

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
BUSINESS AND LABOR COMMITTEE  
MONTANA STATE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 23, 1985

The meeting of the Business and Labor Committee was called to order by Chairman Bob Pavlovich on January 23, 1985 at 8:30 a.m. in Room 312-2 of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All members were present.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 226: Representative Schultz made a motion that HB 226 DO PASS. Second was received and a roll call vote resulted in 11 members voting yes and 9 members voting no. HB 226 DO PASS.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 263: Representative Thomas motioned that HB 263 DO PASS. Representative Schultz felt that 30 days would be squeezing the school board. Representatives Bachini, Glaser and Thomas did agree. Representative Kadas moved that the 30 days on page 3, line 17 of the bill be stricken and 45 days inserted. The amendment did pass with all but Representative Driscoll voting yes. Representative Kadas moved that on page 4, line 8, a new subsection (6) should be inserted stating "unless otherwise agreed in the contract". Question being called for the amendment by Representative Kadas PASSED unanimously. Representative Thomas' motion that HB 263 DO PASS AS AMENDED was carried unanimously.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 264: Representative Kitselman made a motion that HB 264 DO PASS. Representative Kitselman moved the proposed amendments, attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Representative Schultz asked for a roll call vote. Representative Glaser asked what effect HB 264 would have on the U.S. Supreme Court Decision that stated that a contractor must have sufficient cash on hand to pay any sub-contractor, should he not get paid. Representative Glaser was concerned this might jeopardize a sub-contractor's present rights. Following discussion, it was decided that HB 264 deals with interest only. Question being called for amendments number one and two PASSED unanimously and number three PASSED with all but Representatives Ellerd and Schultz voting yes. Representative Kitselman's motion that HB 264 DO PASS AS AMENDED was carried, with all but Representatives Ellerd and Schultz voting yes.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 121: Representative Thomas moved that HB 121 be TABLED. Second was received and a unanimous vote was received.

HOUSE BILL 201: Hearing commenced on HB 201. Representative Jack Ramirez, District #87, sponsor of the bill, stated that this bill would change the liquor license quota law to allow residents of the area within five miles of the city limits to be included in the qualifying population for the number of licenses allowed in a city or town. The law now uses only the city population to calculate the number of licenses allowed in the extended area. The bill requires the University of Montana Bureau of Business and Economic Research to compile estimates of residents within five-mile zones after each decennial census and to provide each an estimate for the 1980 census by December 31, 1985.

Opponent Don Larsen, representing the Montana Tavern Association, supplied written testimony, which is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

Opponent Bob Durkee, representing the Montana Tavern Association, distributed to committee members Exhibit 3. He explained that Montana ranks 27th in the United States for consumption per capita, and ranks 7th for the number of potential customers per license. Montana presently has enough liquor licenses, added Mr. Durkee.

Mr. Howard Heffelfinger, Administrator of the Liquor Division stated that the department is neutral on HB 201.

In closing, Representative Ramirez stated that there is an inconsistency that exists and it must be addressed. This is not a Revenue Oversight Committee Bill, added Representative Ramirez.

Representative Simon asked Mr. Durkee if HB 201 does pass, if the figure on Table 53, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 would change. Mr. Durkee explained that the figure would change, but not dramatically. Patricia Roberts with the Department of Commerce explained that there can be 80% of the population in 20% of a geographical area. An Office Separation Procedure could be used in establishing the quotas. It is a very expensive process and is still a guess, but a very accurate guess. The cost of said procedure would be more than \$60,000.

Representative Jones asked Representative Ramirez to explain the purpose of HB 201. Representative Ramirez explained that there is an inconsistency in the present law, which resulted in people in certain areas not being counted and there is a shortage of licenses in Billings.

Representative McCormick asked Representative Ramirez if the passage of HB 201 would result in any present licensees losing their current licenses, to which the answer was no.

There being no further proponents or opponents, all were excused by the Chairman, and the hearing on HB 201 was closed.

HOUSE BILL 261: Hearing commenced on HB 261. Representative Bruce Simon, District #91, sponsor of the bill, explained that HB 261 would allow for transfers to any location in the state in any year of up to one percent of the all-beverage licenses that were in existence on January 1 of that year. Representative Simon stated that this would help alleviate the problem in the license quota system. Currently, some small towns are allocated more license quota system per population than some larger cities. There is not a need for additional licenses, the problem is with the distribution. In Billings there are 1,058 people per license and in Virginia City there are 50 people per license. The quota system is supposed to be population based. The transfer of 1% of all licenses per year, would mean approximately 14 licenses statewide that could transfer.

Proponent Dick Nelson, a restaurant owner in Billings and owner of a liquor license supported HB 261. He stated that the present system for obtaining a license is too expensive for new people to attain. In obtaining his license, Mr Nelson spent several thousand dollars and it was a very lengthy procedure. It is wrong to pay big money for a piece of paper. Mr. Nelson felt that it was his moral obligation to support HB 261 and by passing HB 261, the price of licenses will decrease.

Opponent Phil Strobe, an attorney and lobbyist for the Montana Tavern Association stated that HB 261 tinkers with the quota system. Mr. Strobe added that Mr. Nelson would have had the same legal fees in 1981

when he obtained his license, as he would have if HB 261 was in effect. Mr. Nelson's case was held up due to a dispute between a church and an applicant over a proximity issue. After the 1980 census, the quota system was modified in Billings in 1981. There were 19 new licenses in Billings due to the 1981 and 1983 legislature and the annexation that occurred in Billings in 1983. Shortly there will be two additional licenses allowed in Billings due to another annexation taking place. This will mean that Billings will have more than a 1/3 increase over a 13 month period. This is a realistic bill, but is being presented at the wrong time, added Mr. Strobe.

Opponent Roger Bell, part owner of Don Machos restaurant in Billings, stated that there has been an increase in the food business and a decrease in the liquor business. The liquor business is down 9% due to an increase in competition and to the more stringent DUI laws. In the Billings area, there are currently licenses for sale. Billings is not using the licenses they have and maybe the situation should be looked at in a few years, added Mr. Bell.

Opponent Johnny Uleston, a former tavern owner, sold his liquor license four months ago. He stated that there are currently nine liquor licenses available in Billings and five beer and wine licenses available with no takers. An approximate sum of \$500,000 is needed to open for business. Mr. Uleston added that his business suffered a 27% decrease in one year, prior to his selling.

Opponent Bob Blair, representing the Reno Club from Billings, stated that his business suffered a 20 - 30% loss last year. Mr. Blair closed with saying that "MADD, SADD and the FUZZ" are killing the tavern owners.

Opponent Ernie Grassisiki, a restaurant/tavern owner from Great Falls, stated that currently there are four licenses not being used in Great Falls. We should work towards building Montana and keep the present licenses where they are now and not move everything to Billings.

In closing, Representative Simon stressed that this is not a Billings bill. There are problems elsewhere and this bill was not designed to relieve the problems in Billings. The 19 new licenses in Billings as stated by Mr. Strobe is not true. There were 11 new licenses and eight licenses were added by expanding the boundaries

of the city of Billings. The hassle of obtaining a liquor license in the state of Montana does deter reputable, out of state firms from coming into the state. Representative Simon asked the committee if moving 14 licenses statewide would create such a large impact on the tavern industry.

Representative Ellerd asked Mr. Uleston the cost of the licenses that are presently available in Billings. Mr. Uleston stated that they are from \$120,000 to \$145,000. Representative Ellerd then asked what a new license issued by the state costs. For a new issuance the fee is \$20,000, explained Mr. Uleston.

Representative Driscoll submitted Exhibit 5, attached hereto.

There being no further discussion by proponents or opponents, all were excused by the chairman and the hearing on HB 261 was closed.

ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 127: Representative Bachini explained the proposed amendments to HB 127 that were suggested by the subcommittee. Representative Bachini moved that HB 127 DO PASS AS AMENDED. Representative Kadas proposed an amendment on page 12, line 19, which would allow for a written notification to be sent to the sheriff. Representative Schultz asked with the casual employment included, if the county would still be liable. It would depend on the individual circumstances. Representative Kadas added that the county or city will still carry a large amount of liability. Representative Glaser added that all reference to security alarm systems should be removed from HB 127. Mr. Clayton Bain and Sheriff Chuck O'Reilly did not object. Representative Brandewie made a substitute motion that House Bill 127 be held until HB 132 and 162 have been presented by the subcommittee. Representative Kadas suggested that perhaps a committee bill should be drafted, and that there is no reason for this bill to include the security alarm system industry. Question being called, Representative Brandewie's substitute motion that HB 127 be held resulted in 12 members voting no, 6 members voting yes and one abstaining. Representative Bachini's motion to move the amendments did PASS unanimously. Representative Kadas' amendment was included in the vote. Representative Glaser moved that all references to security alarm systems in HB 127 be stricken. Question being called for, Representative Glaser's move was PASSED unanimously. Representative Bachini's

Business and Labor Committee  
January 23, 1985  
Page 6

motion that HB 127 DO PASS AS AMENDED received 15 members voting yes, 4 voting no and 1 abstaining. HB 127 DOES PASS AS AMENDED.

ADJOURN: There being no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

  
BOB PAVLOVICH, Chairman

DAILY ROLL CALL  
 BUSINESS AND LABOR COMMITTEE

49th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1985

Date January 23, 1985

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Bob Pavlovich	✓		
Les Kitselman	✓		
Bob Bachini	✓		
Ray Brandewie	✓		
Jan Brown	✓		
Jerry Driscoll	✓		
Robert Ellerd	✓		
William Glaser	✓		
Stella Jean Hansen	✓		
Marjorie Hart	✓		
Ramona Howe	✓		
Tom Jones	✓		
Mike Kadas	✓		
Vernon Keller	✓		
Lloyd McCormich	✓		
Jerry Nisbet	✓		
James Schultz	✓		
Bruce Simon	✓		
Fred Thomas	✓		
Norm Wallin	✓		

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 23

19 85

MR. SPEAKER

We, your committee on BUSINESS AND LABOR

having had under consideration HOUSE Bill No. 226

FIRST reading copy ( WHITE )  
color

**ELIMINATING THE REQUIREMENT FOR A STORE LICENSE  
FROM DEPT. OF REVENUE**

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE Bill No. 226

DO PASS

*ga 1/23/85*

STATE PUB. CO.  
Helena, Mont.

Rep. Bob Pavlovich Chairman.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 23

19 85

MR. SPEAKER

We, your committee on BUSINESS AND LABOR

having had under consideration HOUSE Bill No. 254

FIRST reading copy ( WHITE )  
color

## REQUIRING BUILDING CONTRACTORS TO PROMPTLY PAY SUBCONTRACTORS, SUPPLIERS

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE Bill No. 254

### BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1) Title, line 7  
Following: "WITHIN"  
Strike: "21"  
Insert: "30"
- 2) Page 1, line 25  
Following: "within"  
Strike: "21"  
Insert: "30"
- 3) Page 2, lines 5, 6, and 7  
Strike: subsection (3) in its entirety

AND AS AMENDED,

DO PASS

Amendment  
House Bill 264 - Introduced Bill

1. Title, line 7.  
Following: "WITHIN"  
Strike: "21"  
Insert: "30"
2. Page 1, line 25.  
Following: "within"  
Strike: "21"  
Insert: "30"
3. Page 2, lines 5, 6, and 7.  
Strike: subsection (3) in its entirety

MONTANA



# Tavern Association

Affiliated and Associated with the NLBA and the LBI

STATE HEADQUARTERS / 9 EDWARDS / HELENA, MONTANA 59601

P.O. BOX 851 / PHONE 442-5040

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO HB201 BEFORE THE HOUSE BUSINESS & LABOR  
COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1985.

HB201 is another bill to break the backs of Montana tavern owners. It has a different title and a different number from those that have preceded it, and those that are yet to come this session, but what it does is not new or original. It's just that this time the proponents are taking an awfully long and costly way around trying to come into some liquor licenses without going into the market to buy them...all at the expense of existing licensees who seem to be expendable in the minds of persistent proponents of breaking the quota system by one means or another.

The Montana Tavern Association has gone along with modifications to the quota system, namely with floater licenses, in order to provide some flexibility in permitting additional licenses in those areas that have experienced a growth because of population shifts. But these modifications have never been allowed a sufficient period of time to be fairly tested because every session brings on another host of bills whose real intent is to weaken and eventually abolish the quota system which is the guarantee of the control that is so essential to the protection of ALL citizens of this state with respect to the products we sell.

The quota system is not the design of tavern owners. It was conceived by the legislature and we have lived with it, invested millions of dollars in our establishments that house our licenses, because we had faith in the integrity of the system designed by

the state in which we choose to conduct our businesses.

The method proposed by HB201 to increase the numbers of licenses within incorporated cities has got to be cumbersome and costly. Not only in dollars from the state coffers to get the work done, but costly to the tavern owners who again, if this bill is approved, must wait out another series of experiments on the businesses that provide their livelihood and that of the thousands of people they employ.

At a time when not only Montana but the entire nation is experiencing concentrated movements by the public to control consumption of alcohol, a bill such as HB201 flies in the face of these clear public mandates. The state of Montana as well as our industry are seeing the graphic effects of these movements. State revenues from beverage alcohol have declined and where only a year ago retailers bought over 56% of total liquor sold by the state, we are now, according to department of revenue figures, purchasing only slightly over 50%. This dramatic drop in a short period of time is the best illustration of the change in drinking habits and the economic condition of Montana liquor retailers. There are only so many people in Montana to drink only so much liquor. They cannot be force-fed.

A bill such as HB201, which adds more licenses to an already depressed industry, is dangerous. It fosters an unhealthy business climate in a sector of the business community that should never be allowed to become marginal because of the very nature of the products it sells. The citizens of this state deserve to have prudent management of beverage alcohol. Any weakening of a controlled system at this or any time is not in the interests of the citizens of this state.

We ask that you do not pass HB201.

MONTANA TAVERN ASSOCIATION  
7 Edwards, P. O. Box 851  
Helena, Montana 59624

Exhibit 3  
House Bill 201  
January 25, 1985  
Submitted by:  
Bob Durkee

MONTANA



# Tavern Association

Affiliated and Associated with the NLBA and the LBI

STATE HEADQUARTERS / 9 EDWARDS / HELENA, MONTANA 59601

P.O. BOX 851 / PHONE 442-5040

## NEW YORK STATE:

1964	4,200 package store licenses at the time freeze was removed.
1965	5,600 licenses
1966	6,200 licenses
1984	3,900 licenses

Source: Ralph Levine, National Director, W.L.S.A.,  
Metropolitan Package Store Association, New York City

Table 39. Apparent Consumption of Distilled Spirits, by State, Total and Per Capita, 1982 and 1983

Population <sup>c</sup> July 1, 1983 (000)	Percentage of Total Population	Percentage of U.S. Total Consumption		License States <sup>a</sup>	Rank		Consumption by State			Consumption Per Capita			
		1983	1982		1983	1982	Change	Wine Gallons		Rank			
								1983	1982	1983	1982		
479	0.20	0.34	0.31	*Alaska	45	47	1,470	1,378	6.7	3.07	3.15	4	4
1	1.27	1.31	1.30	Arizona	25	25	5,648	5,697	-0.9	1.91	1.99	25	22
3	0.99	0.65	0.63	Arkansas	36	36	2,800	2,738	2.3	1.20	1.19	49	49
25,174	10.76	12.53	12.44	California	1	1	54,026	54,464	-0.8	2.15	2.20	14	14
3,139	1.34	1.57	1.58	Colorado	21	21	6,766	6,905	-2.0	2.16	2.27	13	11
3,138	1.34	1.79	1.73	Connecticut	19	20	7,733	7,569	2.2	2.46	2.40	7	10
606	0.26	0.37	0.35	Delaware	43	43	1,594	1,552	2.7	2.63	2.58	5	5
623	0.27	0.82	0.80	Dist. of Columbia	34	34	3,556	3,503	1.5	5.71	5.55	1	1
10,680	4.56	6.14	6.00	Florida	3	3	26,478	26,264	0.8	2.48	2.52	6	6
5,732	2.45	2.65	2.51	*Georgia	11	11	11,416	10,977	4.0	1.99	1.95	20	24
1,023	0.44	0.51	0.49	Hawaii	40	40	2,180	2,155	1.2	2.13	2.17	16	16
11,486	4.91	5.22	5.35	Illinois	5	5	22,514	23,404	-3.8	1.96	2.04	23	21
5,479	2.34	1.77	1.80	Indiana	20	19	7,616	7,898	-3.6	1.39	1.44	39	39
2,425	1.04	0.69	0.71	Kansas	35	35	2,982	3,109	-4.1	1.23	1.29	48	45
3,714	1.59	1.19	1.21	Kentucky	27	27	5,142	5,283	-2.7	1.38	1.44	40	40
4,438	1.90	1.81	1.84	Louisiana	17	18	7,813	8,058	-3.0	1.76	1.85	30	29
4,304	1.84	2.37	2.40	Maryland	13	12	10,238	10,516	-2.7	2.38	2.47	9	7
5,767	2.46	3.24	3.23	Massachusetts	9	9	13,964	14,121	-1.1	2.42	2.44	8	8
4,144	1.77	2.03	2.01	Minnesota	16	16	8,744	8,797	-0.6	2.11	2.13	17	18
4,970	2.12	1.47	1.43	*Missouri	22	23	6,321	6,258	1.0	1.27	1.26	45	46
1,597	0.68	0.56	0.58	Nebraska	37	37	2,409	2,523	-4.5	1.51	1.59	35	34
891	0.38	0.99	0.98	Nevada	31	31	4,263	4,288	-0.6	4.78	4.87	2	2
7,468	3.19	3.88	3.80	New Jersey	7	7	16,747	16,643	0.6	2.24	2.24	11	12
1,399	0.60	0.54	0.49	New Mexico	38	39	2,317	2,159	7.3	1.66	1.59	31	35
17,667	7.55	8.44	8.66	New York	2	2	36,389	37,897	-4.0	2.06	2.15	18	17
680	0.29	0.31	0.33	North Dakota	47	46	1,347	1,424	-5.4	1.98	2.13	22	19
3,298	1.41	1.12	1.15	Oklahoma	28	28	4,831	5,041	-4.2	1.46	1.59	38	36
955	0.41	0.47	0.45	Rhode Island	41	42	2,036	1,988	2.4	2.13	2.07	15	20
3,264	1.39	1.46	1.38	*South Carolina	24	24	6,275	6,057	3.6	1.92	1.89	24	27
700	0.30	0.29	0.29	*South Dakota	49	49	1,252	1,267	-1.2	1.79	1.83	29	30
4,685	2.00	1.46	1.43	Tennessee	23	22	6,286	6,274	0.2	1.34	1.35	42	44
15,724	6.72	5.41	5.48	Texas	4	4	23,342	23,987	-2.7	1.48	1.57	36	37
4,751	2.03	2.39	2.40	**Wisconsin	12	13	10,302	10,483	-1.7	2.17	2.20	12	15
<b>165,691</b>	<b>70.81</b>	<b>75.80</b>	<b>75.56</b>	<b>Subtotal License States</b>			<b>326,801</b>	<b>330,677</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
				<b>Control States<sup>b</sup></b>									
479	1.69	1.25	1.24	Alabama	26	26	5,400	5,413	-0.2	1.36	1.37	41	42
1	0.42	0.30	0.31	Idaho	48	48	1,281	1,357	-5.6	1.29	1.41	44	41
2,305	1.24	0.83	0.83	Iowa	33	33	3,576	3,646	-1.9	1.23	1.26	47	48
1,146	0.49	0.53	0.51	Maine	39	38	2,277	2,235	1.9	1.99	1.97	21	23
9,069	3.88	3.92	3.92	Michigan	6	6	16,882	17,148	-1.6	1.86	1.88	26	28
2,587	1.11	0.88	0.88	**Mississippi	32	32	3,800	3,843	-1.1	1.47	1.51	37	38
817	0.35	0.35	0.35	Montana	44	44	1,520	1,546	-1.7	1.86	1.93	27	25
959	0.41	1.02	0.99	New Hampshire	29	30	4,405	4,328	1.8	4.59	4.55	3	3
6,082	2.60	2.20	2.26	North Carolina	14	14	9,489	9,875	-3.9	1.56	1.64	34	33
10,746	4.59	3.12	3.11	Ohio	10	10	13,433	13,627	-1.4	1.25	1.26	46	47
2,662	1.14	1.01	1.03	Oregon	30	29	4,372	4,492	-2.7	1.64	1.70	32	32
11,895	5.08	3.64	3.69	Pennsylvania	8	8	15,714	16,165	-2.8	1.32	1.36	43	43
1,619	0.69	0.31	0.33	Utah	46	45	1,358	1,434	-5.3	0.84	0.92	51	51
525	0.22	0.28	0.28	Vermont	50	50	1,215	1,243	-2.3	2.31	2.41	10	9
5,550	2.37	2.08	2.13	Virginia	15	15	8,980	9,344	-3.9	1.62	1.70	33	31
4,300	1.84	1.81	1.86	Washington	18	17	7,784	8,125	-4.2	1.81	1.91	28	26
1,965	0.84	0.42	0.47	West Virginia	42	41	1,820	2,049	-11.2	0.93	1.05	50	50
514	0.22	0.24	0.25	**Wyoming	51	51	1,025	1,113	-7.9	1.99	2.22	19	13
<b>68,289</b>	<b>29.19</b>	<b>24.20</b>	<b>24.44</b>	<b>Subtotal Control States</b>			<b>104,331</b>	<b>106,982</b>	<b>-2.5</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>1.57</b>		
<b>233,981</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>Total United States</b>			<b>431,132</b>	<b>437,659</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>1.89</b>		

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to total. Percentages were calculated before rounding.

<sup>a</sup>License States: \*Based on shipments from distillers to wholesalers.

\*\*Based on shipments from wholesalers to retailers and other outlets.

<sup>b</sup>Control States: All control state data except Mississippi and Wyoming are retail sales by state liquor stores. Mississippi and Wyoming data represent wholesale sales from state controlled warehouses to private retail establishments.

<sup>c</sup>Resident population.

Sources: Distilled Spirits Council of the United States Inc; Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce. (See Table 36 for details.)

**Table 53. Number of Retail Outlets or Licenses Issued for the Sale of Distilled Spirits, Number of Outlets/Licenses per 1,000 Population, and Number of Persons per Outlet/License, 1983**

State	Number of Outlets/Licenses				Total Population July 1, 1983 (000)	Number of Outlets/Licenses per 1,000 Population				Number of Persons per Outlet/License			
	On-Premise	Off-Premise	On-and-Off-Premise	Total Licenses		On-Premise	Off-Premise	On-and-Off-Premise	Total Licenses	On-Premise	Off-Premise	On-and-Off-Premise	Total Licenses
<b>LICENSE STATES</b>													
Alaska	801	463	—	1,264	479	1.67	0.97	—	2.64	598	1,035	—	379
Arizona	1,351	1,412	1,541	4,304	2,963	0.46	0.48	0.52	1.45	2,193	2,098	1,923	688
Arkansas	591	682	—	1,273	2,328	0.25	0.29	—	0.55	3,940	3,414	—	1,829
California	14,581	11,501	—	26,082	25,174	0.58	0.46	—	1.04	1,727	2,189	—	966
Colorado*	3,687	1,373	—	5,060	3,139	1.17	0.44	—	1.61	851	2,286	—	620
Connecticut	3,436	1,810	—	5,246	3,138	1.09	0.58	—	1.67	914	1,734	—	599
Delaware	443	290	181	914	606	0.73	0.48	0.30	1.51	1,368	2,090	3,349	664
District of Columbia	746	340	—	1,086	623	1.20	0.55	—	1.74	836	1,833	—	574
Florida	1,299	677	6,298	8,274	10,680	0.12	0.06	0.59	0.77	8,222	15,776	1,696	1,291
Georgia	1,905	1,669	—	3,574	5,732	0.33	0.29	—	0.62	3,009	3,435	—	1,604
Hawaii	1,070	781	—	1,851	1,023	1.05	0.76	—	1.81	957	1,310	—	553
Illinois	—	—	17,783	17,783	11,486	—	—	1.55	1.55	—	—	646	646
Indiana	1,147	1,695	3,739	6,581	5,479	0.21	0.31	0.68	1.20	4,777	3,233	1,466	833
Kansas	1,220	1,085	—	2,305	2,425	0.50	0.48	—	0.95	1,988	2,236	—	1,053
Kentucky	1,260	944	84	2,288	3,714	0.34	0.25	0.02	0.62	2,948	3,935	44,215	1,624
Louisiana	6,902	2,950	—	9,852	4,438	1.56	0.66	—	2.22	644	1,505	—	451
Maryland	556	1,026	3,217	4,799	4,304	0.13	0.24	0.75	1.12	7,742	4,195	1,338	897
Massachusetts	6,210	1,799	—	8,009	5,767	1.08	0.31	—	1.39	929	3,206	—	721
Minnesota*	2,375	700	1,112	4,187	4,144	0.57	0.17	0.27	1.01	1,745	5,920	3,727	990
Missouri	—	4,416	3,846	8,262	4,970	—	0.89	0.77	1.66	—	1,125	1,292	602
Nebraska	452	585	2,031	3,068	1,597	0.28	0.37	1.27	1.92	3,534	2,730	787	521
Nevada	780	530	922	2,232	891	0.88	0.59	1.03	2.50	1,142	1,681	966	399
New Jersey	1,535	1,939	8,012	11,486	7,468	0.21	0.26	1.07	1.54	4,866	3,852	933	651
New Mexico	273	79	1,264	1,616	1,399	0.20	0.06	0.90	1.16	5,125	17,709	1,106	866
New York**	23,672	4,098	1,075	27,770	17,667	1.34	0.23	—	1.57	746	4,311	—	636
North Dakota	110	95	—	1,280	680	0.16	0.14	1.58	1.88	6,182	7,158	633	532
Oklahoma	—	846	—	846	3,298	—	0.26	—	0.26	—	3,899	—	3,899
Rhode Island	1,449	308	—	1,757	955	1.52	0.32	—	1.84	660	3,101	—	544
South Carolina	1,571	1,196	—	2,767	3,264	0.48	0.37	—	0.85	2,078	2,730	—	1,180
South Dakota	958	615	—	1,573	700	1.37	0.88	—	2.25	731	1,139	—	446
Tennessee	1,045	586	—	1,631	4,685	0.22	0.13	—	0.35	4,484	7,995	—	2,873
Texas	8,213	3,474	—	11,687	15,724	0.52	0.22	—	0.74	1,915	4,527	—	1,346
Wisconsin	12,706	1,793	—	14,499	4,751	2.67	0.38	—	3.05	374	2,650	—	328
<b>Subtotal License States</b>	<b>102,344</b>	<b>51,757</b>	<b>51,105</b>	<b>205,206</b>	<b>165,691</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1,619</b>	<b>3,201</b>	<b>3,242</b>	<b>807</b>
<b>CONTROL STATES</b>													
Alabama	1,673	140	752	2,565	3,959	0.42	0.04	0.19	0.65	2,367	28,279	5,265	1,544
Idaho	924	132	—	1,056	989	0.93	0.13	—	1.07	1,071	7,493	—	937
Iowa	4,598	214	—	4,812	2,905	1.58	0.07	—	1.66	632	13,575	—	604
Maine	1,211	132	—	1,343	1,146	1.06	0.12	—	1.17	947	8,682	—	854
Michigan	9,335	3,942	—	13,277	9,069	1.03	0.43	—	1.46	972	2,301	—	684
Mississippi	593	667	—	1,260	2,587	0.23	0.26	—	0.49	4,363	3,879	—	2,054
Montana	—	141	1,557	1,698	817	—	0.17	1.91	2.08	—	5,795	525	482
New Hampshire	1,491	71	—	1,562	959	1.55	0.07	—	1.63	643	13,507	—	614
North Carolina	1,216	368	—	1,584	6,082	0.20	0.06	—	0.26	5,002	16,528	—	3,840
Ohio	11,834	426	—	12,260	10,746	1.10	0.04	—	1.14	909	25,226	—	877
Oregon	1,569	231	—	1,800	2,662	0.59	0.09	—	0.68	1,697	11,524	—	1,479
Pennsylvania	19,010	713	—	19,723	11,895	1.60	0.06	—	1.66	626	16,684	—	604
Utah	159	168	118	445	1,619	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.27	10,183	9,637	13,721	3,639
Vermont	1,108	65	—	1,173	525	2.11	0.12	—	2.23	474	8,077	—	448
Virginia	1,960	236	—	2,196	5,550	0.35	0.04	—	0.40	2,832	23,517	—	2,528
Washington*	2,481	376	—	2,857	4,300	0.58	0.09	—	0.66	1,733	11,436	—	1,505
West Virginia	1,276	158	—	1,434	1,965	0.65	0.08	—	0.73	1,540	12,437	—	1,371
Wyoming	654	96	180	930	514	1.27	0.19	0.35	1.81	786	5,355	2,856	553
<b>Subtotal Control States</b>	<b>61,092</b>	<b>8,276</b>	<b>2,607</b>	<b>71,975</b>	<b>68,289</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1,118</b>	<b>8,251</b>	<b>26,194</b>	<b>949</b>
<b>TOTAL UNITED STATES</b>	<b>163,436</b>	<b>60,033</b>	<b>53,712</b>	<b>277,181</b>	<b>233,981</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>1,432</b>	<b>3,898</b>	<b>4,356</b>	<b>844</b>

NOTE: Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

\*Colorado, Minnesota, and Washington outlet data are for 1982

\*\*New York outlet data are for 1981.

Submitted by:  
Representative Bruce Simon

1 as follows:

2 (a) in incorporated towns of 500 inhabitants or less  
3 and within a distance of 5 miles from the corporate limits  
4 of such towns, not more than two retail tavern all-beverages  
5 licenses;

6 (b) in incorporated cities or incorporated towns of  
7 more than 500 inhabitants and not over 3,000 inhabitants and  
8 within a distance of 5 miles from the corporate limits of  
9 such cities and towns, three retail tavern all-beverages  
10 licenses for the first 1,000 inhabitants and one retail  
11 tavern all-beverages license for each additional 1,000  
12 inhabitants;

13 (c) in incorporated cities of over 3,000 inhabitants  
14 and within a distance of 5 miles from the corporate limits  
15 thereof, five retail tavern all-beverages licenses for the  
16 first 3,000 inhabitants and one retail tavern all-beverages  
17 license for each additional 1,500 inhabitants.

18 (2) The number of the inhabitants in such cities and  
19 towns, exclusive of the number of inhabitants residing  
20 within a distance of 5 miles from the corporate limits  
21 thereof, shall govern the number of retail tavern  
22 all-beverages licenses that may be issued for use within  
23 such cities and towns and within a distance of 5 miles from  
24 the corporate limits thereof. If two or more incorporated  
25 municipalities are situated within a distance of 5 miles



REVISED DATED:

JANUARY 22, 1985

QUOTA AREA	1982 CENSUS		QUOTA LIQUOR		PENDING LICENSES		NEW LICENSES APPLICATIONS		PENDING FLOATERS		QUOTA LIQUOR		BEER ISSUED		PENDING BEER APPLICATION		NEW CENSUS/ LIQUOR ISSUES	
	LIQUOR	ISSUED	LIQUOR	ISSUED	STATUS	PENDING	ISSUES	125X	OUT	133X	IN	BEER	ISSUED	STATUS	BEER	PENDING	LIQUOR	ISSUES
15 LAKE CO	14,007	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	778
POLSON	2,897	4	9	(5)	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	322
RONAN	1,571	3	7	(4)	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	224
ST. IGNATIUS	878	2	6	(4)	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	146
16 DANSON CO	5,817	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,817
RICHEY	396	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	396
BLENDIVE	6,526	7	10	(3)	2	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	653
17 ROOSEVELT CO	4,999	6	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,500
WOLF POINT	3,177	5	8	(3)	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	397
BAINVILLE	261	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	131
BROCKTON	392	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	392
CULBERTSON	1,057	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	352
FROID	383	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	192
POPLAR	1,006	3	5	(2)	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	201
18 BEAVERHEAD CO	4,055	5	14	(9)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	290
DILLON	4,167	5	14	(9)	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	298
LIMA	300	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	150
19 CHOUTEAU CO	3,376	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	844
FORT BENTON	1,690	3	6	(3)	3	3	0	3	0	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	282
SERADINE	286	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	143
816 SANDY	787	2	4	(2)	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	197
20 VALLEY CO	4,915	6	9	(3)	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
BLASSON	4,303	5	11	(6)	5	5	0	6	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	391
NASHUA	551	2	3	(1)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	184
OPETH	180	2	3	(1)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	60
21 TUDLE CO	1,813	2	9	(7)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201
KEVIN	230	2	3	(1)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	77
SHELBY	3,103	5	10	(5)	4	4	0	6	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	310
SUNBURST	506	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	253
22 816 HORN CO	7,388	9	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,463
HARDIN	3,446	5	11	(6)	5	5	0	6	0	0	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	313
LODGE GRASS	560	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
23 MUSSELSHELL CO	2,116	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,116
MELSTONE	263	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	132
ROUNDUP	2,261	4	14	(10)	9	0	0	4	0	0	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	162
24 BLAINE CO	4,347	5	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
CHINOOK	1,574	3	7	(4)	4	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	225
HARLEM	991	2	3	(1)	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	330
25 RADISON	3,773	5	13	(8)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	290
ENNIS	667	2	4	(2)	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	172
SHERIDAN	640	2	4	(2)	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	160
TWIN BRIDGES	449	2	3	(1)	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	150
VIRGINIA CITY	192	2	4	(2)	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	50
26 PONDERA CO.	3,143	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	786
CONRAD	3,048	5	6	(1)	0	0	1	6	0	0	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	508
VALIER	657	2	3	(1)	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	219
27 RICHLAND CO	6,167	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,542
FAIRVIEW	1,565	3	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	522
SIDNEY	7,200	7	9	(2)	1	1	1	7	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	800
28 PONELL CO	2,757	3	9	(6)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306
DEER LODGE	3,978	5	8	(3)	2	0	0	6	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	497
29 ROSEBUD CO	9,433	12	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,048
FORSYTH	2,737	4	10	(6)	5	0	0	4	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	274

REVISED DATED:

JANUARY 22, 1985

1982 CENSUS LIQUOR QUOTA LIQUOR ISSUED LICENSE STATUS PENDING LICENSE APPLICATIONS NEW PENDING BEER APPLICATIONS BEER ISSUED STATUS BEER APPLICATIONS BEER ISSUED STATUS

QUOTA AREA	1982 CENSUS	LIQUOR QUOTA	LIQUOR ISSUED	LICENSE STATUS	PENDING LICENSE APPLICATIONS	NEW PENDING BEER APPLICATIONS	BEER ISSUED	STATUS	BEER APPLICATIONS	BEER ISSUED	STATUS	PENDING BEER APPLICATIONS	NEW CENSUS/ LIQUOR ISSUES
30 DEER LOD/AMACONDA	11,583	15	39	(24)			0	0	0	0	0	0	277
31 TETON	3,636	4	6	(2)			1	0	0	0	0	0	666
CHOTEAU	1,753	3	4	(1)			0	0	3	0	0	0	438
DUTTON	366	2	2				0	0	1	0	1	0	183
FAIRFIELD	642	2	3	(1)			1	0	1	0	1	0	214
32 STILLWATER CO	4,317	5	9	(4)			3	0	0	0	0	0	480
COLUMBUS	1,465	3	3	0			0	0	2	0	0	0	468
33 TREASURE CO	537	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HVSHAM	483	2	2	0			0	0	1	0	1	0	242
34 SHERIDAN	2,301	3	4	(1)			1	0	0	0	0	0	575
MEDICINE LAKE	487	2	2	0			0	0	1	0	0	0	244
OUTLOOK	127	2	1	1			0	0	1	0	0	0	127
PLENTYWOOD	2,734	4	6	(2)			1	0	4	0	4	0	456
WESTBY	351	2	2	0			0	0	1	0	1	0	176
35 SANDERS CO	5,744	7	10	(3)			2	0	0	0	0	0	574
HOT SPRINGS	588	2	3	(1)			1	0	1	0	1	0	196
PLAINS	1,135	3	3	0			0	0	2	0	2	0	378
THOMPSON FALLS	1,538	3	3	0			0	0	1	3	2	1	513
36 JUDITH BASIN CO	1,812	2	5	(3)			3	0	0	0	0	0	362
HOBSON	260	2	2	0			0	0	1	1	0	0	130
STANFORD	581	2	3	(1)			1	0	1	1	0	0	194
37 DANIELS CO	1,341	1	3	(2)			2	0	0	0	0	0	447
FLAYVILLE	135	2	2	0			0	0	1	1	0	0	69
SCODEY	1,324	3	6	(3)			3	0	2	1	1	1	221
38 GLACIER	5,897	7	8	(1)			0	0	0	0	0	0	737
BROWNING	1,255	3	4	(1)			1	0	2	1	1	1	314
CUTBANK	3,875	5	11	(6)			5	0	6	3	3	3	352
39 FALLON CO	1,232	1	1	0			0	0	1	0	0	0	1,232
BAKER	2,379	4	6	(2)			1	0	4	2	2	2	397
PLEVNA	168	2	2	0			0	0	1	1	0	1	84
40 SWEETGRASS CO	1,519	2	2	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	760
816 TIMBER	1,767	3	6	(3)			3	0	3	3	0	0	295
41 MCCONE CO	1,779	2	4	(2)			2	0	0	0	0	0	445
CIRCLE	989	2	4	(2)			2	0	1	1	0	0	247
42 CARTER CO	1,121	1	2	(1)			1	0	0	0	0	0	561
EKALAKA	555	2	4	(2)			2	0	1	0	1	0	149
43 BROADWATER CO	1,644	2	5	(3)			3	0	0	0	0	0	329
TOWNSEND	1,641	3	5	(2)			2	0	3	2	1	1	328
44 WHEATLAND CO	992	1	2	(1)			1	0	0	0	0	0	496
HARLINGTON	1,070	3	5	(2)			2	0	2	3	(1)	0	214
JUDITH GAP	198	2	2	0			0	0	1	0	1	0	99
45 PRAIRIE CO	922	1	2	(1)			1	0	0	0	0	0	461
TERRY	981	2	3	(1)			1	0	1	0	1	0	327
46 GRANITE CO	1,051	1	4	(3)			3	0	0	0	0	0	263
DRUMMOND	440	2	4	(2)			2	0	2	0	2	0	110
PHILIPSBURG	1,153	3	6	(3)			3	0	2	0	2	0	192
47 MEAGHER CO	849	1	5	(4)			4	0	0	0	0	0	170
H. S. SPRINGS	1,287	3	7	(4)			4	0	2	0	2	0	198
48 LIBERTY CO	1,392	1	1	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	1,392
CHESTER	1,020	3	5	(2)			2	0	2	0	2	0	204
49 PARK CO	5,863	7	15	(8)			7	0	0	0	0	0	391
CLYDE PARK	265	2	2	0			0	0	1	1	0	1	133
LIVINGSTON	7,168	7	19	(12)			11	0	7	4	3	3	377

REVISED DATED:

JANUARY 22, 1985

QUOTA AREA	1982 CENSUS		QUOTA LIQUOR		PENDING LICENSES		NEW APPLICATIONS		PENDING FLOATERS		IN FLOATERS		BEER ISSUED		PENDING BEER		NEW CENSUS/ LIQUOR	
	1,217	455	1	2	ISSUED	STATUS	PENDING	ISSUED	125%	133%	QUOTA BEER	BEER ISSUED	STATUS	BEER APPLICATION	BEER APPLICATION	ISSUES	ISSUES	
50 GARFIELD CO	1,217	455	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,217	455
JORDAN					3	(1)			1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1		
51 JEFFERSON CO	4,699	1,498	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,699	1,498
BOULDER					4	(1)			1	0	2	1	1	1	1	1		
WHITEHALL	1,080	741	3	5	5	(2)	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	1,080	741
52 WISLAUX CO	741	831	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	741	831
WIRBAUX					5	(3)			3	0	1	1	1	0	1	1		
53 GOLDEN VALLEY CO	630	172	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630	172
LAVINA					2	0			0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		
RYEGATE	280	2,211	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	280	2,211
54 MINERAL	2,211	328	2	10	10	(8)	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,211	328
ALBERTON					2	0			0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		
SUPERIOR	992	450	2	4	4	(2)	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	992	450
55 PETROLEUM CO	450	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450	216
MINNETT					1	1			0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1		
56 LINCOLN CO	12,995	1,304	17	17	17	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,995	1,304
EUREKA/REXFORD					5	(2)			2	0	2	2	2	0	2	2		
LIBBY	2,601	1,114	4	6	6	(2)	0	0	1	0	4	6	6	0	6	6	2,601	1,114
TROY					6	(3)			3	0	2	2	2	0	2	2		
	804,235	1,021	1,422	1,422	(414)	0	0	2	2	11	2	420	74	404	291	113	804,235	1,021

Mr. R. Peyton Hovey  
Chelsea Cellar 301, Limited  
d/b/a CELLAR 301 RESTAURANT  
Post Office Box # 301  
Billings, Montana 59103-0301  
Telephone (406) 256-5301

19 January 1985

Business & Labor Committee  
House of Representatives  
State of Montana  
Helena, Montana


Gentlemen:

I am writing to ask for your favorable consideration on House Bill # 261. I now have all beverage license # 03-101-9563-010 in my possession which was finally awarded after a personally expensive three year ordeal.

With the 'Build Montana' program in mind it seems to be a propitious time to correct this archaic licensing system. I can write with knowledge that my personal involvement did cost both myself and the State of Montana needless legal and administrative expense. Unquestionably, House Bill # ~~216~~ 261 would cut unnecessary administrative & legal cost for both state government and private investors. This bill would give back to the people the power to decide where and when public convenience is necessary. And would give to the state a more equitable balance in distribution of location of all beverage licenses. This would be especially favorable for the state in as much as it would not place the state in an unfortunate position of judgements in which neither they or private citizens should be placed in.

My personal feeling is that this process would be very slow in movement, however, perhaps this is wise. Please vote for House Bill # 261. Thank you.

Sincerely,

  
R. Peyton Hovey



CITY OF BILLINGS  
POLICE DEPARTMENT

P.O. BOX 1554  
BILLINGS, MT 59103

Exhibit 5  
House Bill 261  
January 23, 1985  
Submitted by:  
Representative  
Driscoll

January 21, 1985

Senator Tom Towe  
Chairman  
Taxation Committee  
Helena, Montana

Dear Senator Towe:


It is my understanding that your committee will be discussing the merits of additional liquor licenses for cities and counties. As a law enforcement administrator I have concerns with additional licenses, particularly in the Billings area.

Earlier this year, Sheriff Schafer and I met with the local tavern owners on the issue of an additional tax on alcohol to support jail construction and operation. In that meeting, the owners expressed their concerns as to how their revenues had dropped; and to have an additional tax, would set them back further.

Coupled with what the tavern owners were saying, and the strong possibility of the 21 year drinking age becoming a reality, of which I support, it would seem to me that additional liquor licenses would be detrimental to this industry. Also, I think there would be the temptation, on the part of some owners, to sell to illegal ages in order to survive.

I would recommend that the additional licenses not be issued.

Sincerely,

  
ELLIS E. KISER  
Chief of Police

EEK/pmd

# County of Yellowstone



OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

Mike Schafer, Sheriff

P.O. BOX 35017  
BILLINGS, MONTANA 59107

January 17, 1985

Taxation Committee  
State Capitol  
Helena, Montana 59620

Dear Sirs:

I have been advised that there is a bill before the Legislature to increase the number of liquor licenses in Yellowstone County/City of Billings. I am not familiar with the process to issue more licenses in this area; however, I would like to go on record as opposing more licenses for this region.

Based upon our population, I feel that we have a sufficient number of establishments that serve liquor to meet the demands of our population.

Sincerely,

MIKE SCHAFFER, SHERIFF

YELLOWSTONE COUNTY

MS/lr

ROLL CALL VOTE

HOUSE COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND LABOR

DATE Jan 23, 1985 BILL NO. 226 TIME \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	AYE	NAY
Bob Pavlovich		✓
Les Kitseiman	✓	
Bob Bachini		✓
Ray Brandewie	✓	
Jan Brown	✓	
Jerry Driscoll		✓
Robert Ellerd	✓	
William Glaser	✓	
Stella Jean Hansen		✓
Marjorie Hart		✓
Ramona Howe		✓
Tom Jones	✓	
Mike Kadas		✓
Vernon Keller	✓	
Lloyd McCormick		✓
Jerry Nisbet		✓
James Schultz	✓	
Bruce Simon	✓	
Fred Thomas	✓	
Norm Wallin	✓	

Secretary Debbie Aquil

Chairman Bob Pavlovich

Motion: DO PASS

---



---



---



---

ROLL CALL VOTE

HOUSE COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND LABOR

DATE 1-23-85 BILL NO. 127 TIME 11:20

NAME	AYE	NAY
Bob Pavlovich		✓
Les Kitzelman	✓	
Bob Bachini		✓
Ray Brandewie	✓	
Jan Brown	✓	
Jerry Driscoll		✓
Robert Ellerd		✓
William Glaser	ABSTAIN	
Stella Jean Hansen		✓
Marjorie Hart		✓
Ramona Howe		
Tom Jones		✓
Mike Kadas		✓
Vernon Keller	✓	
Lloyd McCormick		✓
Jerry Nisbet		✓
James Schultz	✓	
Bruce Simon		✓
Fred Thomas		✓
Norm Wallin	✓	

Secretary Debbie Aquil

Chairman Bob Pavlovich

Motion: Brandewie motion to hold bill until 142 + 132  
have been presented by sub-comm.

---



---



---



---

ROLL CALL VOTE

HOUSE COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND LABOR

DATE 1-23-85 BILL NO. 127 TIME \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	AYE	NAY
Bob Pavlovich		✓
Les Kitselman		✓
Bob Bachini	✓	
Ray Brandewie	✓	
Jan Brown	✓	
Jerry Driscoll	✓	
Robert Ellerd	abstain	
William Glaser	✓	
Stella Jean Hansen	✓	
Marjorie Hart	✓	
Ramona Howe	✓	
Tom Jones	✓	
Mike Kadas	✓	
Vernon Keller	✓	
Lloyd McCormick	✓	
Jerry Nisbet	✓	
James Schultz		✓
Bruce Simon	✓	
Fred Thomas		✓
Norm Wallin	✓	

Secretary Debbie Aqul

Chairman Bob Pavlovich

Motion: Do Pass As Amended

VISITOR'S REGISTER

HOUSE BUSINESS AND LABOR COMMITTEE

BILL House Bill 201

DATE January 23, 1985

SPONSOR Representative Ramirez

NAME	RESIDENCE	REPRESENTING	SUP- PORT	OP- POSE
Patricia Roberts	Helena	Dept of Commerce	at request of Committee	
Johnny Helton	Billings	M.T.A.		X
Bob Dean	Billings	M.T.A.		X
Dick Lane	Laurel	M.T.A.		X
Frank Brown	Blair	M.T.A.		X
A. Bellumini	Blair	M.T.A.		X
DOUGLAS L. MARTIN	BILLINGS	M.T.A.		X
Byron Epcow	MALTA	M.T.A.		X
John W. Harper	Bozeman	Gallatin Co. Tavern M.T.A.		X
W. W. Lamm	Helena	M.T.A.		X
Bob Durkee	"	M.T.A.		X

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

WHEN TESTIFYING PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITOR'S REGISTER

HOUSE BUSINESS AND LABOR COMMITTEE

BILL House Bill 261

DATE January 23, 1985

SPONSOR Representative Simon

NAME	RESIDENCE	REPRESENTING	SUP- PORT	OP- POSE
<i>John W. Hansen</i>	<i>Bozeman</i>	<i>GCTA MFA</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>El Hassan</i>	<i>Black Eagle</i>	<i>CLTA MFA Barries</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Mare Brandt</i>	<i>Glasgow</i>	<i>Samm's Supper Club</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>DOUGLAS L. MARTIN</i>	<i>BLNGS</i>	<i>WESTERN BAR</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Jim Bryan</i>	<i>moore mont</i>	<i>alblue Pub</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Bob Blair</i>	<i>Billings</i>	<i>Keno Club</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Byron Erickson</i>	<i>MAITA</i>	<i>Roger's Saloon</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Bill Steens</i>	<i>LAUREL</i>	<i>Sid's Place</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Mark Jorick</i>	<i>Hot Falls</i>	<i>Montana Bar</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Alvin Bryan</i>	<i>Blgs</i>	<i>Play Inn</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Bob [unclear]</i>	<i>" "</i>	<i>Don Medlow</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>D. W. Lamm</i>	<i>Helena</i>	<i>Montana Tavern</i>		<i>X</i>
<i>Bob DURKEE</i>	<i>" "</i>	<i>" "</i>		<i>X</i>

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

WHEN TESTIFYING PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.