MINUTES OF MEETING - ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, 54th Session, March 13, 1967

Meeting was called to order at 2:40 P.M.

Present: Wooster, Swackhamer, Kean, Torvinen (late), Schouweiler (late), Dungan, Hilbrecht, Lowman, White (late)

Absent: None

Woodrow Wilson, Assemblyman Clark County, Eddie Scott, NAACP Reno, and Mr. McDaniel, NAACP Las Vegas, were present to speak against SB 174, 175, and 176.

MR. WILSON: I certainly feel that this type of legislation does not provide lawful demonstration and expression that any group might wish to do around a public agency or building. I think it will prove to be unconstitutional and it doesn't provide liberty for people to express themselves.

Instead of trying to legislate laws to prevent demonstrations, we should be trying to legislate laws to create a climate whereby people will not feel the need to express themselves in this manner.

I certainly oppose this restrictive legislation, and I think it is unconstitutional.

(Mr. Wilson's comments above were about SB 175: Requires persons not engaged in lawful business to leave buildings and grounds of public agencies upon request at times when agency is not open.)

SB 176: Prohibits hampering of police officers and others at scene of disaster areas inciting of riots, and entering into or refusing to leave a disaster area.

MR. WILSON: My feeling is just about the same on this bill. In this bill, you are permitting some persons to demonstrate and not others. Subsection 4, paragraph 2 exempts labor organizations. Supposing NAACP were to demonstrate. Why shouldn't they have the right? This is discriminatory legislation.

Again, let's direct ourselves toward creating a better climate, where demonstrations would not be warranted. It would be a serious mistake to pass either of these two bills, SB 175, or SB 176.

MR. LOWMAN: If Subsection 2 were removed, would you have the same objection?

MR. WILSON: Yes, because the intent is still the same.

MR. LOWMAN: What is your objection to 176? This is a setting for the scene of a disaster. The bill is amended to apply to anybody who gets in the way of law enforcement.

MR. WILSON: That is not the way I understand it. If that was the intent, why Subsection 2?

MR. WOOSTER: Aren't you objecting mostly to section 5?

MR. WILSON: Section 1, paragraph 3, the language is very broad. This is moving in the direction of a police state.

MR. WOOSTER: What other disaster do you think this is meant to cover?

MR. WILSON: It could be used for most anything.

MRS. BROOKMAN: I think both are infringements of constitutional guarantees.

MR. LOWMAN: In what way? I need a for instance.

MR. MCDANIEL: (Read a petition from his organization requesting we reject SB 175 and SB 176. He then gave the petition to Mr. Wooster.)

The intent of the bill is clouded and seems prejudicial toward certain groups. These laws are like cobwebs. They may catch the small flies, but they will let the hornets and wasps through.

EDDIE SCOTT: I certainly follow the lines of the previous speakers. I am here because in our community we are very much concerned, Reno and Sparks. I think if we make it clear once that we do not support riots and destruction of property it might help.

We can see some hidden meaning in the language of this bill. It names all these things but doesn't limit to these things. In 175, public buildings are named after hours. We wanted to hold our May 17 Rally on the Courthouse steps, because it is hard to get a building. Under this law we couldn't do this. We cannot see why law-abiding citizens cannot go to public buildings which they help support with tax dollars.

I understand that the Watts thing overshadows Nevada. We are law abiding citizens here. We are not in Watts. On 176: I have yet to hear of anyone trying to stop a fire truck on its way to a fire, or a police car.

What do you mean "not limited to these things"? If we hold a meeting, hecklers may come by and break up our meeting. We feel the bills are not amended to police and fire trucks. This is a thing from the Watts area.

MR. MCDANIELS: Sections 1 and 2 of 176 are repeating the type of thing Mr. Scott has just mentioned. We have not seen anything of this nature. The bills are so broad they could apply to anything. I would like to know: What is the intent of "not limited to those things"? Who is to interpret an unlawful assembly? There is too much left to the person who interprets the law. These things must be spelled out.

I have several points I would like to make: 1. There is no need for the legislation; 2. Labor unions are excluded. Certain people have certain privileges. This is what we are fighting all over the nation. 3. This gives too much leeway. It isn't clear.

In Section 5, line 7: What conduct? Who is to say what conduct will encourage a riot? The word "conduct" could mean a lot of things. Instead of worrying about this type of legislation, let's worry about creating better atmosphere, so all can live together as citizens.

MR. WOOSTER: You understand the bills did not originate here?

MR. SWACKHAMER: Because of the inherent distrust of the American Public with a Police State, we have built up a body of laws to prevent undue arrests until we have come to the situation where we have put an umbrella over criminal events and people. Some legislation along this line is needed. We are going to have to start giving more authority to the police and stop worrying so much about our individual rights.

There may be a time when you may wish these authorities to have these rights in order to protect you. Instead of just saying "no, no", why don't you give some thought to helping us get legislation to help protect your rights?

MR. SCOTT: We are for giving the police all the power they need to protect us. We have seen police use everything available to squash riots and they squashed them. I don't see where they need more powers. We are for doing everything to protect properties and people.

MR. WOOSTER: You feel there is plenty of law now to protect people?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. MCDANIEL: We have read several incidents recently of police brutality. If they have authority to brutalize someone unjustly, there is no need for this type of legislation. I would love to see legislation to stop this, but nothing like this has been proposed. These bills will cause more riots and more troubles than what they are trying to eliminate. We must protest what we feel is not just. These bills will take this away from us. How will you know when we are not satisfied if we are not allowed to protest? I submit that these bills should be forgotten.

MR. SWACKHAMER: Remember the other day when we had Real Estate people in and we killed their bill? I had a lady realtor call me and tell me she wanted to compliment the committee for their good sense in killing it.

If there is a chance they might hurt the public, we should do something about it. I have a bill here, raising bond from $1,000 to $10,000. I would like the committee to introduce it. I think this would be a significant protection to the public.

There were no objections to a committee introduction.

MR. WOOSTER: I have another bill here for the committee to introduce. Mr. McDonald thought it was easier to introduce a new bill to give the University the three pieces of property, than to amend the old one.

There were no objections to a committee introduction.

AB 287: Provides mandatory penalties for issuance of small checks without sufficient funds.

Assemblymen Dini and Getto were present to speak for the bill.

MR. DINI: We feel we should do something about tightening up our bad check law. Now you can't prosecute. They have 10 days to make it good. Small businesses are loaning agencies for these people. There are professional bad check writers. By reducing the time for making bad checks good, you enable merchants to get their money back earlier.

MR. LOWMAN: The present law is 10 days. What was the reason for giving 10 days? In case checks were written inadvertantly with insufficient funds?

MR. TORVINEN: If he has an account, and merely overdraws the account, he has ten days. This takes care of honest mistakes and inadvertant overdrawing.

MR. DINI: With this bill, they can't go to the Justice of the Peace and soft-soap him. It makes it more mandatory to do something about it.

MR. WOOSTER: Tate Williams said 5 days might be too short and perhaps 10 days should be left in.

MR. DINI: On page 3 line 3: That whole section should be on page 2.

MR. HILBRECHT: One problem: I would like to see "in this state" on line 17 knocked out. Is forgery a similar violation? What is?

MR. GETTO: I have had quite a few retailers ask for a tighter bad check law. This bill would tighten it up some.

About the 5 days: If a man writes a check with insufficient funds, but doesn't know this, no one will prosecute him. It will apply to those persons who write checks and know they have no money. With the ten day law, people are writing checks knowing they have no funds but thinking maybe they will have some.

MR. WOOSTER: You don't have to prove intent to defraud because it is prima facie evidence. Without requiring intent, you have to make some allowance for an honest error.

MR. HILBRECHT: To encourage people to write only good checks would help everyone, but this law would make it hard on people with no bad intent.

MR. DINI: Should we encourage people to write checks when they have insufficient funds?

- - - - - - - - - - -

MR. LOWMAN: I am having two newspaper clipping reproduced for this committee, showing colored people want more police protection, instead of less. This study was done by the Ford Foundation.

MR. WOOSTER: We will hold those bills for final action on Wednesday. Earl White has requested to be heard on these, also.

MISS DUNGAN: Are they right when they say there are other laws to take care of these things? It seems to me they are.

MR. LOWMAN: There are two different deterrants. I think the labor organization exception ought to come out. Whose bills are these? I would like to hear from the people who asked for them.

MR. SWACKHAMER: On AB 287: We should give this some attention. I have serious doubt that this will do much to help, but anything we can do we ought to do.

MISS DUNGAN: The punishment is not right. You would get more for 3 days than you would for 6 months.

MR. LOWMAN: If we can assist the poor merchant who has the problem with this legislation then let's pass it.

MR. SWACKHAMER: I would like to have more to scare people with, the ones that deliberately try to nail you.

Mr. Lowman moved Do Pass

MR. WOOSTER: I am not sold on the 5 day provision.

MR. HILBRECHT: I would like to see the 10 days restored and the two amendments put on that have been suggested. The notice has to be changed and the punishment should be more in line.

Mr. Lowman moved Do Pass with the three amendments.
Miss Dungan seconded
Motion passed unanimously

Mr. Wooster asked Miss Dungan to check on the duplicate bills AB 356 and SB 250.

Mr. Lowman received and passed out the aforementioned reprints from the Ford Foundation.

AB 81: New criminal procedure law.

Frank Daykin was present to give background on the various sections.

SECTION 200, page 33, subsection 7:

Mr. Bryan's objection: This Subsection provides that an expert witness shall not be excluded from the courtroom during the testimony of other witnesses. The peremptory language of this statute is unwise. I believe that the exclusion of an expert witness should be placed in the sound discretion of the trial court. This statute would seem to deprive the trial court of its discretion in excluding expert witnesses.

MR. HILBRECHT: Why not leave within the discretion of the judge?

MR. DAYKIN: This corresponds to Rule 28 A of the Federal Rules. Nevertheless, there seems to be fairly good reason to make it discretionary.

MR. HILBRECHT: Why not "may be excluded in the discretion of the judge"?

MR. DAYKIN: Presence should be the rule and exclusion the exception.

MR. WOOSTER: The rule of exclusion is ordinarily granted. Why don't we change "shall" to "may" and make it discretionary?

Mr. Lowman moved to adopt these two amendments
Mr. Hilbrecht seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 204:

Mr. Bryan's objection: I believe this to be constitutionally infirm in that it would seem to trench upon the constitutional right of the defendant to be protected from double jeopardy.

MR. DAYKIN: This is preserved from NRS 175.275 without change. It may or may not be

constitutionally infirm. None of the Justices took any offense at it.

MR. HILBRECHT: I know what he has in mind. The Supreme Court has held that once a jury has been empaneled jeopardy attaches.

MR. DAYKIN: Jeopardy attaches for the same offense. That does not preclude trying him for a different offense for the same act if the testimony should so show.

MR. LOWMAN: Lots of court action seems to be expected on this and 71. Maybe we could preserve this.

Mr. Lowman moved to reject the objection
Mr. Swackhamer seconded
Motion passed unanimously

MISS DUNGAN: What are the figures that change the crimes?

MR. DAYKIN: Under $100 is a misdemeanor. Over is a felony.

SECTION 207

MR. SWACKHAMER: This is certainly all right, but there is something that doesn't ring a bell with me. Isn't it referring to having witnesses give bail for their appearance?

MR. DAYKIN: You can always hold a material witness or require him to give bail for his appearance. This is not ordinarily done but it is part of the same structure.

SECTION 208

MR. HILBRECHT: We should fix "a time certain" rather than a reasonable time.

MR. LOWMAN: This is talking about crime committed outside the state. Wouldn't it be different if you were in New York or California? Wouldn't there have to be various times?

MR. WOOSTER: The time has to be specified in the order.

MR. HILBRECHT: Then what would you do? Challenge it on a writ?

MR. WOOSTER: I suppose. Dick did not raise this in his written comments.

SECTION 233

Mr. Bryan's objection: This provides that the sentencing Judge must, whenever a person under sentence of imprisonment shall commit another crime, sentence him to a consecutive term of imprisonment not to begin until the expiration of all prior terms. I believe it to be in the interests of justice to provide the sentencing judge with discretion as to whether the sentences should be consecutive or concurrent.

MR. DAYKIN: This is the language of existing Nevada law, 176.150.

Mr. Swackhamer moved to reject the proposal
Mr. Lowman seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTIONS 211 through 213

D.A.'s comments: It would be a grave error to incorporate these provisions. The present law should be retained whereby the judge may make an advisory verdict of not guilty to the jury, but the jury may still return a verdict of guilty if it feels this is warranted. The final decision in these cases should not be taken away from the jury. See State vs. Busscher - 81 Nevada Reports, 587.

MR. WOOSTER: The judge may advise of acquittal.

MR. DAYKIN: Under this, he may render a judgment of acquittal. These are taken directly from the Federal Rules of Procedure.

MR. HILBRECHT: I think we have determinate sentencing. The motion of this committee has been in the direction of giving the judge the power.

MR. WOOSTER: The present law is that the judge can only advise on the verdict. In Section 211, the judge can simply enter an acquittal if he feels there is not sufficient evidence.

MR. Hilbrecht moved to reject the objection
Miss Dungan seconded

MR. WOOSTER: We have our own precedent established in our state which would support the existing law.

MR. CLOSE: I have had two cases where the judge gave advice and the jury followed it. I have no strong feeling on this one way or the other. As a matter of law, sometimes a man should not be convicted of a crime but he is. Certainly the jury's decision should be upheld, but you wonder, was justice really done? In these cases, these sections are meant to apply.

MR. WOOSTER: 211 allows the judge to rule on the evidence, not on the law.

MR. HILBRECHT: This is where the prosecution failed to establish a prima facie case. As a matter of fact, the decision would have to be reversed.

MR. CLOSE: In those cases, the judge would use his advisory power.

MR. HILBRECHT: The judge would have to establish that there was a complete want of evidence on one particular thing to make out the case.

MR. CLOSE: I don't think the Federal Courts have abused this discretion. I doubt if the District Judge would abuse the discretion. This might stop a problem that might exist of giving some guy the business when he should not be convicted at all.

MR. HILBRECHT: Charges to the juries are very ineffective means of putting something across.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to amend by adding to line 37 "as a matter of law" to section 211
Miss Dungan seconded
Motion passed unanimously

Mr. WOOSTER: Mr. Close has a bill for which he would like a committee introduction. It repeals all laws regarding partition fencing.

Mr. Close illustrated with a drawing how a man could be made to help pay for three different kinds of fencing around his property, none of which he really wanted, under existing law.

MR. CLOSE: This is an 1875 law and it provides that if the people can't agree as to the cost of the fence, then they go to the Justice of the Peace and he appoints a "fence viewer". He is paid $2.50 a day and he goes out and views fences. I talked to several assemblymen from the small counties and they are not concerned that this will be any problem with range lands. By the way, before you can be a fence viewer you have to be a free holder. This bill has not even been amended since 1875. There is an inequity here.

MISS DUNGAN: Would this apply if the fence were not right on the line?

MR. DAYKIN: No. A partition fence has to be built on the line.

MR. KEAN: I would like an interpretation of "on the line".

MR. HILBRECHT: Not athwart.

MR. DAYKIN: If the fence is all on his own property, I don't think this applies.

MR. KEAN: Mel, suppose a fence is in a state of disrepair and cattle from Mr. A goes onto property of Mr. B.

MR. DAYKIN: This is a "fence-out" state. You would have to build the fence to keep the other man's cattle out.

There were no objections to a committee introduction of Mr. Close's bill.

SECTION 235 of AB 81

MR. BRYAN's comment: This is unconstitutional as pertains to an indigent person.

MR. DAYKIN: Mr. Bryan cited no cases to the committee and we found none. To turn the dead-beat loose is going against justice. This section is combined from several existin sections which are completely in conflict as to ratios. We put them all together in one section.

Mr. Swackhamer moved to reject the proposal
Mr. Lowman seconded
Motion passed unanimously

MR. KEAN: If you let a man out of prison, can you banish him from the state?

MR. DAYKIN: Not unless that is a term of his probation. Most of them would be from the state.

SECTION 241

D.A.'s objection: It would seem that the requirements of this section merely duplicate efforts already performed by the Clerk, and the requirement seems unnecessary.

MR. HILBRECHT: That is no real objection.

MR. DAYKIN: This is existing law 176.210.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to reject the objection
Mr. Lowman seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 243

D.A.'s objection: The requirement that the statement contain a recommendation of the normal punishment for like offenses in the United States seems impractical, especially if the theory of determinate sentencing provided for in AB 71 is not approved by the Legislature.

MR. HILBRECHT: I think it should stay, in case we do have determinate sentencing.

Mr. Lowman moved to reject the objection
Mr. Kean seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 244

The D.A.'s and Mr. Bryan both feel that they should see the pre-sentence investigation report.

MR. SWACKHAMER: The objections don't make much sense. The case was fairly tried.

MR. WOOSTER: The pre-sentence report is generally background information on the defendant. It includes his family background, other crimes, so forth. This information could be in error. If they have a chance to see the report, they can prove it is in error.

MR. HILBRECHT: Bryan had one case where he discovered that this fellow had been guilty, while in prison, of some misconduct. This could be a very serious matter for the judge in making up his mind. Bryan investigated and found that it was a mistake in identity. As a result, the probation department thanked him and struck this from the report. In rare situations, it could make some difference.

MR. DAYKIN: The section goes on to say that the court may upon its own motion elect todiscuss the report in chambers with counsel for both parties. If the defense feels there is something there he should know about, he will make application to see it. The purposes of this section is to protect sources of information of the Probation Department. They don't have the power of subpoena. They have to go out and dig for this information and under this they can get assurance that it will not be made public. Under the present law, names would have to be left off, because the report goes automatically to the D.A.

MR. WOOSTER: I tend to agree with Mr. Hilbrecht. The judge is going to have a great deal of responsibility in sentencing. If there is a mistake, it should be brought to his attention.

Mr. Kean moved to make the report available to both the D.A. and defense attorney, with this amendment to be made by Mr. Daykin.

MR. DAYKIN: Do you go for the one that is recommended in the Model Penal Code or Federal Rule, that says you shall make it available after deleting names of sources?

MR. Hilbrecht seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 247:

The comment is that the crime of robbery should be continued as a non-probationable offense.

MR. DAYKIN: There was fairly extensive discussion of this in the committee. We felt there were two distinct groups or categories of crimes for this. The first included Murder in the first degree, Kidnapping, and Forcible Rape. The second included Sodomy, Indecent Exposure, and Lewdness. Robbery simply does not fit into either of these categories.

MR. SWACKHAMER: Would you consider putting Robbery back in on a second offense or something like that?

MR. DAYKIN: At present there is no penalty aggravation for a second or other offense.

MR. TORVINEN: In my experience, nobody gets probation on a second offense.

MR. WOOSTER: Under section 247 you can get probation.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to reject proposal
Mr. Lowman seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 266:

MR. DAYKIN: There is a technical error here. We have the wrong board. State Board of Parole Commissioners should be deleted from section 266.

SECTION 291

D.A.'s comments: This involves an automatic appeal in death cases; while there is no objection to the automatic appeal, there should be some procedure spelled out as to how this automatic appeal must be perfected on the part of the court and the time limits involved.

MR. DAYKIN: I think it follows from statute that the appeal would have to be perfected in the same way as any other appeal.

MR. HILBRECHT: Could we say that the day that he would have had the opportunity to waive that the time commences running on the time for the appeal?

MR. DAYKIN: This was borrowed from the California law.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to add within 30 days for time to waive appeal
Mr. Schouweiler seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 209

MR. TORVINEN: Was there any comment on Section 209, page 11? It doesn't allow bail when you are held for another jurisdiction. I can't understand why a man would be denied bail. Could hold for two weeks as a reasonable time. This doesn't fit in with the rest of the section.

MR. DAYKIN: That is present NRS 175.295 unchanged. It comes from the 1911 Crimes and Procedures Act. It probably goes back to the 1869 Act.

MR. TORVINEN: Do you see any reason why we need this?

MR. DAYKIN: Frankly, no. It was kept along with other procedures. This is for when you are holding the defendant after he has been discharged because you do not have juris diction. If he is from another county, he may be held for a warrant from that county. This is not for a fresh arrest. He has been on trial but discharged. It is not the commonplace situation.

MR. TORVINEN: Why is this different from other cases?

MR. DAYKIN: Perhaps it is not different, but basically it has been treated differently.

MR. TORVINEN: I would like to look into this some more.

MR. WOOSTER: We will hold 209 while you look into the matter.

SECTION 372

D.A.'s comment: A dismissal in this situation should require the concurrence of the D.A. as well as the Court. It should be made clear that this refers only to misde- meanors. If it is intended to refer to felonies, this should be spelled out.

MR. DAYKIN: I think this is a venerable statute. It is present language 178.480 and has the same scope of application that it had in there and would apply to gross misdemeanors and felonies under existing law. It would be intended to relate to offense against property, rather than against the person.

MR. HILBRECHT: Another word should go in there instead of deposition.

MR. DAYKIN: This has all the earmarks of being one of those 1869 statutes that nobody has ever done anything about.

MR. SWACKHAMER: It must have some merit.

MR. DAYKIN: It has probably never been used.

MR. SWACKHAMER: Then it can't be much danger.

MR. DAYKIN: The D.A.'s point is rational where the offense is a serious one or an offense against the person.

Mr. Torvinen moved to reject the objections
Mr. Lowman seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 390

D.A.'s comment: Subsection 1 should include stolen or embezzled property taken in violation of laws of other states as well as Nevada. Subsection 3 should include "Criminal Offense" in the place of "Felony".

MR. SWACKHAMER: The objection sounds reasonable.

MR. DAYKIN: This came in part from the Federal Rules. I see no reason why their suggestions could not be followed.

Mr. Schouweiler moved to adopt the two amendments

MR. TORVINEN: What word?

MR. DAYKIN: "laws of Nevada or of any other state or of the United States"

Mr. Lowman seconded Mr. Schouweiler's motion
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 395

D.A.'s comment: This section should be amended so as not to preclude the seizure of any other items of property which may have been stolen or which may have been used in the commission of a felony, although not specifically described in the warrant. Under existing laws of the State of Nevada and the U.S. where a search warrant is properly issued, other property which is found incidental to the search which may constitute evidence of a crime may be seized. The proposal would preclude this seizure and admissibility as evidence. There seems to be no good reason why other property which constitutes evidence of a crime should not also be subject to the seizure if the warrant was on its face valid.

MR. HILBRECHT: I don't think they are right in their law.

MR. DAYKIN: This was taken from Federal 41 E.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to reject the proposal
Mr. Schouweiler seconded

MR. TORVINEN: If a policeman is searching for something and finds contraband, does he have to go back and get another warrant for the contraband?

MR. DAYKIN: He has to now. The Federal people have construed this rather broadly.

MR. HILBRECHT: If he makes an arrest, then seizing the contraband is valid. Otherwise, he must go back and get another search warrant.

MR. WOOSTER: I personally would like to see it broadened, but if it is not constitutional possibly we are stuck with it. It seems to be best to put a hold on this section for now

SECTION 440

D.A.'s comment: We are definitely opposed to this change. It can be of great importance for the D.A. and other law enforcement agencies to receive information obtained by Parole and Probation Officers. The present law should be retained which allows disclosure of this information. There is no objection to a limitation or restriction that t information so obtained be used for official purposes only.

MR. DAYKIN: This really goes along with 244 which we have changed. Therefore, I would see no objection to leaving the law as it is.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to retain the law as it is
Mr. Schouweiler seconded
Motion passed unanimously

SECTION 442

Bryan's comment: This section should be amended to provide discretion with the Public Defender upon court approval to represent indigents in misdemeanor trials occurring in either the township courts or the misdemeanor courts. No increase in money would be required as the Public Defender is not compensated on a per capita basis and the court would retain control of the extent of the Public Defender's intervention in the misdemeanor category by requiring prior approval.

MR. DAYKIN: If we are going to do that, we should go into the Public Defender's section.

MR. TORVINEN: The War on Poverty will allow this to be done. They can do it without our passing the law. We ought to just let it go.

MR. HILBRECHT: This is nothing but more harassment for Bryan to take these on a selective basis, but I would like to get something established in a Rule of the Court.

MR. DAYKIN: If this is to be done, it should not be done by collateral tinkering with this section. It should be done in another section.

Mr. Hilbrecht moved to reject the suggestion and ask for a separate bill.
Mr. Schouweiler seconded

MR. TORVINEN: Isn't there a conflict here with one of Miss Dungan's bills?

MR. DAYKIN: All these conflicts will be taken care of with the amendments.

MR. WOOSTER: Tomorrow we will discuss:

AB 220
AB 221
AB 222
AB 223
AB 224
AB 371
AB 377
AB 341
AB 366

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 P.M.