

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATIVE RULES

February 16, 1995 Hearing Room 50
4:00 p.m. Tapes 10-11

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Lee Beyer, Vice-Chair
Rep. Tony Corcoran
Rep. Peter Courtney
Rep. Lynn Lundquist
Rep. Bill Markham
Rep. Patti Milne
Rep. Lonnie Roberts
Rep. John Watt

MEMBER EXCUSED: Rep. Ray Baum, Chair

STAFF PRESENT:

Cathryn Epley, Committee Administrator
Gretchen Haber, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD:

SJR7: Public Hearing
HB 2291: Public Hearing
HB 2292: Public Hearing
HJR 7: Public Hearing

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE 10, Side A

003 REP. MARKHAM: Calls the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2291, HB 2292 AND HJR 7

Witnesses: Ramona Kenady, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives
Rep. Bill Fisher, District 45
Rep. Anitra Rasumssen, District 11

010 RAMONA KENADY, CHIEF CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Gives brief history on HB 2291, HB 2292, and HJR 7.

086 REP. BILL FISHER, DISTRICT 45: Testifies on the bill package presented.

101 REP. FISHER: Session would be limited to 150 days, with a closure of

May 31. A filing period would follow, beginning June 1.

116 REP. FISHER: This type of agenda would give the people "full value", provide experience for freshman legislators, provide the leadership the opportunity to adjust to position changes, provide committees to set up prior to the start of the session.

133 REP. FISHER: It would also eliminate the confusion surrounding the interpretation of administrative rules passed during the interim.

160: REP. WATT: Are you describing your proposal or are you advocating the proposals we are addressing here?

172 REP. FISHER: I support reorganization, but I cannot support what is before us now.

194 REP. MARKHAM: Is it possible to set out the differences between the bills before us and the "Fisher Proposal?"

200 REP. FISHER: I'd be happy to do that.

209 REP. WATT: This is an initial hearing today. I believe there are at least two major proposals to change the legislative session. The committee would be better served if we were to have available timelines on each proposal, modeled perhaps by those prepared by the Chief Clerk's office.

240 REP. ANITRA RASMUSSEN, DISTRICT 11: Testifies as a member of the legislative class of 1995, in support of the bill package.

ASSISTANT'S NOTE: HB 2291, HB 2292 and HJR 7 were briefly heard today. More detailed testimony will be found in the minutes of the March 14, 1995 meeting of the House Rules Committee when the bills were again discussed.

CLOSES PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 2291, HB 2292 AND HJR 7

OPENS PUBLIC HEARING ON SJR7

Witnesses: Senator Jeanette Hamby, District 5
Senator Marilyn Shannon, District 15
Rep. Liz Vanleeuwen, District 37
Paul C. Hanson, Aloha, Oregon
Robert E. Pletha, Speaking for Self
Lin Ludwick, Speaking for Self
Rod Staab, Salem Area Voter

280 SEN. JEANETTE HAMBY, DISTRICT 5: Testifies in favor of SJR7.
(Exhibits A & B)

320 REP. ROBERTS: How would the participants be chosen?

325 SEN. HAMBY: The chambers would choose the participants.

399 SEN. HAMBY: No special interest group will surface as a cause.

011 SEN. HAMBY: As states we have to make it clear we cannot tolerate the financial burdens without the funds to make federal programs work.

033 REP. ROBERTS: Will this be a Constitutional Convention?

040 SEN. HAMBY: No. This will not be a Constitutional Convention. It is a Conference of the States.

073 VICE CHAIR BEYER: Was there ever a discussion of a constitutional convention?

078 SEN. HAMBY: No. We clearly avoided the notion that there would be a Constitutional Convention.

107 REP. COURTNEY: What would the topics of discussion be?

120 SEN. HAMBY: States rights, and the proper balance between federal and state government.

130 SEN. CORCORAN: Wouldn't this proposal continue to develop the anti-government sentiment ?

152 SEN. HAMBY: I am a strong supporter of this proposal, and I would not consider myself of the "radical right."

230 REP. ROBERTS: Do you think success will put any pressure on the state to come to grips with the problems?

235 SEN. HAMBY: That is exactly what we hope.

240 SEN. MARILYN SHANNON, DISTRICT 15: Testifies against SJR7. There is a proposal in Congress, S1, which would eliminate unfunded mandates to the states.

291 SEN. SHANNON: Continues to testify on SJR7.

321 SEN. SHANNON: Sen. Hamby's language indicated there would be permanent fundamental reform to the federal and state relationship.

349 REP. ROBERTS: States would not need to go through this process to call a Constitutional Convention.

360 SEN. SHANNON: I don't believe there will be any way to limit the agenda to what issues will be heard.

390 SEN SHANNON: Once a Constitutional Convention is created it may not be challenged in court.

Tape 10, Side B

004 REP. LIZ VANLEEUEWEN, DISTRICT 37: Testifies in support of SJR7.

011 REP. VANLEEUEWEN: The Conference of States will prevent a Constitutional Convention.

055 REP. CORCORAN: Do you agree that this is a nonpartisan issue?

058 REP. VANLEEUEWEN: I hope it is.

077 REP. COURTNEY: I support a balanced budget amendment. But I disagree with this bill.

100 PAUL HANSON, ALOHA, OREGON, SPEAKING FOR HIMSELF: Testifies against SJR 7. Gives concerns about constitutional convention.

133 HANSON: Reads Amendment XVII of the U.S. Constitution. Senators are elected by the people. Argues that the XVII Amendment is invalid. If that is true, there is no need to have this Conference of the States.

185 HANSON: Continues to testify against SJR7. There is an alternative to this Conference. The states can recall their Senators.

189 ROBERT E. PLETHA, SPEAKING FOR HIMSELF: Testifies against SJR7. (Exhibit C)

215 PLETHA: Continues to testify against SJR7. Proposes that the 10th Amendment is the solution to the problem.

262 LYN LUDWICK, SPEAKING FOR HERSELF: Discusses concerns regarding the possible ramifications of SJR7. Discusses representation of political parties at conference.

298 LUDWICK: What specific goals would Oregon be looking to achieve by participating in the Conference of States?

322 RODNEY STAAB, SALEM AREA VOTER: Testifiies against SJR7. Refers to written testimony (EXHIBIT D)

342 STAAB: Why would the legal provisions be included in the proposal, if the conference were not intended to develop into a Convention? There will be an attack on the U.S. Constitution. Urges a no vote on SJR7.

Tape 11, Side B

REP MARKHAM: Adjourns meeting at 5:37 p.m.

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

Cynthia Charrey Cathryn Epley
Committee Assistant Committee Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

- A - Testimony on SJR7 - Senator Hamby - 16 pages
- B - Testimony on SJR7 - Senator Hamby - 2 pages
- C - Testimony on SJR7 - Robert E. Pletha, Constituent - 3 pages
- D - Testimony on SJR7 - Paul C. Hanson, Constituent - 1 page
- E - Testimony on SJR7 - Rodney V. Staab, Constituent - 10 pages
- F - Testimony on SJR7 - AFL-CIO, Irv Fletcher, President- 1 page
- G - Testimony on HB 2292 & HJR 7, Lorena M. Buren - 1 page
- H - Testimony on HB 2291, HB 2292 and HJR 7 - Adrienne Sexton - 3 pages
- I - Testimony on HB 2291, HB 2292 and HJR 7 - Ramona Kenady, Chief Clerk - 10

pages