

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
April 13, 1965

The meeting was called to order and discussion was resumed on H.B. 1078. Mr. Marshall moved that it be recommended adversely. Motion was seconded by Mr. Meckel and carried with 12 yes and no dissent.

The Chairman called for discussion on S.B. 43 and Mr. Turner moved that it be recommended for adoption. Motion was seconded by Mr. Buchele. Mr. Doyen inquired if a precedent was being set by authorizing the Council to draft a bill. Mr. Bunten stated that we shouldn't recommend this unless we are convinced that it is a good kind of legislation. He pointed out the experience in California and that he felt that everyone knew both sides of the question. Mr. Fribley stated that the question was studied last year and with the recommendations made, the bill was drafted in the Senate and didn't get anywhere. Mr. Jelinek stated that he believed we should make a gesture in facing the problem. Miss Jacquart inquired how intensive the study was and Mr. Fribley said that they covered all sides of the question. Mr. Doyen said that since the study had been made the council shouldn't be asked to do it again, but that this resolution is writing the rules of the Council. Miss Jacquart stated that she feels the legislature has jurisdiction over the council and can reject the proposal if they didn't like it. Mr. Marshall reiterated that the Council is a "creature of the Legislature" and that since the legislature in 90 days couldn't write a bill, someone else should try. Mr. Turner renewed his motion which carried 13 yes to 3 no.

Meeting was adjourned.