

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
50TH LEGISLATIVE SESSION
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 11, 1987

The meeting of the Judiciary Committee was called to order by Chairman Earl Lory on March 11, 1987, at 8:00 a.m. in Room 312 D of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

ACTION ON SENATE BILL NO. 58: Rep. Brown moved that SB 58 BE NOT CONCURRED IN. Rep. Addy agreed with the motion stating the juries are very smart. Rep. Mercer pointed out that perhaps juries should not be put in a situation that forces them to choose something that they may feel is not just. Rep. Lory asked Rep. Addy if all damage judgement cases must go to a jury trial. He stated that typically, plaintiff's do not ask for a jury trial but defendant's always ask for one. Rep. Lory made a substitutive motion to amend the bill by inserting "it shall apply only to nonjury trials". Rep. Miles stated she opposed the amendment because she would rather see both parties turn in a reasonable agreement. Rep. Bulger requested someone clarify the arguments in favor of the bill. Rep. Addy pointed out, as he understands it, we cannot trust the juries in a civil case anymore. We have to restrict their discretion to two choices, otherwise, they are runaway juries. Question was called and a voice vote was taken. The motion CARRIED 11-7. Rep. Lory moved that SB 58 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. Question was called and a voice vote was taken. The motion FAILED 7-6. Rep. Mercer made a substitutive motion to TABLE the bill. Question was called and a voice vote was taken. The motion CARRIED unanimously. SB 58 TABLED.

ACTION ON SENATE BILL NO. 249: Rep. Addy moved that SB 249, BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Mercer moved the amendments because the bill did not show a good enough argument for economic damages. Rep. Addy pointed out that such an amendment would take the caps off and would strike at the heart of the purpose of the bill. Rep. Brown said he liked the bill the way it was. Rep. Mercer stated he could reword the amendment so it only affects the caps. He moved to withdraw the amendment. Rep. Brown requested the bill be held in committee so that it could be worked on. SB 249 still in committee as of this date.

ACTION ON SENATE BILL NO. 254: Rep. Eudaily moved SB 254 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Cobb pointed out he opposed the bill because the executive order is already in affect and the Governor can already come in and give the authority to do any kind of investigating the Department needs to do. Rep. Addy stated he is opposed to the bill also. Rep. Eudaily pointed out the information he has on the bill dealt with investigation of security fraud and confidentiality was only part of it. The bill only extends this confidentiality to the investigators. Rep. Strizich agreed with Rep. Eudaily. Rep. Hannah felt the language in the bill was just too broad. He asked Mr. MacMaster to clarify for him if the Department can order a cease of the system in the bill if it passes. Mr. MacMaster stated as far as his understanding is on this subject, the Department wishes to become a Criminal Justice Agency. Rep. Bulger sees this bill as a continuation of authority to make it statutory and there is no great mystery. He stated this is exactly the same as they have now, it is just a different mechanism. Rep. Addy asked Rep. Bulger why they need this bill then. Rep. Bulger stated it will make little difference if they pass the bill or not because it will continue in executive order. Question was called. A voice vote was taken and the motion FAILED 8-10. Rep. Brown made a substitutive motion to TABLE the bill. A voice vote was taken and the motion CARRIED 12-6. SB 254 TABLED.

SENATE BILL NO. 214: Senator Mazurek, District No. 23, stated this bill dealt with requiring the consent of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation services or a licensed adoption agency before a parental relinquishment may be executed.

PROPOSERS: JOHN MADSEN, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, stated that the Department's intent in this bill is to clarify that prior to relinquishment of parental rights the Department would be notified of that intent. The Department would have to come before the court and consent to that relinquishment.

OPPOSERS: CHRIS VOLINKATY, Lobbyist for the Developmentally Disabled, stated she understands the need for this bill and understands the SRS's budget crunch but she pointed out that this bill has a flaw. The flaw comes into play when a family needs some help with a disabled child and does not want to relinquish their custody. SRS needs total parental relinquishment. This bill provides potential for abuse.

QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSION) ON SENATE BILL NO. 214: Rep. Addy asked Mr. Madsen what criteria SRS needed to determine whether they will consent to relinquishment. Mr. Madsen stated the cases they are dealing with are cases that

involve new born infants that are up for adoption. The criteria would be could SRS provide services and could the child be adopted. The Department can not take permanent legal custody and relieve parents of their responsibility for children unless SRS can provide a permanent home for the child. Rep. Addy requested that Mr. Madsen state more clearly what criteria will be used in the SRS consent to relinquishment of parental custody. He stated that a permanent place for the child must be determined and the child must be adoptable. Rep. Addy questioned Mr. Madsen on the role SRS would play in a private adoption through an adoption agency. He stated this bill did not have any effect on a parent relinquishing custody to a private adoption agency.

Rep. Eudaily asked Mr. Madsen what would happen if parents want to relinquish their rights and SRS says no. He stated that the situation he can see coming is a parent who wants to relinquish a child, perhaps a teenager, and the Department has nothing to offer that child in terms of services, SRS is attempting to say that they do not want legal custody of children that they can not provide services for. The parents must provide financial responsibility for that child. The Department does not want to relieve parents of their complete and total responsibility of guardianship of children, that we cannot provide services for.

Rep. Keller asked Mr. Madsen about a case of abandonment, are the parents rights totally relinquished and Mr. Madsen stated that a case of abandonment has a totally different set of statutes. The court says after 90 days, SRS can terminate parental rights.

Rep. Addy asked Ms. Volinkaty what she thinks about the SRS criteria in determining if they will place a child for adoption or place a child in other services. She stated the disabled child is very difficult to place for adoption and that is not a reason for that child to be neglected or abused. She felt that if the SRS does not step in to help with the disabled child it is very likely that neglect or abuse will happen.

Rep. Addy asked her to explain where the middle ground is, in regard to SRS's determinations and what her determinations are. She stated she is not sure how a bill could be written but she does know that families are willing to pay a percentage of the care costs to SRS but they cannot afford to pay full financial burden. Rep. Addy asked Mr. Madsen where he thought the middle ground was and stated that it is already there.

Senator Mazurek stated in closing that there is not mischief in this bill and abandonment, neglect and abuse are covered already by statute. The hearing on SB 214 was closed.

SENATE BILL NO. 40: Senator Halligan, District No. 29, stated this bill proposes to amend the crime victims compensation act of Montana to permit certain relatives of a victim killed as a result of criminally injurious conduct or certain relatives of a minor victim of a sexual crime to be reimbursed for mental health treatment. The fiscal note reflects federal money available under the CV fund.

PROPOSERS: HIRAM SHAW, Workers' Compensation Division, Department of Labor and Industry, stated the Department handles the crime victims fund and supports SB 40.

JOY MCGRATH, Mental Health Association, pointed out this bill helps suffering people, and the need for treatment of the entire family who has gone through such crimes are very important for their recovery. She urged support for this legislation.

OPPOSERS: None

QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSION) ON SENATE BILL NO. 40: Rep. Bulger asked Senator Halligan about the sums available on page 5, line 8, in regard to each person being given \$1,000.00 and \$5,000.00 per family, is that correct. Senator Halligan stated that is correct. Rep. Bulger asked him what the thought was in that because the original amounts seemed more appropriate. Senator Halligan stated they were trying to make sure they would use no more than maximum amount available through the Federal program under the Crime Victims Compensation Act.

Rep. Eudaily questioned Senator Halligan on why the brothers and sisters of a crime victim should also be treated and he stated the Senate felt that such crimes would effect the whole family. Rep. Eudaily stated the language should be included so that the immediate family could be treated. Senator Halligan pointed out that he has no problem with the committee redefining this particular wording.

Senator Halligan closed the hearing on SB 40 by stating that presently society thinks there are more rights available for defendants than for victims and this bill will help.

SENATE BILL NO. 94: Senator Lybeck, District No. 4, stated this is an act requiring the staff of the Department of Justice to inquire orally whether an applicant for a driver's license or a renewal intends to make an anatomical gift. He submitted as (Exhibit A) a leaflet entitled, Your

Driver's License Could Save Someone's Life and a card to be carried in a donor's wallet.

PROPONENTS: BILL LEARY, Montana Hospital Association, stated through the process of education and having the driver's license personnel making this information available, we hope more people will execute their voluntary option to donate their organs. He encouraged support for this legislation.

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSION) ON SENATE BILL NO. 94: Rep. Miles asked Senator Lybeck about the last session requiring application of drivers to be given printed information and this bill requests that the information also be given orally and she questioned what was different with this bill. Senator Lybeck stated that the bill last session left the donation purely up to volunteer and this bill specifically states that the bureau will be required to orally ask it the applicant is aware of this donation option. It is the power of suggestion, he said.

Senator Lybeck closed the hearing on SB 94.

SENATE BILL NO. 96: Senator Rasmussen, District No. 22, stated this bill deals with establishing additional penalties for individuals convicted for two or more incidents of elder abuse, neglect, or exploitation. The 1985 session dealt with this subject and made it a misdemeanor but it is not a strong enough penalty. Upon a second or succeeding conviction an offender may be imprisoned for a term not to exceed 10 years and may be fined an amount not to exceed \$10,000.00 or both.

PROPONENTS: ELMER HAUSKEN, American Association of Retired Persons, stated he urges support for SB 96 for the proper care and protection of the elderly of our state. He submitted written testimony. (Exhibit A).

ANNE LIGHT, Montana Senior Citizens Association, Inc., stated that elderly abuse is on the rise in this country, and it must be stopped. By increasing the penalties for those convicted of elderly abuse it may deter such acts. SB 96 would help to curb this rise. She submitted written testimony. (Exhibit B).

CHARLES BRIGGS, State Aging Coordinator, Governor's Office, submitted the 1985 Annual Report compiled and written by Don Sekora, Program Officer, Management Operations Bureau Community Services Division, Department of Social and

Rehabilitation Services, (Exhibit C). He strongly supported SB 96 as priority for this legislature.

There were no opponents.

QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSION) ON SENATE BILL 96: Rep. Eudaily questioned subsection 1 in regard to the language used and asked Senator Rasmussen if he really wanted it to read like it is presently or should the two areas be segregated. Senator Rasmussen stated that perhaps a change should be made back to the original language. He closed the hearing on SB 96.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the committee, the hearing was adjourned at 10:24 a.m.



EARL LORY, Chairman

DAILY ROLL CALL
JUDICIARY

COMMITTEE

50th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1987

Date March 11, 1987

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
JOHN MERCER (R)	✓		
LEO GIACOMETTO (R)	✓		
BUDD GOULD (R)	✓		
AL MEYERS (R)	✓		
JOHN COBB (R)	✓		
ED GRADY (R)	✓		
PAUL RAPP-SVRCEK (D)	✓		
VERNON KELLER (R)	✓		
RALPH EUDAILY (R)	✓		
TOM BULGER (D)	✓		
JOAN MILES (D)	✓		
FRITZ DAILY (D)	✓		
TOM HANNAH (R)	✓		
BILL STRIZICH (D)	✓		
PAULA DARKO (D)	✓		
KELLY ADDY (D)	✓		
DAVE BROWN (D)	✓		
EARL LORY (R)	✓		

YOUR DRIVER'S LICENSE COULD SAVE SOMEONE'S LIFE

State of Montana
Department of Justice—Motor Vehicle Division

Pursuant to the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act, I hereby give, effective upon my death:

A _____ Any needed organ or parts

B _____ Parts or organs listed _____

C _____ My body for Anatomical study if needed.

_____ Date Signed _____ Print or type Name of Donor

_____ Signature of Donor

Signed by the Donor and the following two witnesses in the presence of each other:

_____ Witness _____ Witness

NOTICE

Any individual 18 years of age: you may designate on your driver's license a donation of all or any part of your body, under the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act. The pledge must be signed in the presence of two witnesses. Donation takes effect upon your death.

Place the signed card on the reverse of your license. If you change your mind, destroy the donor card and inform your family, physician, and friends.

A
3-11-87
SB # 94

State of Montana
Department of Justice—Motor Vehicle Division

Pursuant to the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act, I hereby give, effective upon my death:

A _____ Any needed organ or parts

B _____ Parts or organs listed _____

C _____ My body for Anatomical study if needed.

_____ Date Signed _____ Print or type Name of Donor

_____ Signature of Donor

Signed by the Donor and the following two witnesses in the presence of each other:

_____ Witness _____ Witness

WITNESS STATEMENT

EXHIBIT A
DATE 3-11-87
~~SB # 96~~

NAME ELMER HAUSER BILL NO. 296
ADDRESS 400 HIGHLAND ALBANY DATE 3 MAR 87
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT? AARP
SUPPORT V OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments: I REPRESENT THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS AND THE 80,000 MEMBERS RESIDING IN MONTANA.

APPROVE
WE URGE YOU TO ~~PASS~~ SB96 FOR THE PROPER CARE AND PROTECTION OF THE ELDERLY OF OUR STATE.

WITNESS STATEMENT

B
3 11 87
SB 28 # 916

NAME Anne Light BILL NO. 96

ADDRESS Bx 423 Nelson DATE 3/

WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT? MSCA

SUPPORT OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

Montana Senior Citizens Assn., Inc.

WITH AFFILIATED CHAPTERS THROUGHOUT THE STATE

P.O. BOX 423 - HELENA, MONTANA 59624



B
3-11-87
SB # 96

061 443-5341

11 March 1987

Mister Chairman, and Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

My name is Anne Light, and I represent the Montana Senior Citizens Association.

One of the most hateful things any human being can do is to abuse another human beings. This crime is even more awful when the victim is unable to defend him or herself from attack.

Elderly abuse is on the rise in this country, and it must be stopped. By increasing the penalties from those convicted of elderly abuse, SB 96 would help to curb this rise.

We urge you to vote "yes" on SB 96.

Thank you.

EXHIBIT

C
3-11-87
SB # 96

1985
ANNUAL ADULT PROTECTIVE
SERVICES REPORT

Compiled and Written by:

Don Sekora, Program Officer II
Management Operations Bureau
Community Services Division
Department of Social & Rehabilitation
Services

EXHIBIT C
DATE 3-11-87
WR SB # 96

ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICE INVESTIGATIONS

January 1, 1984 - December 31, 1984

Elder Abuse Investigations	147 ✓
Disabled Adult Protective Service Investigations	80
<hr/>	
TOTAL	227

January 1, 1985 - December 31, 1985

Elder Abuse Investigations	414 ✓
Disabled Adult Protective Service Investigations	161
<hr/>	
TOTAL	575

C.
3-11-87
SB# 96

I. INTRODUCTION

The following is the 1985 Annual Report to the Director of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) on Adult Protective Services (APS). The Elder Abuse section is compiled as a report to the Montana Legislature as well as to the SRS Director.

This report is to meet the requirements of the Adult Protective Service Act, Section 53-5-206, MCA; the Developmental Disabilities Protective Service Act, Section 53-20-410, MCA; and the Elder Abuse Prevention Act, Section 53-5-504, MCA.

The information in this report has been compiled from the Protective Service Information System of the Community Services Division (CSD) of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services.

The report will be divided into four (4) primary sections: Elder Abuse; Disabled/Developmentally Disabled; General Summary; and APS Program Developments.

II. ELDER ABUSE

A. GENERAL (For adults sixty (60) years of age or older)

<u>414</u>	elder abuse investigations were conducted by CSD social workers in 1985;
} <u>233</u> or <u>56%</u>	of these cases were valid. (Abuse, neglect, and/or exploitation was verified.)
<u>181</u>	cases were not valid.
<u>38</u>	counties reported valid cases. (A list of counties is in Appendix A.)
<u>28</u>	counties reported invalid cases (for county list see Appendix A).

B. DEMOGRAPHICS OF VALID CASES

1. SEX

<u>120</u>	are female
<u>113</u>	are male

3-11-87

SB#96

- 2. AGE
 - 76.1 is average age of females
 - 76.8 is average age of males
 - 76.5 is average age of valid cases

- 3. MARITAL STATUS
 - 125 Widowed
 - 46 Single/Separated
 - 48 Married
 - 14 Divorced

- 4. REFERRAL SOURCE
 - 80 Friends
 - 36 Social Service Agencies
 - 28 Hospitals
 - 23 Relatives
 - 22 Home Health & Public Health
 - 11 Anonymous
 - 7 Caretakers
 - 7 Aging Services
 - 7 Victim
 - 7 Law Enforcement
 - 5 Physicians

5. TYPE OF COMPLAINT

3-11-87
J. 9

172 Neglect
21 Exploitation
15 Abuse
11 Abuse/Neglect
5 Neglect/Exploitation
6 Abuse/Exploitation
3 Abuse/Neglect/Exploitation

6. PERPETRATOR (Who did the abusing)

148 or 64% Self
26 Son or Daughter
24 Others (Including two (2) doctors)
13 Spouse
8 Other Relative
7 Residential Staff
3 Institutional Staff
3 Other Household Member
1 Sibling

7. SERVICES AND STATUS

233 valid cases received basic investigation and informational and referral services.
133 of the valid cases received intensive resource referral and social work counseling in addition to other services.
64 of the valid cases received home attendant services in addition to other services.
9 valid cases were referred for guardianship.
157 or 67% remained open at the end of the reporting period.

C. DEMOGRAPHICS OF INVALID CASES OF ELDER ABUSE

5 9 3-11-87

1. SEX

103 cases investigated were female.

78 cases investigated were male.

2. AGE

78.4 was the average age for females.

80 was the average age for males.

79.2 was the average age of invalid reports.

3. TYPE OF COMPLAINT

88 Neglect

33 Abuse

28 Exploitation

14 Neglect and Exploitation

8 Abuse/Neglect

6 Abuse/Exploitation

4 Abuse/Neglect/Exploitation

4. SERVICES AND STATUS

36 Cases were opened for social work, counseling and resource development. (These cases were determined to be at immediate risk, but abuse, neglect and/or exploitation could not be verified during the investigations.)

D. REPORT FROM THE LONG-TERM OMBUDSMAN ON ELDER ABUSE *

53 Cases were investigated by the LTCO for alleged abuse, neglect and/or exploitation.

66 Complaints were alleged in these 53 cases.

30 Complaints of abuse were valid.

1 Complaint of neglect was valid.

10 Complaints of exploitation were valid.

* See Annual LTCO Report to the Governor of Montana.

III. DISABLED AND DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED ADULTS

3-11-87
57 96

A. GENERAL (For Adults ages eighteen (18) to fifty-nine (59))

161 Investigations on disabled were conducted by CSD social workers in 1985.

107 or 66.4% of these cases were valid.

54 Cases were not valid.

28 Counties reported valid cases. (See Appendix B for county list.)

18 Counties reported invalid cases. (See Appendix B for county list.)

B. DEMOGRAPHICS OF VALID DISABLED/DD CASES

1. SEX

58 were males

49 were females

2. AGE

42.8 for females

35.3 for males

39 was average age

3. MARITAL STATUS

72 Single

16 Married

14 Divorced

5 Widowed

Q
3-11-87
SB# 96

4. TYPE OF COMPLAINT

<u>52</u>	Neglect
<u>30</u>	Abuse
<u>13</u>	Exploitation
<u>6</u>	Abuse/Neglect
<u>5</u>	Abuse/Neglect/Exploitation
<u>1</u>	Neglect/Exploitation

5. PERPETRATOR

<u>63</u>	Self
<u>11</u>	Other
<u>8</u>	Residential Staff
<u>6</u>	Spouse
<u>5</u>	Sibling
<u>4</u>	Son/Daughter
<u>4</u>	Other Relative
<u>4</u>	Other Household Member
<u>2</u>	Legal Guardian

6. SERVICE AND STATUS

<u>107</u>	All valid cases received basic investigative and referral services.
<u>87</u> or <u>81%</u>	Received intensive resource development and social work counseling services in addition to other services.
<u>15</u>	Cases received home attendant services in addition to other services.
<u>3</u>	Cases received assistance to obtain guardianship.
<u>83</u> or <u>78%</u>	Remained open at the end of the reporting period.

7. DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED CASES THAT ARE WARDS OF SRS

The Department of SRS now has full guardianship of seven (7) developmentally disabled adults. The services for the seven (7) wards consists of financial management and consent for medical treatment.

C. DEMOGRAPHICS OF INVALID DISABLED/DD CASES

1. SEX

28 Females

26 Males

2. AGE

37.4 for Females

34.7 for Males

36 Average Age

3. TYPE OF COMPLAINT

20 Abuse

20 Neglect

9 Exploitation

5 Abuse/Neglect

1 Abuse/Exploitation

4. SERVICE AND STATUS

32 Cases were opened for social work counseling and resource development and protection. These cases were determined to be at immediate risk, but abuse, neglect and/or exploitation could not be verified at the time of the investigation, but was highly suspected.

IV. SUMMARY OF ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES FOR 1985

3-11-87
JB#96

A. GENERAL

575 investigations were conducted by CSD social workers.
340 or 54% of these cases were verified as valid and received basic services.
68 more cases were opened for services due to risk.
240 cases remained open.
408 cases are estimated to be open for Adult Protective Services at this time. (240 from valid cases open; 68 at risk cases and 100 carried over from 1984.)

B. GENERAL STATISTICS FOR ELDER CASES

414 investigations were conducted.
233 or 56% were valid cases and received basic services.
191 were male
223 were female
77.9 was the average age
260 or 63% were neglect cases
172 or 74% of the valid cases the perpetrator was the client. (In these cases the person was at risk due to their own mental and physical disabilities to meet life needs.
80 or 34% of the valid cases were reported by friends of the client.

C. GENERAL STATISTICS FOR DISABLED/DD CASES

161 investigations were conducted.
107 or 66.4% were valid and received basic services.
84 were male
77 were female
 was the average age
72 or 45% were neglect cases
50 or 31% were abuse cases
63 or 59% of the valid cases the perpetrator was the client.

3 1-87
5 96

V. ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS FOR 1985

A specific workshop on Adult Protective Services was conducted in Helena on June 18-20, 1985, and August 20-22, 1985, for sixty (60) social workers and supervisors. Assessing hard to treat clients, legal aspects, and service planning were the major subjects of this training. This workshop tended to give social workers a renewed sense of value and an understanding of their responsible role in protecting Montana adults.

Efforts continued in working with Aging Service Programs. Numerous meetings were held across the state to share information between APS staff and aging service providers so that the elderly person would receive coordinated services.

Adult Protective Service Teams were authorized in the Elder Abuse Prevention Act in 1985. The policy and law was implemented and seven (7) APS Teams were developed. The most active was the team in Yellowstone County.

VI. CONCLUSION

The statistics found in this report and the program development information verify that the Adult Protective Services Program from the Community Services Division of SRS is a viable and essential program to Montana's aged or disabled persons.

APPENDIX A

C
3-11-87
B# 96

VALID ELDER ABUSE CASES BY COUNTY

Big Horn	1
Broadwater	6
Carbon	2
Cascade	22
Custer	3
Daniels	1
Dawson	1
Deer Lodge	1
Fergus	8
Flathead	5
Gallatin	22
Hill	3
Judith Basin	2
Lake	5
Lewis & Clark	10
Liberty	1
Lincoln	3
Madison	1
McCone	1
Meagher	
Mineral	2
Missoula	29
Musselshell	8
Park	3
Phillips	16
Pondera	3
Ravalli	16
Richland	3
Roosevelt	3
Sanders	2
Sheridan	5
Silver Bow	2
Stillwater	1
Sweet Grass	1
Teton	3
Toole	2
Valley	7
Wheatland	5
Yellowstone	25

INVALID ELDER ABUSE CASES BY COUNTY

Beaverhead	
Big Horn	1
Broadwater	3
Carbon	2
Cascade	19
Custer	5
Dawson	1
Fergus	4
Flathead	2
Gallatin	6
Granite	1
Hill	3
Judith Basin	2
Lake	13
Lewis & Clark	12
Lincoln	2
Madison	1
McCone	1
Missoula	28
Musselshell	1
Phillips	4
Ravalli	12
Richland	7
Sanders	4
Silver Bow	6
Stillwater	1
Sweet Grass	1
Toole	1
Wheatland	3
Yellowstone	37

APPENDIX B

C
3-11-87
SB 96

VALID DISABLED CASES BY COUNTY

Big Horn	2
Carbon	1
Cascade	8
Custer	2
Dawson	1
Fallon	1
Fergus	3
Flathead	4
Gallatin	7
Lake	1
Lewis & Clark	10
Lincoln	1
Mineral	1
Missoula	15
Musselshell	3
Park	1
Phillips	7
Pondera	2
Ravalli	5
Richland	1
Roosevelt	4
Rosebud	1
Sheridan	3
Silver Bow	2
Teton	4
Toole	3
Valley	9
Yellowstone	6

INVALID DISABLED CASES BY COUNTY

Big Horn	6
Carbon	1
Cascade	5
Dawson	1
Fallon	1
Fergus	1
Flathead	1
Gallatin	1
Lake	5
Lewis & Clark	1
Lincoln	2
Missoula	8
Musselshell	2
Powell	1
Ravalli	1
Richland	1
Silver Bow	3
Toole	2
Yellowstone	11

VISITORS' REGISTER

JUDICIARY

COMMITTEE

SENATE
BILL NO. 94

DATE March 11, 1987

SPONSOR _____

NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Bill Leary	MT Hosp. Assn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER

JUDICIARY

COMMITTEE

SENATE BILL NO. 40

DATE March 11, 1987

SPONSOR _____

NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Hiram Shaw	WORKERS' COMP	✓	
Steve Waldman	Mental Health Center	X	
Jay McGrath	Mental Health Assoc	X	
#33 #14 [illegible]			
[illegible]	[illegible]		✓
John Madson	SRS	X	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.
PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER

JUDICIARY

COMMITTEE

SENATE
BILL NO.

96

DATE

March 11, 1987

SPONSOR _____

NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
ELMER HALSKEN	AARP	✓	
Charles Bongip	Governor's Office	✓	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.