

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
FINANCE AND CLAIMS COMMITTEE  
MONTANA STATE SENATE

April 15, 1987

The 32nd meeting of the Senate Finance and Claims Committee met on the above date in room 108 of the State Capitol. Following roll call Senator Regan, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7 a.m. to hear House Bills 581, 886, 864, 866 and 889.

ROLL CALL: All members present except Senator Stimatz.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 864: AN ACT TO INCREASE CERTAIN LICENSE AND PERMIT FEES COLLECTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FROM DEALERS, MERCHANTS, AND WAREHOUSEMEN OF VARIOUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES etc.

Representative Manuel, House District 11 and sponsor of House Bill 864 said, this is a subcommittee bill on an Appropriations bill. It deals with fees raised by the Dept. of Agriculture. In doing the budget it was noted that the fee money went back to the general fund and there was money appropriated by the general fund and these fees amounted to about 50% and the rest was a cost to the general fund. The committee thought there should be more paid into the general fund. Some of the fees are by rule and some are by statute and this was a recommendation by the Ag Dept. Some of the fees were raised 100%, and the major one was a wholesalers license and the last time it had been changed was in 1935. There were several that had not been raised since 1935. This fee raise will bring it from \$216,840 to \$296,091 so it will bring about \$80,000 more to the general fund.

There were no proponents, no opponents and Senator Regan asked if there were questions from the committee.

Senator Manning asked, you said this will bring in about \$80,000? Representative Manuel answered, \$80,000, yes.

Senator Manning said, this fiscal note is not in too good a shape then? Representative Manuel said, this is from the Ag Dept, this note here and it doesn't quite come up to \$80,000; it is about \$65,000 on here.

Senator Himsl asked, on page 4 -- the permit for selling grown produce; are Farmers Markets affected by this? Representative Manuel said, I would probably think so. I think they would have to be inspected.

Senator Himsel said, I am talking about the licensing. Would each one have to get a permit of exemption or pay the gent \$20? Representative Manuel said, I think that is old law.

Senator Smith said, in our committee this was discussed, like a farmers market -- where the farmers bring in their produce? Do they have to have a permit? He was told, no, they don't have to have a permit.

Senator Bengtson said, I really have trouble with this. You are doubling fees on some of them. Obviously this affects a lot of people. It is just a tax on the people. What and who determines doubling it? The Department of Agriculture or who? Representative Manuel said, well it passes through. They have to inspect all this.

Senator Bengtson said if you look at page 3 where it goes from \$100 to \$200 for instance. Representative Manuel said, some of these were done in 1935 and most of them were in 1979. The Department checked with all these people and there wasn't too much opposition since they knew they weren't paying their own way. This raises it from 50% to about 80% of the total cost of the inspection.

There were no further questions and Representative Manuel said he closed. Chairman Regan declared the hearing on House Bill 864 closed.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 886: AN ACT PROVIDING FOR TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE; LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF NONMEDICAL GENERAL RELIEF ASSISTANCE; ELIMINATING PAYMENTS FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO NONRESIDENTS OF THE STATE etc.

Representative Winslow, House District 89 and chief sponsor of House Bill 886 said, this is a bill that would limit the state or county from paying for medical expenditures for transients in the general assistance area. He said this resulted from a case in the Great Falls area and the potential that exists for paying medical expenses that become extremely excessive. He said in the case in Great Falls, there was an individual passing through the state, fell off a mountain and was hurt and as of this time the cost is over \$150,000 for the state general fund. This bill would continue emergency assistance funds, however medical assistance for those people was removed. He said this does set up a cost shift where the cost will be shifted to the hospital. He said this is a subcommittee bill, came out of the subcommittee, and they felt it necessary to put a lid on the transient medical care.

PROPONENTS TO HOUSE BILL 886: Dave Lewis, SRS said, we support this bill, and the main reason for testifying is to bring out the fact that we have not addressed the issue of transient assistance in House Bill 2 yet. It has been left

in abeyance until resolution of this particular bill. At the present time we do not have any money in House Bill 2, either for the 3 days of meals and lodgings we have traditionally had for transient assistance and runs about \$30,000 a year; or for the transient medical assistance program because again the fate of that program depends on this bill. It is an item we would like to see brought up in conference committee once we know where we are going to end up.

There were no further proponents, and Senator Regan asked if there were any opponents.

OPPONENTS TO HOUSE BILL 886: Bill Leary, representing the Montana Hospital Association said they reluctantly appear in opposition to House Bill 886. The big problem we see in the bill is that if we get a transient that has been in a serious car accident, and even though the Hospital will do the best they can to track down to see if they have any insurances or resources -- eventually, if there are none, that hospital is going to have to absorb the cost of that. Unfortunately some of those costs could be very high and running into \$100,000 or more and the only effort we can see doing is to shift that cost to all of the other users to share. This particular session the hospital industry has accepted a freeze on the medicaid reimbursement which is going to cost all of the other users of care of the hospitals about \$9 million over the next biennium. We are going to have to shift that cost. We have another problem with this particular bill. If we did have a transient that was involved in one of our hospitals, and let's say it is a small rural hospital and that transient needs to be transported to a larger hospital for more extensive care, we don't have any resources -- we don't have any money to pay to fly that person or transport him by ground ambulance. As a result, we will have to absorb the cost and pass it on to everybody else.

Mr. Leary said perhaps \$3 million to \$5 million did not seem like too much, but with the winter Olympics coming up in Canada in 1988 there may be a number of people moving through our state who are transients, without insurance; primarily the youth going to Canada. Some will be hitchhiking, riding busses, sharing a ride or whatever, and we fear some of these people could be involved in accidents.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Bengtson asked, you said there is no money in House Bill 2. How much do you think would be adequate and what kind of language would have to be put in House Bill 2 to take care of this situation? Dave Lewis said, about \$180,000 a year. There was \$30,000 for the traditional 3 day lodging and meals for transients. Frankly, we found that to be a cost savings. If we didn't have that they could simply go down to the County Welfare

Office and declare the intent to become a resident and at that point they are eligible for \$212 a month on the program. Sometimes we get people in the shelters that are passing through, and so we are ahead to reimburse the shelters for that three days. We have averaged, and feel that around \$150,000 in transient medical assistance is what it has been in the past.

Senator Bengtson said, is that out of the budget? Dave Lewis answered, yes. It was taken out of the budget pending the resolution and final disposal of this bill.

There were no further questions and Representative Winslow closed by saying, sometimes in this process you carry things that you are not real comfortable with. We are not going to avoid somebody being hurt, we are ultimately, or someone will ultimately be responsible for them when they hit this state; however with the potential liability of the high cost of health care and the lack of general fund to fund the general assistance program that we have here and the lack of ability to really reform it, the committee in frustration to a certain extent, proposed this bill and would ask for your concurrence.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 866: AN ACT TO INCREASE BY \$5 THE FEE FOR ISSUING A MARRIAGE LICENSE OR FILING A DECLARATION OF MARRIAGE, etc.

Representative Bradley House District 79 and chief sponsor of the bill said, this is a committee bill to keep the funding for the domestic violence program at it's current level. In our appropriation subcommittee we felt we could no longer justify putting additional general funds in there and we took them out and then later raised the cost of the marriage from \$30 to \$35 it would bring in the additional revenue to keep the program at it's current level. We have left it at it's current level. It is already in House Bill 2, so in essence we have already spent it.

Representative Bradley said, there is a very interesting amendment with an interesting story attached, and I will have Senator Van Valkenburg offer his amendment.

Senator Van Valkenburg told of meeting an older couple who were 66 and 72 years old. They are first cousins, had both lost their spouses in recent years, and wanted to marry. He said this amendment would make it possible. (Amendment is attached as exhibit 1, House Bill 866.)

PROPONENTS TO HOUSE BILL 866: Barbara Archer, Women's Lobbyist Fund said, we support House Bill 866. She said the \$5 increase in the Marriage License Fee that this bill requires will generate approximately \$36,000 for Domestic Violence Programs and Shelters. This will offset the recent

cuts of general fund monies that had been set aside for Domestic Violence Programs. She said, the small increase in Marriage License Fees will compensate for the steadily declining number of marriage licenses. In 1983 there were 8,932 licenses, in 1986 it had fallen to 6,723. Raising the amount of the fee that goes to this area from \$14 to \$19 will enable these networks to continue to provide services for victims of abuse. She said, last year the 15 Domestic Violence Programs and 8 shelters provided Crisis Intervention for almost 6,000 individuals; emergency shelters to over 800 victims and 1100 children. Long term assistance to 1100 individuals and education to 11,000 citizens.

Sue Fifield, Montana Low Income Coalition said, we have a lot of AFDC moms who have come from abusive homes and we would appreciate your support of this bill.

There were no further proponents, no opponents, and Chairman Regan asked if there were questions from the committee.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Gage asked, you talked about a cut in the program. How do you propose to get the funds generated here to restore it in that program. Representative Bradley answered, it is in House Bill 2. Senator Gage asked, there was not a cut then in the funding? Representative Bradley answered, no.

Senator Gage asked, 19-5-404, is that the spouse section of the code? It talks about \$9.60 remitted to the state to be deposited as provided in 19-5-404. It was assumed that it was the spouse section of the code, and Senator Regan said the answer to the question is yes.

Senator Story asked if we didn't already put another bill through on this? Representative Bradley said, no. That is on divorces. Senator Story asked, then this is the only bill we have on marriage licenses? Representative Bradley answered yes.

In closing, Representative Bradley said, I think the programs that are funded certainly are worthy and right from the beginning our subcommittee put the money back in that we had originally taken out. I would have no objection to the amendment.

Senator Regan declared the hearing on House Bill 866 closed.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 581: AN ACT EXEMPTING THE FIRST \$50 EARNED EACH MONTH FROM THE MONTHLY INCOME STANDARD FOR GENERAL RELIEF AND ALLOWING A GENERAL RELIEF RECIPIENT WITH INCOME FROM EMPLOYMENT TO KEEP A PORTION OF HIS MONTHLY GRANT; REQUIRING REIMBURSEMENT OR EXEMPTION OF RECIPIENTS

WHO LIVE MORE THAN 10 MILES FROM THE TRAINING OR WORK SITE, etc.

Representative McCormick, House District 38 said, this bill is a companion bill to House Bill 12 passed last June. It takes care of the 12 counties that are under the state where they worked out a work program. This bill allows them to earn \$50 over their regular welfare check a month. On page 8 there is another amendment that they will get gas for transportation. House Bill 12 says they have to report to the unemployment when they are called to work, and some towns are quite a way from an unemployment office and they must go there and then to a job and with these people on relief it is costing them quite a bit of money. It would be over 10 miles from their home.

Sue Fifield, Montana Low Income Coalition said, we are in favor of this bill. First let me point out, there are families on GA also. There are battered women that are on GA and might not feel they can go out and get a full time job at this time and are just trying to get back into the work place. On this bill in the House a lot of GA people testified that they would go out and find spot jobs but were afraid to do so because if they couldn't keep that spot going on they got penalized for earning the money, even up to 2 months afterward. Their food stamps were cut and their checks were cut, etc. Most of the jobs that people find are by word of mouth. Part time jobs and spot jobs can often turn into full time jobs and this bill would enable them to take any spot jobs they could find.

Barbara Archer, Womens' Lobby Fund said, in addition to what others have said, she would like to point out that many general assistance recipients are often women who are often displaced homemakers whose children are grown and therefore they are ineligible for AFDC and are yet too young for social security; also pregnant women who are not yet in their 6th month of pregnancy and are therefore ineligible for AFDC and need general assistance and a supplement which this bill provides.

Dave Lewis, SRS said, we supported this bill in the House. We believe that there really is an incentive involved here if we allow people to make at least \$50 without an offsetting reduction in their basic grant, that they will do if not more spot jobs, as least not have to violate the law by not reporting the money. We have a lot of appeals, we have a lot of problems of where a person makes \$25 or \$30. Under the current law we have to reduce their grant in the following month by that amount of money. People neglect to report it and it turns up in some kind of an unemployment compensation report or whatever, and then we are back in dispute with them over a very small amount of dollars. We

think disregarding the first \$50 is going to be a good thing to do in this case.

Mr. Lewis said, I have to bring up a concern we have -- the schedule on page 2 that lists the basic household incomes, that define eligibility and determine how much we pay for various family sizes for general assistance. This schedule really drives what we pay for general assistance and AFDC. This schedule was correct based on House Bill 2 when House Bill 2 came out of the House Appropriations Committee. In other words, the dollars that were in House Bill 2 for AFDC and GA benefits were tied back to these dollar amounts in that we had maintained the payments at the current level; the level that exists in this biennium as far as the monthly payments. Given the fact that now Senate Finance and Claims in this committee and also on the Senate floor -- they have endorsed the reductions in AFDC and GA payments to the 41% of poverty that we are at right now. Clearly this schedule has to be changed in the statute in order to comply with the money that is now in the Appropriation Act. We were willing to talk about some amendments to this bill that would do that, however we are a little concerned about Title XII which I know there has been some discussion with the Legislative Council on in the last couple of days and we frankly feel it is almost a certainty that there will be litigation over the reduction of benefits that House Bill 2 requires and I want to make sure we have at least a clean statute when we get into litigation on that issue. I guess I am really inquiring as to the committee's intent, if there was an intent to amend this bill to match with House Bill 2 as far as the payment levels or was there an intent to put in a new bill or what? At least at the present time the dollars that are in House Bill 2 don't match with the schedule that is currently in the statute as far as the level of payments.

OPPONENTS TO HOUSE BILL 581:

Neil Haight, Montana Legal Services, and appearing as an opponent to the bill, but actually addressing the matter which Mr. Lewis just raised. As to an amendment, I don't know if this is a proper time to bring it up, but I guess we can go ahead and do it, in concurrence with the committee. The constitution provides a law shall be passed by bill which shall not be so altered or amended on it's passage through the Legislature as to change it's original purpose. The purpose in this bill is to provide some disregard for people that go out and have some spot employment and it's an effort to help them become self supporting and keep their hand in the labor market. It says nothing about amending the schedule of payments, which Mr. Lewis mentioned, so we think any amendment or elimination of that schedule would be an alteration of the bill which would not be constitutional. In addition there is nothing said in the title; the only thing in the title of this bill says "amending sections"

etc. The amending sections involved are amended to conform with what the title says, which is to allow the disregard and to allow the assistance for workfare if they are so far away from their place of work. I think fairly obviously, a change in the bill, which doesn't conform to the constitution, if it is not contested, it can go through and will become law. If 2 years pass without it being contested, then it is too late to contest it. I think a provision of this nature, and an amendment such as Mr. Lewis suggested, very probably would be contested and if so, found unconstitutional. There is apparently some argument that rather than changing the schedule, if the schedule were eliminated and the amounts were left to be determined by rule of the department that that would correct it. I guess I'd have problems with that. In one sense you are accomplishing by possible indirection what you could not accomplish by direction. The other thing is it is under section 17-8-103, and just abbreviating it, but -- it shall be unlawful to expend contract for the expenditure to occur, permit the occurring of any obligation whatsoever in excess of the Legislative appropriation. I think in setting a rule, if the department does this by rule, there is no way in the world that the department could ever set this amount above what the statute presently says. The department cannot set any appropriation, any schedule above the appropriation. So in essence, it means reducing the schedule and I think it would be just as unconstitutional as the other.

There were no further opponents and Chairman Regan asked if there were questions from the committee.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Hims1 asked Dave Lewis, is this the only place in the statute where this schedule is in? Dave Lewis answered, yes that is correct.

Senator Regan asked, the only way you can legally do this would be by introduction of special legislation. Dave Lewis said, I think I agree with that. I think there are enough questions about the effect of amending these schedules as Mr. Haight said, that if we are going to litigate an issue, we want to make sure we have at least that issue cleared up.

Representative McCormick said he would close and if the bill does get passed out of committee Senator Manning will carry it on the floor.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 889: AN ACT TO CREATE A MONTANA AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL; TO PROMOTE INNOVATIONS IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTION AND IN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES OF AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES; TO ASSIST IN DEVELOPING AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS INCUBATORS; TO ENHANCE DOMESTIC AND



FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL MARKETING OPPORTUNITIES; TO ASSIST EXPORTERS OF MONTANA AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS, etc.

Representative Winslow, House District 89 and chief sponsor of House Bill 889 said, when you heard House Bill 862, some of the proponents of this bill were here to discuss this with you. House Bill 889 is called the Montana Growth Through Agriculture Act, and it is an attempt to deal with the problems that are being faced at the rural areas. The bill establishes an Agriculture Council which will function out of the Department of Commerce. The bill sets aside some funding that would be used for small town incubators to assist towns of less than 15,000. It is an attempt to try to pull something together that would help the community to survive. It would help some of the dislocated farmers that cannot make it on the farm anymore but would like to stay in those rural communities. He said South Dakota has done an excellent job of working with their rural communities and they are looking at their example. He said he had an amendment which would put money into the bill from the general fund. Attached as exhibit 1, House Bill 889.

PROPOSERS TO HOUSE BILL 889: Mons Tiegen, representing Montana Stockgrower's Association, told about the Monfort truck that comes in at the Colonial that has meat for them and takes care of other establishments here in town. We have cattle industry people here in Montana that feed cattle in Montana and sell them to Monfort down in Greeley. They load the cattle, ship them to Greeley, where they are slaughtered, and the meat is sent back up here in another truck and peddled around in Montana. He said they have been involved in the Montana Beef Council in trying to get a viable beef packing plant in the Billings area. He told about the small packing plants, meat processing plants, etc. that could hold Montana communities and the people together in the communities.

Jo Brunner, representing the Montana Agriculture Coalition said this includes the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, the Montana Stockgrowers, Montana Cattle Women, Cattle Feeders, Dairymen, Women Involved in Farm Economics, Grazing Districts, Wool Growers and Cattle Men. She said this would be an incentive to branch out and use the ingenuity to do something on their own to further their operations to be responsibly involved in programs that would require them to pay back funding obtained, and of very great importance. The Coalition feels strongly that the Agriculture Council will be of benefit to our industry simply because we have our peers making the decisions regarding the feasibility of our ventures. This would not be people who can only guess at the needs of the community and only discount or approve because they do not realize first hand the benefit or the reverse of given situations.

There were no further proponents, no opponents, and Chairman Regan asked if there were questions from the committee.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Story said, right now, I see no money in this. If this amendment passes it would take 2/3 of the House to pass it. Senator Regan answered, it would.

Senator Story asked Jo Brunner, were all of the members of that coalition in favor of this? Jo Brunner answered, the ones that I mentioned, yes. The Grange could not participate on the original bill because they have policy that didn't allow them to go into the Coal Tax Fund. I neglected to put Grain Growers on that list. At the end we did not get back to the Grange to find out if they would support the amendments.

Senator Keating asked Mons Teigen, you mentioned that you are trying to get a meat processing plant in Billings, and I know that several outfits have looked at the old Pierce plant and would like to get a meat processing plant open in Montana. What are some of the factors that keep us from opening some of those plants. Mons Tiegen said, essentially, the first problem is a lack of available risk capital to become involved in those. The old Midland Plant operated very successfully for a long time until they got into some management difficulties and by the time that was resolved, they ran out of a source of funding. I think the YDP plant that they are talking about on the West side toward Laurel has a good opportunity. We have economic analysis made of that situation and they say the plant is viable. Indeed it is starting. There was a lack of up-front capital to keep the thing going. You have to get the plant going, then have money to buy the cattle and stock pile them for awhile, and all of those things. The other problem we have had in some of the small communities as far as the packing business is concerned is the lack of a consistent source of fat cattle, or whatever type of cattle the plant handles, month after month. That is not the problem in the Billings area. The lack of risk capital in that area is probably the biggest factor and the Montana Economic Development Board has been involved in this situation and the Japanese are involved in it right now. I think something will get off the ground there. There are some other opportunities -- there is the Sidney area, the Great Falls area, etc.

Senator Story asked, has your membership ratified this request, or directed you to make it, or how, in your type of organization, do you get approval for something like this? Mr. Teigen answered, the authority to support or oppose legislation here comes from the executive committee of the Montana Stockgrower's Association, and they concur in this particular idea. If you say does our membership 100% -- our

membership 100% does not approve of a lot of things. Neither does your constituency, I believe agree with you 100%, but we do follow the direction of our executive committee.

Senator Bengtson asked, I am wondering how much money -- was there a grant or a loan or what to the Montana Economic Development Board on the Yellowstone Beef Parts plant in Billings. Also, how strong the membership on the Montana Economic Development Board is, and if there were a way to incorporate some of the ideas you are putting forth in this bill. It seems to be spelled out very intricately as to how it would work, but what is the problem with the Montana Economic Development Board and what has their involvement up to this date been in Agriculture endeavors? Has it been a total failure? We have listings of all of the loans and the investments made, but it would be interesting to know how Agriculture has fared. Representative Winslow said, my understanding is that they haven't fared very well at this point. This session we have done one other thing, and that is the venture capital funds which might help in that direction. I think there has also been some tension. I think one of the problems we have had is that we have had no representation from Agriculture on our products industry in the Department of Commerce. There has been a lot of glimmer and glamour to High Tech and bringing High Tech and fancy things into the state, but I think we're a little bit at a loss with our own existing industries that are so important to us. One of the best things in this bill is that we would have a council administering this thing that would be involved in the Department of Commerce.

Senator Boylan said, I think rules and regulations are the first obstacle. The next is that this is highly competitive. The truck that Mons Tiegen was telling about, they sold the other day to one of the big feed -- Agri Business or something, you have vertical integration here and competition. It is getting to be big time and they will muscle anybody out that tries to get started in these areas. It is getting so there are only a few packing plants in the United States that are able to survive at all. It has gotten completely out of hand where Agriculture cannot control it's own products.

Senator Smith said, in regard to Senator Keating's question on Midland Packers, isn't it a big problem opening that plant the same as with Western Sugar where the Department of Revenue came in and increased the value 5 times? I understand we even passed legislation to correct that situation. Isn't that where a lot of our problem is, and Workmans' Comp. rates not being comparable to other states, etc.

Mons Teigen said, I am sure that all of that is part of the decision making process, but I think that I failed to point out that what is being attempted in the Billings area is niche marketing. Nobody plans on taking Monsfort head on and slug it out, you are just not going to be able to do that. With the Japanese using a new freezer process, they are going to try to fill a particular niche. Anything big that is worth anything, Monsfort and IVP is going to take care of that; but there is a spot for niche marketing. Our studies have indicated that, but that is not to say in other businesses in the state that these other things such as workers' comp. rates, taxes, etc. come in to play; but nevertheless both Pierce and Midland operated quite successfully for quite awhile under this situation. In getting back to Pierce, Senator Keating, I don't know what the situation is. That was a hog killing plant and I've heard some talk they were considering going to larger animals there, but I just don't know.

Senator Bengtson said, the Ad Hoc committee on Agriculture -- what have they set forth as to endorsing a council of this nature? That seems to be a broad base of people that really can identify some of the issues and some of the solutions. Jo Brunner answered, in my opinion the Governor's Ad Hoc is more or less just a meeting of minds and we just go there for information. The decisions that are made by the Agriculture Coalition do not include Agri Business normally; that is, the Agri Businesses are not included in our decisions.

Senator Bengtson asked, has the Ad Hoc committee endorsed something like this, or is this the direction they are going? Jo Brunner answered, we discussed it many times and there has been a lot of different observations put forth by the Agri Businesses on marketing etc. As far as I know the Ad Hoc committee itself has never taken any stand on promotion.

Senator Gage asked, Cal you talked about amending the Highway Reconstruction thing by 2%. Has that happened, or is that just a suggested source? Representative Winslow said, that is up on the board today. We will attempt to do it at that time.

Senator Hammond said, that Ad Hoc committee, I attended it many times. They just visit, nothing ever comes out of that. They never have made a decision or done anything. I would like to ask Cal, through this Council, would you see money being made available for instance, in one of the communities I represent they set up a meat canning processing plant. Would that be the intent of this money? Representative Winslow said the intent of this bill is that they are innovative seed funds and they are matching funds. None of this is set up to give money away. They would have

to come up with the first half. The second half could come from these funds, although they are very limited since there is not very much money in there at best; but it might be a way to get it started. Yes, that is the type of thing. We are talking small; the money is small, the meat packing plants and the super collider and these big things, I don't think they are even going to be the future for Montana. I think we are going to have to have a lot of development of small businesses.

Senator Hammond said this is already started. Representative Winslow said, if they need a little bit of additional funds and if they can come up with it to keep them going, that's what the seed funds would do.

Senator Hammond said, Mons brought out an interesting point. In order to make these things succeed, there has to be some cattle feeders and they have almost disappeared because of lack of facilities as far as plants are concerned. Would there be money available to encourage feeders to support such a market? Mons Teigen said, in my viewing this bill, I don't read that in there. I don't say it couldn't be done. I think if you get a plant of some kind I think the feeders will be there. You've got the grain, you've got the cattle, etc. I don't think you would necessarily need any financial support to get that process going. There is one point you raised about the distinction between the Ad Hoc committee and the Coalition. The Ad Hoc committee was created during Tom Judge's administration and was to get Agricultural groups thinking and working together. They still continue to meet every other month but along with that there is an Agricultural Coalition which is composed of the representatives of the established Agricultural Organizations that meet privately without any of the bureaucrats, without any of the press, with no trade show and no industry representatives -- just those of us representing Agricultural Organizations. We feel that we take a little different look at things than the Coalition, but when we do agree, we agree, and this is one issue that we are solid behind.

Representative Winslow closed by saying, I think this is a start for rural Montana. It is nothing to help the urban areas. Congress has some money this time to do some incubators in places like Billings and Great Falls and some of the major areas, there is not enough money in here to bring a big plant, and you couldn't get a big plant to come into Conrad or Wolf Point, but there are some funds there to help make the transition for some of the people that are not going to be able to survive on the farm.

Senator Regan declared the hearing closed on House Bill 889.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 864: AN ACT TO INCREASE CERTAIN  
LICENSE AND PERMIT FEES COLLECTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE DEALERS, etc.

Motion by Senator Story that House Bill 864 be concurred in.

Senator Bengtson said we are sitting here on this committee raising fees on people who have not had a voice in accepting or paying the fees.

Senator Story said this is a bill that came out of our subcommittee. We came over here thinking we would do what we could to help balance the budget and pay our share. The first bill that went through here increased fees for forest fire fighting so people who had forest protection would be paying more of their share.

Senator Gage said, Representative Manuel indicated that some of these people were contacted and they didn't vigorously object.

Senator Smith said the thing that disturbed him the most, when the other cuts were made, most of them were put back in. He questioned the language in the bill and said he felt he was misled on who had to pay for a permit.

Question was called, voted, roll call vote,

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 866: AN ACT TO INCREASE BY \$5 THE  
FEE FOR ISSUING A MARRIAGE LICENSE, etc.

Motion by Senator Jacobson to move the amendment by Senator Van Valkenburg (exhibit 1). Voted, passed, Senators Keating and Smith voting no. Motion passed.

Motion by Senator Jacobson that House Bill 866 as amended, be concurred in. Question was called, voted, passed, Senators Story, Smith, Tveit and Keating voting no. Senator Jacobson to carry the bill.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 886: AN ACT PROVIDING FOR  
TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE, etc.

Senator Boylan said, were there some problems with the bill?

Senator Bengtson moved House Bill 886 be not concurred in. She said, this is the bill that says they will not take care of transient medical care or lodging and I don't think it is responsible to pass that liability on to local governments and hospitals. The \$180,000 that needs to be put back in House Bill 2 for this, I am not sure where we are going to get that, but it is the wrong thing to do. It certainly isn't the local communities responsibilities. It

certainly isn't the hospital that should be stuck with the bill.

Senator Smith said, I realize what Senator Bengtson is saying; however I had one of the welfare directors in the county contact me and they have instances where some people are telling these people that Montana has a much more lucrative welfare system and they are buying their bus tickets to come to Montana. Unless we do something about this we will have businesses moving out and these people moving in and I don't think we will operate very long as a welfare state.

Senator Harding said, I believe in committee it was testified that someone in a skiing accident, I think it was, created such a big bill. They were transient and ended up having to be paid for. I realize what Senator Bengtson is saying that it is not the communities problem, it is not the hospital's problem, but is it the state's problem?

Senator Regan said, I have a question for Lee. I asked you to be here Lee, because of legal problems. How do we define residency problems now in our statute and are those statutes upheld in the courts? Lee Heiman, Legislative Council, said a person is a resident of the state if one hour into the state they say that they have an intent to be a resident of the state.

Senator Regan said, that troubles me greatly. Lee Heiman said, a person can literally passing through the state going to the state of Washington, never intending to be a resident. In the state of Montana, it is okay to say you have to be a resident to get welfare benefits, or any kind of benefit, but you can't put a duration on the residency. You can't say you have to be a resident for 30 days. You do say you have to be a resident. We don't have to send welfare checks to a person in Florida who got hurt in Florida and living in Florida with no residency at all. There is a prohibition against irrational residency but no prohibition against residency.

Senator Regan said, the man who fell off the mountain, if he said, well, I really am going to stay here, we're stuck. Lee Heiman said, if he says I stopped here in Glacier on my way to Havre because in Havre I was going to rent an apartment and live there the rest of my life -- he's a resident.

Senator Story said, it is a matter of incentive. If in fact, the burden does fall on the community and the hospital, the most economical thing to do would be to save his life and get him to some other location where they would be more responsible for his welfare. If in fact, if restraint is not possible, the hospital can perform plastic

surgery and all sorts of things knowing the state picks it up -- I am exaggerating the facts, but the point is, how much are they willing to spend on him and how much is necessary to sustain his life and get him to the location where he is going. It is the difference of a savings to the taxpayer.

Senator Jacobson asked, if someone is in a serious accident and has a very serious head injury in some very small town in the state of Montana, who is going to pick up the transportation cost which is a part of the medical service. Dave Lewis said, the state would. Senator Jacobson said, you would pay that, you just wouldn't pay after he got there? Dave Lewis answered, under current law, we pay the hospital for treating him. If this bill passed the state would not pay. It would be the responsibility of whoever found him and the hospital that got him.

Several Senators asked, whoever found him? Dave Lewis said, I don't know. Obviously there is no state obligation if this bill were to pass, so you get into the whole issue of good samaritans and everything else where if I were to pick this person up and haul him to the hospital, etc.

Senator Gage asked, what is the section that is being repealed dealing with? Representative Winslow said, just the medical care. That's the only thing that's being repealed.

Senator Keating asked, would the emergency medical services that would be usually called in the case of an accident, and wouldn't they rush this person to the nearest hospital or facility depending on his needs? Dave Lewis said, in Montana we've always covered this under state law as a state obligation. In other states it hasn't been. We've had situations where people are called from emergency room to emergency room because hospitals won't take charity cases. It is an issue we haven't had to deal with because the obligation has been on the state for some years. I don't know exactly how the emergency response teams work.

Senator Hammond said, the Highway Patrol calls the ambulance and in the more rural areas the ambulance comes and gets them and sometimes they are paid and sometimes they aren't.

Senator Keating said, that is what I am getting at. The Emergency Medical Service is something we appropriate money for and then these people go out and do these good samaritan things and I would imagine under current law they could probably turn to the state and say we would like to have reimbursement for what we've done for this person. Now, we pass this law that says, no, the state doesn't have to reimburse that emergency medical or that ambulance that comes out here. Now, do those people say, now wait a



minute. Before we rush out there and gather up that damaged person we had better check to see if he has any insurance or if he's got anything to pay for it. Are they going to start hesitating and wonder who is going to pay for the service, etc?

Senator Manning said, in some cities where there is EMS a lot of them are attached to the fire and police departments. They respond in most cases where there isn't an ambulance service. Where there is an ambulance service, in most cases the ambulance service has been to the city council and said -- they are to respond at the same time the ambulance does because the ambulance doesn't want to lose either a fee or a patient.

Senator Keating said, is it the council that has to respond? Senator Manning said, the city council tells them that they will respond together. In small communities these units respond on their own. Senator Keating said he did not understand what he was saying and Senator Manning said, what I am saying is that most of your ambulances are not assigned to the hospital, they are private ambulances. They derive a living out of it, so they don't want the EMS taking part of their duties so to speak.

Senator Harding made a substitute motion that House Bill 886 be concurred in. Voted, passed, Senator Harding to carry the bill. Roll call vote.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 581: AN ACT EXEMPTING THE FIRST \$50 EARNED EACH MONTH FROM THE MONTHLY INCOME STANDARD FOR GENERAL RELIEF, etc.

Motion by Senator Manning that House Bill 581 be concurred in.

Senator Hammond said, from what I gathered should be done, is a whole new bill put in on a new schedule? Senator Regan said, that's what they are suggesting. You can't amend this. The question is whether you want to pass this or not, the amendment is apparently not within the scope of the bill. It would take a separate bill and you haven't the time to do it.

Senator Smith asked, is it true that this legislation could be declared not in the proper form for legislative requirements? Senator Regan said, as I understand it -- perhaps Lee or Peter will discuss it. Lee Heiman said, the way the bill sits right now is just fine. The fact is that it is my opinion that amending the schedule for general assistance benefits lower within the bill itself, is a 180 degree change in the purpose of the bill and would probably be struck by the court. The way the bill is sitting right now it is just a bill and is fine.

Question was called, voted, passed. Senator Story voting no. Senator Manning to carry the bill.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 889: AN ACT TO CREATE A MONTANA AGRICULTURE COUNCIL, etc.

Senator Regan said this is the Growth Through Agriculture bill.

Motion by Senator Jergeson to move the amendments to House Bill 889. (see attachment, exhibit 1, House Bill 889).

Senator Jergeson said, as you've heard, Representative Winslow is working on some alternative ways of paying for this over in the House. With our amendment here it would require 2/3 suspension of the rules for the House to accept the bill back and it would be a tough thing to accomplish if they haven't yet come up with a satisfactory method of raising the money for this. Having amended it, providing an opportunity to go to conference with it, I think it is a good program, and the amendment puts us on the road to working this out by the end of the session.

Senator Story said, in the first place if that money was stripped over in the House there is not much chance they will accept it back by 2/3. Senator Regan said, what happened here was -- 862 was a bill that took money from the Educational Trust fund. It took the interest from the Educational Trust Fund and it was in a number of other bills. That money was distributed in House Bill 2, in this bill and in 3 or 4 other bills. Those monies were spent in Senator Van Valkenburg's bill and so you couldn't spend the money twice, and we killed 862. If you look on page 12 of the bill, section 15, where they instruct if House Bill 862 fails to be passed and approved, this act is void. 862 was killed. Representative Winslow would like to strike that language and insert this amendment in and then pass it.

Senator Story said, the bill is harmless without the amendments. I represent a little area; there are all sorts of groups in my area and I have not received one letter asking me to support this bill. This is a lot of money. We go through and cut out a position here and a typewriter there, and we can't just put money in in big globs like this.

Senator Jergeson said, I did not have any constituents say specifically -- vote for House Bill 889, but I have had over the course of a lot of meetings in my district, lots of farmers and ranchers ask whether or not there is this kind of mechanism to help them with some of the ideas they have.

Senator Keating said, I guess I am coming at this from a little different angle. When the Economic Development Board

and the Build Montana Program was initiated, and tapped into the coal tax, to use some money there to help provide capital, it put Montana into the banking business and to providing and subsidizing higher risk businesses that banks didn't want unless they had some backing, and there was a 10% edge given to get that capital going. That money was loaned to new businesses that would compete with existing businesses. It was using tax dollars that came from the coal industry. Now you want to take general fund money which is primarily provided by individual income taxpayers and saying we're going to become a bank and take some of your income taxes and lend money to people in Agriculture to help them get started. I submit it is not the duty of the government to be in the banking business, and to risk general fund money to make loans is not good.

Senator Smith said I am in Agriculture and I was the one who gave the adverse committee report on 862. I am going to vote for this bill. Several of you people added on a fee of \$200,000 on Agriculture, we put another \$1.4 million back in the House Appropriations for the Business Assistance for Montana, we passed a bill to the tune of \$38 million, which is a bonding program out of the Coal Trust account for High Tech. I know High Tech is a much greater risk than Agriculture because Agriculture has been here forever and it is still surviving, but having a lot of problems. I will also say I do not think this will do what we hope it will do unless we remove some barriers.

Senator Hammond said, I am not sure how this will work, but I have been involved in things where we've borrowed money in order to put into a group. That's the way we got this cannery started and some of those things, but right now there are needs for some loading facilities because the only way you can get any kind of break in grain is to be able to ship out in 52 car units. There isn't a 52 car loading facility between Glasgow and Harlem. This could make it possible to create one of those which would allow those people to have one. Many of those farmers right now are hauling 100 or 120 miles. This was the "good turn" that the Burlington Northern did for us. They were going to make our rates so much less, so now we do all the hauling instead of them doing it.

Senator Hammond talked about underwriting business ventures in Agricultural communities to use their products and market them. He said banks were limited as to the amount of a loan, and this bill would make it possible to underwrite a project and help keep Agricultural communities alive.

Senator Regan said, I had some thoughts about this. I think if we amend in this general fund the House may not suspend the rules to take it, but it occurs to me if we strike the language on page 12, lines 16 to 18 and send it back, they

will probably take it with no money in it. Then if Cal can amend in the coal money, I think you have a shot at it in a conference committee. If you are really thinking of passing the bill, I think that's what you've got to do. If you want to go ahead and amend this in, it is a nice gesture, but I don't think it will fly.

Senator Hammond asked Cal Winslow, would you be in favor of this type of operation to try to get the money in if it got over there? Representative Winslow answered, yes. I guess my thoughts are that this amendment we laid before you is appropriate, however if it fails, Senator Regan is exactly right. I would prefer to have that coordinating clause out and send it over with nothing.

Senator Hammond asked, you took 2% of the 12% that was going to the Highway because we felt it would be a shortfall in the Highway funds and now that has been pretty much covered? Representative Winslow said, it is my understanding that the Highway funds got more. We didn't know that they were going to get that much in the gas tax. This money is continued and the increase is coming there and if we get this amendment passed in the House it will take 9 or 10%; enough to cover the program. That is all bonded money and the loss of that amount of money out of \$150 million is not going to jeopardize their bond repayments.

Senator Himsel said, I have difficulty with this. We took away glasses, teeth, hearing aids, and now we are proposing to put \$650,000 into advisory services for information that is made available to the farmers and ranchers. They have plenty of places for information now. It isn't that they don't know what they want. Read the statement of intent.

Senator Regan said, I think the meat of the bill is in section 6 of the bill, the powers and duties of the Council and in section 7.

Motion by Senator Gage made a substitute motion that we adopt #4 of the amendments.

Voted, passed, Senator Bengtson and Senator Smith voting no.

Senator Jergeson said, I understand what we did, we segregated the amendments and voted for #4. Maybe it won't go, but I move amendments # 1,2 and 3.

Question was called, voted, roll call vote. Motion failed.

Motion by Senator Jergeson that House Bill 889 as amended be concurred in. Voted, passed, Senators Boylan, Keating and Story voting no.

The meeting was adjourned.

ROLL CALL

50th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1987

Date 4-15-87

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
SENATOR REGAN	✓		
SENATOR HIMSL	✓		
SENATOR JACOBSON	✓		
SENATOR BENGTON	✓		
SENATOR STIMATZ			✓
SENATOR HARDING	✓		
SENATOR HAFLEY	✓		
SENATOR SMITH	✓		
SENATOR KEATING	✓		
SENATOR STORY	✓		
SENATOR BOYLAN	✓		
SENATOR JERGSON	✓		
SENATOR TVEIT	✓		
SENATOR MANNING	✓		
SENATOR HAMMOND	✓		
SENATOR GAGE	✓		

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTEE ON \_\_\_\_\_ BILL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

BILL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

# VISITOR'S REGISTER

[illegible]

(Please leave prepared statement with Secretary)

1. V  
exhibit #1 #B 866

AB  
Bradley

Amend House bill 866 Third Reading Copy (blue)

1. Title, line 7.

Following: "MARRIAGE;"

Insert: "MODIFYING MARRIAGE CRITERIA;"

Following: "AMENDING"

Strike: "SECTION"

Insert: "SECTIONS"

Following: "25-1-201"

Insert: "AND 40-1-401"

2. Title, line 8.

Strike: "AN EFFECTIVE DATE"

Insert: "EFFECTIVE DATES"

3. Page 5, line 19.

Following: Line 18

Insert: "Section 2. Section 40-1-401, MCA, is amended to read:

"40-1-401. Prohibited marriages. (1) The following marriages are prohibited:

(a) a marriage entered into prior to the dissolution of an earlier marriage of one of the parties;

(b) a marriage between:

(i) an ancestor and a descendant or between a brother and a sister, whether the relationship is by the half or the whole blood; or

(ii) between first cousins unless both parties are at least 60 years of age;

(c) a marriage between an uncle and a niece or between an aunt and a nephew, whether the relationship is by the half or the whole blood.

(2) Parties to a marriage prohibited under this section who cohabit after removal of the impediment are lawfully married as of the date of the removal of the impediment.

(3) Children born of a prohibited marriage are legitimate."

NEW SECTION. Section 3. Severability. If a part of this act is invalid, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid part remain in effect. If a part of this act is invalid in one or more of its applications, the part remains in effect in all applications that are severable from the invalid applications.""

Renumber: subsequent section

4. Page 5, line 19.

Following: "Effective"

Strike: "date"

Insert: "dates"

Following: "."

Strike: "This act"

Insert: "(1) Section 1"

SENATE FINANCE AND CLAIMS  
EXHIBIT NO. 1  
DATE 4-15-87  
BILL NO. 866

5. Page 5, line 21

Following: "line 20"

Insert: "(2) Sections 2, 3, and this section are effective on passage and approval."

XT01

\wp\lee\amdhb866

SENATE FINANCE AND CLAIMS  
EXHIBIT NO. 1 Page 2  
DATE 4-15-87  
BILL NO. 866



# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

April 15 1987

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on **FINANCE AND CLAIMS**

having had under consideration **House Bill** No. **864**

**third** reading copy ( **blue** )  
color

**INCREASE AGRICULTURAL FEES**

**MANUEL (Story)**

Respectfully report as follows: That **House Bill** No. **864**

**BE CONCURRED IN**

~~XXXXXX~~  
~~DO PASS~~

~~DO NOT PASS~~

**SENATOR REGAN**

Chairman.

ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

DATE

4-15-87

H

Bill No.

864

Time

8:12

NAME

YES

NO

SENATOR HIMSL

SENATOR JACOBSON

SENATOR BENGTON

SENATOR STIMATZ

SENATOR HARDING

SENATOR HAFLEY

SENATOR SMITH

SENATOR KEATING

SENATOR STORY

SENATOR BOYLAN

SENATOR JERGSON

SENATOR TVEIT

SENATOR MANNING

SENATOR HAMMOND

SENATOR GAGE

SENATOR REGAN

8 7

Sylvia Kinsey

Secretary

Senator Regan

Chairman

MOTION:

Passed

A/B 864

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

April 15

1987

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on **FINANCE AND CLAIMS**

having had under consideration **House Bill** No. **581**

**third** reading copy ( **blue** )  
color

**MCCORNICK (Manning)**

## REVISING MONTHLY INCOME STANDARD FOR GENERAL ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Respectfully report as follows: That **House Bill** No. **581**

BE CONCURRED IN

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*  
DO NOT PASS

SENATOR REGAN

Chairman.

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

..... April 15 19 37 .....

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on ..... **FINANCE AND CLAIMS** .....

having had under consideration..... **House Bill** ..... No. **336** .....

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

**REVISE GENERAL RELIEF FOR ELIMINATING NONRESIDENT MEDICAL ASSISTANCE**

**WINSLOW (Harding)**

Respectfully report as follows: That..... **House Bill** ..... No. **336** .....

BE CONCURRED IN

~~XXXXXX~~

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

.....  
**SENATOR REGAN**

Chairman.

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

SCRSB866

.....April 15,..... 1967.....

MR. PRESIDENT

## Finance & Claims

We, your committee on.....

House Bill

866

having had under consideration..... No.....

third blue  
reading copy ( )  
color

INCREASE MARRIAGE LICENSE FEE BY \$5

BRADLEY (JACOBSON)

Respectfully report as follows: That.....House Bill..... No. 866.....

BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Title, line 7.

Following: "MARRIAGE;"

Insert: "MODIFYING MARRIAGE CRITERIA;"

Following: "AMENDING"

Strike: "SECTION"

Insert: "SECTIONS"

Following: "25-1-201"

Insert: "AND 40-1-401"

2. Title, line 6.

Strike: "AN EFFECTIVE DATE"

Insert: "EFFECTIVE DATES"

3. Page 5, line 19.

Following: Line 18

Insert: "Section 2. Section 40-1-401. MCA, is amended to read:

"40-1-401. Prohibited marriages. (1) The following

marriages are prohibited:

(a) a marriage entered into prior to the dissolution of an earlier marriage of one of the parties;

(b) a marriage between:

(i) an ancestor and a descendant or between a brother and a sister, whether the relationship is by the half or the whole blood; or

(ii) between first cousins unless both parties are at least 60 years of age;

DO PASS

DO NOT PASS

CONTINUED

Chairman.

April 15,

19

(c) a marriage between an uncle and a niece or between an aunt and a nephew, whether the relationship is by the half or the whole blood.

(2) Parties to a marriage prohibited under this section who cohabit after removal of the impediment are lawfully married as of the date of the removal of the impediment.

(3) Children born of a prohibited marriage are legitimate."

NEW SECTION. Section 3. Severability. If a part of this act is invalid, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid part remain in effect. If a part of this act is invalid in one or more of its applications, the part remains in effect in all applications that are severable from the invalid applications."

Renumber: subsequent section

4. Page 5, line 19.

Following: "Effective"

Strike: "date"

Insert: "dates"

Following: "."

Strike: "This act"

Insert: "(1) Section 1"

5. Page 5, following line 20.

Insert: "(2) Sections 2, 3, and this section are effective on passage and approval."

AND AS AMENDED,  
BE CONCURRED IN

Senator Regan

*Sub 1*  
*889*

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL 889

Third Reading Copy, Second Printing

1. Page 1, line 8  
Following the stricken language  
Insert: "TO APPROPRIATE MONEY FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO THE COUNCIL;"
2. Page 8, line 5  
Strike: Everything after "products." on line 5 through "products." on line 13
3. Page 9, following line 10  
Insert: "NEW SECTION. SECTION 14. APPROPRIATION. THERE IS APPROPRIATED \$650,000 FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO THE MONTANA AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 1989, AS FOLLOWS:  
(1) TO THE AGRICULTURAL AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT ESTABLISHED UNDER SECTION 7, \$350,000;  
(2) TO THE AGRICULTURAL BUSINESS INCUBATOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT PROVIDED FOR UNDER SECTION 8, \$250,000;  
(3) FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF THE COUNCIL, \$50,000."
4. Page 12  
Strike: Lines 16 through 18 — *passed*

*Page*

CLERK OF THE HOUSE AND CLERK OF THE SENATE  
JAN 15 1989  
BILL NO. 889

# ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

DATE 4-15

Bill No. SB

Time 8:12

NAME	YES	NO
SENATOR HIMSL	✓	
SENATOR JACOBSON		✓
SENATOR BENGTON		✓
SENATOR STIMATZ	✓	
SENATOR HARDING		✓
SENATOR HAFPEY	✓	
SENATOR SMITH	✓	
SENATOR KEATING	✓	
SENATOR STORY	✓	
SENATOR BOYLAN		✓
SENATOR JERGSON		✓
SENATOR TVEIT		✓
SENATOR MANNING	✓	
SENATOR HAMMOND	✓	
SENATOR GAGE		✓
SENATOR REGAN		

8 7

Sylvia Kinsey  
Secretary

Senator Regan  
Chairman

MOTION: Receding

16  
Had Come



ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

DATE 4-15-89

14

Bill No. 889

Time 8:55

NAME	YES	NO
SENATOR HIMSL		✓
SENATOR JACOBSON		✓
SENATOR BENGTSON	✓	
SENATOR STIMATZ		
SENATOR HARDING		✓
SENATOR HAFHEY	✓	
SENATOR SMITH	✓	
SENATOR KEATING		✓
SENATOR STORY		✓
SENATOR BOYLAN		✓
SENATOR JERGESON	✓	
SENATOR TVEIT		✓
SENATOR MANNING	✓	
SENATOR HAMMOND	✓	
SENATOR GAGE		✓
SENATOR REGAN		✓
	6	9

Sylvia Kinsey  
Secretary

Senator Regan  
Chairman

MOTION: Leg Amend to 1, 2 & 3

2

1, 2, 3

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

SCR35839

.....April 15,..... 1927.....

MR. PRESIDENT

Finance & Credits

We, your committee on.....

House Bill

389

having had under consideration..... No.....

third

blue

..... reading copy ( ..... )  
color

MONTANA GROWTH THROUGH AGRICULTURE ACT

WINSLOW (JERGESON)

Respectfully report as follows: That..... House Bill..... No. 389.....

BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Page 12, line 16 through 18.  
Strike: lines 16 through 18.

AND AS AMENDED  
BE CONSIDERED IN

DO PASS

DO NOT PASS

.....  
Chairman.

Senator Regan

See Historical Society copy for  
Standing Committee Report on  
House Bill 2.