

SECOND DAY

Bismarck, January 7, 1981

The House convened at 1:30 p.m., with Speaker Peterson presiding.
Prayer was offered by Joanne M. Spears, Quaker, Religious Society
of Friends.

Roll was called and all members were present.

A quorum was declared by the Speaker.

REVISION AND CORRECTION OF THE JOURNAL

Mr. Speaker Your Committee on Revision and Correction of the
Journal has carefully examined the Journal of the First Day

and recommends that the same be corrected as follows:

On page 79 line 15, delete the word "speaker" and insert in lieu
thereof the word "Speaker".

On page 82, line 13 after the word "two" insert the words "be
appointed"

On page 83, line 20, delete the words "new year" and insert
in lieu thereof the words "New Year".

On page 88, line 9, after the word "indicated" insert the word
"in"

On page 101, line 7, after the word on, delete the word "Industru"
and insert in lieu thereof the word "Industry".

On page 108, line 35 after the word "Education" and before the
colon, insert the word "introduced".

On page 117, line 10, after the word "Government" insert a period.

On page 118, after line 11, insert the words "Committee on
Industry, Business and Labor introduced:"

On page 118, delete line 15.

On page 119, line 10, after the word "Business" delete the word
"an" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and".

And when so corrected recommends that the same be approved.

..... Chairman
Rep. Metz moved that the report be adopted, which motion prevailed.

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Your Committee on INDUSTRY, BUSINESS AND LABOR
to whom was referred HOUSE

Bill No. 1073, has had the same under consideration and recommends, by a vote of
Ayes, 15; Nays, 0; Absent, 1, that the same

do pass. do not pass. be placed on calendar without recommendation.

..... Chairman
Rep. Rued
House Bill No. 1073 was placed on the 11th
order of business on the calendar for the succeeding legislative day.

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Your Committee on JUDICIARY
to whom was referred House

Bill No. 1085, has had the same under consideration and recommends, by a vote of
Ayes, 14; Nays, 1; Absent, 0, that the same

do pass. do not pass. be placed on calendar without recommendation.

..... Chairman
Rep. Conmy
House Bill No. 1085 was placed on the 11th
order of business on the calendar for the succeeding legislative day.

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Your Committee on Education
to whom was referred HOUSE

Bill No. 1090, has had the same under consideration and recommends, by a vote of
Ayes, 16; Nays, 0; Absent, 0, that the same

do pass. do not pass. be placed on calendar without recommendation.

..... Chairman
Rep. Knudson
HOUSE REP. KNUDSON
Bill No. 1090 was placed on the 11th
order of business on the calendar for the succeeding legislative day.

MOTIONS

Rep. Haugland moved that House Bill 1065 be returned to the House from the Committee on Social Services and Veterans Affairs and re-

referred to the Committee on Judiciary, which motion prevailed.

Speaker Peterson announced that House Bill 1065 was re-referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

Rep. Conmy moved that House Bill 1181 be returned to the House from the Committee on Judiciary and be re-referred to the Committee on Finance and Taxation.

Speaker Peterson announced that House Bill 1181 was re-referred to the Committee on Finance and Taxation.

Rep. Strinden moved that the House stand at ease to receive the Senate for a Joint Session and at the conclusion of the Joint Session, be on the ninth order of business and at the conclusion of the ninth order of business that the House stand adjourned until 1:30 p.m., January 8, 1981, which motion prevailed.

JOINT SESSION

The Joint Session was called to order with Speaker Peterson presiding.

Rep. Strinden moved that a committee of two be appointed to escort Lt. Governor Sands to the rostrum, which motion prevailed. Speaker Peterson appointed Rep. Mattson and Rep. Black to such committee.

Lt. Governor Sands was introduced to the Assembly and Speaker Peterson turned the gavel over to him to preside.

Rep. Strinden moved that a committee of two be appointed to escort the Honorable Allen I. Olson, Governor, to the rostrum, which motion prevailed. Lt. Governor Sands appointed Sen. Roen and Rep. Eagles to escort Governor Olson to the rostrum. Lt. Governor Sands introduced Governor Olson to the Assembly.

Sen. H. Christensen moved that a committee of two be appointed to escort Chief Justice Erickstad to the rostrum, which motion prevailed. Lt. Governor Sands appointed Sen. Olin and Rep. Lipsiea to such committee and Chief Justice Erickstad was escorted to the rostrum.

Sen. Nothing moved that a committee of four be appointed to escort the Associate Justices of the North Dakota Supreme Court and other state elected officials to the rostrum, which motion prevailed. Lt. Governor Sands appointed Senators Nelson and Holmberg and Representatives Houmann and Kelly to such committee and the Associate Justices and elected state officials were escorted to the rostrum.

Sen. Nothing moved that a committee of four be appointed to escort the district judges and retired district judges to their reserved seats at the front of the Chamber, which motion prevailed. Lt. Governor Sands appointed Senators Fritzell and Cussons and Representatives Peltier and Retzer to such committee and the district judges and retired district judges were escorted to their reserved seats.

Rep. Conmy introduced members of the Board of Governors of the State Bar Association of North Dakota to the Assembly.

Lt. Governor Sands introduced Chief Justice Erickstad to the Assembly.

THE STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

Message By

The Honorable Ralph J. Erickstad

Chief Justice of the North Dakota Supreme Court

I thank you Lieutenant Governor Sands, Governor Olson, Mr. Speaker Peterson, leaders of the Republican and Democrat caucuses in the House and Senate, other members and staff of the Forty-Seventh

Legislative Assembly, leaders of the State Bar Association, Justices, judges who have been especially invited to this joint session, state officials, and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen friends all.

My remarks today will be a condensed version of a more comprehensive written report which you will receive later today.

This is the fifth time in the 91-year history of our state and the 47 sessions of the Legislature that the Chief Justice of our state has been invited to speak to a joint session of the Legislature on the State of the Judiciary. This is the first time that members of the Bar and the Judiciary from throughout the state have been invited to attend. I am very pleased that the Legislature has thus recognized the third branch of our government.

The State Bar Association, the Legislative Council, and our court, including our staff, will serve coffee and cookies in Memorial Hall during recess. I hope you will take this opportunity to meet our people.

Since I last appeared before you, much involving the Judiciary has transpired.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE NORTH DAKOTA JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The North Dakota judicial system is in good health. It is an institution which is growing in vigor, quality, and sensitivity to standards of public service. Cases continue to increase in number and complexity, but the constructive responses to this problem are encouraging. Committees of the Legislature, of the State Bar Association, and the Judiciary have contributed much to our success in coping with the problems of our time. Your continued support of the Judiciary is vital to the preservation of individual freedom as we know and cherish it.

Let me briefly review our caseload.

SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court caseload has increased significantly over the years. There were 289 cases filed in 1978, 320 in 1979, and 374 by December 12, 1980. This compares with about 50-75 cases per year when I first became a member of our court in 1963. In July, August, September, October, November, and December of this year alone, 199 cases were filed in our court. If this trend continues, and we believe it will because we are a developing state, we will be inundated. We have taken steps internally to speed up the processing of cases in our court, and we will take further action in the future. Notwithstanding our efforts, we will need your support if we are to stay current in the future.

TRIAL COURTS

The present trial courts of this state have all experienced substantial increases in cases filed.

DISTRICT COURT:

The district courts have experienced average annual increases in total case filings of 10 percent.

In 1979, the Legislature authorized five new district court judgeships located in Fargo (2), Grand Forks, Minot, and Bismarck to help meet the district court caseload demands. We appreciate your foresight in this area.

JUVENILE COURT:

The juvenile court is an important part of each district court. The juvenile courts have experienced average annual increases in cases of five percent.

COUNTY COURTS:

The county-level courts have experienced average annual increases in cases of 14 percent.

MUNICIPAL COURTS:

Municipal courts have experienced average annual increases in cases of six percent.

In summary, the caseload in North Dakota trial courts has increased substantially for an extended period. As a consequence, appellate cases have also increased. Our forecasts indicate no foreseeable change in the upward trend in demand for court services. The need for additional court services will increase further as the state's energy resources are developed.

LEGISLATIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW JUDICIAL ARTICLE

We are in the process of reassessing judicial services in North Dakota. This healthy reassessment and anticipated change is a major part of the basis of my judgment of the health and vigor of the North Dakota Judiciary. At the center of this reassessment is the greatest judicial constitutional change since our statehood.

The voters of North Dakota approved the new judicial article in September, 1976. We are now proceeding to implement the unified judicial system.

The new judicial article establishes a unified judicial system consisting of

“...a supreme court, a district court, and such other courts as may be provided by law.” (Section 85, North Dakota Constitution).

A unified judicial system is intended to be a cooperative provider of court services. A unified system is one that is accountable for quality services delivered in an efficient and effective manner. A unified judicial system has these characteristics: A consolidated and simplified court structure, effective rulemaking procedure, professional management, and state financing. We are close. We have an effective rulemaking process. We are developing professional management services. There is much that we can do as a supreme court to strengthen this system. Your acts as the Legislature in making structural changes in the future will assist us in implementing that mandate.

INTERIM JUDICIARY “A” COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

By Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4089, the Legislative Council was asked to conduct a study of the judicial system to determine what, if any, structural changes might be necessitated by the passage of the new judicial article. This study was assigned to the Legislative Council's Interim Judiciary A Committee, chaired by former Representative Dean Winkjer.

The results of this effort are House Bills No. 1060 and 1061. These bills provide for important improvements in county court services in North Dakota.

Please let me briefly outline the features of this legislative proposal. They are the result of exhaustive study, and embody many adjustments to reflect the political realities of North Dakota. They merit your most careful attention.

The county court bill is designed to simplify county court structure and strengthen county court services in North Dakota.

The basic proposal is in two parts: To strengthen county courts, first, it gives county commissioners greater authority to organize county court services; and, second, it relieves the counties of most of the expenses of district court by providing for state funding of those expenses. This proposal combines increased local flexibility with indirect revenue sharing for counties while providing improved county court services. In dollars and cents, it will relieve the counties of an eight-million-dollar burden over the next biennium.

The county court bill provides for state assumption of some presently county funded district court services. The total cost of these services is approximately eight million dollars for the biennium as estimated by a study prepared by the National Center for State Courts for the State Court Administrator.

The component parts of this total are easily separated for your consideration within your budget constraints. These parts include:

Indigent defense expense for district court cases in all counties.	\$ 937,000
Salaries, travel and transcript fees for 24 court reporters.	\$1,741,900
Salaries and operating expenses of (62) juvenile court personnel.	\$3,388,000
Operating expenses of 24 district judges and their court reporters.	\$ 221,000
Administrative support staff of 5 persons at the district court and state levels.	\$ 167,060
Law library maintenance in each county.	\$ 260,000
Jury expenses.	\$ 690,000
Referees.	\$ 26,000
Capital outlay.	\$ 39,000

These elements lend themselves to phased implementation.

This proposal was recently endorsed by the Board of Governors of the State Bar Association. The North Dakota Association of Counties has endorsed the state funding of major district court costs. It is endorsed by both the Supreme Court and the Judicial Council.

Let me speak personally for a moment. I like this proposal. I hope you will like it. It provides a reasonable solution to some problems we now have in our limited jurisdiction courts, but leaves the authority for making the arrangements for such courts with county people. It will produce an improvement in our judicial system comparable to the improvement in living that came with the discovery of electricity, which substituted the light bulb for the candle.

The cost of the unified judicial system proposal before you involves a significant shift of financial responsibility from county government to state government where it should be. It will relieve small counties of the threat of sudden, unexpected court expenses like those suffered recently by Adams County when it was forced to levy additional taxes over a three-year period to cover the cost of court proceedings in a homicide case. All small counties are, in effect, given catastrophic

court cost insurance by this proposal. It will permit counties to focus their resources on county court services.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., has said:

“The life of the law has not been logic: It has been experience.”
(The Common Law, 1881)

It is from our experience that we recommend adoption of this proposal.

If I may paraphrase Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr., here: I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving: To reach the port, we must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it — but we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at anchor. (The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table (1858) Chapter 4). We must move forward toward our goal of a unified judicial system. This proposal will move us forward.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

As I mentioned to you in my last address, we have continued our efforts to establish the presiding judge as the key trial court administrative authority for all court services in each judicial district of the unified judicial system. Our Supreme Court has appointed a presiding district judge for each judicial district. The chairman of our presiding judges is Judge Douglas B. Heen of the Northeast Judicial District.

The other presiding judges are: Judge A. C. Bakken, Northeast Central Judicial District; Judge Wallace D. Berning, Northwest Judicial District; Judge Norman J. Backes, East Central Judicial District; Judge Robert L. Eckert, Southeast Judicial District; Judge Benny Graff, South Central Judicial District; and Judge Norbert J. Muggli, Southwest Judicial District.

In reflecting on this concept of the judicial district and the role of the presiding judge, the importance of an effective, participatory local judicial district planning process becomes evident. Pursuant to our rules, each judicial district is encouraged to have an advisory committee to assist the presiding judge in improving local court services in that district. Suggestions for improving services in any court in the judicial district should be directed to the presiding judge for discussion by the advisory committee. These local judicial district advisory committees are essential. Without participation by judges, the public, and the lawyers in these advisory committees, the delegation of supreme court authority may be ineffectively administered, and constitute a burden on a single individual. With such representative participation, group wisdom can be harnessed, conflicting views can be weighed, and effective coordination and support for particular projects and local court service improvements can be implemented. I think you will want to encourage such participation.

JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

As you may know, we have a case reporting system which tells us where every civil and criminal district court case is, what the status of the case is, which judge is responsible for it, and how long the case has been in the system. Judges and trial court administrators use this information to schedule and monitor cases.

We are able to monitor cases and to provide statistical services to trial courts, juvenile courts, county courts with increased jurisdiction, county justice courts, county courts, and municipal courts.

This is an example of a unified service which promotes public accountability and helps our presiding judges know the status of the cases in their districts.

DOCKET CURRENCY STANDARDS

With the assistance of the advisory committees established under our model rulemaking process, we have taken another significant step in improving public accountability for trial court services. Effective July 1, 1980, our Supreme Court approved docket currency standards (Administrative Rule 12-1980) for civil and criminal cases in district courts. All cases are monitored to meet standards of 120 days from date of filing to judgment in criminal cases, and 24 months from date of filing to judgment in civil cases.

The presiding judge and the State Court Administrator initially have responsibilities for reviewing the dockets and keeping them current. The Chief Justice acts only as a last resort.

It is a simple system, with a balanced approach to both civil and criminal cases. It provides flexibility for special cases. In the next biennium we will see the fruits of this effort to improve services and accountability to the public. These standards should, in a short time, result in the disposition of all old undecided cases in the district courts of our state. If it doesn't do that, please let me know.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN IMPROVING COURT SERVICES

The docket currency standards are the product of an open and cooperative effort of judges, attorneys, and members of the public in which we can all take satisfaction. We are committed to encouraging broad public interest and participation in improving court services, and we are very pleased with the contributions which the committees have made. The new open Supreme Court rulemaking process which I described in my last address to you is working well considering its innovative nature. Experience with it, and further study of it by our Court Services Administration Committee, will no doubt result in some amendments to it. It has moved us forward in our rulemaking area of endeavor.

STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEES

There are four standing advisory committees within the rulemaking process: The Joint Procedure Committee, chaired by Justice Paul M. Sand; the Attorney Standards Committee, chaired by Edmund Vinje of Fargo; the Judiciary Standards Committee, chaired by Lowell Lundberg of Fargo; and the Court Services Administration Committee, chaired by William Strutz of Bismarck.

We are very grateful to the members of these standing advisory committees. The work of the committees is described more fully in my printed remarks. They work hard. They represent the diversity of viewpoints in North Dakota. They are open to new ideas. They produce practical proposals and recommendations. They support an open and effective Supreme Court rulemaking process. The members serve only for the purpose of strengthening the services of our courts. Their reward is in seeing that justice is done.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES, BOARDS, AND STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Although we have not named them today, we have many special committees and standing committees of the Judicial Council who perform invaluable services without special recognition. On behalf of our Court, I thank the members of all of these committees for their contribution to justice.

I will single out one of these committees because it is one in which you have a special interest. That is the Committee on Juvenile Court Services, chaired by Presiding Judge Norman J. Backes of Fargo. You

will recall that you established the position of Juvenile Court Coordinator in 1977 and provided for funding through the utilization of Combined Law Enforcement funds in 1979. On the recommendation of the Committee, we employed Greg Wallace as our first such coordinator during this last biennium. We fully expect his work with the juvenile supervisors and probation officers to be productive of much good.

Other committees and boards I only note here, but their work is described more fully in my printed remarks. They include: The Judicial Planning Committee, chaired by Justice Vernon R. Pederson; the Special Committee on Judicial Training, chaired by Judge Larry M. Hatch; the Sentencing Guidelines Committee, chaired by Judge Kirk Smith; the State Bar Board, presided over by President Hugh McCutcheon of Minot; the Disciplinary Board, chaired by Ronald Spitt of LaMoure; the Judicial Qualifications Commission, chaired by Dr. Glenn Smith of Grand Forks; the Commission for Continuing Legal Education, chaired by Jane Heinley of Fargo; and the Continuing Legal Education Committee of the State Bar Association, chaired by Dan Vogel of Fargo.

The many people who serve on these committees and boards are rendering essential services to the cause of justice. Please note that members of the public serve on most of these committees. On the Judicial Qualifications Commission which investigates complaints against judges, the members representing the public are in the majority.

AREAS OF CONCERN

I mention to you today three additional areas of concern to the judicial system: (1) judicial retirement equity, (2) the need for one additional district court judge, and (3) support for the Central Legal Research program at the University of North Dakota Law School.

First, there must be some form of retirement benefit equity among the judges. Inequity in benefits among classes of judges hurts morale and efficiency. This important matter of retirement equity could be partially solved by providing the same retirement benefits for all district judges and supreme court justices. This could be accomplished by giving the judges and justices who have become judges and justices since July 1, 1973, the same benefits as the judges and justices who were judges and justices before that time as provided in House Bill 1105. All who are knowledgeable on this subject recognize that, of the 50 United States, we have the least desirable retirement plan for judges. A resolution of this problem is essential to attracting and retaining qualified judges in the future in North Dakota.

Our caseload statistics indicate a need for an additional district court judge in both Williston and Dickinson. The energy development in these areas is having a substantial impact on court services, and this impact will only increase. However, we are presently requesting only one new judgeship for the Southwest Judicial District during this biennium. We hope that we can handle the increased caseload in these two areas with one new judge and an extra measure of cooperation from the present judges of the state. This cooperation will put strains on court services in other areas of the state, but we believe we can meet our obligations in this way for the next biennium.

Third, I urge you to support full state funding for the Central Legal Research program of the University of North Dakota Law School.

NEW JUDGES, RETIRED JUDGES, AND DECEASED JUDGES

As you know, we have several new district court judges. Judge

Hamilton E. Englert has retired in the Southeast Judicial District and John T. Paulson of Valley City, son of Justice William L. Paulson, was elected to that position. Judge Ray R. Friederick died in office and William A. Neumann of Bottineau was appointed to this position. Presiding Judge Roy A. Ilvedson has retired in the Northwest Judicial District and Wallace D. Berning of Minot was appointed to this judgeship.

The five new judgeships authorized by the 1979 Legislature have been filled by Jon R. Kerian (Minot), Joel D. Medd (Grand Forks), Lawrence A. LeClerc (Fargo), Michael O. McGuire (Fargo), and Dennis A. Schneider (Bismarck). We welcome these people as district judges.

Since I last spoke with you, several other important former members of the Judiciary have died: former Supreme Court Chief Justice James Morris, former Supreme Court Chief Justice Obert C. Teigen, former Supreme Court Justice Harvey B. Knudson, and Supreme Court Commissioner Clifford Jansonius. The contributions of these judges to the North Dakota judicial system will be long remembered with affection and respect.

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

In addition to their opinion writing duties, the justices of the Supreme Court are assuming many important additional responsibilities as indicated in my written remarks. These services, although little publicized, are crucial to the effective administration of our judicial system.

CONCLUSION

We are progressing well in a new era for the Judicial System of North Dakota. The new judicial article has established a unified judicial system. We in the judicial system are moving firmly and quietly to carry out the responsibilities placed upon us by our people. We depend upon you for assistance in this constructive effort, for we cannot make the necessary structural changes nor provide the necessary funds to administer the system. Only you can do this, and how you do this will determine whether or not we have a judicial system which affords justice equally, fairly, and efficiently throughout our state.

In this session of the Legislature, you have a great opportunity to improve the judicial system of our state. This opportunity may not come again. When I look out into your faces, I see only a few who were members of the Legislature when I first came to the Legislature in 1957. My time to legislate is past. This is your time. I hope, during your time, you will take advantage of the great opportunity that is yours so that in time to come your grandchildren and great grandchildren can point with pride to your accomplishments and their freedom under your laws.

I truly believe that the time to press forward is now.

When we recess, I hope to visit with many of you personally, but, should we miss each other, please stop by to see me in my office to express your views, whatever they may be, for improving judicial services in our great state.

I thank you very much.

Rep. Strinden moved that the address of Chief Justice Erickstad be printed in the Journal, which motion prevailed.

Rep. Strinden moved that the Joint Session be dissolved, which motion prevailed.

FIRST READING OF HOUSE BILLS

Reps. Dick and Dotzenrod introduced:

House Bill No. 1205. — A Bill for an Act to amend and reenact section 48-02-02 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to competitive bid requirements when building or repairing public buildings.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Industry, Business and Labor.

Reps. Thompson, Whalen and Sen. Roen introduced:

House Bill No. 1206. — A Bill for an Act to cede to the United States concurrent criminal jurisdiction on lands within the Theodore Roosevelt national park, Fort Union trading post national historic site, and Knife River Indian villages national historic site, and to provide for retrocession of that jurisdiction.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Judiciary.

Rep. Black introduced:

House Bill No. 1207. — A Bill for an Act to amend and reenact section 12.1-28-02 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to gambling offenses and allowing antique slot machines to be collected and possessed as a hobby.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Judiciary.

Reps. Koski, Black, Hoffner, Mushik and Richie introduced:

House Bill No. 1208. — A Bill for an Act to provide for a property tax credit for the installation of storm shelters in mobile homes or apartment buildings; and to provide an effective date.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Finance and Taxation.

Reps. Wald and Goetz and Sen. Olin introduced:

House Bill No. 1209. — A Bill for an Act to amend and reenact section 16-08-07 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to the filling of a vacancy existing on a no-party ballot.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Judiciary.

Reps. Wald and Peltier and Sens. Lodoen and Quail introduced:

House Bill No. 1210. — A Bill for an Act to create and enact two new sections to the North Dakota Century Code, relating to late payment charges of one and one-half percent on overdue accounts and the furnishing of periodic statements.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Industry, Business and Labor.

Reps. Hoffner, Hanson and Richard and Sen. Tierney introduced:

House Bill No. 1211. — A Bill for an Act to require the establishment of tornado preparedness plans in institutions of higher education, junior colleges, and public and private elementary and high schools.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on State and Federal Government.

Rep. Kingsbury introduced:

House Bill No. 1212. — A Bill for an Act to amend and reenact sections 15-40.2-08, 15-59-06, 15-59-07, and 15-59-08 of the North Dakota Century Code to provide that the state pay the excess costs of special education.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Education.

Rep. Kingsbury and Sen. Tallackson introduced:

House Bill No. 1213. — A Bill for an Act to create and enact a new section to chapter 16-01 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to state reimbursement to the counties for the costs of primary, general, and special elections; and to provide an appropriation.

Was read the first time and referred to the committee on Judiciary.

The House stood adjourned pursuant to Rep. Strinden's motion.

ROY GILBREATH, Chief Clerk