# MINUTES OF THE MEETING SENATE STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE MARCH 26, 1977

The meeting was called to order by Senator Towe, Chairman, at 8:00 a.m. in the Governor's Reception Room of the Capitol Building. Committee members present were Senators Towe, Story, Devine, Blaylock, Jergeson, Roskie and Rasmussen. Senator Brown was excused.

The following bills were discussed: HB 791

HB 795

HB 791 Representative George Johnston, District 13, stated he had introduced the bill at the request of the House State Administration Committee. He stated he had introduced HB 133 but its provisions were not broad enough so this bill was drawn up to include the department carrying out the functions of the department; the Director is in charge of personnel hiring and firing; the Commission retains their functions, and personnel has the right to appeal to the Labor Appeal Board rather than the Commission.

#### Proponents

Bob Lohn, staff attorney representing the Governor, stated the bill brings the Commission up to date and draws the line between functions of the department, the director, the Commission and the

Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Two

personnel. The Director will serve as any other department director and at the pleasure of the Governor.

Mons Tiegen, representing the Montana Stockgrowers Association, stated they support the bill in its present form as it will help resolve many past problems.

Bob Gilbert, representing Montana Woolgrowers Association, spoke in favor of the bill.

Peter Jackson, representing the Western Environmental Trade Association, supported the bill.

Bill Asher, representing the Agricultural Preservation Association, urged full support of the bill.

#### Opponents

Jack Cohn, sportsman, farmer and Fish and Game Commissioner, gave a brief history of the bill. After having two attorneys check the bill they determined it takes away 125 rights of the Commission as well as the whole checks and balance system between the Commission and the Director. He also noted the game warden qualifications had been stricken.

Gary Stuker, representing Hill County Wildlife Association, stated definite guidelines are needed for the director and the commissioners need some teeth but have been stripped of them.

Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Three

There were no further proponents or opponents and Representative Johnston closed by stating he had met with the five commissioners and they had approved the bill. He felt under the present law the Director is no more than a secretary to the commissioners.

#### Questions by Committee

Senator Blaylock asked what the bill really does. Mr. Lohn answered it give clear administrative control within the department to the director and defines the responsibilities of the commission—that being a shift of power of sorts but only in defining function.

There being no further questions, the hearing was closed.

HB 795 Representative Bardanouve, sponsor of the bill, stated the bill is the result of concern over the recall initiative that passed in the general election. It was passed by over 40,000 votes which certainly makes it a mandate of the people and the people who worked on it should be commended, however its definitions are ambiguous and it does not clarify or conform to present law.

He further stated the law does provide for amending an initiative measure. It has been thoroughly researched

Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Four

by three legislative council researchers, reviewed by the Secretary of State for conformity to election laws; Larry Elison in the Governor's Office reviewed the bill, and then it was checked out by the Attorney General.

The bill defines the official list of voters as a list of registered voters. Representative

Bardanouve stated a federal judge cannot be recalled according to federal law and only members of the body can pass on the qualifications of a member of Congress. The bill also clarifies who may sign a recall petition. Only people eligible to vote for the person being recalled can sign the petition. The expense of a recall election will be born by the state rather than the county where the petition originates.

Representative Bardanouve presented a copy of research material from legislative council to the committee (see attached #1).

He further stated of the 31 states having recall,
Montana's is the most liberal. The initiative stated
anyone for any reason can be recalled and he stated
this is the most dangerous part of it. The initiative
as originally written would reduce public officials
to puppets as they would only do the popular thing at
any given time.

Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Five

#### Proponents

Jim Murray, Executive Secretary of the Montana State AFL-CIO supported the bill. He noted that under the current initiative minority rule would prevail. Representative John Scully, District 76, stated, as Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, HB 795 is the best researched bill of this session. The mechanics are perfect.

Margaret Davis, League of Women Voters, supported the bill (see attached #2).

#### Opponents

Wyverne Cranmore, Ravalli County Farm Bureau, spoke in opposition to the bill (see attached #3).

Bill Koerner, representing Independent Americans, stated their group worked hard on the initiative and got over 60,000 signatures. He felt the public should have the power to recall any official who is paid by the electorate. He stated they were opposed to all the changes in the bill.

Bud Wallace, representing himself, asked why the originators of the initiative weren't contacted about the bill. He noted that some legislators said they had voted for the bill without being thoroughly familiar with it.

Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Six

Peggy Christianson, representing herself, quoted the Constitution, Article 3, Section 4, regarding initiatives. She was especially adamant that citizens have the right to recall members of the judiciary.

Mary Ann Carlin, representing Independent Americans, opposed the bill (see attached #4).

Steve Trenka, representing the Citizens' Protective Association, Billings, asked what officials were afraid of—how many people have been hurt by recall? He said no one was out to "get" anyone and they would give credit where credit was due. He stated 80 per cent of public employees are appointed and should be subject to recall.

Jimmy Shea, Public Service Commissioner, stated he neither opposed or supported the bill but wished to make two points regarding it. First, who determines what constitutes a physical or mental lack of fitness, and second, the time limit of three months to initiate a recall process is too short.

Mabel Trenka, secretary of the Citizens' Protective Association, Billings, stated she concurred with previous testimony.

Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Seven

Senator Towe allowed all who supported or opposed the bill to stand and state their names and position on the bill.

John Scully (Representative) presented a copy of the hearing schedule and committee report to the committee regarding previous testimony to the effect that adequate notice was not given in the House on the bill.

Representative Bardanouve closed by saying we must have law based on law, not on an official's interpretation of it. He stated the rule of the minority can become as much of a tyranny as the majority who take away the rights of the minority.

#### Questions by the Committee

Senator Towe asked if we have the right to limit the initiative if the people voted on it the way they did.

Representative Bardanouve stated they didn't know what they were voting on as the wording is very ambiguous.

Senator Towe asked about the three month time limit on circulating a petition.

Representative Bardanouve stated three months should be adequate as you don't want a threat of this nature Meeting Minutes Senate State Administration March 26, 1977 Page Eight

hanging over an official's head for an indefinite period of time.

Senator Rasmussen asked Mr. Koerner if the initiative had originally been written as the bill is now, would it have passed as overwhelmingly.

Mr. Koerner stated no it wouldn't have as it isn't what the people want.

Senator Towe asked if the rumor was true that recall petitions were being initiated against the sponsor and signers of the bill.

Mr. Koerner stated this would be sufficient grounds for recall as it goes against the will of the voters.

There being no further questions, the hearing was closed. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned to reconvene Monday, March 28, 1977, at 11:00 a.m.

Thomas E. Towe, Chairman

## ROLL CALL State Cedministration COMMITTEE

45th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1977 Date 3/20/79

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCU <b>SE</b> D
Senator Thomas E. Towe, Chrm.	X		
Senator Pete Story, V. Chrm.	Χ		
Senator Bob Brown			X
Senator A.T. "Tom" Rasmussen	X		
Senator George F. Roskie	X		
Senator John W. Devine	X		
Senator Greg Jergeson	X		
Senator Chet Blaylock	X		
	······································		
			·

Each day attach to minutes.

Aloka Godannista v Iva

COMMITTEE	ON

	VISITORS' REGISTER			
NAME	REPRESENTING	BILL #	Check Support	One Oppose
Nutle Carter	sied	795		<i>i</i> /
Myi Enyder	esest	795		
Debbie Johnson	Sell	795		سسن
Son bear	ij O.	795		i
Pon Parter	SElf	>95		2
BIAL ASHER	AGRI FRUSY ASSN.	791		
and John gin T	se C	195		i
Marmanel STDairs	Laqued Women Voters	195		
Not li Connon	Mat. Covarian Course	793	1	
En maria		791-		V
Man And C. C.	Sand Het amories	1775		-
Encluse Telliteriti	self	795		V
Stormer Land	W. C.	205		~
novie Come Cin	4577	195		<i>_</i>
The state of the state of	And the second	11.5		1
<u> </u>				
<u> </u>				
		ļ	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

NAME: Mons Teigen	DATE: 3/26/71
ADDRESS: Helena	,
PHONE:	
REPRESENTING WHOM? Mont Stockgrowers	Assic
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 48 791	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	

NAME: Moisert 1 (71/ber) DATE: 3-26-77
ADDRESS: Box 1693 Helenin
PHONE: 442 1350
REPRESENTING WHOM? MONTHUIT WOOL GROWNS ASIN.
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 145 791
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: THIS BILL IS LONG EVERYUE. WHILE the
press stores it takes jouens surry from the
Commission the bill actually chearly defines
Not only the commission powers but that of
La director & department. We feel this bill
will give direction to se concerned.
As for provisions allowing the Giv. to vemove
the director, that's the way it is for see other
Repartments a lish & game should be included.
The second of th

NAME: Cetu Jackson	DATE: 2 - 2 6
ADDRESS: Kelena Mond	
PHONE: 443-5541	
REPRESENTING WHOM?	
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 791	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	

NAME: BILL HSHER	DATE: 3-26-77
ADDRESS: RT2 Box 166 MAN	
PHONE: 284-6664	
REPRESENTING WHOM? HERICULTURAL PRESE	RVATION ASSOCIATION
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 45 79/	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	

NAME: Jack 6. John DATE: 3/28/77
ADDRESS: 1510 1/1000
PHONE: 445-2041
REPRESENTING WHOM? no one but myself
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: #B 79/
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:
:

NAME: Day Stubers DATE: 3-26
ADDRESS: Box 282
PHONE: 265-4405
REPRESENTING WHOM? HILL COCUTY WILLIFE ASSOC
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 29/
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: Tenure of Separtment leads of Regional Coordinater Should be proposed by Director but approved by the Commission
Record Continutar should be proposed
by Director but approved by The
Can see soil



#### MATERIAL TO ACCOMPANY HB 795

		Page
Α.	Analysis of Amendments to the Recall Initiative in the Bill	A-1
В.	Analysis of the Montana Recall and Advisory Recall Act	
	Introduction	B-1
	Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	B-2
	Part I: Analysis	B-3
	Part II: Administrative and Cost Implications .	B-6
	Part III: Distinction Between an Officer and an Employee	B-10
	Part IV: Removal of Public Officers in Montana, Past and Present	B-13
	Part V: Potential for Abuse	B-17
	Part VI: Recall of a Senator or Representative in Congress	B-18
	Part VII: Advisory Recall	B-19
С.	Text of the Montana Recall and Advisory Recall Act.	C-1
D.	Survey of Recall Literature	D-1
E.	Adoption of Recall Laws	E-1
F.	Use of Recall	F-1
G	Recall Provisions in Other States	G-1



JAMES W. MURRY

ZIP CODE 59601

LUNDY SHOPPING CENTER MISSOULA HIGHWAY

REMARKS OF JAMES W. MURRY ON HOUSE BILL 795, HEARINGS OF THE SENATE STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE, MARCH 26, 1977

I am appearing on behalf of the membership of the Montana State AFL-C10 who, during our annual convention last summer, adopted a firm policy statement of opposition to Initiative 73, the Montana Recall and Advisory Recall Statement of opposition to Initiative 73, the Montana Recall and Advisory Recall Act.

Quoting from that policy statement, I would like to make it clear that the Montana State AFL-CIO is opposed not to the concept of recall, but to the conditions for recall as set forth in Initiative 73. Our position states that "the petitions for recall elections should be for illegal activities or gross misconduct by an elected or appointed official, not at the whim or fancy of a small group of individuals."

It has been publicly established that the people behind the recall initiative are members of some ultra-conservative political groups operating in this state. Initiative 73, without the safeguards proposed in House Bill 795, would provide minority groups with a free license to remove from office any state official who disagrees with their political philosophy.

Under the wording in the initiative, all they would have to come up with is 10 per cent of the electors voting in the preceding general election in order to put the recall machinery into motion. But is is the grounds for recall specified in the initiative that worries us. According to the initiative, "any reason causing the electorate dissatisfaction with a public official shall be sufficient grounds for recall, notwithstanding a good-faith attempt to perform the duties of his office."

We're not saying that the recall initiative is dangerous and irresponsible just because it happens to be supported by a group of people with a political philosophy that differs from the Montana State AFL-ClO. We would be equally concerned about this issue if Initiative 73 had the backing of the Farmers' Union or the ACLU because the threat of government by minority would be just as real. Any time you talk about removing public officials for any reason that causes dissatisfaction among 10 per cent of the voters, you're talking about minority rule, and we don't care what political philosophy is represented by that 10 per cent.

True representative government is based on majority rule and you, as lawmakers, would be acting irresponsibly to allow a small group of voters, no matter what their philosophy, to tyrannize this state by removing officials without good cause. House Bill 795 eliminates that hazard, and for that reason, we urge your support of this legislation.



#### POLICY STATEMENT #2

As in years before, the John Birchers, Right-to-Workers, and other groups of ultra-conservative leanings have come forth with another—form of minority rule. Initiative number 73, The Montana Recall and Advisory Recall Act, provides for the recall of any person holding office, either elective or appointive, for any reason, regardless of a good faith attempt to perform his duties. Ten per cent (10%) of the voters in the previous general election, could demand the recall of a state official. For county and city or town, fifteen per cent (15%) and twenty per cent (20%) respectively are required for recall of elected or appointed officials.

The right-wing elements in Montana could possibly remove any official who disagreed with their political philosophy, for the minority 10% could challenge any opponent two months after election. Under the provisions of this initiative any person or group of persons need no legitimate reason other than dislike or disapproval to petition for a recall election.

The Montana State AFL-CIO does not oppose the concept of recall, only the conditions for recall. Petitions for recall elections should be for illegal activities or gross misconduct by an elected or appointed official, not at the whim or fancy of a small group of individuals.

The Montana State AFL-CIO vehemently opposes any attempt by the ultra-right to force minority rule on the democratic majority. Our form of government was founded on the principle of "by the people and for the people", not by a person and for all the people.

Submitted by the Executive Board of the Montana State AFL-C10 Convention voted concurrence.

NAME: Margaret S. Davis DATE: 26 Mar 77
ADDRESS: 917 Harrison Helena MT
PHONE: 443-3487
REPRESENTING WHOM? League of Women Voters of Montana
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: <u>HB 795</u>
DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: The League of Women Voters is concerned over the lack of clarity in Initiative 73 as passed in Nov 76.
the definitions alone contained in HB 995 are im-
portant and merit passage.
HB 795 also brings the Recall Act into better
technical shape-clarifying the petition procedure and
making those sporsoring the recall drive publicly known
i responsible for their actions.
The League feels repealing the advisory recall
portions of HB 795 is desirable. Such elections would be enormously expensive and their results would not be binding
be enormously expensive and their results would not
be hinding.
Finally recall is a legitimate means for citizens
to express their displeasure with an official. But depend-
PLEASE LEAVE, ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.  MY ON THE JOYNULA USEA AND THE GYOUNDS JOY VECALL
required buch acts can have the potential for har-
russing dedicated elected = appointed officials who are acting
Well within the light scoriff autils of their offices. The Loague
will within the legal scorie & duties of their offices. The Lague particularly support 5. Section 3 (sub. 03, time 25 pg.3, line 25) which says that no one can be recalled for obeying the law.

#2

NAME: Organica Cramme DATE: 3/36/47
ADDRESS: 1/35 Mon of Price Sio. Cornelling mits.
PHONE: 96/-35/2
REPRESENTING WHOM PORTE Co. Ferris Buscon, Tet Otyoni
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: H 79795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: Service Min little negation and institution
passed by a megicity of the people into
4 months and the first of
4 man have month to the interior

NAME: leggy flister DATE:
ADDRESS: Lectodas
PHONE:
REPRESENTING WHOM? Soft
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 46 795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: 15
the Beaple inslate on Nobel on the reall law and the Rep Rove no legal right to do congler with
reall low and the Rip Rove no
legal right to do congler with
o de

NAME: MARY ANN CARling DATE: 2-26-75 dependent Montano DO YOU: SUPPORT? waged the dog (US) - W That to secure these nights, overhouts are instituted among Men, deriving ir just powers from The Consent

Every time the rights quarautted under the Country of the U.S. are sterilged - less right of my children; grand children; yeurs soul, rights for 30 pieces of silver (now inflated.) Election costs & lent our sights ; freedoms are more precious." we elect them if they "don't trust our judgment" We are not as selly as as protrayed of minority sule — what do we have today momatles what there could or political the belief Howaruch time spent-investigation of each stamped to save time. As it will pass any way Montanas can think for Thomas Rues

						-
Fab.	21	22	23	24 Fo:	r the week	of 26
•	MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.	FRI.	SAT.
434 AGRICULTURE		SB 89				
LIVESTOCK &	ţ.					
IRRIGATION						
10:05 T/Th				1		-
225 Tres. Office		. •				
appropriations						
8:00						
434 BUSINESS &	HB 380 -		HB 784 688- 10:05 AM	• .		
INDUSTRY 10:05 M/W/F 7:30 p. M/W/ F	530-487 536-597 10:05 p.M. 48790-786		10:05 AM			
431 EDUCATION	HJR72		HB 624 467-816 HJR 84			
0:05 M/W/F :30 p. M/W/F	@10`.00 AM				1	
434	@10`.00 AM	SB 281				
'ISH &		HJR82	-		; 	
AME	_				1	

HIGHWAYS &

12:05 T/Th

436

TRANSPORT

10:05

NAME: Steve TRONKL DATE: 3/26/77
ADDRESS: 1530 BIHORROOT DR
PHONE: 259-4625
REPRESENTING WHOM? Myself & Strep assoc,
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: Weall Bil 795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND? OPPOSE?
many somments on the
Consider the puples
as votex on by instructive
and not all apropended
in the final bill

NAME: Habel Trencha DATE: 3/21/27
ADDRESS: 1530 Billion + Anna Billion M.S.
PHONE: 2 (2.4)
REPRESENTING WHOM? Continue of the Continue of
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 46,795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? original AMEND? OPPOSE? as amonded
COMMENTS: We oppose the Bullioneting the
landre the the and the Will en
All It outed for to grow sometimes
or the Chima land the Something
March times and the alless and
to discove of Portunities to Throw hat
sincered submotives and direction or
The amender of treprie Olitica,
Block who sion the betition are
taking advertise that could the
Nights and it wild feel to devict there
divide because of a min to find it.

February 24, 19.77

SPEAKER:	erica de la compania de la compania La compania de la co	ing the state of t	
MR SPEAKER:	and the state of t		
We, your committee on	JUDICIARY		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
we, your committee or			••••
having had under consideration	HOUSE	Bill No795.	
A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLE ADVISORY RECALL ACT, INIT APPLICATION, TO SPECIFY GRESPONSIBILITIES ON THE PROCEDURES FOR U. S. DIST ACT TO REPRESENTATIVES IN AND TO REPEAL CONFLICTING 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, A ACT; AND REPEALING SECTIO AND 11-3540, R.C.M. 1947, RECALL AND ADVISORY RECAL	PIATIVE NO. 73, TO COROUNDS FOR RECALL, PART OF PETITIONERS, POVISIONS OF THE ACT PRICT JUDGES, TO REM CONGRESS, TO CORRESTATUTES; AMENDING ND 19 OF THE MONTAN NS 11-721.1, 11-313 AND SECTIONS 20. 2	TARIFY THE SCOPE OF ITS TO ESTABLISH MORE DEFINED TO CORRECT AND CLARIFY TO REMOVE ADVISORY RECA OVE THE APPLICATION OF TH CT CERTAIN ERRORS IN FORM SECTIONS 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, A RECALL AND ADVISORY REC 2, 11-3220, AND 11-3220.	ALL HE I,
	•	•	
Respectfully report as follows: That	HOUSE , A CONTROL OF THE CONTROL OF	Bill No79.5	<b></b>
•			
	· .		
		•	
		•	
HEAD IN THE SECOND SECO			
DO PASS			
	/	4	···
STATE PUB. CO.	Rep. John	Scully Chairman.	

STATE PUB. CO. Helena, Mont.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

JUDICIARY		
Name of Committee	-	February 18, 19 77
		Date
		•
The following bills will	be heard in	committee in 436 ,
Place or location		23rd ,19 77 , at
xxxxxxxxxxxxx	Dat	te
7:30 a.m. P.M.		
Time		
	нв 639,	795
	,	M. E. Connelly, Sec.
		Committee Chairman for
	•	Judiciary

Martha B. McGee, Chief Clerk House of Representatives

Committee

"Quality Meat & Groceries"

P.O. Box 547 | 85 Hingham, Montana 59528

State administration Comm. Helena mont

Dear Sin:

2 would like to see HB791 sether Killed
on amended so the Commission has power
of approved over dept heads and regional
Coordinator.

Siverely Ray Netz

NAME: Robert Charlessen DATE:	3-26-77
ADDRESS: By 801 Deedlogo M.	Good.
PHONE: 846 3945	
REPRESENTING WHOM? Militure led	Pri - Principal Principal Resource State of the State of
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 199	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE	?
COMMENTS: Vantair The Partle	

NAME: Allie Corvelius	DATE: 3-26-7)
ADDRESS: 130 Brester Que, 6	Dillengs
PHONE: 252-8824	V
REPRESENTING WHOM? Recall lies 79	3-
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

NAME: BENE SPILDE	DATE: 3-26-77
ADDRESS: 13 0 11 NI 13 1513 14 ONT.	
PHONE: 932-3/7/	
REPRESENTING WHOM? S.F.A.	
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 791	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	
-	•

NAME: But Walle			DATE:
ADDRESS: 7/0 20.	Cont	Hon	ullen
PHONE: 363 2433			
REPRESENTING WHOM?			
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:	•		and the second s
DO YOU: SUPPORT?	AMEND?		OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:			
	······································		
		***************************************	
			•
		The state of the s	

NAME: Don Van Dyker	DATE: 3-26-77
ADDRESS: Rt 4 B Ox 81 Bozema	
PHONE: 587 - 3843	
REPRESENTING WHOM? 795	
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE?
COMMENTS:	

NAME: JENNETH LI DERSHNER DATE: 3/26/77
ADDRESS: Pt. 1, Box 63, VICTOR, MY 59875
PHONE: 961-3717
REPRESENTING WHOM? SEZE
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: H.B. 745 (SB 403)
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: The Nevall and Advisory at started
as an initiative by citizens of Montana. It
is an expression of the desires of montane
Serfle the introduction of 14 B 795 which
Idenitalizes the act, is an arrogant
breach of faith will the citizens of montains
The Mostara letigores and should therefore
be killed
Should be referred back to the
citizens for approval.
PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Mr. Chairmen and Members of the Committee (Gor cont. Room)

We the people are responsible for what occurs in our state + nation. We are the masters and those who accountable for their actions, the recall serve must be answereable for their actions, the recall law is desirable as it may exist because it allows people law is desirable as it may exist because it allows people to legally challange their pullic servants. the Challanger may be retained or removed from their position by the ultimate court in the land, the people and their ballat, any person seeking to exempt himself from this procedure of redress is saying to me that the majority of the voters who voted four the current recall law are untrustworthy elinformed, and illiterate beings only worthy of laboring and paying 40% of the income to support government.

The result process is a resonable method involving several steps and can hardly be considered arbitrary as some official seem to fear, first circulation of petition, then validation, mest placement on the ballat, public media imput, finally the vote. What better method, can be denised than energine from the bovenar on down being held accountable to the people

NORMAN HOCKMAN
BelgRADO 388-4618

NAME: BOB PUTNAN DATE: March 26	
ADDRESS: Box 2126 Rt2 HAMILTON MONT	
PHONE: 761-4360	
REPRESENTING WHOM? TNOGPENDANT AMERICANS	•
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: AMENDMENTS TO RECARL KAW	
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?	• ,
COMMENTS: A MAJORITY OF MONTANA QITIZENS VUTED	
TO BRING INTO EXISTANCE A RECALL LAW THAT	
WOULD GIVE US +115 POWER TO RECOVE CORPUR	
OR NOOMPETERUT PUBLIC SERVINGS. I OBJECT	2/
STRUNGLY TO ANY ALTERATION INTHE LAW AS	
IT NOW STANDS FIND PARTICULARY ANY AMEND	_
MENTS THAT WOULD ALTER THE % RESUMENEN	
OR THE ABILITY OF THE CITIZENS OF THIS STATE	
TO HAVE AN ACCOUNTING FROM ALL OF CUR	
Public Officials	•
	,
	•
	•

Manbers OF The Committee I think it is fortunate that we have two Houses in the most, legislature. This bill Shipped Then the House without a dison ting vote. It should Not have rad This easy passage, at the ininimum it should have had my "no vote I arge this committee to take a hard brokat There amondments to the Rocall, Referendum, I think much was deleted that Should be restored Referring to hour you for your Consideration Rep Elmer D Severson Dist 92 Raiallico. HB 795

NAME: Vene Enyole (Nini) DATE: March 36,197,
ADDRESS: 1610 Cannon #3 Allena
PHONE: 442-8668
REPRESENTING WHOM? myself
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
comments: I am an individual and I want to protect our state of montana and maintaine honesty and morcels in our country.

NAME: NORMAN HOCKMAN DATE: MAR 26
ADDRESS: Belgffo
PHONE: 388 46/7
REPRESENTING WHOM? Se/f
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
I would like DEA MISSION to speak
•

Box 114 Sula, Mont. mar. 28571977

Senator rom Tone Capitol Station Relena, Mont. 59601

кы: H В 795

Dear Senator Tone:

Thank you for your March 22 reply; my testimony was not given at the hearing; so I have enclosed the pink sheets, as the secretary was gone when I finished mine.

The biggest rub to me and to most I know is that Mr. Bardanouve openly professes to have chopped and changed the Recall Law with his H B795 axe strictly for our benefit; and yet has obviously condoned the big package of benefits through the House with as much secrecy as possible.

This does not compute, ignorance of the people not-

withstanding.

which brings up the biggest rub; Mr. Bardanouve's position that the great proletariat cannot determine what is best for them.

It is the biggest rub because it has been stated by other legislators also, as well as implied by many more, including the 94 other representatives who voted for nB795, and by one of your committeemen.

I have compared HB795 with Initiative #73 and I am confident that my understanding of basic sematics is sufficient to determine that HB795 is no benevolent package of benefits, but simply rather a brazen attemt to jerk the teeth out of our Recall Law:

I intend to follow 795 closely and to do whatever necessary and possible to protect our right to recall. It is past time to establish just how ignorant the peasants really are.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ses Bean

cc. Senator Russ Bergren

Les Bean Box 114 Sula, Mt. 59871

Dear Les:

I received your letter and testimony on House Bill 795 and will see that your comments are entered into the record.

I appreciated the participation of the many people who opposed the bill. Your arguments are sound and I agree.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Towe Senator, District 34

TET/mas

NAME: LES BEAN DATE: MAR 26, 1977 ADDRESS: BOX 114, SULA MT 5987/ PHONE: 821-3848 REPRESENTING WHOM? SELF FRIEND & NEIGHBORS APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: #6795 DO YOU: SUPPORT? COMMENTS: I HAD HOPED TO TESTIFY AS ITHINK I REPRESENT A PORTION OF THE VOTERS WHO PROBABLY ARE NOT USUALLY REPRESENTED AT THESE HEARINGS; THAT IS, THOSE WHO PAY 21THE ATTENTION TO WHAT CARRIES ON IN HEZENA. MANY PEOPLE WHO ORDINIARILY "COULDN'T CARE LESS ABOUT POLITICS" ARE UPSET ABOUT HB 795. THE MAIN OBJECTION TO THE LAW EXISTS APPEARS TO BE FEAR OF "MINORITY CONTROL." I WOWAY THAT THE TOTO MANDATE IN NOV. THE 90% + SURVEY RESPONSE IN FAVOR OF RECALL, AND THE REMOVE AN OFFICIAL COULD BE EXPRESENTATIVE OF "MINORITY INTERESTS. THE ZNO OBJECTION APPEARS TO BE FEAR OF AN OFFICIAL BEING REMOVED FOR PERFORMING A MANDITORY DUTY OF OFFICE. THE MORAL ASPECT OF PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETA NOT WITH STANDING (WHICH I KOMPLETELY AGREE WITH); I SINCERELY DOUBT THAT A MAJORITY OF VOTERS WOULD EMOVE AN OFFICH FROM OFFICE FOR ANY ACT, HOWEVER IN POPULAR, IF THEY WERE AWARE THAT INDEED MANDITORY. AFTER ALL, WHAT WOULD BE GAINED, SINCE REPLACEMENT WOULD

REGULATION?

IN SUMMARY, THEN I FAIL TO SEE JUSTIFIABLE REASONS FOR THE MAIN OBJECTIONS AS OFFERED. THE ONLY REASONS FOR SUCH DECRETE OF CONCERN CAN ONLY BE OF A NATURE WHICH THUSE PEOPLE CARE NOT TO MAKE KNOWN, IS THE ESSENCE OF MY AND MANY OTHERS EVALUATION. (THE FACT THAT MR. DRISCOLL & MR SEVERSON SAID NOTHING PO NO ONE WHILE HOME AFTER VOTING ON THIS BILL TELLS US AS MUCH AS ANYTHING WOT TO MENTION THE FACT THAT THE ALLEGOD IMPROV-MENTS AND AMENDMENTS" WERE NOT BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE PEOPLE IN GENERAL AND THE GROUP WHO SPONSERED THE RECALL LAW IN PARTICULARY (BEFORE FORMING HB795)

ALSO, REGARDING THE ALLEGED "LEGAL UN-WORKABILITY"
OF THE LAW, IS IT NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE JUDICIAL
BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT TO MAKE SUCH ANDETERMINATTON, NOT THE LEGISLATIVE ? AND EVEN IF SO, HOW IS HB795
ANY MORE "WORKABLE" LEGALLY?

LASTLY, THE "UNWARRANTED COSTS" ARGUMENT IS QUITE INCIDENTAL, BECAUSE I AM SURE THAT THE MADERY OF FLECTORATE WOULD HAVE ALREADY DETERMINED IT TO BE MORE ECONOMICAL TO REMOVE THE OFFICIAL THAN TO VEAVE HIM IN, OR THEY WOULD NOT ATTEMPT? TO RETALL IN THE FIRST PLACE.

NAME: RON FORTER DATE: MAR 26,1917
ADDRESS: RR#1 BOX 1235 HAMILDON; MONT. 59840
PHONE: 363 - 3432
REPRESENTING WHOM? SELF + CONCERNED RESIDENTS OF RAUALL. COUNT
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 795
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE? X
COMMENTS: I think this is a flagrant violation of the  PEOPLE'S Rights after overwhelming voting in  favor of the original RECALL MEASURE 121 the
2 ast GENERAL Election.