

Assembly Committee of the Whole

ASSEMBLY IN SESSION, APRIL 23, 1971. QUORUM PRESENT. MR. SPEAKER PRESIDING.

* * * * *

MR. TORVINEN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that Assembly Bill 825, the reapportionment bill, be placed on the Chief Clerk's desk pending the amendments which are still being worked on by the bill drafter.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard Mr. Torvinen's motion that Assembly Bill 825, an act relating to reapportionment, be placed on the Chief Clerk's desk pending amendments.

MR. MCKISSICK: Yes, I concur, except that I'd like to know timewise. We have about ten conference committees that should be meeting. Could you give us a time at all?

MR. TORVINEN: I assume that Mr. Young is off the floor engaged in that work with the bill drafter, and without being able to talk to him, I couldn't give a time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there additional comments? You've heard Mr. Torvinen's motion, then, that AB 825, an act relating to reapportionment, be placed on the Chief Clerk's desk pending amendments. All those in favor of that motion signify by saying "aye". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) All those opposed say "no". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) The "ayes" have it; it is so ordered.

(Thereupon other business was conducted by the Assembly.)

(Later of the day of April 23, 1971:)

MR. TORVINEN: Mr. Speaker, the only business we have left now, as I understand it, is 625 (sic) if the amendments are prepared. I am informed that the amendments for the bill that's in the Committee

of the Whole -- the Board of Regents, etc., will not be ready until tomorrow. So that 625 amendments may be ready by 5 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It's 825.

MR. TORVINEN: I mean 825 amendments, may be ready by 5 o'clock. So it would be my suggestion that we recess subject to the call of the Chair, for the next 15 or 20 minutes. At that time we should have a definite information from the Counsel Bureau whether or not they'll have them ready. If they won't have them ready until 6 or 7 o'clock tonight, we'll just act on them first thing in the morning and get the bill down to the Senate.

(Thereupon other business was conducted by the Assembly.)

(Later of the day of April 23, 1971:)

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement of Mr. Torvinen relative to not having a Committee of the Whole, I thought it might be appropriate to simply report on some of the progress being made today on the reapportionment bills so that the house doesn't feel that the lack of a Committee of the Whole means we're not making any progress. The Washoe County Delegation has met and made certain decisions with regard to the size of their Board of County Commissioners, their School Board of Trustees and maps representing that decision have been made and those maps converted into enumeration districts for incorporation in the bills.

The same for the Clark County in terms of the numbers we discussed last night in the Committee of the Whole here so that when we do come to a Committee of the Whole we will have some rather specific amendments adopted in accordance with the wishes of this

body, either expressed here on the floor or in your caucuses. So that we will have specific amendments to act upon when we do get into Committee of the Whole, for the Board of Regents, State School Board, County Commissioners, and local school districts.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, it would simply be appropriate to make this kind of a report so that the body doesn't feel we are stalemated on that. We are making progress, and I think we'll have all these available for us tomorrow. The major staff effort has been put forth today on 825 so we can get these amendments out. You've all participated in it and done a good job. We hope to have them by 5, and I hope to have confirmation soon that we will.

* * * * *

MR. MCKISSICK: I'm getting tired of Committee of the Whole business, unless it's absolutely necessary. If we're coming back at 5, only to consider 825, and come back tomorrow for the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education and others, wouldn't it be better to either try to sweat it out tonight and do it as a package, or put them all over until tomorrow?

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, through you to Mr. McKissick, it's a very fair question. In my judgment, there is more work to be done on 825 after it leaves our house than on the other bills. We have the work, as far as this house has done, nearly completed on 825. This has been given priority over the other work, and I don't really feel that we're ready, furthermore, on the other ones. And I feel that once we have the work in printed form in front of you, that we can take very speedy action on the other four bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there additional comments?

MR. SCHOFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask you and the body, or if anyone knows, if they have some idea as to how long it might take once we get reapportionment out of the way? How much longer it might take to get the loose ends wrapped up to the point of sine die. Does anyone have any idea or some ---

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Schofield, I'd have to be real honest with you and tell you that I have no idea whatsoever. I have talked to Mr. McDonald once today with no assurance one way or the other. I feel that at the end of every session things are somewhat stalemated, and that there doesn't seem to be any solution to that. I sincerely hope that if we couldn't accomplish the task by Sunday night, it would certainly be foolish for us to sit here all day Sunday. You'll just have to be patient and see if we can't by tomorrow morning determine at that point just where we are and whether we can make it by Sunday night. I have to be real honest with you at this point. I have no more knowledge than you do.

* * * * *

MR. SPEAKER: I might ask Mr. Frank Young at this point, Frank, do you feel there is a possibility that with not only 825, but with the other bills we can come to some conclusion that would allow us to finish up by Sunday night as far as those bills are concerned?

MR. FRANK YOUNG: I certainly feel so, Mr. Speaker. But it's a dangerous prediction to make because I don't quite know what's going to get in the way of it back in Russ's area. I really think the thing that's going to be more determinative than anything else

is the handling of conflicts. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I've just been handed a note that says the AB 825 amendments will be out in 15 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, then, it behooves us to wait those 15 minutes and get those amendments and at least process those, because there might be some conflict when we try to adopt those and I think we better try to handle that, especially this evening. And then also get it reprinted. If there are no objections, then, we will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, which will be approximately 15 or 20 minutes.

* * * * *

(Assembly then in recess.)

ASSEMBLY IN SESSION, APRIL 23, 1971, 6:05 p.m. Quorum present.
Mr. Speaker presiding.

MR. TORVINEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Assembly Bill 825 be taken from the Chief Clerk's desk and placed on General File and Third Reading for this legislative day. On the top.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard Mr. Torvinen's motion that AB 825 be taken from the Chief Clerk's desk and placed at the top of the General File for this legislative day. All those in favor signify by saying "aye". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) All those opposed say "no". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) The "ayes" have it. So ordered. General File and Third Reading. Assembly Bill No. 825

(Thereupon the Chief Clerk gave third reading to AB 825.)

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any amendments to Section 1?

CHIEF CLERK: I have an amendment by Mr. Homer, Amendment No. 4458 and an amendment offered by Committee of the Whole, Amendment No. ---

MR. HOMER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask permission to withdraw Amendment No. 4458.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, Mr. Homer will withdraw Amendment No. 4458. Mr. Homer is the proposer. So granted.

CHIEF CLERK: I have another amendment, Mr. Speaker. Amendment No. 4431 to AB 825 proposed by Committee of the Whole.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move that we consider Amendment No. 4431 by number only.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frank Young moves that we consider now Amendment No. 4431 to Assembly Bill 825 by number only. All those in favor of that motion signify by saying "aye". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) Those who oppose say "no". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) The "ayes" have it. We will consider it by number only.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I believe the appropriate procedure, since I want to make some changes to the amendment by interlineation, is to make those changes first and then to move the adoption of the amendment after making the changes.

MR. SPEAKER: That's correct, sir.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Before doing that, I want to make some remarks -- general remarks -- on the amendment. Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, this amendment now casts into legal language the maps which we have used up to this point. We are casting them in terms of the Census Bureau's enumeration data maps, enumeration district maps. The amendment has been prepared and checked a number of times by

staff, including Mr. Palmer and Mr. Dugger and Mr. Perry Burnett. You will note that we have numbered the Assembly Districts consecutively from 1 to 40 throughout the state.

At the time we did make a decision that it would be easiest to cast the bill up in this form, the only map that was fixed, or that we thought was final at that time, was the Clark County map, so we decided to go ahead and use 1 through 22 as it existed on the Clark County map. Then, since Washoe was the next one on the drawing board, if you will, to add the next ten districts beyond that and then the last one was the eight rural.

Now, I don't know whether any other questions -- I have not personally looked at this in great detail, but I certainly expect to look at the bill when it comes back from printers tomorrow morning.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, if there are no questions I would like to propose some changes in this amendment. If I may direct your attention to page 2, near the bottom of the page, subparagraph (d). Let me back up by saying this: It is our feeling at this point that rather than to dissect Carson City as extensively as this amendment does, that we would do better to dissect it less and to put Schurz into the Lyon County district.

In accordance with that feeling, -- I'm proposing, Mr. Speaker, the following amendments by interlineation to this amendment: At the bottom of page 2, subparagraph (d) should read as follows: "Assembly District No. 36 shall consist of Esmeralda", insert "and Nye Counties and", again inserting, "and Nye Counties and." Let me go back to Mineral. Cross out the words "and Nye". Change the plural

Assembly Committee of the Whole

of Counties to the singular, County. And add, "excepting Schurz Township." I will now read that line again as soon as the Chief Clerk is ready. Okay?

"Assembly District No. 36 shall consist of Esmeralda and Nye Counties and Mineral County, excepting Schurz Township." Any questions on that change?

Then, Mr. Speaker, two lines below, subparagraph (f) would read: "Assembly District No. 38 shall consist of Lyon and Storey Counties and Carson City Enumeration District No. 3 and Schurz Township in Mineral County."

MR. HILBRECHT: Uh, Mr. Young, didn't you -- it would be your desire, I presume, to omit an "and" before "Carson City" and replace it with a comma.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hilbrecht, you are correct. We should cross out the "and" before "Carson City". We should also cross out the numbers "2 and 11". Cross out the number "2", the word "and" and the number "11", and insert in its place "No. 3". I'll read that line as it should read again. "Assembly District No. 38 shall consist of Lyon and Storey Counties, Carson City Enumeration District No. 3 and Schurz Township in Mineral County".

Now, over on to page 3, subparagraph (g), cross out the number "12", the word "and" and the number "13" and replace it by the word "and" and the number "17". So (g) now reads: "Assembly District No. 39 shall consist of Douglas County and Carson City Enumeration Districts No. 1 and 17." One and seventeen.

MR. ROY YOUNG: Mr. Young, we'd have to go back up here on Senate seats also, wouldn't we, at (c) -- Senate District No. 19 and

insert -- take out your "2" and "11" and insert "3" and "Schurz Township". Page 2.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: You are so correct. Thank you.

MR. ROY YOUNG: Subsection (c). And I think you'd have to do the same thing on subsection (d). Take out "2" and "11" and put in "1" and "17".

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Young, would you repeat that, to make sure we're correct on page 2?

MR. FRANK YOUNG: I assume you mean Frank Young? All right, we're talking now, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, middle of page 2, subparagraph (c). "Senate District No. 19 shall consist of Churchill, Lyon, and Storey Counties and Carson City Enumeration District No. 3 and Schurz Township in Mineral County."

Now, going on to (d), "Senate District No. 20 shall consist of Douglas County and Carson City, less Enumeration District No. 3."

MR. DREYER: To Mr. Young, Mr. Frank Young, did I understand you correctly? You said (c) on page 2 was District No. 3 and Schurz? Then what was (f)?

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, through you to Mr. Dreyer, I'm looking now at Section 5, in the middle of the page, subparagraph (c) -- subparagraph 1 (c), thank you. Senate District No. 19 shall consist of Churchill, Lyon and Storey Counties and Carson City Enumeration District No. 3 and Schurz Township in Mineral County.

Going now to the next paragraph, (d). Senate District No. 20 shall consist of Douglas County and Carson City, less Enumeration District No. 3. Mrs. Frazzini raises the question, shouldn't that be "1" and "17". You see, what we're doing is combining, Mrs.

Assembly Committee of the Whole

Frazzini, Douglas and Carson City, and what we have to eliminate is that enumeration district which is tied to Lyon and Storey Counties. And that is number 3. Thank you, though, for checking me. I appreciate that. Now, Mr. Roy Young, do you see any other place?

MR. ROY YOUNG: I haven't been able to see any.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Now we need to find the --

MR. GETTO: Yes, I think -- to Mr. Frank Young -- then you'll have to define the Senatorial District which Nye County was presently in and eliminate the Schurz Township from it.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Correct. Thank you. And that is, again, just above (c), it's 1 (b). Senate District No. 18 shall consist of Esmeralda, Lincoln -- all right, let's cross out the word Mineral -- shall consist of Esmeralda, Lincoln, Nye and White Pine Counties and Mineral County less Schurz Township... except Schurz Township... excepting Schurz Township.

Mr. Speaker, with the help of the body, I think we have completed the interlineation amendments necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frank Young -- does anyone have any questions now on what we've done as far as the amendment is concerned?

MISS HAWKINS: Have you moved the adoption of it?

MR. SPEAKER: I just want everyone to make sure, due to the fact that we have intentions of passing this tonight, so you better make sure that what is on the amendment is correct in your minds.

MR. LOWMAN: Could we have a one minute recess?

MR. SPEAKER: Sure. There'll be a one minute recess.

Mr. Young, I would think at this point that we should first move the body accept interlineations.

Assembly Committee of the Whole

MR. FRANK YOUNG: I would move.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard Mr. Frank Young's motion, then; Miss Hawkins, excuse me.

MISS HAWKINS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to object to this, and I would like my remarks entered in the record, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you wait until we adopt the amendment? I think that would be the proper time, unless you want to --

MISS HAWKINS: I don't want you to adopt the amendment. If you want to wait till he moves the adoption --

MR. SPEAKER: We haven't moved the adoption now. We're just approving the interlineations. If you object to that --

MISS HAWKINS: All right.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard Mr. Frank Young's --

MR. SWACKHAMER: If Miss Hawkins did not wish to oppose or object to the interdelineations, I do. I would yield to Miss Hawkins if she would -- what do you have to do, Mr. Young?

(remarks -- not distinguishable on the tape)

MR. SWACKHAMER: Adopt what? Adopt the amendments that are interdelineated?

MR. SPEAKER: If you object to the interlineations, you are right.

MR. SWACKHAMER: I object to the interdelineations.

MR. SPEAKER: Then you're in order, sir.

MR. SWACKHAMER: I would yield to the proponents if -- I believe that's in order, isn't it, to yield to the proponents?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, if you so wish.

MR. HOMER: It's a good bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, Mr. Homer, it would be proper to explain why the necessity of the interlineations and probably why the necessity of Schurz.

MR. HOMER: Well, the bill as drafted takes out six enumeration districts in Carson City and cuts it up until nobody would know who they were voting for. There would be as many as two ballots in one precinct -- maybe three ballots in one precinct. And I would love to wish the job off on any of you of our City Clerk, if you would pass that bill as it's done there now, and the confusion to the people, in knowing who their representatives were would be tremendous. So it makes it a tremendously simpler thing.

As the bill is drafted you would take five blocks across, right up through the center of town to Washington Street -- take it away from us. Split the town right up the middle, and then wipe out the top side and come around, and we'd be in a funny shaped island right here in the center. And so, by figuring the numbers out, we've reduced the disparity and left the center of the community of interest intact. And we only have to remove three enumeration districts just by the addition of Schurz. And I state again that Carson City, for representation in this body, is considered by law a county. And I cannot buy the justification for ripping one county apart and not even asking another county to bend a little. And this is why I say that it has to be done in a little more equitable manner for Carson City.

MR. ROY YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Palmer is almost completely worn out, but if you go to the enumeration figures and give

Lyon County two, it makes Ormsby County short. Now the figures that we have just shown you now come out about as close to the 10,500 as he could get the thing worked out. I'll read them to you. Carson City will wind up with 10,478, Douglas County with 10,939, and Storey and Lyon County with 10,399. That's about as close as we could get to come to 10,500.

MR. SWACKHAMER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise in objection. I believe I have already risen in objection to the interdelineation, and for these reasons: I have tried to serve as Chairman of the rural county group in reapportionment, and at every one of our meetings the majority of our people -- a significant majority of our people -- have voted that in the rural counties we would try to adhere as much as practicable to county lines, giving secondary consideration to community of interest. We would adhere to single seat districts and as a secondary consideration to all of those, the disparity factor. We believe that because of the sparse population and the great areas of the 15 rural counties of the state, that the courts would allow us a greater disparity than they would in highly urbanized areas.

Now, the best legal minds that we have appear before us and have told us that the courts give very, very high credence to political lines, feeling that when county lines were drawn they must have a reason, and they have not looked behind that. That is the reason the rural counties have felt that the most defensible area that we could have would be to adhere to county lines, making two or more counties into assembly districts where needed, and not

Assembly Committee of the Whole

break up any except where it was impossible to do otherwise. There is only one county in the state where that is the situation, and that happens to be Carson City, or Ormsby County, where they have a population of between 15 and 16 thousand people which is just exactly, practically, between what you need for two and one district. There is no way in the world that Carson City could escape being cut up, unless it was by a miracle that we could have adopted a House of 36 and a Senate of 18, which, of course, is denied us.

What we have here right now is an obvious political accommodation. It is going to, we understand, if it's not adopted, we're going to be sued. If we do adopt it, I assure you we're going to be sued again. On the first premise, if we are sued by adopting Amendment No. 4431 it is believed that we are on defensible ground by counsel. It's obvious by -- where we have violated our own criteria to accommodate political considerations, that by violating that we are going to be putting ourselves in an indefensible position.

I would urge that the Assembly do now reject all of the inter-delineations that Mr. Young has presented to the Assembly, that we do adopt Assembly No. -- Assembly Amendment No. 4431 undelineated, and let us proceed with reprinting and get on to the business of the house.

MR. TORVINEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise, not so much in favor of the motion for interdelineation, although I am in favor of that, but to respond to some of the remarks made by my learned colleague from Battle Mountain. First of all, he must have been reading different court cases than the ones I've been reading, if he

Assembly Committee of the Whole

thinks that the courts give high credence to political lines. The cases I read went exactly the opposite. They give low credence to political lines and high effect to community of interest. Community of interest overweighs political lines, especially within an area like this.

Secondly, he's talked about rural counties and political considerations. First of all, I think it's just about the time we have to stop thinking of Carson City as a rural county. It's becoming an urban county. And by lumping Carson City in with the other rural counties, and having the majority of the vote of the other rural counties force something down Carson City's throat, that isn't -- that completely violates the community of interest rule. It doesn't seem to me to be political or wrong or the wrong thing to do. We ought to be trying to maintain the community of interest of the people who live right here in Carson City. We ought to do what we can not to split a line right down the middle and cut 'em up. By bringing Schurz into the Lyon County -- basically the Lyon County District, we have less of the violation of the community of interest principle than we do by carving apart Carson City.

Now, if this is a political consideration, then I guess we're guilty. But I would submit to this body that it's a practical consideration. It's a consideration that has to do with the criteria laid down by the courts in redistricting, and not a political consideration. One -- and with that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that we adopt the motion made by Mr. Young.

MR. McKISSICK: Point of order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. McKISSICK: If we're talking about interlineation, not delineation, -- delineation is subtracting from -- we're talking about lineation. Interlineation means adding to. All right. Fine. Now we've established that.

I think it's a dirty, lousy shame that we are now putting this on a political basis. If we are going to discuss this amendment, it has to go to reprint, right? And we hope to not have to sit here until the fourth of July to get this thing to the reprinters. All we're talking about, I think, now, -- although by interlineation we are adding a number of words -- and the Schurz Township, et cetera -- we know what we're talking about. So we're not violating any rule of order of the House.

So the point is, that my good friend, Swack, is saying to -- I think his motion was -- to defeat the interlineations and pass the amendment, 4431 as written and send it to reprint, and then tomorrow I guess we'd vote on it. Which would mean more debate. And it would seem to me more appropriate, now, as the motion was made, I think, by Mr. Young, that we pass the amendment with the interlineations.

MISS HAWKINS: I think all the arguments that have been given here for taking Schurz Township away are more appropriate if they apply to Wadsworth Township. You've called for a community of interest. They have a combined school district, they are within 15 miles of each other. Schurz Township is not within that distance of Yerington. And I see no reason why Mineral County should always be the sacrificial lamb. Last time, we had Mina Township taken away from us. This time it's perfectly all right -- and I'm in complete

Assembly Committee of the Whole

sympathy with Dr. Homer of what has been done there to Carson City. On the other hand, if we're going to go outside county lines, I see no reason why it could not be something that has a greater community interest, the Wadsworth-Fernley area, rather than again take parts of Mineral County away by taking Schurz away from us.

MR. DINI: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm mistaken of what we're supposed to have been doing in the cow county caucus the last two days, of deciding our own housekeeping. The cow counties decided 9 to 3 to adopt this amendment that's in here and now all of a sudden Washoe County and the Republicans say, "drop dead; you guys were wasting your time." I spun my wheels from ten hours of listening to nothing. I can't understand this.

I'm okay either way, but I thought we had made an agreement among the cow counties that the cow counties would reapportion themselves, and try to stay within disparity and county lines. And I think that the job that Art Palmer did on the map he presented us this morning was a great job and kept the disparity down low. I can't imagine making a party issue out of this amendment and trying to ram it down the cow counties' throats.

MR. SWACKHAMER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to briefly respond to my good friend, the Majority Leader. I'm not practicing law this week, so Mr. Torvinen's remarks that he and I were reading different cases can't be true. I'm not reading any at all. I would like the house to know where I got my information, and I got it as late as this afternoon from the counsel who has worked on reapportionment for the Legislature the most, and that is Perry Burnett, who told

Assembly Committee of the Whole

us the courts have been holding that county lines have a significant amount of credence in these boundaries and that community of interest, while it's high, is secondary. Mr. Burnett and Mr. Torvinen are reading the different cases.

MR. HOMER: Mr. Speaker, I was in the cow county delegation, and we were agreed to stick as close to county lines as practicable, in Mr. Swackhamer's words. Until, all of a sudden at the last minute, up comes this new map which suddenly considered Carson City as a municipality, not as a county, and everybody decided to butcher that up. Now, if it's wrong to punch Lyon County and Mineral County in the nose, it's certainly wrong to cut my head off.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there additional comments? You've heard the motion, then, that we do now allow the interlineations on Amendment No. 4431.

MR. SWACKHAMER: Mr. Speaker, we know, I'm sure, what we're voting on and would it be improper at this time to ask for a roll call vote?

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly not, sir. Mr. Swackhamer has asked for a roll call, sustained by Mr. May, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Prince. All those in favor of the interlineations will vote "aye". All those opposed to interlineations will vote "no". The Chief Clerk will call the roll.

(Thereupon the Chief Clerk called the roll on allowing interlineations on Amendment No. 4431.)

MR. SPEAKER: Assembly roll call on the allowance of the interlineations: There are 22 ayes, 14 nos and four absent. The motion is carried. The interlineations will become part of the amendment.

MR. FRANK YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I now move the adoption of Amendment 4431 as interlineated.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frank Young now moves the adoption of Amendment No. 4431 as interlineated, to Assembly Bill No. 825. Are there any remarks? All those in favor, then, signify by saying "aye". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) Those who oppose say "no". (Thereupon a voice vote was taken.) The "ayes" have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there additional amendments?

CHIEF CLERK: No, I have no further amendments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TORVINEN: Mr. Speaker, it's probably a fine time to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: At this time, then, I would move that Assembly Bill 825 be reprinted, and to engrossment.

MR. TORVINEN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we stand adjourned until the hour of 9 a.m. April 24, 1971.

(A voice vote was thereupon taken and the motion carried.
Assembly in Adjournment at 6:49 p.m.)