

## Assembly

MINUTES OF MEETING - COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, 54th Session  
Nevada Assembly, February 9, 1967

11

Meeting called to order.

Present: Garfinkle, Getto, Webb, Prince, Espinoza, Wilson.

Absent: Foote

Chairman Garfinkle called upon Frank Dakin, Chief Deputy of the Legislative Counsel to explain to the committee the reasons for A.B. 186 being introduced for consideration.

Mr. Dakin explained that at the present time many school buildings are leased by the school districts for other uses deemed beneficial to the community such as for use as a community center. It was developed from discussion that such agreements usually allow the use on the most nominal terms to keep the property in good repair and preserve it from molestation and unnecessary deterioration. If the board of trustees determines that the school property should be sold or its use changed to a more beneficial purpose, the present law does not clearly indicate the action that would have to be taken to effect this diversion. The intent of this bill is to clarify the process by permitting lease cancellation upon 30-days written notice and demand. The present doubtful procedure is thus clarified.

Espinoza moved Do Pass AB 186.

Webb seconded.

Motion unanimously passed.

Chairman Garfinkle called attention of all members to the joint meeting of this committee with the Senate Finance and Ways and Means Committees scheduled for 8:00 a.m. February 10 in Room 58 and urged full attendance inasmuch as all of the money bills on education were to be heard at that time.

He then referred to the previous committee meeting on February 7 at which both Dr. Mordy of the Desert Research Institute and Dr. Armstrong of the University of Nevada were heard on A.B. 75. He said that he had received from Dr. Mordy an invitation for all of the committee to visit the Desert Research Institute. The committee expressed a desire and willingness to make such a visit and Chairman Garfinkle stated that arrangements to do so would be made.

Chairman Garfinkle expressed to the committee his hope that in the light of the publicity AB 75 had received the committee would continue to evaluate the bill without regard to personalities or publicity. He outlined the positions as stated by Dr. Mordy and Dr. Armstrong as follows:

Briefly summarized Dr. Mordy indicated that the D.R.I. gets \$100,000 from the state and \$2,500,000 in addition, some from private funds, some from federal matching grants. The private grants are designated as to their use. He stated that the state money was handled through the University of Nevada processes. He said that by paying the moving expenses of

the institute employees here they were earning them. He said that in effect the institute was in competition with big business and the by paying these expenses they had brought here some of the best minds in the world. There was an inference that if the practice were not allowed the Desert Research Institute would be strangled into a position where it would be forced to move. He urged the committee to compare the level of intelligence of the institute employees with that of the people opposing it.

Dr. Armstrong stated the Desert Research Institute had brought prominence to the University of Nevada. He stated that by having the staff at the university they had attracted young men of high ability at a cheaper cost. He urged the committee not to lose sight of what the institute has done for the university as a whole.

Chairman Garfinkle reminded the committee that with regard to AB 61 he had appointed Mr. Webb as a subcommittee to contact Mr. Humphrey at the University to ascertain whether an attempt had been made to compromise the position of the University purchasing department with that of the state under the State Purchasing Act.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the state purchasing agent's position was now held by a new appointee other than the one who appeared before the committee in the first instance when hearing was held on AB 61. Mr. Wilson suggested that it may be advisable when Mr. Webb had heard from the university to again hear from the new appointee so that if conflict of personality had existed the new picture could be ascertained. Also, it was suggested that the new appointee may have a program which would offer a solution to the problems that have been presented for consideration.

The committee adjourned after further reminder that the next meeting would be tomorrow, February 10, at 8:00 a.m.