

DAILY ROLL CALL

HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

50th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1987

Date March 28, 1987

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
HANNAH, Tom (Chairman)			✓
MARKS, Bob (Vice Chairman)	✓		
ADDY, Kelly	✓		
BROWN, Dave	✓		
EUDAILY, Ralph	✓		
IVERSON, Dennis	✓		
MERCER, John	✓		
RAMIREZ, Jack	✓		
QUILICI, Joe			✓
VINCENT, John	✓		

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
RULES COMMITTEE
50TH LEGISLATIVE SESSION

March 28, 1987

The thirteenth meeting of the House Rules Committee was called to order by Vice-Chairman Bob Marks on Saturday, March 28, 1987 at 1:30 p.m. of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All members were present with the exception of Reps. Hannah and Quilici who were previously excused.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 904: Rep. Marks pointed out to the committee that the reason the meeting was called today was to determine whether or not it is appropriate for the House to consider HB 904. This bill was designed to accomplish the same purpose that HB 842 was designed to accomplish. (HB 842 was killed in the House.) House Bill 904 was referred to the Rules Committee in order to determine whether or not it either meets the following criteria or if the committee wants to give approval to its introduction. Rep. Marks referred to Joint Rules 6-8(1) which states:

"No bill may be introduced or received in a house after that house has finally rejected a bill during that session designed to accomplish the same purpose save upon approval by the Rules Committee of the house in which the bill is offered for introduction or reception."

Rep. Mercer said in his mind, there is no question that the bill is subject to this rule. He feels HB 904 accomplishes the same purpose as HB 842, and HB 842 could have been amended with an appropriation making it identical to HB 904.

Rep. Iverson said he too agreed that it is currently under Rule 6-8.

Rep. Vincent said there is no question that Rule 6-8 is the relevant rule. However, a review of all the bills that come before this committee relative to Rule 6-8 would indicate that the Rules Committee has been "all over the map." He feels there would be a great lack of consistency if all the bills were looked at. This bill, however, is different in the sense that it appropriates funds, he said.

Rep. Ramirez stated that this bill is clearly designed to accomplish the same thing as Rep. Harp's original bill (HB 842) and should be rejected. Rep. Ramirez agreed with Rep. Vincent in that we haven't always been consistent; he indicated a necessity for caution in establishing a precedent in resurrecting killed bills by placing an appropriation in the bill. It will make it even more complicated to finish all the work that needs to be done in 90 days.

Rep. Mercer moved the Rules Committee declare the purpose of this bill the same as the purpose of HB 842. Discussion followed.

Rep. Vincent said his contention is that a good part of the bill is designed to accomplish the same purpose as HB 842; however, a pretty significant part of the bill is designed to accomplish another purpose.

In Rep. Mercer's opinion, the only difference between the bill (the amended version of HB 842) is that HB 904 has three lines that appropriate money to the general fund, and it also has a coordination clause.

Rep. Addy said that we need to consider the coordination clause as well. He said both bills have different coordination clauses, and there is a substantially different purpose in HB 904 than there is in HB 842.

Rep. Ramirez said he doesn't see where the coordination clause changes the purpose at all.

Rep. Marks said there is another question that the House Rules leaves a bit vague -- such as what condition the bill was in when it was finally rejected. He pointed out that HB 842 was not in the same condition when it was killed as when it was introduced.

Rep. Addy said the real question is whether or not the Rules Committee approves HB 904's introduction into the House. He suggested disposing of this question first. Rep. Mercer said the committee has no business deciding that unless it comes under Rule 6-8.

The question was called on Rep. Mercer's motion. It FAILED 4-6 following a roll call vote.

ADJOURN: A motion having been made, the meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.



Rep. Bob Marks, Vice-Chairman

ROLL CALL VOTE

HOUSE RULES

COMMITTEE

DATE March 28, 1987

BILL NO. HB 904

NUMBER _____

NAME	AYE	NAY
ADDY, Kelly		✓
BROWN, Dave		✓
EUDAILY, Ralph		✓
IVERSON, Dennis		✓
MERCER, John	✓	
RAMIREZ, Jack	✓	
QUILICI, Joe		✓
VINCENT, John		✓
MARKS, Bob - Vice Chairman	✓	
HANNAH, Tom - Chairman		

TALLY

4

6

Marcene Lynn
Secretary

Tom Hannah
Chairman

MOTION: Rep. Mercer moved the Rules Committee declare the purpose of HB 904 the same as HB 842. The motion FAILED 4-6.