

## **MINUTES**

### **MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 54th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION**

#### **COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION**

**Call to Order:** By **REP. RICHARD SIMPKINS, Chair**, on January 10, 1995, at 10:00 a.m.

#### **ROLL CALL**

##### **Members Present:**

Rep. Richard D. Simpkins, Chairman (R)  
Rep. Matt Denny, Vice Chairman (Majority) (R)  
Rep. Dore Schwinden, Vice Chairman (Minority) (D)  
Rep. Matt Brainard (R)  
Rep. Patrick G. Galvin (D)  
Rep. Dick Green (R)  
Rep. Antoinette R. Hagener (D)  
Rep. Harriet Hayne (R)  
Rep. Sam Kitzenberg (R)  
Rep. Bonnie Martinez (R)  
Rep. Gay Ann Masolo (R)  
Rep. William Rehbein, Jr. (R)  
Rep. George Heavy Runner (D)  
Rep. Susan L. Smith (R)  
Rep. Carolyn M. Squires (D)  
Rep. Jay Stovall (R)  
Rep. Lila V. Taylor (R)  
Rep. Joe Tropila (D)

**Members Excused:** none

**Members Absent:** none

**Staff Present:** Sheri Heffelfinger, Legislative Council  
Christen Vincent, Committee Secretary

**Please Note:** These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

##### **Committee Business Summary:**

Hearing: HB 91, HB 87  
Executive Action: HB 91, HB 63

#### **HEARING ON HB 91**

##### **Opening Statement by Sponsor:**

**REP. MARIAN HANSON, HD 1**, brought this bill to the committee to address a personal problem she had encountered. This bill would

extend the time in which contribution notification must be made from twenty four hours to forty eight hours. This fall she was out helping her husband ride. They only received mail three times a week. By the time that she had gotten back from the roundup the mailman had already gone back into town. She had received a contribution and she consequently had to take that report into the post office in order to make the twenty four hour deadline. If it had been a forty eight hour deadline there would be no problem. This affects all representatives and senators.

**Proponents' Testimony:**

none

**Opponents' Testimony:**

none

**Informational Testimony:**

none

**Questions From Committee Members and Responses:**

REP. PAT GALVIN questioned REP. HANSON about line 30 where within twenty four hours after receiving a contribution of \$500 dollars or more there must be notification. He stated that he had never received five hundred dollars and asked if \$500 is a normal amount. He asked why it would have any effect and if it was law.

REP. HANSON stated that this would be actual law and would be for state wide candidates.

REP. GALVIN asked if state wide if there was a \$500 elimination.

REP. HANSON stated that she saw what he was saying but what she was trying to change were the ones for senators and representatives.

REP. SIMPKINS asked if there would be any objection to changing each of those from twenty four hours to forty eight hours for a \$500 contribution.

REP. HANSON stated that when she called the Committee of Political Practices office the commissioner stated that he could not do anything about it. She stated that she could.

REP. BILL REHBEIN stated that in his situation he lives in Lambert and his treasurer lived in Sidney, when a contribution came for him he would send the contribution to Sidney the next day. It was difficult for him to get the notification out in twenty four hours. **HE MOVED TO AMEND TO SEVENTY TWO HOURS.**

REP. SIMPKINS stated that there are some organizations in Montana that think that the representatives and senators are crooks. He didn't think that the committee could get away with seventy two hours. He then asked REP. HANSON if she had any objections to amending the bill to include how to supply to a committee.

REP. HANSON stated that she had no objection to amending the bill.

REP. BRAINARD asked if the sponsor knew when the donation should be counted. He asked if it should be counted on arrival or when you open it.

REP. SIMPKINS asked REP. BRAINARD to please refer to line 18 page one for the answer to his question. And stated that it said that the dates should be counted upon receiving the donation.

Closing by Sponsor:

REP. HANSON closed by stating that she had no objection to amending the bill. She stated that she feels that forty eight hours is a reasonable amount of time. She did not know if seventy two hours would be reasonable or not and stated that she would look into that. She hoped that the committee would look favorably upon the bill.

HEARING ON HB 87

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

REP. LARRY GRINDE, HD 94, explained that this bill would change the primary dates of the elections. It would take the date from where it is now, in June, and move it to August. He stated there are three reasons for doing this. The first is that the public is tired of all the mudslinging that occurs during campaigns. The second is that he personally was tired of continually campaigning. They are supposed to be part time legislators and they are becoming more full time legislators. It is becoming so comprehensive that it is hard to keep up on everything. The final point was that there is a great emphasis on the amount of money spent in campaigns. The passage of I118 in the past election shows that people think that they spend too much money. He is hoping for the bill to save the legislators some money. The bill seems to be very simple and straight forward. There have been questions asked about how this bill would affect the Clerk and Recorder and what it does about presidential elections and conventions. Everything is under statutes. It can be found under 1310 in the Codes book. This bill will hopefully bring some sanity to the current elections. He thinks that this would be good for the people and for the legislators.

Proponents' Testimony:

none

Opponents' Testimony:

**Robert Frossen, Montana Association of Clerks and Recorders**, testified against this bill by stating that by moving the election date from June to August would cause difficulties for the members of the Clerk and Recorders offices. These people have many responsibilities and this would cause them to often do double duties. There would also be little time to prepare for the general election. He stated that he sympathizes with the reasons behind proposing the bill, but recommended a do not pass by the committee.

Informational Testimony:

none

Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

**REP. GALVIN** stated that he had not had a dirty campaign until the last forty eight hours. He asked **REP. GRINDE** how this bill would compensate for the late campaign mudslinging.

**REP. GRINDE** stated that this bill would not stop the mudslinging but would slow it down.

**REP. REHBEIN** asked the number of states that have late elections and how they ran those elections.

**REP. GRINDE** stated that he did not have the answer to that question and requested that **Doug Mitchell** be allowed to answer the question.

**Mr. Mitchell, Chief of Staff, Secretary of State** stated that he didn't know the exact number of states in the union that do this. Two things are traditional in those cases. They hold separate presidential preference primaries so that their state may participate in the presidential election. In addition they will have a different type of primary that is held at a later date and is essentially a run off. The top two qualifiers will be advanced so that they will get rid of the partisan aspect at the primary all together.

**REP. REHBEIN** asked **Mr. Mitchell** if this bill were to pass would it add to the expense of the primary elections.

**Mr. Mitchell** said there is no requirement that states participate in presidential nomination. The parties do that as their own rule.

**REP. JOE TROPILA** asked what the canvas would be on contested race that went to district court.

**Mr. Mitchell** answered by stating that the time schedule here is extremely tight. The dates for various things to happen are

based around the primary election date. Canvass happen 20 days after the election. If there were to be a contest of that they would not have absentee ballots available for members of the military when required by law. They would violate some laws regarding the delivery of election ballots in a timely manner. That aspect would have to be dealt with legislatively if this bill was passed.

**REP. TROPILA** stated that he has a bill that would move the primary to April. He also has a bill to eliminate state primaries. He asked if it would be all right to wait and hear other bills related in content.

**REP. GRINDE** stated that he didn't have a problem with waiting. This way he could get up to speed on some of the election laws as well.

**REP. CAROLYN SQUIRES** questioned the actual time. She stated that August is a family time. This would keep them from voting if they were taking a vacation. She is a person who believes in voter participation. She believes that there would be a decrease in voter participation if the elections were moved to August. She asked for a comment from **REP. GRINDE**.

**REP. GRINDE** replied by stating that her question made a good point. He said that he had taken that into account. When he had put this bill together and decided on the dates, it was more of how it would affect the people that were running. It would perhaps get more people involved in the process and would benefit those people in agriculture. He stated that he thought her question definitely had some bearing.

**REP. SQUIRES** stated that there were also town fairs going on at that time and that would reduce the number of people that were to vote also, because it is a family event. She stated that she was not trying to pick the bill apart but was looking at some of the events happening around the time that is proposed in the bill. These events would affect voter participation.

**Closing by Sponsor:**

**REP. GRINDE** thanked the committee for their time. And stated that the Clerk and Records did have some validity in what they testified to. He thought that this would be something that they could work out. It is controversial, but thinks that it is something that needs to be done. He hoped that the committee would look favorably on the bill.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 91**

**Discussion:**

REP. SIMPKINS stated that in the bill there are three different times that twenty four hours are mentioned. He asked Sheri Heffelfinger if they were within the title to change these.

Ms. Heffelfinger stated that yes the committee would be within the title to change these times.

REP. SIMPKINS asked the committee if they want to amend it to seventy two hours.

REP. GALVIN stated that it would be easier for people if the bill were to be amended to seventy two hours. He then gave an example when he received a contribution that he opened three days before the general election that had been mailed in July.

REP. SIMPKINS stated that the reason for the law is because of organizations that like to track spending for elections. They want the information as soon as possible before the elections. They may need to take action on that as well. He asked the committee what time limit they would like to impose.

Motion:

REP. REHBEIN MOVED HB 91 DO PASS.

Motion:

REP. REHBEIN MOVED TO AMEND THE BILL TO SEVENTY TWO HOURS.

Discussion:

REP. SQUIRES was concerned that part of the reason for the twenty four hours was to keep track of last minute contributions within a campaign. If one was to increase the amount of time there is a greater chance of dishonesty. There could be people dumping money into their accounts without the public knowing. She stated that she felt that seventy two hours is too long of a time. She believes that the Commissioner of Political Practice could stand corrected.

REP. SIMPKINS reminded the committee of I118, that would limit the amount of individual contributions to \$100.

REP. SQUIRES stated that with seventy two hours there would not be the opportunity to know the amount of money. Seventy two hours would put a crimp in doing what ever necessary for their campaign. She believes that seventy two hours is much too long of a time.

REP. SIMPKINS restated that the sponsor was only asking for forty eight hours and that needed to be taken in to consideration.

REP. SQUIRES asked when the Commissioner of Political Practices counts the time period. She asked if it was the post mark on the envelop or if he counts the actual time that it is received.

REP. SIMPKINS stated that it was the post mark used for filing not the time the commissioner receives the report.

REP. DORE SCHWINDEN stated that he was disappointed that the commissioner didn't have someone here to discuss the possibility this would be enforced and to tell the committee what an appropriate amount of time would be for this bill. He suggested delaying action until the committee could hear from these people.

REP. SIMPKINS asked if the committee would like to delay action on this bill until they could talk to the commissioner or someone from his office. The committee was split on whether or not to delay action. He asked REP. REHBEIN to withdraw his proposal for amendment.

REP. REHBEIN asked what would happen to the bill if he didn't withdraw his proposal.

REP. SIMPKINS stated that the bill would sit where it was. He stated that the committee would not take action on the bill until the commissioner had a chance to talk to the committee. He also proposed the committee delay action on HB 87 until the committee had a chance to look over other related bills. He felt that the committee could take action on HB 63, however.

REP. GALVIN remarked that the postal meters could be changed and people could be dishonest as far as the postmark is concerned.

REP. SIMPKINS stated that if there was a honest delay in the mail that would be fine. However, if there was a withholding of the information deliberately there would be problems.

REP. SQUIRES stated that the individual running for office should pay attention to the dates, especially the last fifteen days. She stated that they should be responsible, within themselves, to make sure reports are filed in a timely manner. She stated that when she receives donations, especially within the last fifteen days, she is on top of things because she doesn't want to give her opponent the opportunity to say that she was pumping additional money into her campaign that might indicate that it was inappropriate for her campaign.

#### Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

REP. SIMPKINS stated that in regard to HB 63, he had checked into what the impact is and how much it would take to change from a defined benefits plan to a defined contribution plan. He stated that he didn't think that it looked very good. HB 63 is taking a defined contribution plan and changing it to a defined benefit

plan. He asked the committee if there were any objections to discussing HB 91 with **Ed Argenbright**. There was no objection from the committee. He asked for the comment on the effects it has and any problems it might receive. He also asked when his office receives the notification if the postmark is the valid time or if the valid time is the time they receive the notification.

**Ed Argenbright, Commissioner, Political Practices**, responded by stating that he hadn't had much time to take this into consideration. He said the reason for the filing is that it is a piece of financial disclosure in campaigns. If candidates get contributions during that time period they are required to file within twenty four hours. He stated that they attempt to get people to fax the reports in, and he and his staff would accept the post mark. They have not prosecuted, but if a complaint were to be filed his office would take a look at it. People come in and look at them. He stated that his office doesn't do a whole lot with the reports except they put them in the candidate's file which is all a part of financial disclosure. From his point of view the amendment would be reducing the ability of people to know about money coming in. He stated that he understands that people in rural homes have some difficulty with regards to reporting. He didn't think that this bill would have a big effect on the operation of his office. There is a little less understanding of finances on a timely basis.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that people don't seem to have a problem with extending the deadline to forty eight hours, but thinks that seventy two hours would be stretching this too far. He asked for the commissioner's comment to that.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that twenty four hours has worked effectively. The forty eight hours would be more convenient for candidates who receive money and have to file forms. Seventy two hours would cause a decrease in understanding in the financial situation of those campaigning.

**REP. JAY STOVALL** asked how he deals with complaints received.

**Mr. Argenbright** answered by stating that they have not had to deal with such complaints. The commissioner's office does call people if someone complains. Their first line of operation is to inform people and get compliance from them.

**REP. REHBEIN** asked how the office looked at the relationship between the date on the check and the actual filing time.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that the law says that it must be filed within twenty four hours of receipt. The postmark would be what his office would go by. If someone didn't file they would certainly have the means to investigate.



**REP. REHBEIN** asked how the office of Political Practices would determine the date received.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that they have never had a complaint where they had to investigate and make that determination. He stated that they certainly could. If someone doesn't file, as stated by law, they are subject to an investigation and prosecution.

**REP. GAY ANN MASOLO** asked when they file if the office of Political Practices goes by the postmark or receiving time.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that when they receive it and they could back off on the postmark. He stated that they try to get people to fax their reports in. According to federal regulations it is the postmark. There is a natural confusion built into it. He also stated that he had not had much time to look into the matter.

**REP. GEORGE HEAVY RUNNER** stated that the focus is on the candidate as far as fair campaign practices and to look at these parameters. It is imperative that they work within the parameters.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that he is the commissioner and he has two staff people. He said that they don't have the capacity to deal with all of the violations.

**REP. SCHWINDEN** asked if the committee were to amend the bill to seventy two hours if the office of Political Practices would be prone to prosecute late filings more vigorously to make up for weakening the law.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that just getting people to file the reports on a timely basis is difficult.

[TAPE 1 SIDE B]

**REP. SCHWINDEN** asked if the committee amended the bill to seventy two hours if the office of Political Practices would be able to do more calling to get those people to file their reports.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that he didn't know.

**REP. SIMPKINS** summarized that the Office of Political Practices is hesitant about the seventy two hours because it is unsure as to what would happen. The twenty four hours has not technically created a problem because if they are late in filing a report there are no means of prosecuting because of staff. All the committee is dealing with for forty eight hours is the comfort of the candidates.

**REP. SQUIRES** asked if the candidate does everything to get the report to the office of Political Practices, if the postmark is close to that of what it is supposed to be, doesn't the office of

Political Practices have more important things to prosecute. She asked if that was how **Mr. Argenbright** perceived it.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that he agreed.

**REP. SQUIRES** stated that the office cuts that person slack if they call the office.

**REP. SIMPKINS** asked if the committee were to change it to forty eight or seventy two hours if they should change it for state wide office as well as the political committees.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that the state wide offices generally have computerized capabilities that are highly scrutinized by the press. He thinks that in the interest of financial disclosure the office will have to deal with that. If the committee wanted to go to forty eight hours notification they can administratively can handle that. It would be a lessening of the ability of people to know about campaign financing on such a timely a basis which exists now.

**REP. SIMPKINS** asked if the committee left it twenty four hours for the state wide offices and changed it to forty eight for the political committees and change it to forty eight for the individual if there would be a problem or inconsistency problem.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that he was reluctant to say. Administratively he could see no problem.

**REP. MATT DENNY** asked if under I118 there was a contribution maximum of \$100.

**MR. Argenbright** stated that was true.

**REP. DENNY** asked if that were the case wouldn't this be irrelevant.

**Mr. Argenbright** stated that given the new era and I118 there are instituted limits of \$100 and reduced amounts along the line. There are a number of ramifications there. He stated that he hadn't thought about how that would affect this bill.

**Discussion:**

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that the committee should be able to revert back and discuss whether or not this is dealing with the public after talking to the commissioner of Political Practices.

**REP. MATT BRAINARD** stated that in request to the motion the committee has other considerations besides just the campaign contributions. He stated that the committee also had campaign indebtedness that occurs at the same time which allows a person to put a charge on at the last part of an election, which is not

recorded at all. He wondered if twenty four hours is really pertinent matter of discussion with a \$100 contribution.

**REP. LILA TAYLOR** stated that the sponsor wanted to make the change to benefit the honest people and keep them honest. She stated that dishonest people are going to be dishonest and this bill just helps those people that are being honest. She felt that the committee needed to get back to the real issue of the bill instead of being hung up on one thing.

**REP. REHBEIN** stated that he didn't believe that everyone that runs for state office is a crook. He believes that if there is a level of responsibility the candidates are not responsible to the political commissioner, they are responsible to their constituents. If the candidates receive money they are going to explain that to their constituents. He restated that it is his belief that seventy two hours is a more reasonable time for rural people to report their contributions. He stated that he was willing to change his amendment to leave the major campaign committees and nationwide committees at twenty four hours or forty eight hours.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that the amendment had been modified to read that the committee change line eight page two from forty eight hours to seventy two hours. The committee has been told by people that have access to the press that we need campaign reform. He stated the committee had to consider the perception of the people and that the legislators give to the people. He stated that it is the legislators jobs to listen to the people.

**REP. TROPILA** asked **REP. REHBEIN** if he could send his accountant a copy of the report and vice versa.

**REP. REHBEIN** replied by stating anything is possible. He stated that it would be a lot easier and convenient without the twenty four hour deadline.

**Motion\Vote:** MOTION TO AMEND HB 91 MADE BY **REP. REHBEIN**. A ROLL CALL VOTE WAS TAKEN. THE MOTION PASSED 11 TO 7 WITH **REP. SIMPKINS, REP. DENNY, REP. SCHWINDEN, REP. HAGENER, REP. MASOLO, REP. SQUIRES, AND REP. TROPILA** VOTING NO.

**Motion:** MOTION TO DO PASS AS AMENDED WAS MADE BY **REP. HARRIET HAYNE**.

**Discussion:**

**REP. SQUIRES** stated that she didn't feel that the voters sent her here to find the most convenient way to record her fiscal responsibilities during an election process. She stated that she could not support this bill in its entirety

**Vote:** MOTION PASSED 13 TO 5 WITH **REP. DENNY, REP. SCHWINDEN, REP. HAGENER, REP. SQUIRES, AND REP. TROPILA** VOTING NO.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 63****Discussion:**

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that what has happened in the past with fire fighters has been very difficult for two reasons. It was hard to know who met the requirements because it wasn't know who was there. The firefighter must have a certain amount of annual training to be qualified. The proposal is that these firefighter will receive one hundred dollars a month after their years of service. This is the only benefit these people have. They don't get paid for their work. Everything is volunteer time. The actuary was asked to look at it and come close to an actuarial cost that could be sustained by the average premium dollar that went into this program. The system will be changing from a defined contribution going into a defined benefit plan. The retirement committee studied this bill and came out of that committee with a recommendation that it do pass. They came up with a better system to record how many people are out there and how to record the training requirements.

**Ms. Heffelfinger** clarified the defined contribution plan. The volunteer firefighter plan is not a contribution plan because it receives contributions from five percent of the fire insurance premium tax which varies from year to year. In a defined contribution plan the member defines how much the contribution will be. The benefits are defined by what the contributions earn.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that they had asked the actuaries if they could come up with past history so that they could justify letting the person know how much they would be receiving for their benefit payment.

**REP. GALVIN** stated that he pays a \$15 assessment each year in taxes for the volunteer fire department. He asked if that money went toward equipment or some other expenses.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that it was for equipment.

**REP. TAYLOR** asked if the taxes are determined by counties.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that the taxes are determined by fire districts.

**REP. REHBEIN** asked if the committee were to pass this bill what would happen if the teachers would want to introduce a bill like this.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that the teachers wouldn't want to pass a bill like this one.

**Ms. Heffelfinger** clarified that the volunteer firefighter do not have any compensation and can not contribute to their plan. Their employers do not contribute to the plan either. This plan is entirely different from all other plans.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that a problem that came about during the last session was that no one knew who was out there. They didn't know who was certified, etc. They didn't know if they were mailing in their certificates of training. They then gathered statistics and they could then make a prediction to the actuarial soundness of this bill.

**REP. SCHWINDEN** stated that without this bill the benefits will terminate on July 1, 1995, and they will be without benefits entirely.

**REP. BRAINARD** asked if this is a statewide fund.

**REP. SIMPKINS** stated that was correct.

**Motion:** **REP. SAM KITZENBERG** MOVED A DO PASS ON HB 63.

**Vote:** MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

HOUSE STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

January 10, 1995

Page 14 of 14

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 11:45 a.m.

  
RICHARD SIMPKINS, Chairman

  
CHRISTEN VINCENT, Secretary

RS/cdv

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## State Administration

ROLL CALL

DATE January 10, 1995

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Rep. Dick Simpkin, Chairman	✓		
Rep. Matt Denny, Vice Chairman, Majority	✓		
Rep. Dore Schwinden, Vice Chair, Minority	✓		
Rep. Matt Brainard	✓		
Rep. Pat Galvin	✓		
Rep. Dick Green	✓		
Rep. Toni Hagener	✓		
Rep. Harriet Hayne	✓		
Rep. George Heavy Runner	✓		
Rep. Sam Kitzenberg	✓		
Rep. Bonnie Martinez	✓		
Rep. Gay Ann Masolo	✓		
Rep. Bill Rehbein	✓		
Rep. Susan Smith	✓		
Rep. Jay Stovall	✓		
Rep. Carolyn Squires	✓		
Rep. Lila Taylor	✓		
Rep. Joe Tropila	✓		



## HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 10, 1995

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on State Administration report that House Bill 91 (first reading copy -- white) do pass as amended.

Signed: *Dick Simpkins*  
Dick Simpkins, Chair

And, that such amendments read:

1. Title, line 5.

Strike: "48"

Insert: "72"

2. Page 2, line 8.

Strike: "48"

Insert: "72"

-END-

Committee Vote:  
Yes 13, No 5.

081253SC.Hbk





## HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 10, 1995

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on State Administration report that **House Bill 63** (first reading copy -- white) **do pass.**

Signed: *Dick Simpkins*  
Dick Simpkins, Chair

Committee Vote:  
Yes 18, No 0.

081143SC.Hbk

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## ROLL CALL VOTE

### State Administration

DATE January 19, 1995 BILL NO. HB NUMBER 63

MOTION: Do Pass Motion Made By REP. SAM KITZENBERG

NAME	AYE	NO
Rep. Dick Simpkin, Chairman	✓	
Rep. Matt Denny, Vice Chairman, Majority	✓	
Rep. Dore Schwinden, Vice Chairman, Minority	✓	
Rep. Matt Brainard	✓	
Rep. Pat Galvin	✓	
Rep. Dick Green	✓	
Rep. Toni Hagener	✓	
Rep. Harriet Hayne	✓	
Rep. George Heavy Runner	✓	
Rep. Sam Kitzenberg	✓	
Rep. Bonnie Martinez	✓	
Rep. Gay Ann Masolo	✓	
Rep. Bill Rehbein	✓	
Rep. Susan Smith	✓	
Rep. Jay Stovall	✓	
Rep. Carolyn Squires	✓	
Rep. Lila Taylor	✓	
Rep. Joe Tropila	✓	

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## ROLL CALL VOTE

### State Administration

DATE January 10, 1995 BILL NO. H.B. NUMBER 91

MOTION: Motion on Amendment made by Rep. BILL REHBEIN

(SEE Exhibit 1)

NAME	AYE	NO
Rep. Dick Simpkin, Chairman		✓
Rep. Matt Denny, Vice Chairman, Majority		✓
Rep. Dore Schwinden, Vice Chairman, Minority		✓
Rep. Matt Brainard	✓	
Rep. Pat Galvin	✓	
Rep. Dick Green	✓	
Rep. Toni Hagener		✓
Rep. Harriet Hayne	✓	
Rep. George Heavy Runner	✓	
Rep. Sam Kitzenberg	✓	
Rep. Bonnie Martinez	✓	
Rep. Gay Ann Masolo		✓
Rep. Bill Rehbein	✓	
Rep. Susan Smith	✓	
Rep. Jay Stovall	✓	
Rep. Carolyn Squires		✓
Rep. Lila Taylor	✓	
Rep. Joe Tropila		✓

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## ROLL CALL VOTE

### State Administration

DATE January 19, 1995 BILL NO. HB NUMBER 91

MOTION: DO PASS AS AMENDED MADE BY REP. HARRIET HAYNE

NAME	AYE	NO
Rep. Dick Simpkin, Chairman	✓	
Rep. Matt Denny, Vice Chairman, Majority		✓
Rep. Dore Schwinden, Vice Chairman, Minority		✓
Rep. Matt Brainard	✓	
Rep. Pat Galvin	✓	
Rep. Dick Green	✓	
Rep. Toni Hagener		✓
Rep. Harriet Hayne	✓	
Rep. George Heavy Runner	✓	
Rep. Sam Kitzenberg	✓	
Rep. Bonnie Martinez	✓	
Rep. Gay Ann Masolo	✓	
Rep. Bill Rehbein	✓	
Rep. Susan Smith	✓	
Rep. Jay Stovall	✓	
Rep. Carolyn Squires	✓	✓
Rep. Lila Taylor	✓	
Rep. Joe Tropila		✓

Amendments to House Bill No. 91  
First Reading Copy

Requested by Rep. Rehbein  
For the Committee on House State Administration

Prepared by Sheri S. Heffelfinger  
January 10, 1995

1. Title, line 5.  
Strike: "48"  
Insert: "72"

2. Page 2, line 8.  
Strike: "48"  
Insert: "72"

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITORS REGISTER

State Administration

COMMITTEE

DATE 1-10-95

BILL NO. HB 87

SPONSOR(S) Grinde Foster

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME AND ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	Support	Oppose
ROBERT THROSSELL	MT Assoc. of Clerks & Rec		X
DOUG MITCHELL	SECRETARY OF STATE	INFORMATION ONLY	

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS  
ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

HR:1993

wp:visbcom.man

CS-14

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITORS REGISTER

*State Administration*

COMMITTEE

DATE *1-10-95*

BILL NO *HB 91*

SPONSOR(S) *M. Hanson*

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME AND ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	Support	Oppose

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS  
ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

HR:1993

wp:vissbcom.man

CS-14