

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON JUDICIARY

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
February 4, 1981

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Melvin D. Close, at 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, February 4, 1981, in Room 213 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Senator Melvin D. Close, Chairman
- Senator Keith Ashworth, Vice Chairman
- Senator Don W. Ashworth
- Senator Jean E. Ford
- Senator William H. Hernstadt
- Senator William J. Raggio
- Senator Sue Wagner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Shirley LaBadie, Committee Secretary

SENATE BILL NO. 102 -- Raises upper age limit of children eligible for foster homes.

Bill LaBadie, Deputy, Nevada State Welfare stated that his department is charged with the responsibility of providing services and care to juveniles until they are 18, the law states the age to be 16 so far as licensing foster homes. The ages should be compatible, that is the reason for the change, to raise the age to 18 on the licensing of foster homes.

Senator Raggio stated that his concern was that at the age of 18, any child is free from parental control. The child has the option to leave the home.

Mr. LaBadie pointed out that if they chose to leave, the department dismisses custody unless they are regularly attending school, then we can maintain them until they are through age 20.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

Senator Keith Ashworth pointed out that as the bill reads, under 18, would eliminate the 18 year old juveniles. Mr. LaBadie stated that the bill specifies up to 18, same as the other bill reads, this would include juveniles up through the age 17.

Senator Ford asked what the Welfare Department is doing with juveniles in the 16 and 17 age bracket. Ms. Gloria Handley, Nevada State Welfare, stated that the policy of the department is that if they are making payment for a 16 or 17 year old child in foster care, either the home must be licensed or approved as meeting licensing standards. The same protection should be provided to this age group, as well as those under 16. This is our own policy but is not a law.

Mr. LaBadie stated that in some situations, a family might be willing to take a juvenile, age 17, that came in from another area; if the placement did not work out, the boy might move in with the family of one of his friends. Many times these families do not want to bother filling out forms to be licensed, will not cooperate, but they meet our licensing standards and that is what we abide by.

Senator Ford stated that in discussing this in the interium committee, on dependant neglect, the testimony indicated that because they were't covered, you had more leeway in getting these kids homes. It is harder to get foster placements for 16 and 17 age groups, than younger ones. She was surprised that the department wants to require that they be put in a licensed foster home. Mr. LaBadie stated that the bill would maintain the same leeway, the home must meet the standards, but not necessarily be licensed.

Ms. Handley stated that the licensing statute now does give the department some leeway, there are several different types of licenses. In a bind in finding a home, they can use a provisional or special license, which means that the home does not meet the requirements but has something special to offer to the child.

Senator Close asked if a boy was living with his friends, would this be considered a foster home and would payments be made to the family. Mr. LaBadie stated that as long as the home met standards, and the family agreed to the placement, we pay if the juvenile is in our custody.

Senator Wagner asked what the difference was in a home which is licensed and one that meets standards. Mr. LaBadie stated that there really is no difference, just the license which is issued. The same criteria is used in investigation of the home.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

SENATE BILL NO. 103

Removes certain requirements regarding filing of annual statements of corporations and abolishes certain certificate issued to corporations.

Mr. William Swackhamer, Secretary of State, stated that this bill has two sections but one purpose and that is to save money for the state. He found that when the professional corporations send in their annual list, they have to have their signatures notarized, this is not true of the regular profit corporations and about 1/2 of them come in not notarized and we have to return them. Unless there is a good reason why the professional corporations should have to have their signatures notarized, while others do not, we would like to have that removed. The main reason is to avoid sending them back at the expense of the state. Also the profit corporations are the people with a regular corporation and the signatures do not have to be notarized.

Senator Ford asked what the repealer is? Mr. Swackhamer stated that this was brought to the attention of the legislature two years ago and is a problem that is going to get worse. The law requires that when a corporation files an annual list of officers, we send them a certificate to allow them to continue to do business. This is actually a receipt, and common business practice has indicated receipts are no longer given for every bill paid.

Mr. Swackhamer pointed out that two years ago, it was a legitimate problem; a person sending in an annual list of officers for one corporation and one check. The problem was brought up two years ago of the law firms that send in multiple corporations with one check. The firm would not be able to prove they had paid. The system we use is that when a check comes in from a corporation, we note the corporate file number on the check. A check that listed 26 corporations, we listed the file number of each one. If it is a law firm, or corporate service organization and one check is sent, we send them back the list of all the corporations and file numbers that the check covered. On that basis, this would answer the questions raised two years ago. We have some 40,000 corporations, with postage going up the first of March, this is a significant amount of money which can be saved by not using the duplicate on the original document.

Senator Raggio stated that he opposed this during the last session and still opposes it. NRS 78.155 is a requirement that when you file the list of officers annually, which in effect is the method by which any corporation retains its good standing, that the certificate authorized is the authority to transact busi-

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

ness and conduct its operations for a year. It is the only record that a corporation or resident agent has of that situation and the effect and consequences of a corporation not being in good standing are very severe. A corporate service or law firm that handles multiple corporate filings could possibly overlook a filing.

Mr. Swackhamer pointed out that when his office sends back the list of officers, there are two duplicates on the form. One is used for the department's audit trail and the other is the receipt we return to the resident agent. He stated that the filing fee was \$20.00.

Senator Don Ashworth stated for the record that he certainly agrees 100% with Senator Raggio's analysis of this. He pointed out that the receipt that is returned is the top four inches of the form which shows the name of the corporation and the officer's list comes below. It is stamped paid and returned and you can check in your file to determine whether or not a corporation is current without calling the Secretary of State. This receipt is needed.

Senator Keith Ashworth stated that he also agreed with Senator Don Ashworth and Senator Raggio that this certificate is needed. He questioned if an increase in fees would help offset the budget.

Mr. Swackhamer stated it would not make that much difference. All money that comes into the office is for the benefit of the general fund. We work on appropriated money only. He just felt it was an area in which to save the state a few dollars.

Senator Ford questioned if the bill should become effective upon passage and approval. There is a bill which makes all states September 1, 1981, unless otherwise specified. Mr. Swackhamer stated that this would be better. If NRS 78.155 is retained, this speaks to July 1 of the next succeeding calendar year. This did not get amended to harmonize with the anniversary date law and he suggested an amendment.

SENATE BILL NO. 104

Provides penalty for foreign corporation's failure to file certain documents.

Mr. Swackhamer stated that the purpose of this bill is to give us the right to revoke a charter of a foreign corporation that

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

refuses to pay a fee that is developed through an amendment. We have foreign corporations that file amendatory documents raising their capitalization. When we bill them for the additional fees that are required, they refuse to pay. When a domestic corporation that is out of the state raises their capitalization, they are qualified here but we have no way of knowing until three years later when they supply an amendment and recite their capitalization. When we see it is changed, we bill them for the difference. This would give us an additional way to collect.

Senator Raggio questioned why you would file their amended articles, increasing their authorized capitalization if the fee was not included. Mr. Swackhamer stated that they would not. If they file an amendatory document, amending their articles in their respective area, they are supposed to file a document with us amending their corporation. They will file here two or three years later and in the comparison we will find the increase in capitalization.

Senator Don Ashworth asked if there was any way of checking on the filing of the financial statement of a foreign corporation. Mr. Swackhamer stated that they are not filed with his department, they are sent to the newspapers and published. There is no way of policing this. He suspected that this procedure of publishing in the local newspapers was just a subsidy to the paper.

After discussion and review of the testimony and remarks, the committee voted on the following bills:

SENATE BILL NO. 102

Senator Raggio moved to Do Pass S. B. No. 102 and place on the Consent Calendar.

Senator Wagner seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

SENATE BILL NO. 103

Senator Raggio moved to amend and Do Pass S. B. 103.

Senator Don Ashworth seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

SENATE BILL NO. 104

Senator Keith Ashworth moved to Do Pass S. B. No. 104.

Senator Don Ashworth seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

SENATE BILL NO. 106

Senator Hernstadt moved to Do Pass S. B. 106 and place on the Consent Calendar.

Senator Don Ashworth seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

SENATE BILL NO. 108

Senator Raggio moved to Do Pass S. B. 108 and place on the Consent Calendar.

Senator Don Ashworth seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

SENATE BILL NO. 109

Senator Raggio moved to Do Pass S. B. 109 and place on the consent Calendar.

Senator Hernstadt seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

The following testimony was made on:

SENATE BILL NO. 112

Ratifies technical corrections made to multiple amendments of NRS.

Mr. Frank Daykin gave the chairman a copy of notes explaining the changes to S. B. 112. (See Exhibit C.). Mr. Daykin stated that this bill is a correction of multiple amendments. Those arise when you amend a particular section of NRS in one bill, also amend it in another bill and the later amendment does not

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

take account of the former amendment. In no case does this bill change the substance of the law, it changes the particular session law which should have taken account of a previous one to read as if it had. He explained that the brackets and italics which appear in this bill are all the correct ones.

Mr. Daykin explained how the changes were made. He stated that this bill is not changing the law as enacted, it is not changing NRS by brackets and italics; it is amending an earlier session law to read as it should have read.

Senator Don Ashworth pointed out that the session laws are already printed and questioned why these corrections are necessary to these laws. Mr. Daykin stated that the constitution requires that every act or section which is amended must be set out at length as amended. In a bill such as this with 20 sections, probably 40 sections of session law could be affected. In printing the supplement, we make the necessary corrections so as to give effect to the legislative intent. There are no substantive changes in the bill. He stated that you are making no change in NRS, you are ratifying my reconciliations of conflicting amendments. We are charged by law to figure this out when we prepare the supplement, correcting it and because of the constitution, we feel the legislature should ratify that correction. The law should not rest upon my judgment.

There being no further discussion, the following action was taken by the committee.

SENATE BILL NO. 112

Senator Don Ashworth moved to Do Pass S. B. 112.

Senator Raggio seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

The following action was taken by the committee on bills that were scheduled on February 3, 1981.

SENATE BILL NO. 71--Requires payment of medical expenses of victim by defendant.

Chairman Close stated that the bill would be held, pending additional information from Warden Wolff.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
February 4, 1981

SENATE BILL NO. 72--Provides additional exemption to provisions governing land sales.

Senator Hernstadt moved to Do Pass S. B. 72.

Senator Ford seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

SENATE BILL NO. 73--Provides for sentencing of misdemeanants to make restitution or perform certain work as alternative to punishment by fine or imprisonment.

Chairman Close stated that the bill would be held, pending additional information.

SENATE BILL NO. 47--Provides for protection of agricultural activities from lawsuits.

Chairman Close stated that the bill would be held, pending the review by the committee of information and testimony presented on this bill.

Senator Ford advised the committee that she is chairing a subcommittee in Government Affairs to look at the election laws and would like some input from the committee.

The following Bill Drafting Request was presented and received for committee introduction.

BDR 11-500 (S.B. 188)

Makes various changes concerning custody of children in cases of parents' separation or divorce.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Shirley LaBadie
Shirley LaBadie, Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Mel D. Close
Senator Melvin D. Close, Chairman

DATE: February 10, 1981

SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

EXHIBIT A

Committee on JUDICIARY, Room 213.

Day Wednesday, Date February 4, Time 9:00 a.m.

S. B. No. 102--Raises upper age limit of children eligible for foster homes.

S. B. No. 103--Removes certain requirements regarding filing of annual statement of corporations and abolishes certain certificate issued to corporations.

S. B. No. 104--Provides penalty for foreign corporation's failure to file certain documents.

S. B. No. 106--Makes technical correction concerning affidavits in small claims.

S. B. No. 108--Reconciles penalties prescribed for possession of another's credit card.

S. B. No. 109--Removes conflict between statutory provisions which impose different penalties for similar assaults and batteries.

S. B. No. 112--Ratifies technical corrections made to multiple amendments of sections of NRS.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

DATE: February 4, 1981

EXHIBIT B

* PLEASE PRINT	PLEASE PRINT	PLEASE PRINT	PLEASE PRINT
NAME	ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	
<i>W. Zubacic</i>	<i>State Welfare</i>	<i>4771</i>	
<i>D. Hendley</i>	<i>Madison Avenue</i>	<i>885-4771</i>	
<i>Bill Curran</i>	<i>Clark County DA Office</i>	<i>386-4765</i>	
<i>D. Fowler</i>			
<i>Mrs D. Fowler</i>	<i>4067 Hill View Dr.</i>	<i>882-5544</i>	
<i>Cora Fowler</i>	<i>4067 Hill View Dr.</i>	<i>882-5544</i>	
<i>0</i>			

Section 1.

Note: Section 14, ch. 365, Stats. 1979, p. 630, (A.B. 24) repeals NRS 353.275 and § 106, ch. 683, Stats. 1979, p. 1797, (A.B. 103), amends that NRS section at the same time. A.B. 24 which provides for managing the insurance risks of the state reenacts the provisions of NRS 353.275 as § 9 of the act. A.B. 103 which creates the department of transportation amends that NRS section only to change the name of the former department of highways. If the repealer did not take precedence over the amendment, NRS 353.275 and § 9 of A.B. 24 would substantially duplicate each other. For these reasons, the repealer takes precedence. This technical conflict is resolved by postponing the repealer made by subsection 3 of § 14 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 106.

Sec. 2.

Note: Section 3, ch. 221, Stats. 1979, p. 322, (A.B. 450), and § 6, ch. 524, Stats. 1979, p. 1019, (S.B. 131), both amend NRS 297.-090 at the same time although § 6 incorporates the changes made by § 3. This technical conflict is resolved by postponing the amendment made by § 6 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 3. Also clarifies references to "hereafter" by substituting the correct effective date and replaces an internal reference superseded by ch. 267, Stats. 1979, with the correct references.

Sec. 3.

Note: Section 1, ch. 248, Stats. 1979, p. 344, (S.B. 232), and § 7, ch. 554, Stats. 1979, p. 1100, (S.B. 233), both amend NRS 625.-390 at the same time although § 7 incorporates the changes made by § 1. This technical conflict is resolved by postponing the amendment made by § 7 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 1.

Sec. 4.

Note: Section 3, ch. 176, Stats. 1979, p. 255, (A.B. 478), and § 1, ch. 561, Stats. 1979, p. 1110, (S.B. 415), both amend NRS 286.-070 at the same time although § 1 incorporates the changes made by § 3. This technical conflict is resolved by postponing the amendment made by § 1 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 3.

Sec. 5.

Note: Section 20, ch. 688, Stats. 1979, p. 1845, (A.B. 523), effective July 1, 1981, fails to reflect changes made to NRS 232.-250 by § 78, ch. 592, Stats. 1979, p. 1218, (S.B. 173), effective July 1, 1979. This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 78 into the text which § 20 amends.

Sec. 6.

Note: Section 5, ch. 635, Stats. 1979, p. 1375, (A.B. 426), and § 221, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1642, (S.B. 539), both amend NRS 361.455 at the same time. Section 6 also fails to reflect the change made by § 221. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the change made by § 221 into the text which § 6 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 6 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 221.

Sec. 7.

Note: Section 4, ch. 593, Stats. 1979, p. 1233, (S.B. 204), fails to reflect changes made to NRS 361.455 by § 6, ch. 635, Stats. 1979, p. 1375, (A.B. 426). Also the amendments contained in

§§ 4 and 6 are made at the same time because of the postponement of the effective date of § 6 necessitated by the resolution of a technical conflict in the next preceding section of this act. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 6 into the text which § 4 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 4 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 6.

Section 21, ch. 593, Stats. 1979, p. 1243, (S.B. 204), and § 61, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1588, (S.B. 539), both amend NRS 387.1233 at the same time. Section 21 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 61. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 61 into the text which § 21 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 21 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 61.

Section 21.5, ch. 593, Stats. 1979, p. 1243, (S.B. 204), and § 62, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1588, (S.B. 539), both amend NRS 387.1235 at the same time. Section 21.5 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 62. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 62 into the text which § 21.5 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 21.5 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 62.

Section 7, ch. 364, Stats. 1979, p. 609, (S.B. 255) and § 12, ch. 593, Stats. 1979, p. 1238, (S.B. 204), both amend NRS 333.150 at the same time although § 12 incorporates the changes made by § 7. This technical conflict is resolved by postponing the amendment made by § 12 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 7.

Sec. 8.

Notes: Section 6, ch. 598, Stats. 1979, p. 1267, (S.B. 263), fails to reflect changes made to NRS 218.220 by § 2 of that act at p. 1265. This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 2 into the text which § 6 amends.

Sec. 9.

Notes: Section 1, ch. 605, Stats. 1979, p. 1301, (S.B. 412), and § 192, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1628, (S.B. 539), both amend NRS 394.371 at the same time. Section 1 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 192. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 192 into the text which § 1 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 1 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 192.

Sec. 10.

Note: Section 1, ch. 619, Stats. 1979, p. 1331, (S.B. 583), and § 42, ch. 338, Stats. 1979, p. 521, (S.B. 72), both identically amend NRS 245.213 at the same time. This technical conflict is resolved by deleting § 1 as superfluous. Section 42 takes precedence because S.B. 583 is a "trailer bill" drafted to deal with NRS sections not already dealt with in S.B. 72.

Sec. 11.

Notes: Section 4, ch. 651, Stats. 1979, p. 1409, (A.B. 825), fails to reflect changes made to NRS 450.440 by § 3 of that act at p. 1408. This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 3 into the text which § 4 amends.

Sec. 12.

Notes: Section 4, ch. 8, Stats. 1979, p. 12, (S.B. 43), and § 147, ch. 653, Stats. 1979, p. 1465, (S.B. 9), both amend NRS 356.-110 at the same time although § 147 incorporates the changes made

by § 4. This technical conflict is resolved by postponing the amendment made by § 147 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 1.

Sec. 13.

Notes: Section 97.4, ch. 392, Stats. 1979, p. 1224, (S.B. 173), and § 54, ch. 663, Stats. 1979, p. 1557, (S.B. 443), both amend § 13, ch. 688, Stats. 1979, p. 1841, (A.B. 523), at the same time. Section 13 as it appears in A.B. 523 and in § 97.4 of S.B. 173 repeals, among other NRS sections, NRS 645.220, 645.290, 645.390 and 645.555, effective July 1, 1981. The version of § 13 which appears in § 54 of S.B. 443, omits those NRS sections so that they can be repealed effective July 1, 1979, by § 55 of S.B. 443. A.B. 523, the "sunset law," deals with the subject matter of those sections only from the standpoint of terminating the real estate division: S.B. 173, which concerns manufactured housing, amends § 13 for a purpose entirely unrelated to the subject matter of those NRS sections. (It deletes a reference to NRS 482.324.) It is S.B. 443 which deals with that subject matter specifically and for this reason § 54 of S.B. 443 should prevail in its technical conflict with § 97.4 of A.B. 523. To resolve the conflict, the amendment made by § 54 is postponed to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 97.4.

Subsection 1 of § 55, ch. 663, Stats. 1979, p. 1557, (S.B. 443), which repeals NRS 645.290, 645.390 and 645.555, is also postponed until 12:01 a.m., July 1, 1979, to resolve its technical conflict with § 97.4, ch. 392, Stats. 1979, p. 1224, (S.B. 173), effective at 12:00 midnight on that date.

Sec. 14.

Notes: Section 98, ch. 338, Stats. 1979, p. 345, (S.B. 72), effective in 1980 when the decennial census is reported, fails to reflect changes made to NRS 387.170 by § 65, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1589, (S.B. 539), effective July 1, 1979. This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 65 into the text which § 98 amends.

Section 1, ch. 579, Stats. 1979, p. 1162, (S.B. 407), and § 42, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1580, (S.B. 539), both amend NRS 386.363 at the same time. Section 42 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 1. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 1 into the text which § 42 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 42 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 1.

Section 42.5, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1580, (S.B. 539), which amends NRS 386.363 by amending § 97, ch. 338, Stats. 1979, p. 344, (S.B. 72), effective in 1980 when the decennial census is reported, also fails to reflect the changes made by § 1, ch. 579, Stats. 1979, p. 1162, (S.B. 407), and by § 42, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1580, (S.B. 539). This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by §§ 1 and 42 into the text which § 42.5 amends. Section 42.5 should take effect at 12:01 a.m., July 1, 1979, at the same time § 42 becomes effective.

Section 154, ch. 633, Stats. 1979, p. 1467, (S.B. 9), and § 106, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1600, (S.B. 539), both amend NRS 390.230 at the same time. Section 106 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 154. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 154 into the text which § 106 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 106 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 154.

Section 133, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1607, (S.B. 539), and § 2, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1830, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3115

at the same time. Section 133 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 2. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 2 into the text which § 133 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 133 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 2. NRS 391.3115 deals with the discipline and removal of school employees and in reconciling the texts, A.S. 519 takes precedence because it deals specifically with that subject matter, while S.B. 539 deals with it only generally by way of reorganizing the education law.

Sec. 15.

Notes: Section 2, ch. 676, Stats. 1979, p. 1724, (A.B. 28), fails to reflect changes made to NRS 4.370 by § 12, ch. 668, Stats. 1979, p. 1630 (S.B. 545). This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 12 into the text which § 2 amends.

Section 148, ch. 655, Stats. 1979, p. 1463, (S.B. 9), and § 8, ch. 676, Stats. 1979, p. 1727, (A.B. 28), both amend NRS 361.540 at the same time. Section 8 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 148. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 148 into the text which § 8 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 8 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 148.

Sec. 16.

Notes: As enacted, § 8 of ch. 680 (A.B. 70) repealed a section of S.B. 583 which had nothing to do with the subject of A.B. 70, because the sections of S.B. 583 were renumbered by amendment after the repealer was inserted in A.B. 70. S.B. 583 makes changes in the classification of counties and townships according to population; section 6 as enacted referred to justices' courts while § 7 referred to regional street and highway commissions. A.B. 70 changed the name of the latter to "regional transportation commissions" and in § 4 also made the change related to population. This amendment of § 3 corrects the number of the section of S.B. 583 to be repealed.

Sec. 17.

Notes: Section 5, ch. 680, Stats. 1979, p. 1749, (A.B. 70), and § 17, ch. 683, Stats. 1979, p. 1765, (A.B. 103), both amend NRS 408.200 at the same time. Section 17 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 5. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 5 into the text which § 17 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 17 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 5.

Sec. 18.

Notes: Section 1, ch. 660, Stats. 1979, p. 1513, (S.B. 313), and § 1, ch. 684, Stats. 1979, p. 1813, (A.B. 108), both amend NRS 482.215 at the same time (January 1, 1980). Both amendments are also substantively incompatible with each other: S.B. 313 which repeals the Nevada Motor Vehicle Insurance Act ("No-fault") removes the requirement for a declaration at registration that security is maintained on the vehicle while A.B. 108 retains that requirement. A.B. 108 takes precedence because it specifically addresses the matter of proof of mandatory insurance while S.B. 313 is concerned almost exclusively with the repeal of "no-fault" and all references in NRS to it. These technical and substantive conflicts are resolved by repealing § 1 of S.B. 313.

Likewise, § 2, ch. 660, Stats. 1979, p. 1514, (S.B. 313), and § 2, ch. 684, Stats. 1979, p. 1819, (A.B. 108), both amend NRS 482.280 and present the identical technical and substantive conflicts described above. Those conflicts are resolved by repealing § 2 of S.B. 313.

Section 9, ch. 660, Stats. 1979, p. 1519, (S.B. 313), repeals NRS 484.263 and § 3, ch. 684, Stats. 1979, p. 1320, (A.B. 108), amends that NRS section at the same time (January 1, 1980). S.B. 313 repeals NRS 484.263 because its prohibition against driving without the security required under chapter 698 of NRS became obsolete with the repeal of "no-fault." In amending NRS 484.263, A.B. 108 substituted the reference to NRS ch. 698 for a reference to its requirement for mandatory insurance and added several other prohibitions. For these reasons it is clear that the amendment made by § 3 of A.B. 108 is intended to take precedence over the repealer made by § 9 of S.B. 313. This technical and substantive conflict is resolved by removing NRS 484.263 from the repealer in S.B. 313.

Sec. 19.

Note: Section 132, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1606, (S.B. 539), and § 1, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1329, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.311 at the same time. Section 1 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 132. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 132 into the text which § 1 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 1 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 132. The word "under" is substituted for the word "for" in the phrases "Taught under one probationary contract" and "Worked as an administrator under one probationary contract" in subsections 1 and 2, respectively, of § 1 to improve grammatical construction for clarity.

Section 134, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1607, (S.B. 539), and § 3, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1330, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3116 at the same time. Section 3 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 134. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 134 into the text which § 3 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 3 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 134. In reconciling the texts, the phrase "dismiss or refuse to reemploy" added to § 3 with respect to administrators is deleted in the interest of clarity because it confusingly repeats the immediately preceding reference to the right of the board of school trustees to do that with respect to certificated employees, which clearly include administrators.

Section 135, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1607, (S.B. 539), and § 3.5, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1330, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3123 at the same time. Section 3.5 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 135. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 135 into the text which § 3.5 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 3.5 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 135.

Section 136, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1608, (S.B. 539), and § 4, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1331, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3127 at the same time. Section 4 also fails to reflect the change made by § 136. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the change made by § 136 into the text which § 4 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 4 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 136.

Section 137, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1608, (S.B. 539), and § 8, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1333, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3161 at the same time. Section 8 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 137. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 137 into the text which § 8 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 8 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 137. In reconciling the texts, the words "hearing officer" are deleted from the phrase "hearing officer list" in the second sentence of subsection 1 of § 137 to conform the name of the list to that given in the first sentence ("list of hearing officers") and to avoid unnecessary repetition.

Section 137 of S.B. 539, which is primarily concerned with reorganizing the education law, removes from subsection 3 of NRS 391.3161 a provision dealing with the duty of a hearing officer to hear certain cases involving the discipline of school employees and § 110 of that bill essentially reenacts that same provision. Section 8 of A.B. 519 retains and substantively amends that provision of NRS 391.3161. This substantive conflict between § 8 of A.B. 519 and § 110 of S.B. 539 is resolved by repealing § 110. Section 8 takes precedence because A.B. 519 deals specifically with the discipline of school employees, while S.B. 539 deals with it only generally.

Section 138, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1609, (S.B. 539), amends NRS 391.3165 and § 18, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1838, (A.B. 519), repeals that NRS section at the same time. NRS 391.3165 deals with the composition and duties of a commission for hearing cases involving the discipline of school employees. The repealer takes precedence because A.B. 519 which abolishes the hearing commission deals specifically with the matter of such discipline, while S.B. 539 deals with it only generally by way of reorganizing the education law. This technical and substantive conflict is resolved by repealing in § 18 the amendment made by § 138.

Section 140, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1609, (S.B. 539), and § 11, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1834, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.31913 at the same time. Section 11 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 140. While both amendments deal specifically with disciplinary procedures affecting school employees, the amendment by § 140 of S.B. 539 does so primarily as it affects the hearing commission which A.B. 519 abolishes. Section 11 of A.B. 519 takes precedence over § 140 of S.B. 539 because A.B. 519 as a whole deals specifically with the matter of such discipline, while S.B. 539 as a whole deals with that subject only generally by way of reorganizing the education law. These technical and substantive conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 140 into the text which § 11 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 11 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 140.

Section 141, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1610, (S.B. 539), and § 12, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1834, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3192 at the same time. Section 12 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 141. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 141 into the text which § 12 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 12 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 141.

Section 142, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1610, (S.B. 539), and § 13, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1835, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3193 at the same time. Section 13 also fails to reflect the change made by § 142. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the change made by § 142 into the text which § 13 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 13 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 142.

Section 143, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1611, (S.B. 539), and § 14, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1835, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3194 at the same time. Section 14 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 143. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 143 into the text which § 14 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 14 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 143.

Section 144, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1611, (S.B. 539), and § 15, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1836, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.3196 at the same time. Section 15 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 144. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 144 into the text which § 15 amends

and by postponing the amendment made by § 15 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 144.

Section 148, ch. 667, Stats. 1979, p. 1612, (S.B. 539), and § 17, ch. 687, Stats. 1979, p. 1837, (A.B. 519), both amend NRS 391.355 at the same time. Section 17 also fails to reflect the changes made by § 148. These technical conflicts are resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 148 into the text which § 17 amends and by postponing the amendment made by § 17 to become effective 1 minute after the amendment made by § 148.

Sec. 20.

Notes: Sections 6 and 6.5, ch. 696, Stats. 1979, p. 1915, (A.B. 541), fail to reflect changes made to NRS 445.133 by § 5.5 of that act. This technical conflict is resolved by incorporating the changes made by § 5.5 into the text which §§ 6 and 6.5 amend.