

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, PROCEDURES, ETHICS, AND
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS**

**Seventy-Fourth Session
February 13, 2007**

The Committee on Elections, Procedures, Ethics, and Constitutional Amendments was called to order by Chair Harry Mortenson at 3:48 p.m., on Tuesday, February 13, 2007, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Harry Mortenson, Chair
Assemblywoman Ellen Koivisto, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblyman Ty Cobb
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblywoman Heidi S. Gansert
Assemblyman Ed Goedhart
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom
Assemblyman James Settelmeyer

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick (Excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst
Sheila Sease, Committee Manager



Terry Horgan, Committee Secretary
Trisha Moore, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Joseph Turco, Public Advocate, ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) of Nevada
Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association
Michael Alastuey, Member, Committee on Local Government Finance;
Technical Advisor, Legislative Committee for Local Government Taxes and Finance
Dino DiCianno, Executive Director, Nevada Department of Taxation

Chair Mortenson:

[Roll taken] I encourage testimony from lobbyists and concerned persons providing the Legislature with information; however, remember that statements you make to Legislators, whether within the Committee hearing room or outside it, have to be truthful and accurate to the best of your knowledge. If they are untruthful, you may be guilty of a misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor.

If you are planning on testifying in front of the Committee, you should sign in on the attendance roster at the back of the room. If you are not going to speak, it still may be helpful to sign in because we may be able to provide you with information that might interest you. If you have materials to be distributed to the Committee, please try to submit them in electronic form or make certain you bring 17 copies. Any material used by the Committee becomes the property of the Committee.

In this Committee, you do not have to go through the Chair to talk to a member of the Committee. You may talk directly to the Committee members.

We will open the hearing on A.J.R. 10 of the 73rd Session. Patrick, will you give a brief summary?

Assembly Joint Resolution 10 of the 73rd Session: Proposes to amend Nevada Constitution to revise residency requirement for purpose of being eligible to vote in elections. (BDR C-1379)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Joint Resolution 10 of the 73rd Session proposes to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* to provide that a person must be a resident of the State for 30 days before an election to be eligible to vote in that election.

Assembly Joint Resolution 10 of the 73rd Session is a returning resolution from the 2005 Legislative Session where it passed. If it passes this Legislative Session unchanged in form, it will be presented to the voters at the General Election in 2008; and, if approved in that election, the *Constitution* will be amended.

Chair Mortenson:

Assembly Joint Resolution 10 of the 73rd Session brings the *Constitution* in line with decisions of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has decided against our *Constitution*, which says that you must be a resident for six months. The criteria now are 30 days.

Assemblyman Christensen:

Did this not pass the 2005 Session?

Patrick Guinan:

It did pass the 2005 Session without any real obstacles, but because it is a Constitutional Amendment, it must pass two sessions to go to the general election.

Chair Mortenson:

Both resolutions we will hear today are returning resolutions. They both passed with very little opposition, and we presume there is very little opposition today.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Does it become a Constitutional Amendment if we pass it now, or does it have to be approved by the voters?

Chair Mortenson:

It has to be approved by the voters and then it becomes a Constitutional Amendment.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Is that in the 2008 General Election?

Chair Mortenson:

That is correct, providing it passes both the Senate and the Assembly.

Joseph Turco, Public Advocate, ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) of Nevada:

I am sure there is no opposition to the portion of A.J.R. 10 of the 73rd Session that brings the *Nevada Constitution* in line with the *United States Constitution*.

Anything that allows people to vote easier and sooner is always a good thing in a democracy.

The issue in A.J.R. 10 of the 73rd Session that raised red flags is, "no person who has been adjudicated mentally incompetent, unless restored to legal capacity, shall be entitled to the privilege of an elector." Legally, adjudicated as mentally incompetent comes in three areas: People are adjudicated mentally incompetent to stand trial; to make their own medical decisions; or to handle finances. I do not know of proceedings whereby people are rendered mentally incompetent to vote.

I think we can all agree that the right to vote is pretty important in this democracy, so it is not something to be taken lightly. This matter is currently being litigated at the Eighth District Circuit Court. Anything less than a legal finding that holds that a person is mentally incompetent to vote, i.e., failure to understand the process of elections, renders them incompetent to vote. Someone might not be able to make medical decisions, but might very well be able to vote. There are scenarios in which someone who cannot handle their finances does know how to vote, and reasonably understands the system of elections.

The case I refer to in the Eighth District Circuit Court is from Missouri. The position of the ACLU in that case is that the lack of self-care skills does not imply an inability to understand the nature and effect of voting. Missouri, nevertheless, categorically prohibits all individuals under guardianship from voting, without any individualized inquiry into their competence to vote. I do not know if this is opening a Pandora's Box or not.

Chair Mortenson:

You are absolutely right about this. We reviewed this subject in a previous session, and changed the wording in that section in a previous Constitutional Amendment. I think the wording used was "imbecile" or "idiot" or something equally obnoxious. At those hearings, this question arose; however, we could not come to a good conclusion, but we knew we wanted to change the wording. In the future, we have to address what you believe to be a problem, but we do not want to do that on this Resolution, because we would have to start all over again and we are halfway through the process now.

Joseph Turco:

If it passes as is, it will violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; it will violate the Americans With Disabilities Act; and probably violate the Rehabilitation Act.

Chair Mortenson:

You may be right about that, but I think it will be up to this Committee to decide if they wish to take half a step, instead of delaying that half step for a long time in order to take a full step. If we creep up on the problems, we will solve them a lot better. I understand where you are coming from and I respect what you are saying.

Joseph Turco:

I think I know what you mean by "creeping up on it." On this matter, if anyone needs the assistance of the ACLU, we are at your service.

Assemblywoman Koivisto:

The part you are talking about is already in the *Constitution*. That is not being changed. All that is being changed in A.J.R. 10 of the 73rd Session is changing "6 months" on line 7 to "30 days."

Joseph Turco:

I thought the word "idiot" was replaced with "mentally incompetent," as well. We are delighted with the 30-day aspect of this Resolution. "Idiot" was replaced with "mentally incompetent" because it was considered derogatory. That was laudable.

Assemblyman Conklin:

Mr. Turco, as you are new to this process, perhaps some clarification is in order. For any bill to go before the people as a constitutional amendment, it has to pass both Houses during separate sessions of the Legislature, then it goes to a vote of the people. The bill you are looking at has one change. It deletes the phrase "six months". The rest of the language in the bill is current *Nevada Constitution* language. If we propose an amendment, this bill in its current form dies, and the process starts all over. It must pass both Houses this year, both Houses two years from now, and then go to a vote of the people two years after that; so this change will not take effect, literally, for almost eight years.

Maybe there is another bill this session you could amend. A proposed amendment to A.J.R. 10 of the 73rd Session would literally stop this process and start the clock all over again. If you truly believe going from 6 months to 30 days is a good idea, and I believe you do, then this is a good bill.

Chair Mortenson:

There were ten constitutional changes on the ballot this past November; in their wisdom, eight were rejected by the people. I think the people are pretty wise in most cases. Amending our *Constitution* is very difficult. We need to keep it

simple—one change per bill. It is easier to understand, and you have a better chance of getting it passed.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Has the U.S. Supreme Court ever ruled that someone who is declared mentally incompetent cannot be barred from voting? Is there case law on that issue?

Joseph Turco:

Not to my knowledge. Some of the facts in the case in the Eighth District Circuit Court seem similar to this, so that matter may go to the Supreme Court.

Chair Mortenson:

Any further questions from the Committee or testimony from the audience? [There was no response.] We will close the hearing on A.J.R. 10 of the 73rd Session and open the hearing on A.J.R. 16 of the 73rd Session.

Assembly Joint Resolution 16 of the 73rd Session: Proposes to amend Nevada Constitution to provide requirements for enactment of property and sales tax exemptions. (BDR C-422)

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Joint Resolution 16 of the 73rd Session also passed the 2005 Legislative Session. The Resolution proposes to amend the *Constitution of the State of Nevada* to provide requirements for the enactment of property and sales tax exemptions.

Chair Mortenson:

Again, this is a returning bill. It passed both Houses during the previous session. We would prefer not to make any amendments to this bill because we would have to start over again. This is a good bill; we want to get it passed.

Carole Vilardo, President, Nevada Taxpayers Association:

This bill is the result of the interim Legislative Committee for Local Government Taxes and Finance. On behalf of the Association, we absolutely support the bill. We originally considered a statutory change; however, Legal advised us that the Legislature can change whatever is demanded of it, and that if we wanted something very effective, it would have to be placed in the *Constitution*.

We have a longstanding policy statement that states exemptions may be valuable at times, but at no time should an exemption be forever. Circumstances under which the exemption was granted can change, so there

should absolutely be a sunset, a time certain. At that time, you reevaluate to see if the exemption is still needed, or if changes to some of the provisions governing the exemption need to be made. Those of you serving on the Taxation Committee know we have always testified to put a sunset date on bills dealing with exemptions, because we do not believe anything is static or that anything should last forever.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Could you tell us the history behind this?

Carole Vilardo:

We went through a period—1995, 1997, 1999—where there were a number of bills requesting many exemptions. Every time you put an exemption on a tax, particularly exemptions on the local portion of the sales tax, you erode the base. If you add enough exemptions, you wind up eroding the base of that revenue source. Obviously, the revenue stream has been created to provide a service. For example, you may give a sales tax exemption to a new company on the goods they need to manufacture their product if they can qualify with the Department of Taxation and the Commission on Economic Development. When those exemptions are examined, those agencies, by statute, must show that the company being offered the exemption will be responsible for bringing in jobs. The company must pay the average wage and provide medical insurance, and meet other conditions. So, even though you may be giving some sales taxes away, you are employing more people who are then able to purchase other goods and services or buy a house, so there is a trade off.

We once had a request to exempt items purchased by motorcycle clubs for events they were holding. We have had a number of requests like that, but what does that benefit? If you start adding too many exemptions, you will erode the tax base, then, to provide revenue for the service you need, you are looking for an increased tax rate somewhere else, or to modify another tax to generate more revenue. That was the concern with having open-ended exemptions without any criteria for evaluating them, which is what this bill does.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Were there exemptions passed and signed that did not meet this criteria?

Carole Vilardo:

In my opinion, yes.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Could those exemptions have been removed at the next legislative session?

Carole Vilardo:

Sometimes other issues come into play, or contracts would be generated based on the exemption, which then makes it difficult to repeal. Sometimes it is the pure politics of who asked for the exemption, and how the exemption was granted.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Could you identify one?

Carole Vilardo:

I have a complete list of all property tax and sales tax exemptions and I will make them available to you.

Chair Mortenson:

Please provide that to Mr. Segerblom, and it would be nice to have that in the archives of the Committee too, so please send us a copy.

Carole Vilardo:

Yes.

Michael Alastuey, Member, Committee on Local Government Finance; Technical Advisor, Legislative Committee for Local Government Taxes and Finance:

Ms. Vilardo's testimony has absolutely characterized the history of some of what we have been through to get to this point. This is a measure going through its second legislative iteration and, if passed, would appear on the 2008 General Election ballot.

The Legislature has long wrestled with exemption issues, in some sessions more than others. The issue is so complex, that it became clear in one Senate Committee hearing, that the exemption issue was one that could not be untied in short order. All manner of religious and fraternal organizations, business interests, and agricultural product interests, have requested exemptions at one time or another. This measure takes a step back and provides, on a prospective basis, a framework for legislative deliberation in terms of considering exemptions.

It is a constitutional measure, and we believe it is appropriate to the purpose without specifically eliminating any current exemption. All the issues of the

past could be reexamined at any time individually by the Legislature. This does not remove anyone's current exemptions.

Section 1 would require a Legislative finding. Right now, the Legislature is not required to make any particular finding or to undergo any particular deliberative process other than the process that sometimes becomes abbreviated late in the session of considering exemptions. There needs to be a finding that a social or economic purpose will be served. In the ensuing subparagraph, the exemption cannot adversely impair bond payments. Also, the Legislature should ensure that application of the exemption is thought to be fair for similar classes of taxpayers. Finally, each exemption passed from here forward would require a sunset date.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

When you talk about ad valorem taxes on property and excise taxes on the sale, storage, or consumption of tangible personal property, does that cover all property taxes and all sales and use taxes, or is it more limited in scope?

Michael Alastuey:

It would cover all property taxes, although some of the exemptions are, in effect, abatements or partial abatements of certain property taxes for certain business purposes.

The sales tax situation is particularly awkward because the sales tax is bifurcated. A portion of the sales tax, that being the original 2 percent that was implemented in the 1950s, was actually put on the ballot and retained, or ratified, by the people in the 1956 General Election. Other sales tax components, depending upon where you live, were implemented statutorily without a vote of the people.

The legal opinions all say, if you want to exempt sales from the 2 percent portion, it must go on the ballot, because what was publicly approved must now be publicly revised. Consider a situation like farm equipment. You can statutorily remove the application of sales tax on farm equipment, but that would only affect the portion other than the 2 percent; however, if you want to make farm equipment exempt from the two percent, it must be placed on the ballot. You can wind up with discontinuities in taxation where part of the sales tax may be exempted, while other parts may not be, depending upon the timing of elections.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

In the wording, "the Legislature finds," would that entail studies by committees, or more sophisticated research? If this is adopted into the *Constitution* and the Legislature wanted to grant an exemption to a certain group, would it simply be a deliberation of this Body or would we need academic studies? What exactly do you think "finding" would entail?

Michael Alastuey:

As I read that language, the "finding" is that of the Legislature. The Legislature would have to meet its own standards in making such a finding. As an individual citizen, I would contemplate that this would give pause to the legislative process in making a specific inquiry, and, in effect, announcing a finding and making such finding a matter of record in some form.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Does paragraph (b) on page 2 possibly pose an insurmountable hill for any exemption that a future Legislature might want to grant? Would not any reduction in revenue "impair adversely?"

Michael Alastuey:

No, not necessarily. As an example, if an exemption is shown, or "found" by the Legislature to be sufficiently stimulating to a certain kind of business, and the location of that business in Nevada as opposed to another place may be reasonably found to eventually generate a larger tax base, then, that economic stimulus may, in fact, make the taxing jurisdictions whole, even though the taxing jurisdiction excused, abated, or exempted taxes. There may actually be a net benefit. That would have to be evaluated.

Often, the argument proponents for exemptions bring forward is that "this is a very minor exemption; just a little bite." But if there is no beneficial purpose found by the Legislature in that "little bite," the Legislature would, as this would contemplate, probably hesitate to approve such an exemption. There are circumstances where you might find that there is sufficient reduction of revenue that is not recouped by any positive economic effects of the proposal; or you may find that it is a break-even situation, in which case there would be no impairment to the bonds.

Assemblyman Conklin:

Last session, this Body dealt with the issue of property tax. In doing so we were creative and did a lot of things we thought were in the best interests of the public. When you do such things, you create exemptions. If A.J.R. 16 of the 73rd Session had been enacted, how would that have impacted an issue as

complex as that? This appears to be sound fiscal policy we are implementing here, but from a practical standpoint, is there an impact on some of the broader issues like property tax?

Michael Alastuey:

I believe this stands independent of any of the actions you took last session, or may take in the future on property taxes. This specifically addresses the exemption issue. The policies you implemented last session only addressed broad categories—owner-occupied residences, commercial property, rental property in certain cases, and provided for different methods of restraining or capping the fluctuation in tax bills. I see this bill as independent from those policies.

Carole Vilardo:

In referring to the property tax cap from last session, you did make a "finding" and the finding actually had basis in discussion about what the impact would be. There was discussion about how bonds would be addressed. That is a known quantity, and there would be no impact, so, last session, you actually did what is in A.J.R. 16 of the 73rd Session. That application not only applied to individual business, but also for a class of people.

Another example from last session, although there was no finding, was the Lied buildings, the green buildings, and an exemption was provided for them. It was for a class of building, not an individual. In the testimony, absent a specific declaration, it was found that trying to use renewable energy sources, and trying to use less energy, were major public policies that would save money in other areas down the road.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

If this had been part of the *Constitution*, would the Lied standards still have been able to pass, or would they not have been able to meet the standard in paragraph (b) "will not impair adversely"? Would the bonds and obligations have been paid off in time?

Carole Vilardo:

You are the Legislature, so it is your determination. In my personal opinion, that was a good first step. That did have a sunset date. The sunset date on that bill passed by the 2005 Legislature was December 31, 2005, I believe. The reason there was a sunset is because we have a streamlined sales tax and are not allowed to bifurcate the rates. Because of the local sales tax component, it had to sunset because we expected Congress to act in January, 2006. That has now been pushed to 2008. Yes, I do think the finding would have been that it

served a public purpose. I also think you would have found it would not have impaired any bond contracts.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Let us say the Legislature wants to give an exemption for energy efficiency; however, it might impair the ability of the State to meet some obligations in the short run, but in the long run it would not. Do you think that would still qualify under this constitutional provision?

Carole Vilardo:

You would much more likely be able to determine if there was going to be an impairment in the short run because it is always much more difficult to project what the situation is going to be in 10 or 12 years. If you are talking about the short term being 2 years, I know what my bond payments have to be, and I have a very good idea how many people might apply for the exemption, also, if it has statewide application or would just impact one county. I would have a much better chance of being absolutely able to determine short term impact. If I saw a short term impact, you, as Legislators, would want to know that you were going to be able to get another source of revenue because you do not impair bond contracts. You could also defer or delay that exemption, or not pass the bill, and have the proponents of the bill come back two years from now when you could take a better look at it.

Yes, I think there are certain circumstances in which you might not grant the exemption and that is okay, from my perspective. You do not want exemptions that are eroding your revenue base so much that you come back the next session and request an increase in that tax because you gave too much away this time.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Is the gaming tax considered to be one of these taxes?

Carole Vilardo:

I think it is specific to the property and sales taxes.

Michael Alastuey:

The summary of A.J.R. 16 of the 73rd Session reads, proposing "to provide requirements for enactment of property and sales tax exemptions" only, so gaming is not included.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Would this cover the sales tax exemption on the purchase of food?

Michael Alastuey:

Yes.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

I know the exemption is already there, but if, in the future you tried to pass that kind of exemption, this law could prohibit that.

Carole Vilardo:

Sometime around 1980, the voters approved the sales tax exemption on food. If you want to change that, you must go back to them.

Dino DiCianno, Executive Director, Nevada Department of Taxation:

There is already a constitutional provision in Article 10, Section 3[A], with respect to food. To answer whether this would have an impact on the current food exemptions in NRS (*Nevada Revised Statutes*) 372, yes it could, but there is also an overriding provision within the *Constitution* as far as food is concerned.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

In the future, if someone tried to come up with a similar exemption, would this bill address that?

Dino DiCianno:

This does impact property tax exemptions and existing sales and use tax exemptions that would come before this Body on a prospective basis for approval. As administrators, we do not take a position one way or the other with respect to a particular bill; however, the language that is contained in A.J.R. 16 of the 73rd Session would provide us with better insight as to how we would administer those exemptions in the future; and this Body would be required to do some type of means testing.

As Chairman Mortenson, Mr. Alastuey, and Ms. Vilardo have indicated, the discussions on any new exemption that would come before you would provide that analysis, and you would make that finding prior to its being adopted.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

This would not apply to exemptions that are approved by voters, is that right?

Dino DiCianno:

As indicated earlier, because the sales tax is bifurcated, the 2 percent portion is subject to voter approval. The concern here is bifurcation on the local portion. This Body has the authority to change that part of it.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Did we not just vote on exempting prescription drugs?

Carole Vilardo:

That was in the 2004 election. Six exemptions were proposed in Question 8 and one of them was prescription drugs. The reason that Question went to the voters was the Streamlined Sales Tax, because those six exemptions only applied to the local portion of the sales tax, not the 2 percent.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

This would not cover that because that was a voter-approved exemption.

Carole Vilardo:

It might, because you cannot put anything to the voters that you, as a Legislative Body, do not agree to. Let us say you wanted to try again for a prescription drug exemption that previously failed, and this time, because you have better language, a better finding, and have narrowed the exemption, you would write the bill, and both Houses would pass that bill to put it on the ballot. You still have an impact as to whether you agree or not to put an issue on the ballot for the voters to see.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Does any other state have a similar constitutional amendment?

Carole Vilardo:

There is no state that I am aware of that has the same type of constitutional restriction we have. Part of the reason is that the majority of states do not have initiative and referendum processes. Only 24 states allow initiatives and referendums. When our *Constitution* was amended to allow the referendum process, it said, "What the voters approve; only the voters can change."

In the 1955 Session, the Legislature approved the 2 percent sales tax. When that Body left the 1955 Session, many Legislators were threatened with never being returned to office because at that time, enactment of that portion of sales tax was to be used primarily to fund education. There was a real split between the people who did not like the new tax, and the recipients of the revenue from the tax who did not like the idea of it going away. They formed a committee and went with a statewide referendum that stated approval of the statute that was enacted by the 1955 Legislature. That particular section has never gone back to the voters for updating. The referendum initiative was successful and, because it was successful, we are in this situation.

Dino DiCianno:

We are a part of the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement. One of the complications the State of Nevada has with respect to the current sales tax laws is that the 2 percent portion is subject to referendum. The vast majority of other states do not have that problem when it comes to the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement. Their legislative bodies have the ability to amend the state portion along with the local portion.

What you will see during this session is a bill draft the Department of Taxation is bringing forward to clean up specific language in NRS 372 that is specific to your question, is separate from this, and deals with that kind of bifurcation. In that bill draft, we are requesting that the 2 percent portion go back to a vote of the people, and allow this Body to amend that portion without ever having to go back to a vote of the people. If this Body approves that, it goes to a vote of the public in 2008. If it gets approved by the public in 2008, from that day forward this Body would have the ability to amend Chapter 372, which is the sales tax, for both the State portion of the rate, and the local portion of the rate. That will be coming to you shortly.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Because our sales tax is unique, do we need a provision like this as a constitutional amendment?

Dino DiCianno:

The Streamlined Agreement is a separate issue from this Joint Resolution. This Joint Resolution requires this Body to make a determination from a prospective basis about whether there is a beneficial need to have an exemption.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Is there any other state that has this kind of constitutional amendment?

Dino DiCianno:

I cannot answer that.

Chair Mortenson:

We will close the hearing on A.J.R. 16 of the 73rd Session.

I have received many questions about this Committee, so I want to provide a little bit of history about the Constitutional Amendments portion of this Committee. In 1999, the Constitutional Amendments Standing Committee was established to hear proposed amendments to the *Nevada Constitution*. That Committee had very few bills and met at the call of the Chair, generally on

Friday afternoons. The next session I chaired the Committee, but we had more bills, so it was really rough to meet on Friday afternoons. The following session we had even more bills, and it was decided we needed to change the situation, so the Legislative Counsel Bureau married these two committees.

The Constitutional Amendments Committee has exactly the same Committee members as Elections, Procedures, and Ethics, and exactly the same time slots. Last session we operated that way and had seven bills. This session we potentially have 17 bills, so the business of this Committee is escalating. We do not hear a lot of bills, but we are an important Committee simply because we are working on the *Constitution*, which is a lot more stable and lasts longer than legislation.

If there are no questions and no further business, we will adjourn [at 4:51 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Terry Horgan
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Harry Mortenson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Elections, Procedures, Ethics, and Constitutional Amendments

Date: February 13, 2007

Time of Meeting: 3:45 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster