

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY - CRIMINAL LAW

April 9, 1999 Hearing Room 357

8:30 a.m. Tapes 128 - 129

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Mannix, Chair

Rep. Prozanski, Vice-Chair

Rep. Bowman

Rep. Gianella

Rep. Hansen

Rep. Simmons

Rep. Sunseri

STAFF PRESENT: John Horton, Counsel

Patsy Wood, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:

HB 2349 Work Session

HJR 7 Work Session

HB 2352 Work Session

HB 2353 Work Session

HB 2354 Work Session

HB 2392 Work Session

HB 2394 Work Session

HB 2275 Work Session

TAPE/#	Speaker	Comments
TAPE 128, A		
007	Chair Mannix	Calls the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.
<u>HB 2349 WORK SESSION</u>		
015	Counsel Horton	Explains that the ñ1 amendments to HB 2349 replace the bill with the provisions from HB 2647 plus the addition of testing for any communicable diseases (EXHIBIT A) . The ñ2 amendments allow the district attorney to designate the indictment as "confidential" (EXHIBIT B) .
026	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2349-1 amendments dated 03/23/99.
		VOTE: 4-0-3 EXCUSED: 3 - Rep. Bowman, Rep. Prozanski Rep. Simmons,
		Chair Mannix
		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
029	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2349-2 amendments dated 03/29/99.
		VOTE: 5-0-2 EXCUSED: 2 - Rep. Bowman, Rep. Prozanski
		Chair Mannix
		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
045	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves HB 2349 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 5-0-2 EXCUSED: 2 - Rep. Bowman, Rep. Prozanski

	Chair Mannix	<p>Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.</p> <p>REP. ROSS will lead discussion on the floor.</p>
050	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2349.
<u>HB 2394 WORK SESSION</u>		
091	Counsel Horton	HB 2394 expands murder to include deaths caused by a person fleeing or attempting to elude a police officer or, under some circumstances, by a person driving while under the influence of intoxicants. The ñ1 amendments pertain to a felony allude (EXHIBIT C). The ñ6 amendments pertain to the vehicular assault provisions of HB 2394 (EXHIBIT D).
137	Chair Mannix	Do the ñ6 amendments have the limitations that we wanted on page 3 of HB 2394?
138	Counsel Horton	Yes. They refine, expand and clarify in what situations felony allude is the predicate crime and in what situations DUII is the predicate crime. The ñ5 amendments have the affirmative defense to the felony murder statutes (EXHIBIT E). The ñ5 and the ñ3 amendments (EXHIBIT F) have the affirmative defense, but the ñ3 apply to the assault statutes.
166	Rep. Sunseri	Is it the affirmative defense if two 20 year olds are driving around drinking and the passenger is killed?
170	Counsel Horton	It is an affirmative defense to the crime of felony murder only. The ñ2 amendments retain the current statute for unauthorized departure, but rename it unauthorized departure in the second degree and create the new crime of unauthorized departure in the first degree when a person fails to return to custody from temporary release or transitional leave (EXHIBIT G).
194	Chair Mannix	Any prior discussion on HB 2534 and HB 2303 should be incorporated here. Is there a fiscal impact on HB 2303?
209	Phil Lemman	<p>Criminal Justice Commission</p> <p>HB 2303 that elevates unauthorized departure to a Class C felony does have a fiscal impact.</p>
217	Rep. Sunseri	Do you know how much over the \$50,000 threshold for a fiscal impact?

218	Lemman	It takes 15 additional cases per year, under probation supervision to reach the \$50,000 threshold. HB 2303 would add 80 or 90 cases.
234	Counsel Horton	There is other legislation that the ñ2 amendments would fit into.
239	Chair Mannix	We will set aside the ñ2 amendments (EXHIBIT G) and check on the fiscal impact.
243	Rep. Bowman	Asks for a clarification of the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT C) regarding the issuance of an arrest warrant.
270	Rep. Prozanski	Discusses the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT C) and whether or not line 8 on page 1 should apply only to felony charges and how someone would have the knowledge that a warrant had been issued.
281	Chair Mannix	The ñ5 and ñ6 amendments (EXHIBITS E & D) reflect more recent activity on HB 2394 and we need to go back and clarify the ñ1 and ñ3 amendments (EXHIBITS C & F).
295	Rep. Sunseri	How would you establish that a person had knowledge that a warrant had been issued for their arrest?
300	Rep. Prozanski	The person could have been told on the record or by an officer that if they failed to appear in court an arrest warrant would be issued.
321	Rep. Sunseri	If a judge tells a defendant that if he fails to appear for the next hearing a warrant will be issued and the defendant doesn't appear, would that constitute knowledge that a warrant would be issued?
325	Rep. Prozanski	Yes.
333	Chair Mannix	I am going to ask Legislative Counsel to make one single amendment out of these six amendments, and that draft to be circulated to all interested parties.
346	Rep. Prozanski	It would be helpful to know the fiscal impact on the ñ2 amendments even if we don't pass them, and then ask fiscal to look at the full bill for impacts.
362	Rep. Sunseri	Can an amendment be drafted without the ñ2 amendments so HB 2394 could go to the floor without having to go to Ways & Means for a fiscal impact?
369	Chair Mannix	Discusses blending the amendments with and without the ñ2 amendments.
379	Rep. Bowman	In the ñ3 amendments, is the preponderance of the evidence the highest level of proof?

382	Chair Mannix	No, that is generally the lowest for a civil proceeding. You go from preponderance, to clear and convincing, to beyond a reasonable doubt.
397	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2394.
399	Rep. Prozanski	Did the counties have input on the fiscal impact of the ñ2 amendments to HB 2349 regarding keeping these indictments confidential?
434	Chair Mannix	Have you been involved in any discussions involving the ñ2 amendments and keeping the indictments confidential?
TAPE 129, A		
003	Paul Snider	Association of Oregon Counties No.
004	Chair Mannix	Do you know if there is a fiscal impact when allowing the indictment to become confidential?
006	Snider	No.
012	Counsel Horton	Clarifies when an indictment is to be inspected only by the judge.
<u>HJR 7 WORK SESSION</u>		
024	Counsel Horton	Discusses the difference between the ñ7 and ñ8 amendments to HJR 7 (EXHIBITS H & I). The ñ3 amendments to HB 2352 (EXHIBIT J), the ñ5 amendments to HB 2353 (EXHIBIT K), and the ñ3 amendments to HB 2354 (EXHIBIT L) all accompany HJR 7.
078	Rep. Bowman	Was Mark Gardner going to talk to the committee about the work the work group has been doing on HJR 7?
080	Chair Mannix	The work group never came to a resolution so they do not have a package compromise to present to the committee.
088	Rep. Bowman	It would be helpful to find out the areas of dissention.
093	Chair Mannix	Some refinements came out of the work group and those have been incorporated to some extent.
101	Rep. Sunseri	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HJR 7-8 amendments dated

		04/08/99.
103	Rep. Prozanski	I would like to have some invited testimony because some of the changes suggested by the Department of Justice were not included in the ñ8 amendments.
111	Chair Mannix	The Chair is satisfied that we have had enough testimony and input.
121	Rep. Prozanski	On page 1, line 20, why is treason in there? Who is the victim of treason?
127	Chair Mannix	It is in current language. Do you want to remove it?
130	Rep. Prozanski	Yes.
133	Rep. Gianella	What is the definition of treason?
136	Counsel Horton	Reads the definition of treason in statute.
142	Chair Mannix	Do you have a number of alternatives to offer?
143	Rep. Prozanski	Yes, a number of issues were not included in the amendments to HJR 7.
149	Chair Mannix	The best way to present a set of changes would be in a minority report. We could make a conceptual amendment to remove the reference to treason on page 1, line 20 of the ñ8 amendments to HJR 7.
167	Rep. Gianella	Could you explain the issue of treason?
169	Chair Mannix	It is in the state constitution now that you do not get bail for murder and treason. It was traditional in the Constitution that treason was a capital offense and if someone was thought to be a traitor, they could not be trusted to be released on bail.
178	Rep. Prozanski	I would like to propose that on page 1, line 22 delete "Öa court has determined there is probable cause to believe the defendant committed the crimeÖ" and insert "the proof is evident that the person is guilty". This change is based on my review of suggested changes by the Department of Justice.
199	Chair Mannix	How many other changes are you proposing?
202	Rep. Prozanski	About 6-8 changes.
205	Chair Mannix	It is inappropriate to deal with that many changes to Legislative Counsel (LC)

		draft amendments. You could offer a LC draft of an alternative to substitute or a minority report.
213	Rep. Prozanski	It is hard to provide such a document when the amendments are not given to us sooner.
221	Chair Mannix	We have had technical adjustments in the language for the past two weeks, but none of the concepts have changed.
224	Rep. Prozanski	We were going to have the work group come back and explain their progress. It is inappropriate to move forward on a document that was received only 30 minutes before we vote on it.
234	Chair Mannix	Your objections are noted, but you need a written alternative LC draft to present to the committee or a minority report could be filed.
241	Rep. Prozanski	Why don't we want to put out the best product to protect victims? If this legislation goes to the voters one more time and is overruled, what have we accomplished for victims?
245	Chair Mannix	It is an appropriate matter for debate because some members of the committee may be of the opinion that we have the best product available and are prepared to move on it.
247	Rep. Prozanski	We are not having that debate. The Chair is set on moving this forward without inviting testimony on why certain changes were made. We should want to set a record for the courts as to the deliberations made on HJR 7. There is also the question if HJR 7 should be broken out into different sections to prevent a constitutional challenge.
266	Rep. Sunseri	I am satisfied with the 7 amendments (EXHIBITS H). I would prefer to see Rep. Prozanski's proposed changes in a LC draft.
278	Rep. Bowman	I would like a definition of a "social victim". A "victim" is someone who suffered direct financial, social, psychological or physical harm, but what is a "social victim"?
287	Chair Mannix	Gives his definition of "social victim" as someone who may have lost the society of another member of their family.
293	Rep. Bowman	Isn't that a psychological loss vs. a social loss?
295	Chair Mannix	The loss could be psychological as well as social.
300		VOTE: 4-3

		<p>AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix</p> <p>NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski</p>
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES.
306	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HJR 7-1 amendments dated 2/10/99.
312	Rep. Bowman	Is a "social victim" used currently in our Constitution or defined in statute?
316	Chair Mannix	I don't know about the statutes defining "social victim", but the context of the language relates to "harm" being financial, social, psychological or physical.
326	Rep. Prozanski	Describes the 11 amendments (EXHIBIT M). Discusses a handout <i>Crime Victims' Rights: Constitutional Provisions by State</i> (EXHIBIT N). Distributes news articles that reflect the importance of the evidence that is presented at a trial to determine a person's guilt (EXHIBITS O, P, and Q). Discusses reasons to substitute the 11 amendments for the 8 amendments to HJR 7.
TAPE 128, B		
088	Chair Mannix	Technically, the 11 amendments should have been offered as a substitute for the 8 amendments. Discusses the defendant's rights and the victim's rights in a civil and a criminal trial.
115	Rep. Prozanski	I do agree a victim has the right to be in attendance at a criminal trial and would strike the exclusion "unless the victim is to testify" from the 11 amendments on page 2, lines 1-2.
129		<p>VOTE: 3-4</p> <p>AYE: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski</p> <p>NAY: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix</p>
	Chair Mannix	The motion FAILS.
135	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to split the separate paragraphs out of HJR 7, as amended by the 8 amendments, to be voted on as separate resolutions.

142	Rep. Prozanski	If HJR 7 is presented as a package instead of separate initiatives, we are running the same risk that Ballot Measure 40 faced as being ruled unconstitutional.
165	Chair Mannix	It would be out of order for this committee to split a resolution into multiple resolutions and send it to the floor in seven pieces. The resolution can send multiple amendments to the voters, but if we want separate votes on the amendments by the House or Senate, there have to be separate resolutions. But, in case I am incorrect, I will allow a vote on the motion.
185	Rep. Prozanski	You have the power as chair of this committee to ask the Speaker of the House to allow this to occur.
195	Chair Mannix	I conferred with the Chief Clerk of the House if a resolution could be split into multiple resolutions and she said, "no". Any committee can request permission from the Speaker to file additional resolutions. Your motion could be a motion to defer this matter while we request separate resolutions so we can send HJR 7 to the floor in separate pieces.
204	Rep. Prozanski	When you say "defer" this matter, do you mean "table" HJR 7?
206	Chair Mannix	I said "defer" because "table" has a different meaning.
210	Rep. Prozanski	If we move the ñ8 amendments, then we need to be very careful about what we send out to the voters.
214	Chair Mannix	Discusses 3 amendments to the Oregon Constitution that were sent to the voters to be separately voted on under one resolution in 1984.
225	Rep. Prozanski	Have you heard from anyone else regarding this resolution?
227	Chair Mannix	I have heard informally from the Attorney General's staff.
228	Rep. Prozanski	I am making this motion today because I think we need to address the concerns of the people who will have to defend this legislation for the state, mainly the Department of Justice.
234	Rep. Bowman	Have you received anything from the Attorney General's office that addresses this issue of separate resolutions?
237	Chair Mannix	The Attorney General's staff and Legislative Counsel stated there is the "possibility", not the "probability" of a problem if HJR 7 is not split into separate resolutions.
250	Rep. Hansen	We should try to pass out a measure that is secure from constitutional challenges. Because a Constitutional amendment is the most serious action that the House

		can ever take, House members should be allowed to vote on the resolutions separately. There are clearly some pieces of HJR 7 that I adamantly support and I would like to be able to vote for those.
286		VOTE: 3-4 AYE: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski NAY: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix
	Chair Mannix	The motion to defer HJR 7 and split it into separate resolutions FAILS.
294	Rep. SUNSERI:	MOTION: Moves HJR 7 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED recommendation.
298	Rep. Bowman	Discusses her objections to various portions of HJR 7 and her frustrations with moving this legislation without having adequate information from the work group. The voters will be frustrated all over again if we send them this legislation and it is deemed unconstitutional. I am concerned that this legislation will destroy juvenile courts in Oregon.
351	Chair Mannix	HJR 7 is not intended to destroy juvenile courts.
360	Rep. Prozanski	I received a note from Kathie Osborn, Juvenile Rights Project, that the ñ8 amendments do not solve the juvenile court problem.
377	Rep. Simmons	Acknowledges the hard work done by Chair Mannix on HJR 7.
383	Rep. Sunseri	We need to remember that this legislation was not proven unconstitutional on its context, but on the manner in which it was presented to the voters.
400	Rep. Prozanski	I believe victims have the right to be in the courtroom and to be heard. We, as elected officials, should have that same right to look at these amendments on an individual basis. We all want to protect victimsí rights, but there are components of HJR 7 that run afoul in determining a personís guilt and holding them accountable if their guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt.
433	Rep. Gianella	I am proud to be a part of looking out for victimsí rights.
TAPE 129, B		

003	Rep. Sunseri	VOTE: 4-3 AYE: 4 - Gianella, Simmons, Sunseri, Mannix NAY: 3 - Bowman, Hansen, Prozanski
	Chair Mannix	The motion CARRIES. REP. MANNIX will lead discussion on the floor.
004	Rep. Bowman	Serves notice of a possible minority report.
009	Rep. Prozanski	Serves notice of a possible minority report.
011	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HJR 7.
<u>HB 2354 WORK SESSION</u>		
037	Counsel Horton	The ñ3 amendments to HB 2354 specify the date for the special election (EXHIBIT L) .
040	Chair Mannix	Discusses dates that would set deadlines for ballot titles, fiscal impact statements, explanatory statements and arguments.
052	Rep. Prozanski	Is HB 2354 the "vehicle" for getting HJR 7 to Ways & Means to determine the amount of money needed for the special election?
054	Chair Mannix	Yes.
055	Rep. Prozanski	Do you want this to go out in an off-election cycle that would be this November?
057	Chair Mannix	Yes. There are other measures pending including term limits.
066	Rep. Prozanski	Are there other "vehicles" being proposed by other committees?
068	Chair Mannix	No. This is the generic "vehicle" for a special election in November.
079	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2354-3 amendments

		dated 03/17/99.
		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
088	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves HB 2354 to Ways & Means with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
104	Chair Mannix	Action will be deferred on HB 2352 and HB 2353.
105	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2354.
<u>HB 2392 WORK SESSION</u>		
111	Counsel Horton	HB 2392 prohibits driving while under the influence of intoxicantsi diversion if the defendant caused damage to the property of another person. Describes the ñ1 amendments (EXHIBIT R).
125	Rep. Prozanski	Why is HB 2392 necessary if ORS 813.220 already gives the court the authority to deny an individual from entering into a diversion program?
157	Chair Mannix	Explains that the ñ1 amendments allow the person who suffered property damage to be heard at any hearing on a petition for a diversion agreement.
173	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2392-1 amendments dated 02/22/99.
		VOTE: 7-0

	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED .
177	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves HB 2392 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	<p>Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.</p> <p>REP. PROZANSKI will lead discussion on the floor.</p>
182	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2392.
<u>HB 2275 WORK SESSION</u>		
189	Chair Mannix	Discusses the provisions of the ñ4 amendments (EXHIBIT S). These amendments need to be modified further because the Department of Corrections (DOC) wanted to make sure that stopping an inmate's mail to check it wouldn't be construed as mail theft. Page 2 of the ñ3 amendments to HB 2275 has the DOC language (EXHIBIT T). We could adopt page 2 of the ñ3 amendments and the ñ4 amendments.
230	Rep. Sunseri	On page 1, line 5 of the ñ3 amendments we had changed "knowingly" to "intentionally". Was that taken care of in the ñ4 amendments?
232	Chair Mannix	No.
233	Rep. Sunseri	I thought we only dropped page 1, line 14 of the ñ3 amendments?
234	Counsel Horton	My understanding was either all of page 1 or Section 4 of the ñ3 amendments were dropped out. I remember discussing "knowingly" being replaced by "intentionally", but was there a motion to do that?
246	Chair Mannix	We are not using anything from page 1 of the ñ3 amendments because we are eliminating the "obstruction" portion. Section 2 of HB 2275 has "knowingly takesÖor obtains". We can move to change the word "knowingly" to "intentionally". Explains the difference between the two phrases.

253	Rep. Prozanski	Is that on the original of HB 2275, line 19?
253	Chair Mannix	Yes.
268	Rep. Prozanski	Do we want to have this crime be at an "intentional" level or just be able to presume that through knowledge which would be the "knowingly"?
279	Chair Mannix	Reads ORS 161.085 which defines "intentionally or with intent" and "knowingly or with knowledge".
309	Rep. Sunseri	My preference would be to make this "intentionally".
314	Rep. Mannix	MOTION: Moves to SUSPEND the rules for the purpose of adopting a conceptual amendment.
		VOTE: 7-0
Chair Mannix		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
317	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to AMEND HB 2275 on page 1, line 19, to substitute "knowingly" with "intentionally".
		VOTE: 7-0
Chair Mannix		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
321	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT HB 2275-4 amendments dated 4/01/99.
		VOTE: 7-0
Chair		Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.

330	Rep. Prozanski	MOTION: Moves to AMEND HB 2275 by adding page 2, lines 1-10 of the ñ3 amendments to blend with the ñ4 amendments.
		VOTE: 7-0
	Chair Mannix	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
340	Counsel Horton	Informs the committee that if a theft occurs, there is automatically an "intent" according to the definition of "theft".
357	Chair Mannix	The use of the word "theft" incorporated the requirement of "intent"?
360	Counsel Horton	Yes.
361	Chair Mannix	I would entertain a motion to withdraw the conceptual amendment changing "knowingly" to "intentionally".
363	Rep. Sunseri	Why would it matter because it doesn't change anything?
364	Chair Mannix	It will make sure "intentionally" is not used twice.
370	Rep. Bowman	Why don't we put the semicolon after the second <i>person</i> on line 19 of page 1?
373	Rep. Prozanski	If we don't specify in the bill, prosecutors could use a broader interpretation.
379	Rep. Simmons	What would happen if someone parks their car in front of a mail truck?
390	Counsel Horton	That specific situation would not apply to line 19, page 1 because that line applies to the "taking" of the mail. On line 22, if a person "knowingly" takes the mail with the "intent" to deprive someone of their mail, then a crime has been committed.
401	Chair Mannix	HB 2275 describes the crime of mail theft, but we never actually say the person has committed theft. If that is the case, are we really getting "intentionally" in HB 2275?
405	Counsel Horton	To be safe, we could state that "theft" has the meaning as used in ORS 164.015. I want to make sure that statutes that provide for theft are consistent with each other.

416	Chair Mannix	We will have Legislative Counsel draft those proposed amendments and comment on the interaction between "knowingly" and "intentionally".
428	Rep. Bowman	Expresses her concern about being consistent with the identity theft bill and the mail theft bill.
441	Chair Mannix	Closes the work session on HB 2275.
445	Chair Mannix	Adjourns the meeting at 10:23 a.m.

Submitted By, Reviewed By,

Patsy Wood, Sarah Watson

Administrative Support Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A - HB 2349, -1 amendments (LC 1540), dated 3/23/99, staff, 4 pgs.

B - HB 2349, -2 amendments (LC 1540), dated 3/29/99, staff, 1 pg.

C - HB 2394, -1 amendments (LC 336), dated 3/4/99, staff, 1 pg.

D - HB 2394, -6 amendments (LC 336), dated 4/1/99, staff, 2 pgs.

E - HB 2394, -5 amendments (LC 336), dated 4/1/99, staff, 1 pg.

F - HB 2394, -3 amendments (LC 336), dated 3/4/99, staff, 1 pg.

G - HB 2394, -2 amendments (LC 336), dated 3/4/99, staff 1 pg.

H - HJR 7, -7 amendments (LC 1511), dated 4/8/99, staff, 9 pgs.

I - HJR 7, -8 amendments (LC 1511), dated 4/8/99, staff, 9 pgs.

J - HB 2352, -3 amendments (LC 1829), dated 4/8/99, staff, 1 pg.

K - HB 2353, -5 amendments (LC 1830), dated 4/8/99, staff, 6 pgs.

L - HB 2354, -3 amendments (LC 1846), dated 3/17/99, staff, 1 pg.

M - HJR 7, -1 amendments (LC 1511), dated 2/10/99, staff, 2 pgs.

N - HJR 7, *Crime Victims' Rights* submitted by Rep. Prozanski, 4 pgs.

O - HJR 7, Oregonian article submitted by Rep. Prozanski, dated 2/6/99, 2 pgs.

P - HJR 7, The New York Times article submitted by Rep. Prozanski, dated 2/16/98, 2 pgs.

Q - HJR 7, The New York Times article submitted by Rep. Prozanski, dated 2/5/99, 1 pg.

R - HB 2392, -1 amendments (LC 317), dated 2/22/99, staff, 1 pg.

S - HB 2275, -4 amendments (LC 1541), dated 4/1/99, staff, 1 pg.

T - HB 2275, -3 amendments (LC 1541), dated 3/24/99, staff, 2 pgs.

U - HJR 7, written testimony submitted by Rick Hill, Oregon Youth Authority, dated 4/9/99 1 pg.

V - HB 2349, written testimony submitted by Rep. Barbara Ross, dated 4/8/99, 1 pg.