

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Dini  
Mr. Marvel  
Mr. Fitzpatrick  
Mrs. Westall  
Dr. Robinson  
Mr. Craddock  
Mr. Jeffrey  
Mr. Bedrosian  
Mr. Harmon  
Mr. Bergevin

GUESTS PRESENT

See Guest List attached

\* \* \* \*

Chairman Dini called the meeting to order at 8 A.M. He stated the first order of business would be AB 286 because the Committee had never taken action although the testimony had been heard. Chairman Dini stated the Committee had recommended increasing the amount of money to \$5,000.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

AB 286 - Mr. Craddock moved AMEND and DO PASS, seconded by Mr. Fitzpatrick, and unanimously carried.

AJR 13 - URGES CONGRESS TO ENACT CERTAIN LEGISLATION AND PROPOSED CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL CONSTITUTION WHICH WOULD LIMIT ACTIVITIES AND REDUCE COST OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

AJR 14 - REQUESTS CONGRESS TO CALL CONVENTION FOR PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION WHICH WOULD LIMIT ACTIVITIES AND REDUCE COST OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

PEGGY CAVNAR, Assemblyman, Dist. 1, Las Vegas

Mrs. Cavnar distributed a file packet for each member of the Committee containing her presentation and testified from prepared text, a copy of which is attached hereto and made part of the record.

Chairman Dini then requested Mrs. Cavnar to discuss her resolutions, all the members of the Committee having the prepared document in front of them, and asked for questions from the Committee on AJR 13. A general discussion ensued between Committee members and Mrs. Cavnar on the proposed resolutions, namely, reducing Federal Government spending, giving the states more rights, limiting tenure of office for senators, no salaries, taxes, etc.

Chairman Dini then requested Mrs. Cavnar to give testimony on AJR 14.

Mrs. Cavnar stated the differences between AJR 13 and AJR 14 were that AJR 14 is more stringent. Mrs. Cavnar stated the reason it was designed the way it was was to strongly request the Congress to act with a little bit more of lenient type of procedure. She stated in AJR 14 they were calling a Constitutional Convention that the total amount of taxes that could be collected per person would be \$1,000 rather than \$1,200. She stated this would mean if the Congress waits until a Constitutional Convention is called then they will ultimately have less money to spend. Mrs. Cavnar stated that is one of the differences between the Memorial and the request for a Constitutional Convention. Mrs. Cavnar stated the other difference is the reduction of the national debt.

Chairman Dini questioned Mrs. Cavnar whether it was her proposal that the working man give up his prerogative of attempting to increase his standard of living and for better wages, and she stated he would not have to because his money would be worth more; he won't be giving his federal income tax money to the government and he will have that in his pocket.

SAM CAVNAR, Private Citizen

Mr. Cavnar read a prepared text into the record, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof. His statement supports AJR 13 and AJR 14.

Chairman Dini stated to Mr. Cavnar he had no problem with the philosophy of the resolutions but he advised Mr. Cavnar he had absolutely no chance of getting the Bill through because of a click of eastern liberals, bankers, and the money people in the country, that are raping the people. Mr. Cavnar stated this was the way to stop it.

SHIRLEY PATE, representing N.O.W.

Mrs. Pate read a prepared statement into the record, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Mrs. Pate's statements are in opposition to AJR 13 and AJR 14.

SB 68 \* - STRENGTHENS STANDARDS FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

MRS. REBA CHAPPEL, Chief, Emergency Medical Services Section  
Bureau of Community Health Services in  
the Nevada State Division of Health

Mrs. Chappel stated that SB 68 would amend NRS 450(b)(1) and NRS 630.430. She stated the proposed amendments would allow the removal of outdated and unnecessary requirements placed on volunteers applying for licensing as an ambulance attendant; will provide a penalty for persons or ambulance services which misrepresent emergency care capability and will allow the Board of Health to establish reasonable, minimum standards for the interior design and configuration of ambulance vehicles placed in service after July 1, 1979. Mrs. Chappel stated that in order to provide the best patient care possible there must be some standard applied to interior design and configuration. Mrs. Chappel stated their intent was to be able to have some authority to establish some guidelines to help people in rural areas not make mistakes.

SHIRLEY WOLFE, Nevada Nurses Assn., Legislative Committee

Mrs. Wolfe stated she wanted to add to the Bill and was interested in patient care. Her particular concern centered around air ambulances, and that if they advertise themselves as such they should give their best. Mrs. Wolfe went on to outline the amendments she proposed concerning the responsibilities and capabilities needed by personnel aboard air ambulances and those people operating them.

A discussion ensued and Committee members offered to Mrs. Wolfe that the standards she proposed were extremely stringent. Mrs. Wolfe agreed that she was but she felt that she would want her family, if need be that they required such service, to receive the ultimate in care and professionalism. Mrs. Wolfe stated that if anyone advertised air ambulance service the criteria for care should be the very best. She stated there are air ambulance services who just throw a patient in the back of the plane, no one available to monitor the patient, and when the patient arrives at the destination he or she is dead. She stated she felt they should aim for the highest standards.

\* See Exhibits

Mr. Getto suggested to Mrs. Wolfe that she was making it so restrictive that the rural areas would suffer as a result.

Mr. Fitzpatrick brought out the fact that the amendment says that you can't advertise as an Advanced Emergency Care unless you have all the specifics and that was agreed upon by the Committee and Mrs. Wolfe. Mr. Getto suggested what Mrs. Wolfe was proposing was that no air ambulance should be licensed unless they have the standards.

WILLIAM M. EDWARDS, M.D. M.P.H. Nev. State Health Services

He stated they strongly support SB 68. He stated they support the concept of Mrs. Wolfe's amendment; the mandatory upgrading. Dr. Edwards, however, stated he had some concerns for instance getting a medical director in Winnemucca but the physicians in that area might not accept the position because of the malpractice situation. Dr. Edwards reiterated they agreed with the concept but whether they were ready for it or not that he did not know.

Chairman Dini suggested perhaps it would be better to have a separate piece of legislation rather than taking the agency Bill.

Dr. Edwards stated they had some other problems and that it should be discussed so that they have the approval of the State Board of Medical Examiners, State Board of Pharmacy, etc. Dr. Edwards said he agrees that they should have the best air ambulances available.

Chairman Dini stated it was not the intent of the Chair to take action on AJR 13 and 14 nor to take action on Senate Bill 68 until he has an opportunity to talk to Senator Blakemore, the sponsor, and with the indulgence of the Committee he would like to wait until tomorrow (March 1st) to find out about it.

Chairman Dini announced he had a request from the Retirement Board to introduce BDR 23-241 into the Bill making technical corrections to the Public Retirement System Act.

Mr. Craddock moved that BDR 23-241 be introduced, seconded by Mr. Bergevin, and unanimously carried.

\*AB 478

Chairman Dini stated that the Committee was aware there was an AMEND and DO PASS on AB 85 in which the Committee directed him to place the office under the State Treasurer. Chairman Dini stated that in conferring with the money Committees he found that they prefer to have it put under the Dept. of Commerce and he felt it a waste of effort and time to print a budget and put it under the wrong department and may not get it out of Ways and Means. Chairman Dini asked for direction from the Committee as to whether the previous motion should be amended.

Mr. Marvel moved that the Committee reconsider its action whereby they amended and Do Pass SB 85 and place it under the State Treasurer's Office, seconded by Mrs. Westall, and carried unanimously.

Mr. Getto moved that the Committee Amend and Do Pass AB 85 per previous discussion except that the function be put under the Commerce Dept., seconded by Dr. Robinson, and unanimously carried.

There being no further business before the meeting, the same was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Shatzman  
Assembly Attache

PRESS RELEASE

Assemblywoman Peggy Cavnar  
Room 349, Nevada State Legislative Bldg.  
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Contact: (702) 882-7740

CAVNAR INTRODUCES BILLS TO START NATIONWIDE  
CALL FOR FEDERAL SPENDING REVERSAL

"The federal budget broke the 100 billion dollar barrier for the first time in 1962. Taking just nine years more to double and break the 200 billion dollar mark in 1971. In just four more years, 1975, it had passed the 300 billion limit and only two years later exploded through the 400 billion ceiling. Last year's budget was close to 500 billion and the proposed limit this year is 531 billion," stated Assemblyman Peggy Cavnar, Republican of Clark County.

"The federal budget doubled in six years, 1971 - 1977, and threatens to double again in four more years if excessive spending and inflation are not brought to an immediate halt," declared the Nevada Assemblyman as she introduced two measures designed to reverse the process through the State Legislature.

"The first bill is a Memorial to Congress which calls upon them to set up the machinery to remove the Federal Government from activities which should be solely in the hands of local governments; to not only balance the budget -- but also put limits on the total amount of taxes which may be collected from any source on a per capita basis; and to limit the size of government and number of federal employees as well as the years that Congressmen may serve," declared the Las Vegas Republican.

"The end result will be a reversal of the budget to the 1971 - 1972 level; the next seven years will bring about gradual elimination of income taxes; yearly reduction in the national debt; limited Federal Government; closer attention to the problems of the poor, infirm and senior citizens by local government; and halting the inflationary spiral. The bottom line is a sound

dollar, full employment and the ability to compete once again in the world market with a plus instead of the 28 billion dollar deficit we had this year in our balance of trade," Cavnar stated.

"The Memorial to Congress is the nice, but firm, approach to the Federal Legislature from 34 or more of the state legislative bodies saying in effect: 'We would like you to take the appropriate action,'" noted Mrs. Cavnar.

"The second bill I will introduce will have the built in power to do the job in the event Congress does not act -- just as our Nevada Questions 4 and 6 give the people the final say at the polls in 1980 if we in the Nevada Legislature do not produce meaningfully. The people of the nation will, through their state legislative bodies, have the final say with the second piece of legislation which calls for a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of specifically and only implementing this program. With the concurrence of two-thirds of the state legislatures, Congress must convene a Constitutional Convention where the people will enact a more stringent program than called for in the Memorial. Only four additional states will be required to ratify that action, and we expect to have them with us before the Convention is called. Petitions to the affect have been circulating since late 1977 by local and national groups."

"In other words," concluded Mrs. Cavnar, "We get their attention with a backup promise with teeth: either they take action as proposed in the Memorial -- or the Constitutional Convention will do it for them."

Mrs. Cavnar stated supporters of the program wanted it to be launched by the Nevada Legislature because of this state's already proven ability to operate soundly with a balanced budget, no income and many other taxes, ~~plus relatively low taxes of all other kinds.~~

## Introduction of Memorial To Congress and Constitutional Convention Bills

by Assemblywoman Peggy Cavnar

AJR 13

AJR 14

Mr. Chairman, Fellow Legislators:

Many of us have already agreed to co-sponsor or vote for a Joint Resolution calling on the Congress of the United States to mandatorily balance the federal budget.

This is certainly a step in the right direction. However, as we all know -- a mandatory balanced budget is only as good as the lawmakers -- who have the power to tax -- make it. For they can increase the budget as much as they want by simply voting new taxes or increasing existing taxes to produce the revenue in order to balance that increased budget.

The only way to insure that Congress not only operates within their means and the desires of the citizens is to require a balanced budget with a pro-rata limit on all taxes that may be collected from any and all sources.

As a body, we recently passed Assemblyman Rhoads' bill to cut down on federal intervention and control in Nevada.

The only way to stop the billions of dollars being wasted or spent on projects which should not be the prerogative of the Federal Government in the first place -- and to get the federal government out of our hair and our business -- is to limit the amount of money for all federal programs and systematically reduce that ceiling each year until a reasonable and responsible limited federal government balanced budget is attained.

Current reports that federal government officials admit waste, fraud, and graft of from 38 Billion to 50 Billion dollars per year shows there is plenty of room to start on existing programs.

Today, I am introducing two bills to start the ball rolling to <sup>do</sup> something about Big Brother Bureaucracy. The first is a Memorial to Congress seeking tax and spending reform. The second calls for a Federal Constitutional Convention as a means of



backing up the Memorial. The Memorial calls upon Congress to take action while the second bill provides for action by the people if Congress fails to act. This is much like the one-two punch of Question Six here in Nevada where either we in this body act responsibly with tax and budget cuts and accompanying fiscal responsibility — or the voters will make Question Six mandatory at the polls in 1980 — along with sending new people here to replace us with legislators they feel are more atuned to their wishes.

If Congress does not follow the "request" as covered in the first bill which is the Memorial to Congress — then with the concurrence of two-thirds of the fifty state legislatures — a Constitutional Convention must be called by Congress at which the necessary action will be taken to:

1. Mandatorily balance the Federal Budget. The only exceptions would be in case of War or Extreme National Emergency.
2. Systematically reduce federal spending each year for the following five years.
3. Establish a pro-rata limit on the amount of taxes of any kind which may be collected from all sources based on the population of the United States. Ceiling to be based on either a flat percentage of the Gross National Product (GNP); or pro-rata basis of a predetermined reduction of the current federal budget which will be reduced ten per cent per year for five years with very limited constitutionally required services for the federal government. Returning most responsibility to the individual states.
4. Mandatorily reduce the National Debt systematically until eliminated entirely.
5. Maintain a reserve "rainy day" fund for extreme emergencies or war.
6. Eliminate agencies and bureaus which should be the sole

responsibility of the individual states.

7. Put a ceiling on the number of federal employees based on a flat percentage of the total population.
8. Limit the length of time any Congressman may serve: Four 2 year terms for Representatives and preferably two 4 year terms for U. S. Senators. Thus eliminating the professional political system, with its built-in Big Brother Bureaucracy mentality.

Whereas the federal government collected somewhere in the neighborhood of 180 Billion dollars from income taxes last year -- with this program fully carried out -- the need for personal income taxes will be totally eliminated in a period of five years after enactment. Corporate income taxes can also be eliminated and should any additional revenue be required to replace a portion of that tax, it can be levied in the form of a national sales or manufacturers tax based upon the pro-rata limit on total taxes which may be collected previously mentioned in step 3.

9. Therefore, number 9 will be to eliminate income taxes completely five years from the date of implementation with repeal of the 16th Amendment to the Constitution.
10. Systematically reduce the length of the sessions of Congress to correspond with the reduced responsibilities. Reduce the staffs and committee staffs of the Congressmen accordingly. Finally, reduce the compensation and other expenses of each Congressman to conform to the vastly reduced time necessary to carry out the mandated limited functions of the federal government.

I believe our great State of Nevada should be the first to approve these measures -- because our own mandatory balanced budget has not been abused by irresponsible legislators over the years -- and our relatively low over-all taxes

shine brightly above those of most states. Also -- because we have no income EXHIBIT  
taxes -- we are a prime example for all of the states and particularly the U.S.  
Congress. We are the perfect state to lead the way.

Legislators and concerned citizens in other states have asked for exact copies  
of these proposed resolutions to introduce in their own states. Because the wording  
must be identical, we have informed them copies will be immediately forthcoming  
after introduction in the Nevada Legislature.

When this program was first presented to some leading present and former U.S.  
Congressmen in the form of the book Big Brother Bureaucracy: THE CAUSE AND THE CURE,  
there was a question from a former Congressman asking if the complicated web of  
federal spending programs and mandates could ever be straightened out.

One veteran congressman who serves on the Ways and Means Committee of the  
House responded:

"What the Congress has wrought....the Congress can un-wrought."

I would spell wrought a little differently. Perhaps R-O-T is more definitive.

Please join with me in supporting these Joint Resolutions  
so we may move for a quick passage by both houses of this illustrious body -- in  
order for Nevada to be the first state to approve -- and so other states may follow our  
lead during their current sessions.

--Peggy Cavnar, Assemblyman  
District One  
State of Nevada

Chairman Dini, Members of the Government Affairs Committee:

On Monday I asked Chairman Dini if I might appear before this committee to answer some of the questions posed by opponents of a Constitutional Convention to balance the federal budget. Since then, my wife Peggy -- and I expect all of you--received a letter from U.S. Senator Edmund Muskie which pretty well presents the case for the opposition.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on Mr. Muskie's enclosure which was a speech to the National Press Club in Washington, DC on February 13, 1979. I believe Senator Muskie's remarks pretty much sum up the objections of most opponents and therefore deserve an honest reply.

For a little background about myself, perhaps I should tell you that I have been involved on the federal level through various organizations and in my own consulting business for nearly 35 years. During that time I served as a District Manager for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Nation's Business Department; as National Chairman of the Civic Association of America; as a consultant to various Congressmen and Senators; a publisher of national newsletters primarily concerned with the very problems the proposed call for a Constitutional Convention addresses; and as a very concerned citizen who wants some type of relief for the beleaguered taxpayer and the stranglehold on the nation itself by the advocates of 'Washington knows best' ideas.

Now, down to the subject of Senator Muskie's speech. I agree with his statement that "the constitutional convention issue has attracted much attention -- but little careful thought." He says, "It is considered too casually by proponent and foe alike."

About four years ago, proponents of the single-purpose call for a balanced budget asked me to help. I told them I would be happy to do so if they would also provide for some restraint on the amount of taxes which could be collected and reduction of the massive federal government by returning most of the responsibilities for government to the state and local level. They simply couldn't see a reason for doing so -- despite the fact that I explained that simply balancing the budget meant absolutely nothing, since Congress need only add on to existing taxes or invent new ones to raise additional revenues and thus raise the budget ceiling accordingly.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is exactly what we must all face up to. The "scare" tactics -- no matter how they are presented -- in a neat, concise, gentlemanly way such as Senator Muskie does in his speech, or in the old "shoot from the hip" type of derision used by too many newspaper editorialists and big spending members of Congress, career federal bureaucrats and other proponents of Potomac Plurality, will no longer work with the American taxpayer.

First, as Senator Muskie himself tries, there is the old scare of fear of a constitutional convention because it may run wild with all kinds of special interest, one issue groups taking charge and in effect completely rewriting and in the end destroying our present constitution. He says: "The only convention we've ever had was called to revise the Articles of Confederation. But the delegates didn't stop at revision. They scrapped the system. They built a new one. And what would prevent a wholesale recasing of the document they devised?"

Isn't it strange that some of the opponents go along with Senator Muskie on this contention? They claim, on the one hand, that we have the most perfect constitution in the world with its Bill of Rights (and I certainly agree to that) -- However, they then tell us that the delegates to the first convention literally wreaked havoc and they fear that will happen again. I wonder sometimes if these people even listen to themselves or read their own words? Either they want to keep the document that is the result of that constitutional convention "gang that got out of hand" the first time around...or, they want to protect us from ourselves.

The fact is that Article V of the constitution prevents the very things from happening that they fear, by its unique system of checks and balances. No matter what may come out of that convention...it must still be ratified by three-fourths of the states. Only 13 states need disapprove or simply take no action and any unwanted changes cannot become the law of the land.

Senator Muskie goes on to cite figures that purportedly show that a balanced federal budget is an "ill considered contrivance". He, like so many of the long time residents of Capitol Hill, can only repeat the same tired figures that for many years did the sales job for the big spenders. But, when one examines those figures closely, one sees quite clearly that they are all disasters predicated on the original

disaster which was the budget built on the theory that Washington can do it better. When you take away the responsibilities that the states have relinquished to the feds...you then take away all of their reasons for needing to have the tools for being able to raise or lower taxes to control the economy...so the feds "can protect us in time of expansion or recession".

Senator Muskie tells us about President Ford's WIN button campaign and the proposed 9 billion dollar deficit that eventually became a 52 Billion dollar deficit recommendation. Frankly, that's when I broke with President Ford. However, Mr. Muskie goes on to state that President Carter proposed a year ago - a budget with a 60 billion dollar deficit. "We worked hard," he tells us, "to trim it -- and by September we had cut that deficit to 38 Billion"...but eventually it went up another 5 billion because of inflation, interest rates, etc...when Congress wasn't even in session."

Unfortunately, all of this talk about reducing the federal deficit, only reinforces my contention that it doesn't make any difference what the ceiling is...or, how much the deficit comes down (supposedly) --it is: what was the total budget. The thing you will find, of course, is at no time did the federal budget decrease in these periods...it kept going higher and higher...and along with it the federal debt continued to increase dramatically. The budget increased from \$365.6 Billions in 1976 to \$401.9 Billion in 1977; to \$462.2 Billion in 1978; to \$497.38 billion in 1979; and Mr. Carter predicts it will be \$532 billion in 1980 -- while many experts say it will go as high as 561 billion dollars...or more.

What about our deficits during that same period? In 1976 it was 73.6 Billion Dollars; in 1977, \$53.7 billion; in 1978, \$73.3 billion; in 1979, 54.5 billion; and in 1980...anywhere from Mr. Carter's proposed 29 billion dollars to the experts' 41, 51 or even 61 billion dollars.

And, the national debt: \$631.9 billion in 1976; \$709.1 billion in 1977; \$785.6 in 1978; \$850.7 in 1979; and \$900.7 in 1980 according to the Carter budget figures.

Seems like all of the opponents to this effort bring out in one way or

another that the federal government could simply cut off their "grants to state and local governments" to balance the budget. Or, as Mr. Muskie points out..."In 1978, the states ran a combined surplus of \$29 billion....a figure that matches the President's deficit for fiscal 1980. An appealing solution to the balance dilemma leaps very quickly to mind." Obviously, Mr. Muskie sees the answer in having the states ante up that surplus to take care of the deficit. And, you can bet the big government spenders see that as more potential revenue...

an example of what the federal government could have with all of the inflation which has pushed the average worker into a higher tax bracket...and thus, presented more tax money for them to throw down the next rat hole. The states, on the other hand, are trying to respond to the will of the people and cut taxes instead of finding new ways to spend that surplus.

Next, Mr. Muskie tells us Congress has been perfecting a different theory since 1975 in reaction to 37 years of deficit spending. "For the first time in its history, Congress established a standing committee with one exclusive mission," he tells us, "to set a fiscal plan -- to hold the Congress to it -- to pull us back from those irresponsible deficits."

If the method of reducing those deficits is by the inflationary tactic of pushing people into higher income brackets and thus higher tax brackets in order to raise more money to reduce the deficits...then, by gosh, they have succeeded. If the purpose of that committee is to hold the line on spending and reduce the deficits, then they have failed dismally. The trick in this case, however, is to fool the public into thinking that because they have reduced the deficit...they have solved the problem. Nothing could be further from the truth. Until Congress cuts out the fat, gets out of the states' business entirely and performs only those functions as authorized by the constitution, they will never see the light...and, our grandchildren will be saddled with their folly.

Senator Muskie goes on to paraphrase a Supreme Court Justice: "our Constitution is not a rubber ball to be tossed about and played with by each succeeding child. It embodies the sense of our system. There is no room in it for yesterday's whim or tomorrow's fancy." How unfortunate Mr. Muskie didn't point out that yesterday's whim

was the idea that the intent of the Constitution could (and was) changed by those who decided big government was best for everybody and thus brought about those 37 years of deficit spending; and the "fancy" was that Senator Muskie's colleagues of like thinking in the U.S. Congress could best decide what was best for all of the people...and they, in their fiefdoms had the right to levy the taxes and lord over the serfs who will be under their blessings and pronouncements from here to eternity.

Finally, Mr. Muskie tells us, "We need fiscal discipline. We need to make informed, prudent judgements about hundreds (actually hundreds of thousands) of separate spending choices. We need the will to make those judgments stick. If we have the will, no formula is necessary. If we don't, no formula will work."

And, that my friends, is the crux of the whole matter embodied in AJR-13 and AJR-14. AJR-13 gives members of Congress, like Senator Muskie, a formula which will work if they have the will. AJR-14 goes one step further and calls for a constitutional convention to do those things and more...in the event they do not have the will in the Congress..

Enactment of these resolutions in concert with at least 33 other states will get the message to congress that the state legislatures are ready, willing and able to take over the major portion of those "hundreds of spending choices" and leave the Congress with the limited functions our forefathers envisioned. They will also get the message that convening a constitutional convention does not scare the legislators of the 50 states, but does in fact allow them to carry out just one more function of this near perfect document...that of checks and balances upon the Congress, the Courts and the Executive by the states.

On the other hand, perhaps the good Senator and his colleagues will get the message just a little bit sooner and take the required action in order to eliminate the need for a Constitutional Convention. As in the case of President Nixon wherein the Constitution set up the avenue to impeach - Mr. Nixon got the message and resigned, thus eliminating the need to proceed with the constitutionally provided avenue of impeachment. Now, I believe the forefathers of the Greatest Nation on Earth saw this as one of those special checks and balances where in a wise and perceptive person or body of persons (as in the Congress) will get the message and prevent the need for the convention. However, we must not shy away from



that convention if Congress does not get the word. That's what the beautiful system of checks and balances is all about. Not the ploy of: we'll first take your checks and then we'll get the balance of your assets another way.

Finally, I'd like to have Mr. Muskie and all of the other criers of doom who don't want to see a balanced budget convention, just where in the devil do they think all of this money they would take away from the states came from in the first place? The feds printing presses can't seem to print it fast enough...but, we have to pay for it in the form of more taxes, more inflation, more debt, and more worry. The fact that the American public has been ripped-off to the tune of two trillion -- yes, I said two trillion dollars - from inflation alone since 1940 as their insurance policies, savings accounts, and even savings bonds lost value consistently to the point that the current dollar is worth only 13¢ in purchasing power compared to the 1946 dollar.

Senator Muskie doesn't really have to worry about that, though. Congress always manages to find a way to increase their "club" members' living expenses, travel expenses, junket cash available, and their staff's allotments, plus a nice juicy retirement plum when they finally get out voluntarily, or by the will of the voters.

Several members of that exclusive club --- many of long standing -- got that message the hard way in the last election. I believe that with the message in AJR-13 and AJR-14, many others will get the message to to something before the next elections to avoid getting that final message at the polls if they do not do something.

We all know the cause. We must now implement the cure. Nevada is the ideal state to take that additional step beyond the single-purpose call for a Constitutional Convention only for a balanced budget. I hope you see it in your wisdom to also call on Congress or a convention to also limit the amount of taxes that can be collected from any source; limit the size of government; and return the majority of the responsibility for government to the states and the local governments where it can be administered more freely and more equitably at far less cost to the taxpayers. AJR-13 and AJR-14 are the tools to get that job done. I hope you will give them a "do pass" and that the full legislature will comply. Thank you.

Testimony of Shirley Pate  
 Legislative Committee  
 Northern Nevada Chapter  
 National Organization for  
 Women (N.O.W.)  
 February 28, 1979



Northern Nevada NOW  
 P.O. Box 1265  
 Sparks, Nevada 89431

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 13 - GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,

My name is Shirley Pate and I am a member of the Legislative Committee of the Northern Nevada Chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW). In that role I am here today to speak against several sections of Assembly Joint Resolution 13. + 14

It is difficult in these days of Proposition 13 and Question 6 euphoria to speak against a resolution that calls upon the U.S. Congress to implement stringent belt-tightening measures. All of us from time to time have become discouraged at what we perceive to be federal mismanagement of our tax dollars. Therefore, we are within our rights as taxpayers to request that Congress hold down federal spending. Yet, it is our duty as U.S. citizens to offer rational, responsible solutions to effect such an end.

A. J. R. 13 does not represent such a solution. Instead, it provides in several sections (specifically 2,4,6,8,9 and 10) for some very arbitrary limits on: the federal budget (\$1200 per person, based on the U.S. population); federal agencies ("periodic elimination"); federal civilian employees (reduce over a 7 year period to one-half of 1 percent of the U.S. population) and perhaps the most ludicrous of all - the eventual reduction of Senators' and Representatives' staffs to one secretary and their salary to nothing.

The above measures represent careless, retaliatory attacks on our Federal government rather than responsible remedies for tough budgetary

problems. The intent of this resolution is not to help or guide the Federal government, but to cripple it. And as a result to cripple those who can afford it the least - the poor, the disabled, the disadvantaged - a great majority of whom are women.

It is the purpose of our organization to take action to bring women into full participation in the mainstream of American society, exercising all privileges and responsibilities thereof in truly equal partnership with men. This is especially difficult noting such statistics as 50% of widows and single women exist on poverty level incomes and 50% less income is earned by women who head families than by men who head families.

The Federal government has been a prime mover in instituting programs which aid these women. The National Organization for Women fears that such blanket requests to reduce federal spending, as contained in this resolution, will cause these programs to be largely reduced or eliminated altogether. Traditionally, social and welfare programs have been the first to be cut in belt-tightening actions.

Much has been made of zero based budgeting, or ZBB, as an aid in reducing a burgeoning federal budget. Rather I would think that ZBP, zero based programming, would be a more appropriate approach. Instead of focussing on a ratio or percentage by which to slice the federal budget, why not focus on those programs thought to be duplicative and wasteful? Then one could assess the savings to the taxpayer by elimination of such programs.

No matter how much we demand the Federal government to reduce its budget by a specific percentage - it will not eliminate the problems of a rapidly growing nation. In the end if we do not allow the Federal government some

latitude in providing programs for those until they can begin to provide for themselves, the problem will be on the doorstep of the State of Nevada and the expense may well be greater than it is now.

In light of my comments today Northern Nevada NOW urges you to carefully reconsider the measures proposed in A. J. R. 13.

## A.J.R. 13 PROBLEMS AND DEFICIENCIES

THERE ARE SO MANY SERIOUS PROBLEMS WITH A.J.R. 13 THAT IT IS DIFFICULT TO KNOW WHERE TO BEGIN. AS IT STANDS, THE RESOLUTION WOULD BE AN EMBARRASSMENT TO THIS LEGISLATURE AND THE STATE. IT MAKES SEVERAL DUBIOUS ASSUMPTIONS, LEAPS TO SEVERAL CONCLUSIONS AND DOES NOT STAND THE TEST OF EVEN INTERNAL CONSISTENCY.

1. THE THIRD WHEREAS CLAUSE IMPLIES THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS INTO UNCONSTITUTIONAL AREAS AND SHOULD BE IN NOTHING NOT MENTIONED SPECIFICALLY IN THE CONSTITUTION. ARTICLE I, SECTION 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION IS THE "ELASTIC CLAUSE" WHICH SAYS CONGRESS MAY "\* \* \* MAKE ALL LAWS WHICH SHALL BE NECESSARY AND PROPER FOR CARRYING INTO EXECUTION THE FOREGOING POWERS, AND ALL OTHER POWERS VESTED BY THIS CONSTITUTION IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES." DO WE IGNORE THIS CLAUSE THAT THE FRAMERS WISELY INCLUDED BECAUSE THEY KNEW THEY COULD NOT THINK OF EVERYTHING?

IF IGNORED AND WE ONLY OBSERVE THE FIRST 17 CLAUSES OF THE SECTION, WE WILL HAVE NO SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM; NO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION; NO AID TO THE ELDERLY, THE BLIND, THE DISABLED OR THE NEEDY; NO NATIONAL PARKS, NO FEDERAL HIGHWAYS EXCEPT AS NECESSARY TO DELIVER MAIL; AND NO AIR FORCE. THIS IS ONLY A SHORT LIST OF THINGS THAT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOES THAT ARE NOT SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED. ARE WE TELLING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO STOP ALL THESE THINGS AND MORE?

2. THE FIFTH WHEREAS CLAUSE ASSUMES THAT NET TAX BURDENS WILL BE REDUCED BY ELIMINATING THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX AND TRANSFERRING FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. STATE AND LOCAL SPENDING ARE TO BE HELD IN CHECK BY "WISELY" SUPPLYING ONLY ESSENTIAL SERVICES. WHAT ARE ESSENTIAL SERVICES? DO WE ALL AGREE ON WHAT'S ESSENTIAL? ALSO, THE ASSUMPTION OF LOWERED TAX BURDEN IGNORES THE CALL IN SECTION 11 OF THE FIRST RESOLVED CLAUSE FOR UP TO A 10 PERCENT MANUFACTURERS' TAX. THAT WON'T REPLACE THE INCOME TAX BURDEN? MORE ON THAT IN A MOMENT.
3. SECTION 2 OF THE FIRST RESOLVED IGNORES THE POSSIBILITY THAT INFLATION MAY NOT BE MIRACULOUSLY CONTROLLED WITH THE PASSAGE OF THE LEGISLATION SUGGESTED. AT THE END OF 5 YEARS, THE REAL REDUCTION IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET COULD BE A LOT MORE THAN 50 PERCENT.
4. SECTION 3, WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF SAYING INTEREST ON THE DEBT MUST BE PAID FROM THAT YEAR'S BUDGET? YOU ALREADY SAY IT MUST BE A BALANCED BUDGET. IF THAT'S THE CASE, WHERE ELSE WOULD THE MONEY TO PAY INTEREST ON THE DEBT COME FROM?
5. SECTION 4, WHAT ACTIVITIES ARE PROHIBITED BY THE FIRST 10 AMENDMENTS BUT ARE BEING ENGAGED IN BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT? THE SUGGESTION IS MEANINGLESS. IF SOMETHING IS PROHIBITED BUT THE GOVERNMENT IS DOING IT, RECOURSE IS THROUGH THE COURTS. YOU DON'T SOLVE THE PROBLEM BY SAYING "DON'T DO THOSE THINGS YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM DOING."

IN THAT SAME SECTION, THE EXPENDITURE LIMITATION FOR 7 YEARS HENCE EQUALS ONE-HALF OF THE CURRENT FEDERAL BUDGET. THAT APPARENTLY IS THE GOAL OF THIS WHOLE PROGRAM. THE CURRENT DEFENSE BUDGET IS OVER \$130 BILLION. DEFENSE IS NOT TO BE REDUCED ACCORDING TO SECTION 6 SO THAT WILL LEAVE \$146 BILLION TO RUN THE REST OF THE GOVERNMENT WHICH NOW IS SPENDING ABOUT \$400 BILLION. THE NON-DEFENSE EFFECT OF THIS PROPOSAL IS NOT A 50 PERCENT CUT IN SPENDING BUT A 64 PERCENT CUT! IS THE SPONSOR REALLY SAYING THAT TWO-THIRDS OF WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS DOING OUTSIDE OF DEFENSE IS NOT LEGITIMATE OR CAN BETTER BE DONE BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

ALSO, DOES THE \$1,200 PER PERSON LIMITATION APPLY TO INSURANCE PROGRAMS SUCH AS SOCIAL SECURITY AND UNEMPLOYMENT! I SUPPOSE NOT SINCE THESE ARE NOT ENUMERATED POWERS IN THE FIRST PLACE. THEY WOULD <sup>simply</sup> SIMELY BE ELIMINATED.

6. SECTION 6 SEEKS TO REDUCE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT BY ABOUT 50 PERCENT BUT IT EXCLUDES EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES. THERE ARE 2.7 MILLION FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES. MANY PEOPLE DO NOT REALIZE THAT OVER 1 MILLION WORK FOR THE ARMED FORCES. THIS SECTION EXCLUDES EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES. IT AIMS AT A FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORK FORCE OF 1,150,000 WHICH IS ONE HALF OF 1 PERCENT OF OUR POPULATION. THAT MEANS 1,150,000 EMPLOYEES WILL DO THE WORK OF THE REST OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. THE POSTAL SERVICE ALONE EMPLOYS 680,000 PEOPLE. AND DELIVERY OF THE MAIL IS AN ENUMERATED CONSTITUTIONAL POWER!

IN THAT SAME SECTION, THE EXPENDITURE LIMITATION FOR 7 YEARS HENCE EQUALS ONE-HALF OF THE CURRENT FEDERAL BUDGET. THAT APPARENTLY IS THE GOAL OF THIS WHOLE PROGRAM. THE CURRENT DEFENSE BUDGET IS OVER \$130 BILLION. DEFENSE IS NOT TO BE REDUCED ACCORDING TO SECTION 6 SO THAT WILL LEAVE \$146 BILLION TO RUN THE REST OF THE GOVERNMENT WHICH NOW IS SPENDING ABOUT \$400 BILLION. THE NON-DEFENSE EFFECT OF THIS PROPOSAL IS NOT A 50 PERCENT CUT IN SPENDING BUT A 64 PERCENT CUT! IS THE SPONSOR REALLY SAYING THAT TWO-THIRDS OF WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS DOING OUTSIDE OF DEFENSE IS NOT LEGITIMATE OR CAN BETTER BE DONE BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

ALSO, DOES THE \$1,200 PER PERSON LIMITATION APPLY TO INSURANCE PROGRAMS SUCH AS SOCIAL SECURITY AND UNEMPLOYMENT! I SUPPOSE NOT SINCE THESE ARE NOT ENUMERATED POWERS IN THE FIRST PLACE. THEY WOULD SIMPLY BE ELIMINATED.

6. SECTION 6 SEEKS TO REDUCE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT BY ABOUT 50 PERCENT BUT IT EXCLUDES EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES. THERE ARE 2.7 MILLION FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES. MANY PEOPLE DO NOT REALIZE THAT OVER 1 MILLION WORK FOR THE ARMED FORCES. THIS SECTION EXCLUDES EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES. IT AIMS AT A FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORK FORCE OF 1,150,000 WHICH IS ONE HALF OF 1 PERCENT OF OUR POPULATION. THAT MEANS 1,150,000 EMPLOYEES WILL DO THE WORK OF THE REST OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. THE POSTAL SERVICE ALONE EMPLOYS 680,000 PEOPLE. AND DELIVERY OF THE MAIL IS AN ENUMERATED CONSTITUTIONAL POWER!



THAT WILL LEAVE 470,000 TO DO THE WORK THAT IS NEITHER DEFENSE NOR POSTAL. THERE ARE 1.1 MILLION EMPLOYEES NOW OUTSIDE THOSE TWO AREAS.

7. SECTION 7 SEEKS TO REDUCE THE LENGTH OF CONGRESSIONAL SESSIONS AT THE SAME TIME THE RESOLUTION IS IMPLORING CONGRESS TO ENACT AND OVERSEE SUNSET AND ZERO-BASED BUDGETING BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES. THESE OTHER REQUIREMENTS ARE ADDING TO CONGRESS' RESPONSIBILITIES WHILE THIS SECTION WOULD CUT THE TIME IT HAS TO DO THEM.
8. SECTION 8 HARDLY SEEMS WORTH COMMENT. OBVIOUSLY, NO CONGRESSMAN WOULD EVER KEEP IN TOUCH WITH HIS CONSTITUENTS WITH ONE SECRETARY. IS THAT THE AIM OF THIS SECTION? ONLY ABOUT HALF THE STAFF OF CONGRESS IS PERSONAL STAFF. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE COMMITTEE STAFFS, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE AND OTHER CENTRAL STAFF TO BE DECIMATED?
9. SECTION 9 IS EVEN MORE LUDICROUS THAN SECTION 8. IF IT IS VALID TO ELIMINATE THE SALARIES OF CONGRESS, DOES THAT MEAN THAT STATE LEGISLATORS SHOULD RECEIVE NO PAY? WHAT KIND OF PERSON WILL RUN FOR OFFICE. TWO TYPES; THE INDEPENDENTLY WEALTHY AND THE SCOUNDREL WHO FIGURES HE CAN STEAL ENOUGH TO MAKE IT WORTH HIS WHILE.
10. SECTIONS 10 AND 11 WOULD REPLACE WHAT IS PERHAPS A DISTASTEFUL TAX IN THE INCOME TAX WITH A "MANUFACTURERS TAX" OF UP TO 10 PERCENT. WHAT IS THIS MANUFACTURERS TAX? IT SOUNDS LIKE THE VALUE ADDED TAX WHERE THE PERCENT OF THE TAX IS ADDED AT EACH STAGE OF PRODUCTION

AND, OF COURSE, PASSED ON TO THE CONSUMER. MANY PRODUCTS GO THROUGH SEVERAL MANUFACTURING STAGES AND 10 PERCENT COULD BE ADDED EACH TIME. THIS WOULD BE AS REGRESSIVE A TAX AS COULD BE CONCEIVED AS OPPOSED TO THE INCOME TAX WHICH HAS SOME DEGREE OF PROGRESSIVITY.

11. SECTION 12 DISREGARDS ANY POSSIBILITY OF INFLATION AND WOULD LIMIT EXPENDITURES FOREVER TO ROUGHLY ONE-HALF OF WHAT THEY ARE NOW ON A PER CAPITA BASIS.
12. SECTION 1 OF THE SECOND RESOLVED, WOULD PLACE A MORE STRINGENT SPECIAL SESSION TIME LIMIT ON CONGRESS THAN EXISTS FOR THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE. OUR 20-DAY LIMIT IS ONLY FOR PAY.
13. SECTION 2, THE BURDEN OF PROOF AS TO THE DESIRABILITY OF LIMITING SENATE TERMS TO 4 YEARS IS ON THE PROPOSER. THERE IS NO GROUNDSWELL OF OPINION ON THIS. THE 6-YEAR SENATE TERMS ARE A SOURCE OF STABILITY IN CONGRESS. APPARENTLY THE ONLY REASON IS SO THE TERMS FIT THE 8-YEAR MAXIMUM SERVICE PROVISION OF THE NEXT SESSION.
14. THE EFFECT OF LIMITING LEGISLATIVE SERVICE AT STATE OR NATIONAL LEVEL CLEARLY IS TO STRENGTHEN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AT THE EXPENSE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH. WHAT NATIONAL INTEREST IS SERVED BY PREVENTING THE ACCUMULATION OF EXPERIENCE AND UNDERSTANDING? INEXPERIENCED LEGISLATORS NEED STAFF ASSISTANCE FAR MORE THAN THE EXPERIENCED, YET THE RESOLUTION WOULD ELIMINATE THE STAFF WHILE IT PROHIBITS EXPERIENCE.

NEVADA HAS HAD A LONG HISTORY OF ITS CONGRESSMEN ATTAINING POSITIONS OF INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS. THIS GOES BACK TO WILLIAM STEWART WHO WROTE THE 1872 MINING LAW THAT IS STILL IN FORCE TODAY AND IT COMES UP THROUGH PITTMAN, McCARREN, BIBLE AND CANNON. A SMALL STATE NEEDS ALL THE HELP IT CAN GET AND HAVING STRONG CONGRESSMEN IS ONE FORM OF HELP.

1979 REGULAR SESSION (60TH)

ASSEMBLY ACTION		SENATE ACTION		Assembly	AMENDMENT BLANK
Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>	Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>	Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>	Adopted <input type="checkbox"/>	AMENDMENTS to	Senate
Lost <input type="checkbox"/>	Lost <input type="checkbox"/>	Lost <input type="checkbox"/>	Lost <input type="checkbox"/>	Bill No. 68	Joint Resolution No.
Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	BDR 40-226	
Initial:	Initial:	Initial:	Initial:	Proposed by	Committee on Commerce
Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>	Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>	Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>	Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>		
Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/>		
Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:		
Initial:	Initial:	Initial:	Initial:		

Amendment N<sup>o</sup> 163



Amend section 5, page 2, line 39, after "Sec. 5.", by inserting "1.".

Amend section 5, page 2, line 41, by deleting "1." and inserting "(a)".

Amend section 5, page 2, line 42, by deleting "2." and inserting "(b)".

Amend section 5, page 2, by inserting between lines 45 and 46:

"2. An air ambulance service shall not represent, advertise or imply that it is authorized to provide advanced emergency care unless it has:

(a) A currently valid permit issued by the health division to provide advanced emergency care;

(b) A medical director who is a physician licensed by the State of Nevada;

(c) A registered nurse licensed by the State of Nevada, who has completed training as a flight nurse including altitude physiology

E & E  
LCB File  
Journal  
Engrossment  
Bill

Amendment No. 163 to Senate Bill No. 68 (BDR 40-226) Page 2

---

and at least 2 years' experience in intensive care or cardiac care, or both, present on each flight;

(d) A licensed emergency medical technician present on each flight to assist the nurse; and

(e) Standard equipment as recommended by the Federal Aviation Administration for air ambulance operation."



## CLARK COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT

P.O. BOX 4426 • 625 SHADOW LANE • LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106 • 702-385-1291

January 31, 1979

Reba Chappell, Chief  
EMS Section  
Nevada Health Division  
505 East King Street  
Capitol Complex  
Carson City, NV 89710

Reference: Senate Bill Number 68

Dear Mrs. Chappell:

We have reviewed Senate Bill Number 68 which is being considered by the Legislature and would like to express our support for these improvements to the Nevada EMS Program.

Sincerely,  
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Karl Munninger  
EMS Coordinator

KM:at

286

282

## CLARK EMS REGION

EXHIBIT

Air Vegas (Comm-Air)

1 1969 Cessna  
1 1955 Beech

Utilizes Mercy EMT's

Basic Management (Ind)

1 1955 Ford

6

Boulder City Volunteer (FD)

1 1974 Chev. Modulance  
1 1968 Int'l Panel

20

2

18

Clark County FD Trauma Unit

2 1977 Ford  
3 1976 Mod Ford

28

5

23

Craig Road Speedway (Ind)

1 1972 Chev. Suburban

3

1

2

Henderson Volunteer (FD)

1 1969 Cadillac MM  
1 1974 Chev. Modulance

26

9

6

11

Probationary

Interstate Air Ambulance (Comm)

1 1973 Cessna

Utilizes Mercy EMT's

Jean-Goodsprings Volunteer

1 1977 Ford Modular

3

1

3

Mesquite Volunteer

1 1976 Ford Modulance

12

12

Mercy Ambulance (Comm) (Serves  
LV, NLW, & County)3 1977 Dodge Van  
1 1976 Dodge Van  
2 1977 Chev Suburban  
2 1975 Chev Suburban  
1 1974 Chev. Panel

35

20

9

6

Mt. Charleston Volunteer (FD)

1 1966 Int'l Panel  
1 1978 Ford Mod.

23

6

17

Las Vegas FD Trauma Unit

1 1977 Ford Modular  
1 1976 Ford Modular

21

1

9

11

Overton Volunteer

1 1977 Ford Modular

26

1

26

Jean Prison (Ind)

1 1977 Ford Modular

1

1

Searchlight Volunteer

1 1977 Ford Modular

10

4

6

288

NORTHWEST EMS REGION

CARSON CITY

EXHIBIT

Aids (Commercial)

1 1972 Chev. Suburban  
1 1973 Cad. MM  
1 1971 Chev. Suburban

TOTAL #  
of  
ATTENDANTS

14

ATTENDANT TRAINING LEVELS

Basic 16 hr	Bureau Lines	Red Cross	81 Hr. E.H.T.	21 Hr. Equiv.	A-EMT (500hr)
----------------	-----------------	--------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

13

1

Carson T-Car (Ind)

1 1974 Chev. Van

9

9

Carson Tahoe Aviation (Comm. Air

1 Cessna 310  
1 Cessna 421  
1 Cessna 402  
1 Cessna 340  
1 Cessna 206

Utilizes  
Aids EMT's

2 LV

2 Reno

1 Winnemucca

CHURCHILL COUNTY

Fallon Volunteer (FD)

1 1972 GMC  
1 1975 Cadillac

18

2

16

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Douglas County Volunteer (FD)

1 1960 Cadillac  
1 1972 Cadillac Coach

26

18

7

1

Tahoe-Douglas Volunteer (FD)

1 1974 Chev Modulance  
1 1965 Cadillac MM

30

1

13

15

1

LYON COUNTY

Fernley Volunteer

1 1969 Chev. Suburban  
1 1974 Dodge Van

9

1

8

Dayton Volunteer

1 1978 Chev. Van

7

7

Mason Valley Volunteer (FD)

1 1965 Oldsmobile  
1 1974 Chev. Van

24

11

13

Silver Springs Volunteer (FD)

1 1973 Chev. Van

14

4

10

Smith Valley Volunteer (FD)

1 1972 Chev. Van

9

3

6



682

## NORTHWEST EMS REGION

Page 2 continued

## PERSHING COUNTY

Lovelock Volunteer (FD)

1 1973 Cadillac MM  
1 1966 Cadillac MM

20

Basic  
16 hrBureau  
LinesRed  
Cross31 Hr.  
E.M.T.31 Hr.  
Equiv.A-EMT  
(500hr)

7

13

## STOREY COUNTY

Virginia City Volunteer

1 1972 International  
1 1959 International

20

8

12

EXHIBIT

## WASHOE COUNTY

Aids (Commercial)

1 1975 Chev. Surburban 4x4  
1 1970 Cadillac  
1 1977 Chev.  
1 1975 Cadillac  
2 1974 Cadillac

14

14

A. S. I. (Comm-Air)

1 1976 Cessna 206  
1 1977 Cessna 210  
1 1974 Cessna 310

Service has it's own RN on contract.

Gerlach Volunteer

1 1972 Cadillac

1

1RN

Medic-1 Reno (Comm)

(ALS in City &amp; County)

2 Modular Classis

11

7

4

Mt. Rose First Aid Squad (Vol)

1 1968 Int'l Travellal

6

4

2PN's

Air Neva (Comm-Air)

1 1978 Piper Simca  
1 1972 Cessna 414  
1 1978 Piper Navajo

Service has it's own RN contract.

Truckee Amb. (Comm)

1 1975 Chev. Suburban  
1 1975 Chev. Van

12

12

1RN

Sub Totals

33 Vehicles  
11 Aircraft

245

5

-0-

67

162

7

4



Assembly Committee on.....

Date:.....

Page:.....

STATE OF NEVADA  
**DIVISION OF HEALTH**  
BUREAU OF COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES  
KINKEAD BUILDING, 505 EAST KING STREET  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

WILLIAM M. EDWARDS, M.D., M.P.H.  
CHIEF OF BUREAU  
CHIEF OF PREVENTIVE  
MEDICAL SERVICES  
TELEPHONE 885-4800

