

February 22, 1977

PUBLIC HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS:

A meeting of the House Public Health, Welfare and Safety Committee was held on Tuesday, February 22, 1977 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 431 of the State Capitol. All members were present except Reps. Menahan, Palmer, Colburn, Gould and Kimble, who were excused.

In the absence of the Chairman, Vice-chairman Holmes called the meeting to order. After some discussion, the committee voted to begin bill hearings immediately.

The first bill to be heard was HOUSE BILL 301. Rep. Ellerd as chief sponsor explained the bill and the reasons behind it. He presented several amendments. He also submitted a letter from the Montana Veterinary Medical Association, stating their support of the measure. Dr. J. W. Glosser, Department of Livestock, then spoke. There are nine major parameters in the human health sector that the veterinarian plays an active role in. Mons Teigen, Montana Stockgrowers, Woolgrowers and Cattlemens Association, spoke next. The livestock industry would feel much more comfortable if the Board of Health had a veterinarian on it, as well as a doctor. Jess Kilgore, a rancher and member of the Agriculture Protective Association, which represents the people of Gallatin County, spoke in support of the bill. Rod Gudgel, Pharmaceutical Association and the Nursing Home Association, felt that the Board should include a pharmacist and a nursing home administrator as well.

There were no opponents to HOUSE BILL 301. The sponsor closed. Questions were asked. The sponsor stated that he was not in support of Mr. Gudgel's proposed amendments.

HOUSE BILL 805 and HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 73 were then heard. These two pieces of legislation were the alternative committee bill and resolution which were drafted in lieu of the bill introduced by Rep. Eudaily.

HOUSE BILL 805 inserts "offensive violence" into the present criminal statute dealing with offensive sexual material in film previews which are viewed by minors. This definition is patented after the definition of offensive sexual material. William L. Romine, Theater Owners Association then spoke; see prepared statement. He expressed his association's neutrality towards the bill, in view of the fact that they had not yet been able to study it in detail. Tom Keegan, Motion Picture Association of America, spoke next, expressing their support of the bill.

There were no opponents to HOUSE BILL 805. There were no questions.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 73 was explained by the committee attorney Bob Pyfer. The resolution censures theater owners who have knowingly or recklessly shown offensive violent or sexual previews when minors were in the audience. It also urges county attorneys to prosecute in such cases. William L. Romine spoke, expressing his association's wholehearted support of the resolution; see prepared statement. There are only a few theater owners ignoring the red and green-banded trailers; these people should be prosecuted. Tom Keegan also spoke again. He too wholeheartedly supported the resolution, and pointed out that his association obviously supports this philosophy, in view of the fact that they do manufacture two different sets of previews for the two age groups. John Frankino, Montana Catholic Conference, spoke up in support of both the bill and the resolution concerning this matter.

There were no opponents to HJR 73. There were no questions.

HOUSE BILL 622 was heard. Rep. Marks was the chief sponsor. One of his main concerns is that there is some looseness in the way that the welfare program is being handled. This problem has not been specifically addressed. This bill provides that welfare recipients and others may be required to work, by the persons who administer the welfare programs, if they qualify under the provisions of this bill. This work would be in the area of public work and would not interfere with the private work force. Norman Waterman, Director of the County Welfare Departments in Lewis and Clark, Broadwater, and Jefferson Counties, spoke. At present such programs seem to work very satisfactorily. The programs would probably only apply to those people with school-aged children. Also, persons could be excused for good cause. Jack R. Carlson, Administrator of Economic Assistance, Dept. of SRS, then spoke. There are several programs such as the WINN Program, and the Carter Administration has promised several new ones, which accomplish a similar purpose as this bill would.

There were no opponents to HOUSE BILL 622. The sponsor closed. He stressed that it was very important for the committee to consider the exemptions in the bill. These programs would not be used to perform work already performed by employees of any department of the government or the private sector. Persons involved in work incentive programs would be exempted from this act. If this bill were enacted, 20-30% of those persons who apply for welfare might choose to seek better paying work, rather than be involved in such a program. Also, more people would enter educational programs. If this is accomplished, it will release the funds for those persons who are truly "wards of the state". Questions were then asked. Rep. Harper

questioned if it was the intent of the bill to make sure that there were enough jobs to go around. Rep. Marks stated that the intent of the bill was not to give these people degrading jobs. Rep. Metcalf commented that the state might just be better off, from a financial point of view, to provide the welfare. Rep. Holmes suggested an amendment which would exclude people "actively looking for work". The sponsor resisted the amendment. Mr. Waterman stressed that it would not take a full-time job to meet the requirements that wages equal the benefit amounts.

HOUSE BILL 730 was then heard. The sponsor was Rep. Quilici. This is an important bill; there are 950 foster homes and 75 group homes in Montana which would be affected. The bill will do three things: (1) it gives the Fire Marshall's office the opportunity to inspect these buildings before they give licenses; (2) also, the Dept. of Health would have this opportunity. (3) Local communities can do these inspections if the state cannot get there to do them. The importance of these inspections was brought home in an incident a few years ago in which a child burned to death in a foster home. Pat Melby, Director of the Dept. of SRS, then spoke. He presented several housekeeping amendments. His department supports the bill as amended. Bruce Houston, Deputy State Fire Marshall, spoke. These annual inspections could be made, and if there were any problems, the State Fire Marshall's office could give assistance. He does not agree with the provision granting the homes licenses if not inspected after 30 days, however. Rod Gudgel, Montana Nursing Home Assoc., spoke up in support of the bill. He pointed out that the Fire Marshall's office has input in the area of fire safety procedures; however the Health Dept. is not involved in setting health standards. Bill Emge, representing AIDS, stated his willingness to support the bill as amended.

There were no opponents to HB 730. The sponsor then closed. The bill intends to make the law less restrictive to run these homes, so they are not forced to close while waiting for an overdue inspection. He stressed the importance of having fire and health standards in these places. Questions were then asked. Rep. Ryan expressed opposition to lowering standards and felt that the bill would in effect do this. The sponsor said that he hoped the additional 30 days would be enough time for the inspection to be taken care of; however if it was not taken care of, this bill would insure that the homes would not have to close their doors. Mr. Melby said that the home would get a license for another full year, even without the inspection, if it is not made in time. Rep. Holmes suggested to possibly stipulate that the license would be temporary. The proponents were opposed to this approach because it would not effectively change the

existing situation. Giving a temporary license would burden the foster home with having to operate under less than desirable circumstances, and would not provide any incentive for the Fire Marshall to make more timely inspections. However, the proponents had no objections to the committee working out amendments to deal with this problem. The hearing was then closed.

HOUSE BILL 385, sponsored by Rep. Roth, was then heard. She described the contents of the bill. The bill asks for unprofessional people to be on the Board of Medical Examiners in cases relating to unprofessional conduct. Gale R. Gustafson, representing the general public, then spoke. The very people who this profession professes to serve and protect are unrepresented on the board; there is not even a token representative of the public. People bring their complaints to the board, and if they are "summarily tossed out", the only recourse is a lawsuit, which would then give the matter public notoriety. Willaim T. Gustafson from Great Falls then spoke. Every doctor he has talked to at the Board of Examiners meetings has admitted bias. In addition, he found that at the last meeting which he attended there was very little interest in what he had to say. The Board admitted that they had not even read his letters which had been submitted. Doctors are going to protect themselves and he doesn't see how a biased group can give the public any kind of a fair deal.

The opponents to HB 385 then spoke. Dr. Allan L. Goulding, Billings, spoke. He is the Chairman of the Board of Medical Examiners. This bill was presented because of the proponents' feeling that the Board treated them unfairly. The Board did give that particular party what he thinks was an adequate consideration. To bring individuals to a meeting four to six times a year costs money. The money to run the Board is assessed to the physicians in the state. Also, this is the first real criticism of their actions that they have had, he pointed out. Dr. John W. McMahan, Montana Medical Association, then spoke. He has no objection to having a lay person on the Board of Medical Examiners, but is opposed to the bill. He presented a paper which outlined what doctors are doing to police themselves. Contrary to what the proponents had stated, the Board does on occassion forbid doctors to practice in this state. He stressed that it was a difficult job to police the art aspect of medicine. Jerry Loendorf, representing the Montana Medical Association, also spoke. The MMA caused to be introduced HB 610. Section 6 of that bill would allow the Board to increase the doctors' dues to \$100 per year. Another bill would ask that all complaints in the state be brought to them; this is HB 408, and it has passed to the Senate at this time. By adding

six new members to the Board the expenses would be increased substantially. If there needs to be a lay person, then put one on the Board, but not six. There have been five licenses taken in the last year alone; he feels that the information presented in support of this bill was not correct.

Rep. Roth then closed. She explained that she had submitted this bill on request, and all the bill does is ask for lay representation on the Board of Medical Examiners. There were no questions.

HOUSE BILL 663 was then heard. The sponsor, Rep. Harper, explained that the need for this bill was brought about by rising medical and institutional costs and because of the effects which prolonged institutional care have on people. Many people over the age of 65 are in need of home health care. 50-60% of Montana's people have access to home health care. This proposal would bring this figure up to 78 1/2%. Home health care improves the quality of life for these people; it allows them to stay at home, rather than going to an institution. Care as provided in this bill is a low-cost alternative; it would be 4-10 times less costly than institutional care. Persons who could not afford institutional care could quite logically afford home health care, and be provided all their needs. Dr. McMahan then spoke. This is the biggest need to address, namely, some sort of relief from the institutionalization program. He hopes the program can be enlarged ultimately to cover all people in the state. Janet Kovalchik, representing the Montana Association of Home Health Agencies, spoke; see prepared statement. She presented a map showing the locations of the current active Home Health Services in the state. Virginia Kenyon, Chief of the Bureau of Nursing of the Dept. of Health then spoke. She also left prepared testimony. She in addition distributed a pamphlet entitled "Home health care under Medicare". John Frankino, Montana Catholic Conference then spoke and also left a prepared statement. Sharon Dieziger, Montana Nurses Assoc., then spoke. She endorsed the previous testimony. Rod Gudgel, Nursing Home Assoc., spoke up in support of this bill also. He pointed out that the Dept. of SRS budget has included a request for 12 social workers for home health services. Passage of this bill is important in order that those 12 positions might be approved. The fiscal analyst has recommended a reduction in the SRS budget, specifically in the amount of \$11,000,000. If HB 360 is favorably acted upon, then Section 3 of that bill should be amended to provide for compliance with state law and regulations, to conform with this bill. Jan Brown, Montana Association of Churches, spoke next. She distributed copies of that association's position on the bill.

There were no opponents to HOUSE BILL 663. The sponsor closed. Questions were then asked. It was pointed out that if the licensure goes through as presently written, this would include both profit and non-profit agencies. Mr. Gudgel stated that if this committee did consider the profit aspect, he would then be opposed to the bill.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 74 was heard. The sponsor was Rep. Cox. This measure addresses a problem shared by many of the families in the state. She pointed out a case in her district which was part of the reason for the drawing up of this resolution. Rod Gudgel, Montana Nursing Home Assoc., then spoke. In regard to the federal requirements relating to medicare, law prohibits supplementation. Congress should be directed to amend this law; otherwise this resolution's plea would not be satisfactorily spoken to.

Bill Ikard, Chief of the Medical Assistance Bureau, Dept. of SRS, spoke in opposition to the resolution. He informed the committee that supplementation was forbidden under federal regulation only. Care has to be "medically necessary" to fall under the medicaid provisions.

Questions were then asked concerning HJR 74. Rep. Cooney wished to go on record as having resolved not to ask Mr. Gudgel any more questions. Mr. Ikard felt that if this resolution were passed then all patients would start asking for private rooms. The hearing was then closed.

HOUSE BILL 756, sponsored by Rep. Frates, was then heard. Amendments were passed out. He also added several additional amendments verbally, as follows: Title, line 5, strike "SUPPLEMENTARY PAYMENTS"; line 7, strike all of that amending section after the word "SERVICES"; strike everything on lines 10 through 25; on page 2 strike lines 1 through 11, and renumber subsequent sections. The problem this bill is trying to address is that payments coming in to various departments have had a lag. After 10 days, a notification of non-payment is to be made, and the following month all of the bill has to be paid, plus interest. Chad Smith, Montana Hospital Assoc., then spoke. The bill as amended provides for timely payment to health care providers of money due them. Regardless of the reasons for the delay, money has to be borrowed, which costs the health care providers money. This bill is proper and legal. Rod Gudgel, Montana Nursing Home Assoc., then spoke. Similar legislation was introduced in the 1975 session of this legislature, but it was allowed to die because the Dept. of SRS promised to make speedier payments. This has not proven to be the case for the last year and 3/4. He recommended a DO PASS AS AMENDED for the bill. Bill Ikard, Dept. of SRS,

supported the concept of the bill. He stressed the need for amendments. He explained that 23-24 days normally elapse after receipt of a bill before payment is accomplished. He feels this is faster than the general public pays their bills. He would like to see a fund set up so that if payments are late, the fund could take care of the payments. He felt that no one should have to pay interest. John Frankino then spoke. He tentatively supported the bill as amended. Ken Rohyans, representing AIDS spoke, concurring with the Dept. of SRS amendments.

There were no opponents to HB 756. The sponsor closed. There were no questions.

The meeting was then recessed until 8:30 p.m., the same day. Following are the proceedings from this 8:30 meeting. Several committee members were not present for the entire meeting. These persons submitted their votes in writing; see attached copies. Rep. Gunderson was excused and did not leave any votes.

A quorum was temporarily present at the 8:30 p.m. meeting in room 431 of the State Capitol. Rep. Colburn moved to suspend the rules of the committee and proceed with the meeting, although the quorum was no longer present. Motion carried with 5 ayes and 4 no's. Rep. Porter then commented, "This is not what we are here for, for our convenience; we are here to legislate." It was questioned whether the vote previously taken was valid, being as there was not a quorum present. The sentiment was expressed that the system the Legislators were working under did not allow them to operate properly or to make rational decisions. Four more members then arrived. The original motion made by Rep. Colburn was then withdrawn.

HOUSE BILL 300 was the first bill to be acted upon. Rep. Stobie brought up that in a previous executive session there was some question about whether the Radiologic Technologists were in favor of this bill or not. A telephone message from Dr. R. K. Helm, Radiologist for Plains, Montana, was read. It expressed concurrence with the additional amendments submitted by the Licensing Board and approval of the bill as so amended. A motion by Rep. Ryan was made and seconded to not reconsider this committee's previous action of DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED on HB 300. Motion carried. Discussion then took place. Chad Smith was present and explained that the people from Dillon and Glasgow still were concerned whether they would be able to obtain an X-ray Technologist. He introduced one additional amendment which had been worked out by the Board of Health. Rep. Stobie made a motion to reconsider action on the bill. Motion failed with two members in favor of it.

Rep. Feda moved that HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 73 and HOUSE BILL 805 DO PASS. Motion carried unanimously.

Rep. Colburn moved to not accept the amendments offered to HOUSE BILL 301. Rep. Stobie made a substitute motion to accept the amendments. The substitute motion carried. A motion was then made that the bill DO PASS AS AMENDED. Rep. Colburn made a substitute motion that the bill DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED. Veterinarians who had contacted him say that this is impractical from their point of view. The substitute motion failed. The original motion was then voted on and carried unanimously.

Another motion to reconsider action on HOUSE BILL 300 was then made. Motion failed.

HOUSE BILL 756 - Rep. Porter moved that it DO PASS AS AMENDED according to the the amendments agreed upon among the sponsor and several others earlier that day. Rep. Ryan made a substitute motion that it DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED. Discussion. Rep. Porter said that there would be no additional cost to the state. The substitute motion was then voted on and failed; see roll call vote. The original motion was then carried via reversal of the vote on the substitute motion, which was done at the consent of all members present.

HOUSE BILL 682 was the next bill to be acted on. Rep. Gould moved that it DO NOT PASS. Rep. Porter seconded the motion. Motion carried with Reps. Holmes, Metcalf, Kimble and Cooney opposed. Rep. Harper had submitted in writing that he wished to abstain on the vote on this bill.

HOUSE BILL 114 - Rep. Gould moved that it DO NOT PASS; Rep. Colburn seconded the motion. Discussion. Motion carried with Reps. Holmes, Kimble, Metcalf, Harper, Cox and Cooney opposed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 74 - Rep. Gould moved that it DO PASS; motion seconded. Rep. Porter made a substitute motion that it DO NOT PASS and Rep. Stobie seconded this motion. Rep. Porter then withdrew his motion. Rep. Gould also withdrew his motion. Rep. Gould then moved adoption of amendment #1 of the proposed amendments which had been submitted. Motion carried unanimously. Rep. Gould then moved adoption of amendment #2 of the proposed amendments. Motion failed. Rep. Vinger then moved that it DO PASS AS AMENDED. Discussion. Motion carried with Reps. Porter, Ryan, Wyrick, Metcalf, Kimble and Cooney opposed.

HOUSE BILL 622 - A motion was made that it DO PASS; motion

carried with Rep. Palmer opposed.

HOUSE BILL 730 - Rep. Wyrick moved that it DO PASS AS AMENDED. Rep. Ryan was opposed to the motion, because more than one temporary license could be issued and this could go on year after year. Acting chairman Rep. Holmes entertained a motion to amend the bill to provide for a temporary 60-day license. Rep. Palmer moved the original proposed amendments, see copy. Motion carried. Rep. Colburn then moved that the bill DO PASS AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

HOUSE BILL 594 - Rep. Fedra moved that it DO NOT PASS; Rep. Colburn seconded the motion. Discussion took place. The feeling was expressed that the industry would take care of this themselves. Rep. Harper then made a substitute motion that the bill be amended, by striking the portions of the bill dealing with alcoholism and drug addiction. Motion carried unanimously. The motion of DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED was then before the committee. Rep. Harper made a substitute motion of DO PASS AS AMENDED. Discussion. Rep. Fedra stated that if one wanted this kind of insurance coverage, they could already get it. Rep. Harper replied that this might assure funding for the persons who need the services of mental health centers. Rep. Fedra stated that even Lloyd's of London would not write up an insurance policy such as this bill proposes. The substitute motion was then voted on. Motion failed, with Reps. Palmer, Harper, Holmes, Lynch and Kimble in favor and Reps. Cox and Metcalf abstaining. The votes were then reversed on the original motion and as a result the original motion of DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED carried.

HOUSE BILL 385 - Mr. Gale Gustafson had submitted further written testimony on this bill, which had been passed out to the committee members. Rep. Fedra moved that it DO NOT PASS; motion carried with Reps. Lynch and Kimble opposed and Rep. Cox abstaining.

HOUSE BILL 663 - Rep. Harper moved that it DO PASS AS AMENDED. Discussion. The proposed amendment, which was needed if HB 360 received a DO PASS, was discussed. Question was then called for and the motion carried with Reps. Stobie and Kenny abstaining and Reps. Colburn, Ryan, Fedra and Lynch opposed.

HOUSE BILL 303 - Mr. Pyfer, the committee attorney, explained the proposed amendments. Discussion took place. Rep. Fedra moved and Rep. Colburn seconded that the bill DO NOT PASS. Motion carried, with Reps. Palmer, Gould, Holmes, Cox, Kimble, Lynch and Cooney opposed.

HOUSE BILL 724 - Rep. Colburn moved that it DO PASS. Motion carried with Reps. Stobie, Vinger and Wyrick voting no and Rep. Metcalf abstaining.

The bills heard by the Problems of the Elderly Subcommittee were then presented, with recommendations made by that subcommittee. Rep. Palmer presented the subcommittee reports and explained the subcommittee's actions on the following bills, one by one.

HOUSE BILL 52 - This bill received unanimous subcommittee approval of the motion DO PASS AS AMENDED. The recommendation was then accepted by the committee.

HOUSE BILL 61 - The subcommittee offered several amendments and it was moved that AS SO AMENDED HB 61 DO PASS. Recommendation accepted.

HOUSE BILL 255 - The sponsor had requested that this bill be tabled. Rep. Colburn moved that the bill be TABLED. Motion carried unanimously.

HOUSE BILL 286 - Amendments were submitted, see copy. This bill had received a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation by a subcommittee vote of 4 to 1. Rep. Porter then made a minority report, having been the one dissenting vote. (1) The patient can either contact the doctor directly or through the pharmacist and receive lower priced drugs; this is presently allowed in all 50 states. (2) This bill is aimed only at senior citizens. (3) Testimony was given by at least two senior citizens who said that they did not want their prescriptions altered without express permission from their doctors. (4) Savings would be minimal and might in the long run raise the price of all drugs. (5) Section 8, paragraph (2) states that if there were any adverse effects from a substitute drug, the patient would have no recourse. (6) Research could be cut off if this bill were passed. Rep. Colburn then made a motion, in view of Rep. Porter's statements, that HB 286 DO NOT PASS. Rep. Palmer then spoke on the motion. This bill essentially brings the pharmacist into the picture of total health care that is being provided for the customer. Only one section of the law is being changed. At present, pharmacists do not want to bother with calling doctors in order to obtain permission to use generic equivalents. If there is a question in the doctor's mind, he can stipulate on the prescription that no substitution be made. The customer can request that the drug not be substituted, also. If there is any doubt on the pharmacist's part, he would simply not substitute. There has not been one recorded death due to generic drug-related accidents. Discussion then took place. This bill would not force the pharmacist

to use generic equivalents. Rep. Cooney stated that if the majority of the senior citizens feel that they can get a savings on this, then the Legislature should opt to give them this opportunity. Rep. Palmer pointed out that much more money was spent on advertising than on research. Rep. Ryan then expressed his opinion that this bill should never have been referred to the subcommittee, and that this was only a smokescreen to get supporters. "This business of savings is certainly not in the bill. A pharmacist can substitute anything that he wants. This is a bad bill and addresses nothing." Rep. Palmer expressed resentment of Rep. Ryan's accusations. He also pointed out that 21 states have adopted similar legislation. The Montana Medical Association has taken no position on the bill. The Pharmaceutical Association is in support of the ability to substitute generic drugs by the pharmacists. Question was then called for and the motion of DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED failed. Rep. Palmer then made a motion that the bill DO PASS AS AMENDED. The votes were switched at the consent of the committee members.

HOUSE BILL 350 was then considered. This bill received a 4 to 1 recommendation of DO PASS. Rep. Gould had been opposed. Rep. Porter quoted from a comment made by Rep. Kimble that "This bill will not get through this time, but it has to be started and this is an effort to get the aged into a place where they can be properly viewed and cared for." Rep. Gould then spoke. (1) He is opposed to the cost factor; this is money that will be lost from services. (2) Visual services. If this function is put into Aging, a big majority of the persons involved will not be senior citizens. (3) Medicaid. There is a bigger share of welfare recipients who are not senior citizens involved in this area, also. Rep. Harper expressed agreement with Rep. Gould's points. He said that this was not the time nor the place for the bill, and it should be disposed of in committee. Rep. Kenny expressed support of the bill, and said that whether or not the bill was killed, the Legislature should begin considering the senior citizen. Rep. Colburn moved that the bill DO PASS AS AMENDED; the vote was tied. The following day Rep. Gunderson submitted her vote which was in favor of the bill and as a result the committee reported DO PASS AS AMENDED.

HOUSE BILL 360 - The subcommittee recommended that it DO PASS, unanimously. Rep. Feda moved that the subcommittee report be adopted; motion carried unanimously.

HOUSE BILL 569 - This bill will have to go to the Appropriations committee. The subcommittee unanimously recommended that it DO PASS AS AMENDED. Rep. Colburn moved adoption of

the subcommittee report. Rep. Stobie commented that the bill was unnecessary, and that sometimes you can help people too much. Rep. Porter had two problems with the bill. (1) Page 6, section 10. A person with personality and leadership abilities is needed in such a program. (2) Outreach programs. "Bless your hearts, you have to go where the jobs are." He feels that there would not be job opportunities in the communities where the outreach programs would be located. Rep. Cox expressed concurrence with Rep. Stobie's statements. Rep. Colburn spoke in support of the bill. Rep. Holmes said that when she attended the Women's Issues Forum that this was one of the bills which they were most interested in. Rep. Vinger felt that this type of situation should be handled in the families themselves; Rep. Feda concurred with Rep. Vinger. The question was then called for. The vote was tied; see roll call vote. Rep. Gunderson also voted on this bill the following day and as a result it received a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation from the committee.

HOUSE BILL 674 had received a subcommittee recommendation to be TABLED, by a unanimous vote. Rep. Colburn moved that that recommendation be accepted. Motion carried unanimously.

HOUSE BILL 644 was the last bill to be considered. The subcommittee recommended unanimously that the bill DO PASS AS AMENDED. Rep. Colburn moved acceptance of the subcommittee report. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was then adjourned, at 11:30 p.m.

Chairman - Rep. Wm. "Red" Menahan

Secretary