

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

March 9, 1983

The meeting of the Business and Industry Committee was called to order by Chairman Allen Kolstad on March 9, 1983, at 10:05 a.m., in Room 404, State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All members were present with the exception of Senator Fuller who was excused.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 219: An act amending sections 30-13-202, and 30-13-205, MCA, relating to when registration of an assumed business name is prohibited; and providing an effective date.

Representative Tom Hannah stated this bill was by request of the Secretary of State. It amends the law that deals with registering under assumed business names. It is a disclosure bill.

PROPOSERS TO HOUSE BILL 219: Cliff Christian, Secretary of State's Office, stated the Model Business Corporation Act attempts to make uniform the filings they have across the country. In this case the filing under an assumed business name could in fact, if everything is uniform, make one file. It attempts to make filings uniform under assumed business names, trademarks and limited partnerships. He handed the committee sections which have already been passed. (Exhibit No. 1) and a copy of Title 35 that other states have passed or are passing portions of the Model Business Act. (Exhibit No. 2) He went through the subsections of the bill. This will make it more uniform and other states will be adopting similar language.

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

The hearing was closed on House Bill 219.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 218: An act to amend section 18-8-103, MCA, to broaden the exemption of registered professional engineers, surveyors, real estate appraisers, or registered architects from the laws regulating private consultants employed by stage agencies; and providing an immediate effective date.

Representative Les Kitselman stated this clarifies a gap in the consultant law. During the development of the selection procedure it was determined by the counsel for the Department of State lands that they could not use the exemption for engineers for a federally funded project to inspect private mines. This type of conflict also occurred in some other federal grant funds. It was suggested by the Department of State Lands that this bill be used to clear this up. It would provide that federal funds are to be treated the same way as handled by the State. He urged passage of this bill.

PROPOSERS TO HOUSE BILL 218: Sonny Hanson, Montana Technical Council, stated they support this bill. It evolved from the passage of Representative Moore's house bill last session. In developing the selection process it was determined that the State Lands stated they could not implement this type of process for these funds. Therefore, they suggested that we come in with this particular amendment. The

Department of Administration supported this bill in the House.

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Goodover asked where in this one-page bill did you find all those things that you talked about? Representative Kitselman gave Senator Goodover a letter that referred to all of that.

The hearing was closed on House Bill 218.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 267: An act increasing the allowable fee for transfer of equity incident to a retail sale; amending section 31-1-234, MCA; and providing an immediate effective date.

Representative Les Kitselman stated it has become necessary in this bill to increase the transfer of equity fee from \$15 to \$75. It is used when the equity is made to a new owner. It is made through a credit check, the transfer of seller to the buyer and when the loan is transferred to a new buyer at the same rate of interest. The cost is \$67.50. The bank cannot continue to provide this service without a loss. Therefore, they need to make new loans with large interest charges.

PROPONENTS TO HOUSE BILL 267: Stan Hill, Vice President, First Bank West, Billings, and Chairman, Montana Bankers Association, stated he supports this bill. This bill has not been updated since 1959. His written testimony is attached to the minutes. (Exhibit No. 3)

Tom Carruthers, Vice President, First National Bank, stated yesterday he ran a survey of banks in Helena and found that two banks in Helena are offering this service because of the cost. We still, at this time, feel the mobile home is a viable business and this bill would help recover costs for this service. We feel this bill is needed in order to maintain financing available for mobile homes.

John Cadby, Montana Bankers Association, stated they support this bill for the reasons already expressed.

Ed Sheehy, Jr., Montana Manufactured Housing Association, stated they would like the banks to continue transferring equity in mobile homes because they would like to continue selling mobile homes.

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Christiaens asked how close to actual costs is this \$75 for transfers? Mr. Hill stated the Federal Reserves takes the cost of a transaction and compiles an average and that comes out to \$67.50 for putting an installment loan on the books.

Senator Christiaens asked you mean you are not charging this new buyer for that title transfer? Mr. Hill stated no, we do not charge anyother fee other than the \$15.

Senator Christiaens stated this bill does not specifically mention mobile homes yet that is the only testimony that has come up. Mr. Hill stated the transfer of equity refers almost exclusively to the transfer of mobile homes. It could be used in others but it has not been done.

Senator Christiaens asked how is this going to fit in with the variable interest rates? Mr. Hill stated he knows of no bank that is offering variable interest rates. They use a specialized contract study when they get into variable interest rates.

The hearing was closed on House Bill 267.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 578: An act to give the Montana Insurance Department jurisdiction to determine jurisdiction over providers of health care benefits; to indicate how each provider of health care benefits may show under what jurisdiction it falls; to allow for examinations by the state if the provider of health care benefits is unable to show it is subject to another jurisdiction; to make such a provider subject to the Montana Insurance Code if it cannot show that it is subject to another jurisdiction; and to require disclosure to purchasers of such health care benefits concerning whether or not the plans are fully insured.

Representative Ron Miller presented the bill to the committee. His written testimony is attached to the minutes. (Exhibit No. 4)

PROPOSERS TO HOUSE BILL 578: Jane Mitchell, Montana Insurance Department, stated the bill is designed to plug a loophole on Federal and State jurisdictions. It puts the burden on the entity to show that it is truly exempt and it puts the burden on the person claiming exemption. She proposed two amendments. Page 1, line 24, following "person" insert "or other entity" and page 2, line 5, following "person" insert "or other entity".

Lester H. Loble, II, American Council of Life Insurance, stated he supported this bill. His written testimony is attached along with his proposed amendments. (Exhibit No. 5)

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Regan asked on page 2, lines 10 through 13 it does not address the problem of another state. Do you agree with Mr. Loble's amendments? Ms. Mitchell stated yes they have seen them and they have no objections.

Senator Christiaens asked do these not fall under the jurisdiction of the insurance department now? Ms. Mitchell stated this gives us a presumption of authority. It clarifies and strengthens it.

Senator Christiaens asked are these plans now currently backed by capital and surplus funds? Mrs. Seiffert stated no because it is questionable under what jurisdiction it would fall.

Senator Christiaens asked then is that true of both profit and nonprofit groups? Mrs. Seiffert stated they are nonprofit because a majority of

them have a solvency problem.

In closing, Representative Miller stated this is a "catch 22" situation which needs to be addressed.

The hearing was closed on House Bill 578.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 578: Senator Dover made the motion that the proposed amendments from Ms. Mitchell and Mr. Loble Be Adopted. Senator Lee seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller who was excused, that the proposed amendments to HOUSE BILL 578 BE ADOPTED.

Senator Dover made the motion that House Bill 578 As Amended Be Concurred In. Senator Lee seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller, that HOUSE BILL 578 AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN.

Senator Dover will carry this bill on the floor.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 218: Senator Goodover made the motion that House Bill 218 Be Concurred In. Senator Christiaens seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller who was excused, that HOUSE BILL 218 BE CONCURRED IN.

Senator Goodover will carry this bill on the floor.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 219: Senator Lee made the motion that we adopt the proposed amendment on page 2, lines 1, 6, and 10, following "contains" insert "or there is added at the end of the name,". There is no substance change, it just makes it clearer.

Staff Attorney Petesch stated there is no substance to this amendment. Senator Dover seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller who was excused that the proposed amendments to HOUSE BILL 219 BE ADOPTED.

Senator Dover made the motion that House Bill 219 As Amended Be Concurred In. Senator Lee seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller, that HOUSE BILL 219 AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN.

Senator Dover will carry this bill on the floor.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 267: Senator Christiaens stated he has a problem with this bill in that it refers to all retail sales and transfers of

equity. There are all sorts of retail contracts that could be transferred. I am not convinced there is not that much cost in all of those. He has a problem with the amount.

Senator Gage stated this is one of those things which shall not exceed but probably means it would be \$75.

Senator Regan made the motion that we amend line 15 to read \$50. Senator Lee seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller who was excused, that the proposed amendment to HOUSE BILL 267 BE ADOPTED.

Senator Christiaens made the motion that House Bill 267 As Amended Be Concurred In. Senator Lee seconded the motion.

The Committee voted unanimously, by voice vote, with the exception of Senator Fuller who was excused, that HOUSE BILL 267 AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN.

ADJOURN: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.



ALLEN C. KOLSTAD, CHAIRMAN

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 9

19 83

MR. **PRESIDENT**

We, your committee on **BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY**

having had under consideration **HOUSE** Bill No. **218**

KITSELMAN (GOODOVER)

Respectfully report as follows: That **HOUSE** Bill No. **218**

~~XXXXXX~~

BE CONCURRED IN

W.C.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 9 1983

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

having had under consideration HOUSE Bill No. 219

HANNAH (DOVER)

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE Bill No. 219 be amended as follows:

- 1. Page 2, line 1.
Following: "contains"
Insert: ", or there is added at the end of the name,"
- 2. Page 2, line 6.
Following: "contains"
Insert: ", or there is added at the end of the name,"
- 3. Page 2, line 10.
Following: "contains"
Insert: ", or there is added at the end of the name,"

AND AS SO AMENDED
BE CONCURRED IN

~~XXXXX~~

Handwritten signature

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 9 19 83

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

having had under consideration HOUSE Bill No. 267

KITSELMAN (CHRISTIAENS)

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE Bill No. 267 be amended as follows:

Page 1, line 15.
Strike: "\$75"
Insert: "\$50"

AND, AS SO AMENDED, BE CONCURRED IN

XXXXX

Handwritten initials

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 9

19 83

MR. **PRESIDENT**

We, your committee on **BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY**

having had under consideration **HOUSE** Bill No. **578**

MILLER (HOVER)

Respectfully report as follows: That **HOUSE** Bill No. **578**
be amended as follows:

1. Page 1, line 24.
Following: "person"
Insert: "or other entity"

2. Page 2, line 5.
Following: "person"
Insert: "or other entity"

3. Page 2, line 7.
Following: "this"
Insert: "or another"

4. Page 2, line 11.
Following: "this"
Insert: "or another"

5. Page 2, line 18.
Following: "THIS"
~~XXXXX~~
INSERT: "or another"

C O N T I N U E D

MC

March 9

83

HOUSE BILL 578

19.....

6. Page 3, line 1.
Following: "this"
Insert: "or another"

AND, AS SO AMENDED,

BE CONCURRED IN

HC

to alter, amend, or repeal the bylaws or adopt new bylaws, subject to repeal or change by action of the shareholders, shall be vested in the board of directors unless reserved to the shareholders by the articles of incorporation. The bylaws may contain any provisions for the regulation and management of the affairs of the corporation not inconsistent with law or the articles of incorporation.

History: En. Sec. 25, Ch. 300, L. 1967; R.C.M. 1947, 15-2225; amd. Sec. 14, Ch. 475, L. 1981.

Compiler's Comments

1981 Amendment: Inserted "subject to repeal or change by action of the shareholders: after "adopt new bylaws".

Part 3

Corporate Name, Registered Office and Agent, and Service of Process

35-1-301. Corporate name. (1) The corporate name:

(a) shall contain the word "corporation", "company", "incorporated", or "limited" or shall contain an abbreviation of one of such words;

(b) shall not contain any word or phrase which indicates or implies that it is organized for any purpose other than one or more of the purposes contained in its articles of incorporation;

(c) shall not be the same as or deceptively similar to the name of any domestic corporation existing under the laws of this state or any foreign corporation authorized to transact business in this state or a name the exclusive right to which is, at the time, reserved in the manner provided in this chapter or the name of a corporation which has in effect a registration of its corporate name as provided in this chapter, except that this provision does not apply if the applicant files with the secretary of state either of the following:

(i) the written consent of such other corporation or holder of a reserved registered name to use the name or a deceptively similar name with one or more words added to make such name distinguishable from such other name; or

(ii) a certified copy of a final decree of a court of competent jurisdiction establishing the prior right of the applicant to the use of such name in this state.

(2) A corporation with which another corporation, domestic or foreign, is merged or that is formed by the reorganization or consolidation of one or more domestic or foreign corporations or upon a sale, lease, or other disposition to or exchange with a domestic corporation of all or substantially all the assets of another corporation, domestic or foreign, including its name, may have the same name as that used in this state by any of such corporations if such other corporation was organized under the laws of or is authorized to transact business in this state.

History: En. Sec. 7, Ch. 300, L. 1967; R.C.M. 1947, 15-2207; amd. Sec. 15, Ch. 475, L. 1981.

Compiler's Comments

1981 Amendment: Inserted subsection (1)(a); added language "except that this provision ... in this state" in (1)(c); and added subsection (2).

TITLE 35

CORPORATIONS, PARTNERSHIPS, AND ASSOCIATIONS

CHAPTER 1 BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

Chapter Compiler's Comments

Source: This chapter is based principally on the Model Business Corporation Act prepared by the Committee on Corporate Laws, Section of Corporation, Banking, and Business Law, American Bar Association, in 1960. Extensive amendments to the model act subsequently proposed by the ABA Committee on Corporate Laws were adopted by Ch. 475, L. 1981.

States Adopting Model Act: In response to an inquiry by the compiler, Mr. Harry P. Kamen, Secretary of the Committee on Corporate Laws, American Bar Association, supplied a copy of an October 9, 1980, memo from Mr. Sheldon L. Cohen on the states which have adopted the Model Business Corporation Act in whole or in part. The memo read in pertinent part as follows:

"The first grouping of states are, according to the MBCA Annotated, those which have adopted the act identically in substance. The CCH Corporate Law Guide refers to the states as jurisdictions which have adopted the MBCA substantially in full. They are: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

[William M.] Fletcher [author of the Cyclopeda of the Law of Private Corporations] notes that the second grouping of states are those which have employed the MBCA to some extent in the drafting of new acts. The MBCA Annotated refers to these as states with comparable statutory provisions. They are: Alabama, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania.

The third grouping Fletcher refers to as other states which have enacted new or substantially revised corporate statutes which, to a considerable extent, are patterned after or influenced by the Model Act. These are: Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia.

Finally, there are five remaining states which neither have adopted nor referred to the MBCA in any significant manner. They are: Hawaii, Idaho, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire."

Editing of Official Comments: Some of the American Bar Association (ABA) comments in the Model Business Corporation Act Annotated ([American Bar Foundation] West Publishing Co. 1960) contained internal references to those annotations for other sections of the Model Act. Most of these internal references were to annotations other than the official comments. Because only the official comments are reprinted herein, the references to the other annotations have been edited out of the official ABA comments reprinted here.

When the ABA comments for one section referred to another section of the Model Act, the corresponding section of Montana law has been substituted in brackets.

21

12

12

None

3

When the comments refer to forms or bylaws, they refer to forms or bylaws found in Vol. 3 of the annotated Act (1960).

Chapter 475, L. 1981, extensively amended the Model Act, which in turn affected the applicability of many of the original official ABA comments to the Model Act. The annotator has deleted comments rendered totally inapplicable but retained intact other comments. As a result, official ABA comments to the Model Act must always be read in conjunction with the "1981 Amendment" compiler's comment for each MCA section amended, and with the "General Comments". Official comments of the ABA Committee on Corporate Laws to the amendments to the Model Business Corporation Act may be found in Volumes 32, 33, and 34 of "The Business Lawyer". The American Bar Foundation is in the process of compiling a third edition of the Model Business Corporation Act Annotated, which will reflect the numerous changes made since 1977. It is scheduled for completion by the end of 1982. Official ABA comments contained therein are contemplated for inclusion in the Montana Code Annotated at some future date, at which time the 1960 comments will be deleted.

Source of General Comments: General comments, including comments to the 1981 amendments of the Montana Business Corporation Act, were supplied by University of Montana Law School Professor Ronald C. Wyse and the Business Law Section of the Montana Bar Association. The comments were prepared in conjunction with Ch. 475, L. 1981 (SB 475), and were available for consideration by the 1981 Legislature. With the exception of certain editing of tense and grammar (to reflect that the amendments are now adopted rather than proposed and to clearly distinguish pre-1981 law from present law), the "General Comments" are substantially those contained in the "Montana Business Corporation Act and Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act" published by the State Bar of Montana Continuing Legal Education Committee in September 1981, as compiled by Mr. Wyse.

Chapter Law Review Articles

The Status of the Adoption of the Model Business Corporation Act in Montana—A Commentary, Schaefer, 36 Mont. L. Rev. 29 (Winter 1975).

The Family: How Are You Going to Keep Them Down on the Farm?, MacDonald, 35 Mont. L. Rev. 88 (Winter 1974).

Introduction to the Montana Business Corporation Act, Poore, 29 Mont. L. Rev. 163 (Spring 1968).

Incorporation Under the Civil Code of Montana, Chapter 42, De Dobbeleer, 7 Mont. L. Rev. 49 (Spring 1946).

Changes in the Model Business Corporation Act—Amendments to Financial Provisions, 34 Bus. Law. 1867 (1979).

Part 1

General

Part Collateral References

Illegal Corporate Behavior, U.S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA, Nat'l Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (1979).

35-1-101. Short title.

Official Comments

ABA COMMENTS TO MODEL BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT (1960)

Historical: In England, the early corporations received their charters from the crown or by special Parliamentary bill; however, in the United States the granting of corporate franchises has from the beginning been regarded as a

MONTANA BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Testimony on House Bill 267

Senate Business and Industry Committee

10:00 a.m.
Room 404

Wednesday
March 9, 1983

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Stan Hill. I am Vice President of First Bank-West Billings, Billings, Montana. I am also chairman of the Montana Bankers Association Consumer Lending Committee and in their behalf, we thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of House Bill 267.

House Bill 267 deals with that portion of the Retail Installment Sales Act which addresses transfer of equity fees. This section has not been updated since 1959. The present transfer of equity fee is \$15.00 and House Bill 267 would increase that fee to \$75.00.

A transfer of equity fee occurs almost exclusively in the financing of mobile homes, but it could be used on other forms of conditional sales contract financing. In a transfer of equity situation, the customer receives the benefit of assuming an existing loan at the existing interest rate without the need of refinancing. This enables the consumer to get into a mobile home for considerably less money than would be required if he were purchasing a new mobile home requiring a down payment.

The need for House Bill 267 is apparent when one considers the cost of making an installment loan in today's market place, that cost is \$67.50. This figure is based on the Federal Reserve Functional Cost Analysis published in 1982. In a transfer of equity we perform two additional services for the consumer which we do not perform in a normal installment loan transaction:

1. The title is transferred from seller to buyer so that the buyer has an orderly transfer of ownership.
2. The property taxes are collected and paid up to date so the buyer receives the mobile home free of delinquent taxes.

With the passage of House Bill 267 it will make it possible for financial institutions to cover their costs pertaining to a transfer of equity. This will induce more financial institutions to offer this alternative method of financing as well as possibly making more funds available for the financing of housing.

Testimony of the Montana Insurance Department on H.B. 578.

This legislation is based on a model act adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) in Philadelphia in June of 1982.

The purpose of this bill is to give the Montana Insurance Department authority to examine health care providers to determine whether they fall under the jurisdiction of the Department. The bill is designed to control Multiple Employer Trusts which are not qualified ERISA exempt programs. The bill provides that if the entity can provide the commissioner with an appropriate certificate, license or other document issued by a state or federal agency permitting it to provide health care coverage, then the Insurance Department will not regulate it. If the entity is unable to show it is subject to another state agency or the federal government, then the Montana Insurance may examine it to determine whether it is subject to the insurance code and to determine its solvency.

The bill also provides that production agencies or administrators who advertise, sell, transact or administer coverage which is not provided by an admitted insurance company or nonprofit health service corporation advise prospective purchasers or purchasers of the lack of insurance or other coverage.

Further an administrator who sells such coverage, must advise any production agency of the elements of the coverage.

The bill is necessary because many other states have had solvency problems with Multiple Employers Trusts which do not qualify as ERISA programs. These entities have "gone broke" in other states and left people without health care coverage.

POSITION OF AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURANCE
ON MONTANA H.B. 578

Statement of Position

The Council supports the efforts of the Montana Insurance Department to exercise jurisdiction over uninsured multiple-employer trusts doing business in Montana. We do, however, recommend an amendment to this bill which would clarify its intended purpose while retaining the authority the Department seeks. We suggest that H.B. 578 be amended as follows:

Line ^{11, 12}~~3~~: "another agency of this or another state or any subdivision thereof or

Line ^{18, 12}~~7~~: "another agency of this or another state or any subdivision thereof or

Line ^{1, 3}~~20~~: "agency of this or another state or any subdivision thereof or the

Background

In the wake of repeated insolvencies of uninsured multiple-employer trusts, insurance commissioners across the country began to seek solutions which would aid persons covered under such trusts who suddenly found themselves without any protection. The insolvencies of these trusts received considerable publicity, particularly as a result of occurrences in the State of California. That state's Insurance Department developed a proposed bill which was submitted for consideration by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC). Given the ever-increasing urgency of this problem, the NAIC quickly adopted the California proposal as a model bill.

H.B. 578 is an exact duplicate of this model bill.

As of this time, two states have enacted legislation along the lines proposed in H.B. 578. The first state to act was California, the state which initiated the original proposal. Recognizing that the proposal could be misconstrued to apply to fully-insured contracts issued in another state, the California law was modified from the proposal adopted by the NAIC. That modification, made in California, is the same modification which we propose. The other state which has taken similar legislative action is Illinois and that law also contains the modification we propose for H.B. 578.

Analysis

By following the original NAIC model, the exemption language would not extend to a group insurance contract issued in another state and, therefore, subject to the supervision of that state's insurance department. If an out-of-state group contract covered Montana residents, the Montana Department of Insurance would have certain, specified jurisdiction. The Unfair Trade Practices Act of Montana and other selected portions of the insurance code would apply. On the other hand, the contents of the contract, and other supervisory provisions would be left to the state where the contract was issued. This careful and long-standing balance between the states has proven to be an effective and efficient means of regulating group insurance contracts. Moreover, we are not aware of any intention of the Montana Insurance Department to alter this balance. As a result, the amendments we propose would not in any

way diminish the authority sought by the Department to exercise jurisdiction over uninsured multiple-employer trusts.

By following the form adopted in other states (with the amendment language), Montana could assure some sense of uniformity among the states and could receive the benefit of actions taken under an identical statute in another jurisdiction.

In all other respects, the Council is pleased to support this proposal.

(This sheet to be used by those testifying on a bill.)

NAME: H.S. HANSON

DATE: 3/9/83

ADDRESS: HELENA

PHONE: _____

REPRESENTING WHOM? MT. TECHNICAL COUNCIL

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB-218

DO YOU: SUPPORT?

AMEND? _____

OPPOSE? _____

COMMENT:

1. This Bill will eliminate the
conflict between the different
depts in the administration of
the selection procedures

2. It has been submitted in response
to a suggestion by ~~the~~ an attorney
for the state lands.

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

(This sheet to be used by those testifying on a bill.)

NAME: Stan Hill DATE: 3-9-83

ADDRESS: Box 20007 Billings Montana

PHONE: 245-5101

REPRESENTING WHOM? First Bank West Billings & Montana Bankers Assoc

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 267

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENT: Support this bill because it will help to keep more funds available for housing them out the state of Montana. It provides the consumer with an alternative method of financing a home that at times is denied because the financial institutions cannot cover their paper work costs therefore they don't participate in a transfer of equity program. Bill has not been amended since 1959 and costs of doing business have increased dramatically since that time.

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

(This sheet to be used by those testifying on a bill.)

NAME: LESTER H. LOBLE, II DATE: 3/9/83

ADDRESS: POB 176 HELENA

PHONE: 442 0070

REPRESENTING WHOM? American Council of Life Insurance

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HRS 578

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENT: ATTACHED

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.