work for the Federal Government. Rather, it is home to almost three-quarters of a million people. . . .

This report presents the facts about the amendment and those people and separates the District of Columbia as their home from the myth of the District of Columbia as simply the seat of our national government.

What the Amendment Will Do

The Amendment Will:

- Give American citizens who make their home in the District of Columbia full voting representation in the U.S. Congress—two Senators and the number of Representatives proportionate to the District's population (at least one).
- Give the men and women of the District of Columbia representation in the Electoral College proportionate to the District's population.
- Give the citizens in the District of Columbia a voice in ratifying Constitutional amendments, just like Americans in the 50 states.
- Repeal the 23rd Amendment, which gave residents of the District of Columbia representation in the Electoral College no greater than that of the smallest state.

The Amendment Will Not:

- Make the District of Columbia a state.
- Change the unique status of the District of Columbia envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.
- Provide "home rule"—local self government—for the District of Columbia or in any way alter the control which the U.S. Congress exercises over the District.

Who Supports the Amendment?

Supreme Court Justice
William H. Rehnquist
(as Assistant Attorney General in 1970)

"The need for an amendment of that character at this late date in our history is too self-evident for further elaboration; continued denial of voting representation from the District of Columbia can no longer be justified."

The Republican Party
(National Party Platform, 1976)

"We . . . support giving the District of Columbia voting representation in the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

The Democratic Party
(National Party Platform, 1976)

"We support . . . full voting representation in the Congress [for the District of Columbia]."

EXHIBIT 6
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

SJR 11 D. C. Amendment

The League of Women Voters of Montana supports SJR 11. We find this a very appropriate year to consider this amendment with Montana's own concern with proper representation through reapportionment and redistricting.

In 1970, the District of Columbia Delegate Act gave residents in the nation's capital the right to elect one non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives. However, a voice without a vote is not representation.

The District of Columbia is a unique entity. While citizens of all other cities enjoy voting representation in the Congress, the District does not....although D. C. citizens are taxed as all citizens are; ~~their~~ are subject to the draft; and they must abide by the Constitution and all laws passed by the Congress. The basic right of representation in Congress is a right due all taxpayers....this is one of the foundations of our democracy. Depriving these citizens of voting representation is as capricious and unjust as if the Congress had refused to recognize our right to statehood because we were too agricultural or our population was made up of too many cowboys! Or, for that matter, not allowing the residents of state capitals the right to voting representation in their state legislatures because a fair number of the population are employed by state government.

Again, we fully support SJR 11, and hope you will send it to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation.

EXHIBIT 7
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

Dear Committee Member:

Although I am now a resident of the state of Montana, I lived in Washington D.C. from 1978-1981. While I lived in D.C. I was particularly frustrated not to have any voting representation in Congress. I paid federal taxes, but could not address a Congressional Representative on federal policy that affected me. I felt this was an abridgement of my rights as a U.S. citizen. Every other state including Maryland and Virginia (where the majority of federal employees live) has Congressional representation. We living in D.C. had none.

Washington D.C. is a poor city. The population is 60% black and many of those are unemployed. They need to have equal representation in Congress determining federal policy on employment, housing, social services, health and defense spending just as we do here in Montana.

Please give 637,651 people the same basic rights that 229 million other U.S. citizens now have and support the D.C. Voting Rights Amendment.

Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully Yours,

Edie Harding

Edie Harding
Helena, Montana

EXHIBIT 8
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

MONTANA STATE AFL-CIO
APRIL 29 1956

Box 1176, Helena, Montana

JAMES W. MURRY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ZIP CODE 59624
406/442-1708

TESTIMONY OF JIM MURRY ON SJR 11, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION, FEBRUARY 8, 1983

I am Jim Murry, executive secretary of the Montana State AFL-CIO. I am here today to testify in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 11. This Joint Resolution provides for Montana's ratification of a constitutional amendment relating to representation of the District of Columbia.

The amendment, which was passed by a two thirds majority of each house of Congress, provides that for purposes of representation in the Congress, election of the president and vice president and for purposes of Article 5 of the United States Constitution, the District of Columbia shall be treated as a state.

As far back as 1967, the national AFL-CIO adopted a resolution at its convention supporting full sufferage for the District of Columbia. For decades before that, citizens and union members of Washington, D.C. had advocated full sufferage for the District of Columbia.

This amendment is a matter of simple justice. Without it, citizens of our nation's capitol are disenfranchised, second class citizens, denied rights which other citizens of our land enjoy. The citizens of the District of Columbia deserve to vote and to be represented, just as the citizens of Montana have that right.

The Montana State AFL-CIO urges ratification of this amendment. Please vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 11.

Thank you.

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF SENATE J.R. 11
SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION
SENATOR PETE STORY, CHAIRMAN
FEBRUARY 8, 1983

EXHIBIT 9a
State Admin.
Feb. 8, 1983

BY: John Heffernan
Intern/Lobbyist
Common Cause of Montana

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for this opportunity to testify here today. My name is John Heffernan and I represent Common Cause of Montana as an intern/lobbyist. I offer this testimony in support of Senate J.R. 11. I would also like it to be known that although I am a resident of the State of Montana and have been for three years now, I was a resident of the District of Columbia for the first 17 years of my life.

Congress passed the DC Voting Rights Ammendment in 1978 and it is now up to 38 states to ratify the ammendment granting citizens of the District of Columbia representation in Congress.

690,000 people reside in the District. Residents of the District pay Federal income taxes - more so than 11 other states including Montana - fight and die in the nations wars and suffer the burdens of inflation and unemployment. But unlike other Americans they have no one to represent them in the U.S. Congress which makes the laws and sets the taxes that all citizens must respect. For almost 200 years, these fellow Americans have been suffering from taxation without representation while the rest of us enjoy full representation in Congress.

It is unreasonable to argue that granting representation to the District would deprive any state of its "equal suffrage in the Senate." Since ratification of the Constitution by the original 13 states, 37 additional states have been admitted to the union. As a result the suffrage of the original 13 has already been"diluted"nearly four-fold from 2/26 to 2/100. Yet no one seriously argues that any of the older states have been deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate by the admission of the new states. So long as the people of the District of Columbia are represented in the Senate equally with those of each state, representation for the District will not violate the provisions of Article V. The people of each state will continue to have two votes in the Senate.

During Senate debate on the ammendment, Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), a supporter of D.C. representation, said, "It has long ago been established by court decrees, as well as by American political tradition, that the right to vote in federal elections is a right that follows directly from the Constitution to each citizen of the United States. This right is one belonging to national citizenship and it arises out of the very nature and existence of the nation itself."

Common Cause recognizes that it would be very easy for the Montana Legislature to vote down the D.C. Voting Rights Ammendment;however, by doing so you must agree that you are denying fellow Americans their right to representation in Congress. The same fellow Americans who are paying taxes like you and I and the same fellow Americans who have fought on battlefields alongside Montanans for the American way of life. Common Cause enthusiastically endorses Senate J.R. 11

Thank You

EXHIBIT 9c
State Admin.
Feb/ 8, 1983

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT

A report on the proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution to give citizens in the District of Columbia full voting representation in the U.S. Congress

Why Is this Amendment Necessary?

The population of the District of Columbia is larger than that of seven states. Residents of the District pay large amounts of taxes to the federal government. District residents have fought and died in all the nation's wars.

Yet today, two centuries after America was founded, citizens in the District of Columbia are denied representation in the institution which writes the nation's tax laws and declares war—the United States Congress.

The District of Columbia is not merely a collection of museums, monuments, and government buildings. It is also the home of 690,000 men, women, and children.

Under one of the basic principles of our democracy, U.S. citizens in each state are represented in the Senate and the House. Yet, the 690,000 citizens in the District of Columbia are denied this fundamental right of citizenship.

The issue is one of simple justice for the 690,000 Americans of the nation's capital. For decades, District residents, concerned local leaders and many Members of Congress have sought this basic goal. Indeed, the goal is remarkable only in the sense that it has been denied for so long to so many. In a nation that was founded on the principle of representative government and that has prided itself for two centuries on the strength and vitality of its democracy, it is outrageous that the people of the District of Columbia have no voice in Congress.

What Does this Amendment Say?

"Section 1. For purposes of representation in the Congress, election of the President and Vice President, and article V of this Constitution, the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall be treated as though it were a State.

"Sec. 2. The exercise of the rights and powers conferred under this article shall be by the people of the District constituting the seat of government, and as shall be provided by the Congress.

"Sec. 3. The twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 4. This article shall be inoperative, unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

The Case for Full Voting Representation

The debate over full voting representation for the Americans in the District of Columbia centers on the basic issue of civil and human rights. The only way to allow these people to be represented in Congress is to amend the U.S. Constitution.

One of the most honored principles of our democratic system is the concept of "one person, one vote." But, for citizens in the District, the rule is "690,000 persons, no votes."

In Congress, the amendment has strong bipartisan support. It has been endorsed by the

Cont. on p. 2

The Case

Chairmen of both the Democratic and Republican National Committees. Both the Democratic and Republican 1976 party platforms supported voting representation in the Senate and House for citizens in the District.

Passed by Congress in August 1978, the D.C. Voting Rights Amendment is now before the states. Thirty-eight states must ratify the amendment by August 1985.

Taxation Without Representation

Before there was a Constitution or a United States, the American people were united on a fundamental principle: there would be "no taxation without representation." Yet, two centuries after this principle sparked American independence, citizens in the District of Columbia are forced to pay federal taxes without being represented in the U.S. Congress.

Library of Congress data summarizing federal tax payments from each of the 50 states and the District show the degree to which the District of Columbia bears the burden of taxation without representation.

Residents of the District paid $1.4 billion in taxes to the federal government in fiscal year 1977. That amount is greater than the taxes paid by 11 states:

	($billion)
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	$1.470
Maine	1.400
New Hampshire	1.330
Alaska	1.225
Nevada	1.190
Idaho	1.155
Delaware	1.120
Montana	1.085
North Dakota	0.945
South Dakota	0.840
Wyoming	0.735
Vermont	0.630

If the federal tax burden is calculated on a per capita basis, the comparison is even more dramatic. For District of Columbia residents, the per capita tax burden is $2,116—$491 above the national average of $1,625. Only one other state—Alaska—has a higher per capita tax burden.

These figures provide a compelling argument for granting representation in Congress to the Americans in the District of Columbia.

It is time to end, once and for all, the burden of taxation without representation that has been imposed on the U.S. citizens in the nation's capital.

Representation for the *People* of the District

The District of Columbia is the home of 690,000 persons. Its population is greater than, or equal to, that of seven states, based on the most recent data available from the Bureau of the Census. The population estimates for 1977:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	690,000
South Dakota	689,000
North Dakota	653,000
Nevada	633,000
Delaware	582,000
Vermont	483,000
Alaska	407,000
Wyoming	406,000

The people of each of these states have voting representation in Congress—two Senators, and either one or two Members of the House of Representatives, depending on the population of the state. Yet the people of the nation's capital have no such voice.

Conscription Without Representation

Residents of the District of Columbia have fought and died in all of our nation's wars. In the Vietnam war, 237 citizens from the District were killed—a casualty level greater than the levels for ten states (Alaska, Delaware, Idaho, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont and Wyoming).

The people of those states were able to influence the decisions of Congress on the war, decisions that affected the lives of thousands of citizens who served their country in that war. But the citizens of the District of Columbia had no such influence.

A Solution Is Available

According to a 1978 study by the Library of Congress, among 115 nations in the world with elected national legislatures, only the United States and Brazil deny representation to citizens in their capital cities.

The analysis provides an additional rationale to support the voting rights amendment. It highlights the position of the United States in the international community on an important human rights issue—the right to representation.

The universal practice in almost all nations with elected legislatures—whether democracies or totalitarian systems—is to grant representation to residents of the capital city on a par with other cities in the nation. Of the 16 countries with federal systems similar to the United States, 14 have instituted an equitable system of representation for the residents of their capitals.

It is clear that opponents of representation for the Dis-

Solution

trict of Columbia cannot hide behind the federal analogy. Arguments for denying representation, based on the view that the District of Columbia is not a state, are outweighed by the justice of allowing the citizens in a capital city the right to participate in the political process. Other federal nations modeled on our government have resolved this issue against discrimination and in favor of representation for the capital's residents.

Myths about Full Voting Representation

Opponents of D.C. voting representation have created several myths which are not supported by the facts. Those most frequently heard are:

Why Not Give the District Back to Maryland?

Opponents argue that voting representation for the people of the District should not be achieved by independent representation in Congress, but by alternative methods which would link the District in various ways to the state of Maryland. There are serious objections to these alternatives, known as "full retrocession" (giving the District's territory back to Maryland) or "partial retrocession" (allowing District citizens to vote in Maryland elections.)

The 23rd Amendment, ratified in 1961, recognized that there was no justification for linking the District to Maryland for purposes of voting in Presidential elections. There is no justification today for linking the District to Maryland for purposes of voting in Senate and House elections.

Retrocession proposals surfaced during Congressional hearings when the amendment was under consideration. But they were quickly discarded, in large because of the resistance of the Maryland Congressional delegation. Over the years Maryland elected officials declared that such a proposal is politically preposterous and would stand no chance of passage.

There are a number of legal and Constitutional questions that would have to be resolved to make retrocession a serious possibility. Full retrocession would subject the federal government to the powers of the state of Maryland and contradict the Constitutional provisions which establish the District as a federal entity. Partial retrocession—simply turning District citizens into Maryland residents for the purpose of voting in Senate and House elections—would raise other basic questions. For example, should District residents then be entitled to send representatives to Annapolis to participate in drawing new Congressional district boundaries? Should they vote for the Governor of Maryland who has the power to fill U.S. Senate vacancies?

Retrocession is not a realistic proposal for gaining Congressional representation for the people of the District.

Why Give a City Representation?

Some opponents of full representation claim that the District is a city, not a state and that only states are entitled to representation in the House and Senate. They argue that there is no more reason for this city to be represented in Congress than there is for any other large city.

In fact, the district is neither a city nor a state, but a unique area set aside for a specific purpose—to be the home of the federal government. Congress has been willing to view the District of Columbia as a state in other circumstances. For example, the District has long been considered a state in virtually every piece of federal grant legislation.

Some critics of the amendment are willing to grant the District a vote in the House because population is the basis for representation in that body. But they disagree with Senate representation, arguing that only states can have this right. They fail to recognize that Senators do not represent states; they represent the *people* of those states. To deny the people of the District Senate representation would be to refuse them the full rights of American citizenship—the right to be represented in *both* houses of Congress.

Won't D.C. Representation Give the Bureaucrats More Power?

Opponents of representation in Congress for D.C. residents, often claim that representatives elected from the District would be "special pleaders" for federal employees.

Cont. on p. 4

Myths

The fact is that more federal employees live in the nearby Virginia and Maryland suburbs than in the District of Columbia. In fact, the District accounts for less than one-third of all federal employees in the Washington area.

District of Columbia:	110,000
Maryland suburbs:	140,000
Virginia suburbs:	143,000
Total:	393,000

This argument ignores other economic and social factors aside from federal employment. Members of the House and Senate elected from the District also represent taxpayers who work in private occupations, senior citizens, and the poor. It would be as unreasonable to deny representation to the District's residents because of its large number of federal employees as to deny representation to a state because of its large number of farmers.

Isn't D.C. Representation Unconstitutional?

Another objection to representation in Congress for the Americans in the District of Columbia rests on the provision in Article V of the Constitution, which declares that "no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

It is unreasonable to argue that granting Congressional representation to the District of Columbia would deprive any state of its "equal suffrage in the Senate." Since ratification of the Constitution by the original thirteen states, 37 additional states have been admitted to the union. As a result, the suffrage of the original thirteen states in the Senate has already been "diluted" nearly four-fold from 2/26 to 2/100. Yet no one seriously argues that any of the older states have been deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate by the admission of new states.

The principle is clear. So long as the people of the District of Columbia are represented in the Senate equally with those of each state, representation for the District will not violate the provisions of Article V. The people of each state will continue to have two votes in the Senate.

Supporters of the D.C. Amendment Include:

AFL-CIO
American Association of University Women
American Civil Liberties Union
American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees
American Federation of Teachers
American Jewish Committee
Americans for Democratic Action
American Veterans Committee
Catholic Archdiocese of Washington
Common Cause
Communications Workers of America
Democratic National Committee
D.C. Republican Committee
El Congresso
The Episcopal Church
Friends Committee on National Legislation
International Union of Operating Engineers
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade
National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees
NAACP
National Association of Counties
Natl Conf of Christians and Jews
National Education Association
National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council
National Urban League
National Women's Political Caucus
The Ripon Society
United Auto Workers
United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society
United Presbyterian Church
United States Jaycees
United Steel Workers of America
Washington Bar Association

What You Can Do For Ratification In Your States:

WRITE your State Representative and State Senator at regular intervals. If your legislators fail to reply or act on the amendment, arrange a visit —either alone or with a group of supporters.

For more copies of this pamphlet, write to: Common Cause, 2030 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 or call: (202) 833-1200.

Place Stamp Here

Feb 8, 1983

EXHIBIT 10
State Administration
Feb. 8, 1983

Mr Chairman - Members of the Committee

I feel we have been in far much trouble now from not adhering to the intent of the framers of this country. Therefore I am opposed to Bill 578 I feel certain those who planned the Wash D.C. area were aware that the population would continue to increase yet they did not allow for special group representation at the people.

I believe that Wash DC should remain as it is for the benefit of all 50 states - as a special area set aside for U.S. Govt facilities.

Ben Evans
Helena

EXHIBIT 11
State Admin.
2/8/83

Feb. 8, 1983

EXHIBIT 11
State Admin.
2/8/83

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

"The voters of all States should be alerted to the manifest deficiencies in this proposed Amendment" as stated by Fred Blanton of Birmingham, Ala.

It grants the District of Columbia the unique rights and privileges of representation without assuming the duties and responsibilities of Statehood. Obviously it is a special interest rip-off Amendment. The fifty states and their voters, as soverign states, contribute toward the United States of America.

Washington, D. C. should be thought of as a city rather than a State. All States are well aware that it was set aside as the seat of the United States Government made up of an ever changing population. Continuity of good government as a State could only be a hopeless mish mash of special interest legislation depending on who should be in power.

It is to remain the servant of the people and not become a master. All fifty States contribute and certainly would want it no other way. No one as a Citizen of America is denied their constitutional right to vote be it in Maryland or absentee ballot from their home State where most prefer to keep in touch with their Soverign State's Government.

Presently, all District of Columbia residents can vote for the President and Vice President. To offer stature as a State would reduce all fifty States as we would set a precedent totally out of line with the Preamble to the Constitution and reduce the Soverignity of Statehood.

In five years only ten States have been swayed to vote for this arrogance of power for Washington, D. C. This 62.7 square miles was set aside for nothing more than an enclave for a Federation of States to conduct National Administration without the politics of Government for Special Interests.

Please vote "NO" on S.B. 11.

Rose Mary Rodgers

Rose Mary Rodgers

(1517 Alomerre
Helena Mont
59601

D. C. plan ill-advised

Editor:

The legislatures of the 50 states have been given the task of passing upon the proposed constitutional amendment contained in House Joint Resolution 554, which provides for two senators and at least one representative in the U. S. Congress for the District of Columbia.

The voters of all states should be alerted to the manifest deficiencies in this proposed amendment.

First, the proposed amendment is the epitome of special interest legislation in that these some 500,000 persons get all the advantages, rights, and privileges of representation without assuming one iota of the duties and responsibilities which have heretofore been borne by the states and its voters.

Second, the passage of this amendment and its ultimate ratification would destroy the very foundation of the national government of the United States in that our nation would no longer be a federation of sovereign states. As a onetime professor of law at the University of Virginia Law School teaching constitutional law, I feel very deeply that this nation based upon a concept of states basis should be preserved, and that the destruction of this basis is unwarranted and ill-advised.

Lastly, granting that these 750,000 people are deserving of representation in the national congress, this end can be accomplished quite simply by the cession of the District of Columbia, reserving constitutional control over the federal enclave, back to the State of Maryland, where these people would achieve full participation in the governmental processes of a state. There is ample authority for such a cession in that the Congress has previously ceded back to the State of Virginia that part of the original District of Columbia which lay within the confines of that state.

The voters of every state who see the validity of the position espoused here should communicate immediately with state representatives and make their views quite clear.

Fred Blanton
Birmingham, Ala.

EXHIBIT 11b

James Kilpatrick

D.C. amendment deserves defeat

WASHINGTON — Proponents of the D. C. amendment to the Constitution needed 66 votes last Tuesday night. In the showdown, they got 67. If Barry Goldwater had only voted the conscience of a good conservative, this grotesque proposition would have gone down in deserved defeat. Instead, it has gone out to the states for ratification.

Doubtless, Mr. Goldwater was persuaded to vote for the resolution by the proponents' appeal to human rights and to what Sen. Edward Kennedy called "simple justice." These appeals are valid, but they were misplaced in this botched-up amendment. Mr. Goldwater and his companions voted in haste. Lovers of the Constitution will repent at leisure.

The amendment says, in Section 1, that "for purposes of representation in the Congress, election of the President and Vice President, and Article V of this Constitution, the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall be treated as though it were a state."

THE WORDING IS clumsy, clumsy, clumsy! The chefs who cooked up that syntactical hash never heard of the rules of parallelism. Section 2 is worse. Section 2 says: "The exercise of the rights and powers conferred under this article shall be by the people of the District constituting the seat of government, and as shall be provided by the Congress."

James Madison, roll over in thy grave! Does anyone profess to know what is meant by Section 2? To be sure, if the District of Columbia is to elect two senators and one representative, the people must elect them. Who else would elect them? But let us pursue the whole of this mishmash amendment as it flaps and stumbles its way toward a place in the supreme law of the land.

The District is to be treated "as though it were a state." This hypothesis is to apply in three functions only: (1) representation in the Congress, (2) election of presidents, and (3) the exercise of powers under Article V, which provides for future amendments to the Constitution.

BUT EVERYONE KNOWS that the District is not a state. The District is to remain subject to the most positive, least ambiguous provision in the whole of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district ... as may become the seat of the government of the United States."

Under this proposed amendment, the District of Columbia becomes nothing but a nothing; it is not a thing at all. It becomes a political centaur, horned but impotent. It is not to be a state in terms of interstate compacts. Its judicial proceedings are not to enjoy full faith and credit. It gets no guarantee against domestic violence. It has no reserved powers under the 10th Amendment. It does not qualify under the 14th Amendment. And so on.

Under Article V, constitutional amendments may be ratified by the "legislatures" of three-fourths of the states. Are we to understand that the District's City Council is to be metamorphosed into a legislature? So great a transformation has not been seen since Puck slipped the ass's head upon the shoulders of Nick Bottom.

THE AMENDMENT SIMPLY is out of tune. It is a stylistic abomination. And to talk politics for a moment, as distinguished from constitutional exegesis, the effect would be to send two liberal, urban Democrats to the Senate in perpetuity, with all the foreseeable consequences in terms of treaties, filibusters, committee membership, and the like.

I said at the outset that appeals to human rights and simple justice are valid. They are valid, and they are overblown. The clamor for voting rights for the District's residents is the amplified bullhorn clamor of a few activists. The people of Washington have had the power to vote for president, vice president, congressional delegate, mayor, council and school board, and their voting turnouts have been abysmal.

But if equal representation is the be-all and end-all, the answer is to cede the whole 62.7 square miles back to Maryland and be done with it. True, Maryland has done nothing to deserve such a fate, but who ever said life is fair?

EXHIBIT IIc
State Admin.
2/8/83

READER'S ALLEY

Against D.C. representation

Dear Editor:

I feel compelled to answer as forcefully as possible the letter you printed from Richard Hopkins regarding amending the Constitution. D.C. two Senators and Congressmen without making this federal enclave a regular state.

We have a federal system. Mr. Hopkins, and a national union made up of 50 sovereign states joined together purposely as stated in the Preamble to the Constitution. Each state has rights and duties. Each state is equally represented in the Senate, and the House. Membership is based on population. The Federal District was not placed in a state as it is intended to be the seat of government of all the states.

Each state has two Senators. This gives each state, large or small, an equality in one house of Congress. This is the basis of our system. Those who want to alter this plan by giving direct election of the President, by doing away with Marylandi in Federal elections would be the same as joining Montana with Wyoming. Again, D.C. is not a state.

We survive as a nation, as America, as a union of 50 separate states because our Constitution defines our rights as citizens of each state and of the union. We are not yet a homogeneous mass controlled by the Federals, although unfortunately we have taken many steps in that direction in recent years.

This proposed amendment is another step. Let it promptly be defeated.

M.F. Keller
Great Falls

The ripoff amendment

Dear Editor:

On Aug. 22, 1978 the U.S. Congress passed and sent to the states a new proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution to give the District Columbia representation if it were a state. It be ratified by three-fourths of the states within a seven-year period.

This proposed amendment should rightfully be called the "ripoff" amendment.

It is not true that District residents are the victims of taxation without representation. In 1961 the 23rd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which gave Washington D.C. three electoral votes, provided for the vote for president and vice president by residents of the District of Columbia. It was pointed out in Senate debate that the District gets back from the federal government $1 for every 29 cents it pays in federal taxes.

In 1970 Congress granted the District the right to elect a delegate to the Congress. While he cannot vote in the House, he does participate in House floor debates and he does vote on House Committees. The position is held by Walter E. Fauntroy. In 1973 the city council was given powers to legislate local matters.

District residents do not have voting representation in Congress for two reasons. First, the United States is a soverign nation of many soverign states, and the District is not a state in any definition of the word. Second, the Founding Fathers had great wisdom, in Article I Section 8 of the Constitution, to exempt the seat of government from political process so that the federal government might remain the servant of the people and not become its master.

There are many unanswered questions about this proposed amendment For example: Due to reapportionment which state will be forced to give up a Representative to Congress so that D.C. can have one? Will Montana lose one of its Congressmen?

Since D.C. is totally "federal government" isn't this a grab for more control? It definitely is federal office bureaus and employees wanting special privileges and more power and say in ruling the rest of U.S.

There is a push to get the states to ratify the amendment without any hearings and study. The people in D.C. don't want to let the other people find out the dangers of the amendment.

Since the U.S. Constitution (including all ratified amendments) is the supreme law of our land, there is more reason for state legislatures to take their time, so the people can study and investigage the issue thoroughly. The whole idea of ratifying a constitutional amendment without due consideration is an insult to constitutional integrity. Beware Montanans of the District of Columbia amendment. It is a simple name on a deceitful amendment.

Mary Ann Jirsa
Helena

Mar 13 1979

EXHIBIT 12
State Admin.
Feb. 8, 1983

To Chairman and Members of the Committee

Helena, Mont. 59601
Feb. 7, 1983

Against Proposed S.J.R. 11

If passed this would be a ~~[illegible]~~ giant step in the deterioration of our United States of America.

Washington, D.C. is America's capital, and has served us well since 1800. It is the seat of our government.

Our Nation's capital represents all of our United States and each state needs and deserves this representation as provided by our Constitution.

Washington, D.C. is the capital of every American not just those who reside there.

To change the representation would be to weaken and change each American's vote — even Montana's vote.

Mrs. Barry Hunkel