

NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Minutes of the

FAMILY LAW COMMITTEE

Friday, September 13, 2002
Roughrider Room, State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota

Representative John Mahoney, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Members present: Representatives John Mahoney, Lois Delmore, Mary Ekstrom, Jim Kasper, Lawrence R. Klemin, Dan Ruby, Sally M. Sandvig, Dwight Wrangham; Senators Linda Christenson, Dick Dever, Russell T. Thane

Members absent: Representatives Roxanne Jensen, Carol A. Niemeier; Senators Robert S. Erbele, Michael A. Every, Darlene Watne

Others present: See attached appendix

It was moved by Representative Delmore, seconded by Representative Ekstrom, and carried on a voice vote that the minutes of the July 1, 2002, meeting be approved as distributed.

ADOPTION LAW STUDY

Chairman Mahoney called on committee counsel to present the child-placing agency bill draft [30193.0100]. Committee counsel said the bill draft is based upon language submitted by the informal task force of licensed child-placing agency representatives discussing adoption laws. The primary substantive changes being made to North Dakota Century Code (NDCC) Chapter 50-12, she said, pertain to when a child-placing agency is required to consider criminal history record information and the procedure a child-placing agency must follow for increasing adoption service fees.

Chairman Mahoney called on Ms. Julie Hoffman, Administrator of Adoption Services, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Human Services, for comments regarding the child-placing agency bill draft, proposed amendments to the paternity registry bill draft, and in vitro fertilization as it may apply to adoption law. Ms. Hoffman provided written testimony, a copy of which is on file in the Legislative Council office.

Ms. Hoffman reviewed the changes to NDCC Chapter 50-12 in the child-placing agency bill draft. A copy of this summary is on file in the Legislative Council office. Ms. Hoffman said the bill draft removes the annual licensing requirement for child-placing agencies to allow for the possibility of extending a licensure period to two years. She said the Department of Human Services would limit the extension to child-placing agencies that have a good history in the state. Additionally, she said, the bill

draft would clarify that a child-placing agency is allowed to consider all criminal background check information available when making a recommendation in a home study report. She said this change is consistent with current practice. Several provisions in the bill draft, she said, make the procedures used in foster care placements consistent with procedures used in adoption placements. She said under the bill draft the Department of Human Services would be given notice of situations in which a child is being brought into this state in order to give adequate assurance of safety and service provisions. Finally, she said, the bill draft precludes facilitator agencies from making adoption matches for a fee in this state.

In response to a question from Representative Ruby, Ms. Hoffman said the changes being made to NDCC Section 50-12-06 reflect the current practice for placement of a child in a home pending finalization of an adoption.

Ms. Hoffman said the bill draft contains an error in the amendment to NDCC Section 50-12-14.1. She said on page 5, line 2, "permanent" should be deleted.

In response to a question from Representative Klemin, Ms. Hoffman said the suggested removal of the word "permanent" on page 5, line 2, of the bill draft is not intended to be substantive in nature, as the department views all guardianships as permanent unless otherwise stated.

Representative Delmore said existing language in NDCC Section 50-12-17, on page 5, line 20, is in need of housekeeping to improve grammar.

In response to a question from Representative Delmore, Ms. Hoffman said for child placement, the criminal history of proposed adoptive parents is not automatically updated; however, she said the practice is to annually update the criminal history if a placement has not yet been made.

In response to a question from Representative Wrangham, Ms. Hoffman said the extension of a child-placing agency licensure to two years will not impact licensure revenue for the Department of Human Services because there is no fee associated with child-placing agency licensure.

In response to a question from Senator Christenson, Ms. Hoffman said the two-year extension and licensure reflects current practice. She said the change in the law would continue to allow the Department of Human Services to require annual licensure

until the department determines the child-placing agency is in good standing in the state.

In response to a question from Representative Mahoney, Ms. Hoffman said the proposed changes in the child-placing agency bill draft have not been reviewed by the broader task force.

It was moved by Representative Delmore, seconded by Senator Christenson, and carried on a roll call vote that the bill draft, as amended on page 5, lines 2 and 20, relating to child-placing agency licensure be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council.

Senator Dever expressed his concern that because this meeting was the first opportunity to review the bill draft, there has not been a chance for the public to comment.

Chairman Mahoney said because the bill draft is drafted by the Legislative Council, a second reading is not required. He said there would be an opportunity for public comment and review during the legislative session.

Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

Ms. Hoffman presented proposed changes to the paternity registry bill draft [30107.0100]. She said the proposed changes would assist punitive fathers in making informed decisions about whether to sign on to the registry and would clarify that a paternity registry form would be admissible in a proceeding to establish paternity but would not create a rebuttal presumption of paternity under NDCC Section 14-17-04.

Representative Delmore said because of the possible constitutional challenges relating to paternity registries, she does not support the paternity registry bill draft at this time.

Representative Ekstrom said the paternity registry bill draft is a solution looking for a problem. She said she has a serious problem legislating a sex registry and is in opposition to the bill draft.

Senator Christenson said although she recognizes some of the problems relating to constitutional challenges, the paternity registry bill draft is intended to expedite adoptions and to help children be placed more quickly in adoptive homes.

Representative Mahoney said he agrees there is some merit to the paternity registry bill draft.

It was moved by Senator Christenson, seconded by Representative Sandvig, and carried on a roll call vote that the paternity registry bill draft, with Ms. Hoffman's proposed amendments, be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council.

Representative Klemin said earlier testimony indicates that at least 21 states have adopted some type of paternity registry.

Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Klemin, and Sandvig and Senators Christenson, Dever, and

Thane voted "aye." Representatives Ekstrom, Kasper, Ruby, and Wrangham voted "nay."

Ms. Hoffman briefly reviewed the adoption law study bill draft relating to eligibility for certification as a special needs adoption [30110.0100], child relinquishment to identified adoptive parents [30111.0100], Uniform Parentage Act [30112.0100], and Revised Uniform Adoption Act [30113.0100].

It was moved by Representative Delmore, seconded by Representative Ekstrom, and carried on a roll call vote that the bill draft relating to the revised Uniform Adoption Act be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

It was moved by Representative Ekstrom, seconded by Senator Christenson, and carried on a roll call vote that the bill draft relating to child relinquishment to identify adoptive parents be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

In response to a question from Representative Sandvig, Ms. Hoffman said in the bill draft relating to eligibility for certification as a special needs adoption, the use of the term "handicap" instead of the term "disability" is consistent with the terminology used in the rest of the section and with federal law. However, she said, it would be possible to use the term "disability" if that was the committee's wish.

Representative Ruby said he is concerned that for purposes of the eligibility for certification as a special need child in the adoption bill draft, the term special needs is too broad and may result in opening the floodgates.

It was moved by Senator Christenson, seconded by Representative Delmore, and carried on a roll call vote that the bill draft relating to eligibility for certification as a special needs adoption be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, and Sandvig and Senators Christenson and Thane voted "aye." Representatives Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, and Wrangham and Senator Dever voted "nay."

It was moved by Representative Wrangham, seconded by Representative Ekstrom, and carried on roll call vote that the bill draft relating to the Uniform Parentage Act be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

PRIVACY STUDY

Representative Mahoney distributed and discussed a bill draft [30178.0100] relating to exceptions to the financial privacy law. He said this bill draft incorporates the exceptions of Section 502e of the federal Financial Services Modernization Act, which is also known as the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

Chairman Mahoney called on Mr. Timothy Karsky, Commissioner, Department of Financial Institutions, for comments regarding the financial privacy bill draft and financial privacy activities of the State Banking Board.

Mr. Karsky said although he would support the committee's bill draft relating to financial institution customer privacy definitions and exceptions and he would support Representative Mahoney's bill draft relating to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act Section 502e exceptions to the financial privacy law, he does have some concerns regarding the committee bill draft definitions of customers and financial institutions. He said he would support the suggestions of the banking industry regarding the definitions of customers and financial institutions.

Mr. Karsky distributed a copy of a July 18, 2002, State Banking Board order and a July 19, 2002, State Credit Union Board order relating to incidental powers of banks and credit unions. A copy of each of the orders is on file in the Legislative Council office. He said the orders help to clarify what types of activities banks and credit unions may partake in as incidental powers necessary to carry on the business of a credit union and bank.

Mr. Karsky said the Department of Financial Institutions is receiving inquiries on a daily basis from out-of-state financial institutions seeking clarification of North Dakota's law on financial privacy. He said the department is responding to these inquiries by telling people that North Dakota's law is not exported to out-of-state financial institutions; however, the law does apply to all North Dakota residents regardless of the location of the financial institution.

In response to a question from Representative Mahoney, Mr. Karsky said although the state's protective financial privacy laws could be used as a beneficial marketing tool for financial institutions, the law also could cause banks to leave the state or decide not to enter the state.

In response to a question from Representative Kasper, Mr. Karsky said the action or inaction of the committee does not legally affect his interpretation of the state's financial privacy law. He said when the state's financial privacy law was enacted, the financial industry was different from today's financial industry, as banks in the state did not have out-of-state branches. He said prior to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, the interpretation of the state's financial privacy law had never been an issue; whereas, interpretation of the state's financial privacy law is receiving significant attention at this time.

Chairman Mahoney called on Ms. Marilyn Foss, North Dakota Bankers Association, for comments regarding the committee's financial privacy study. Ms. Foss said her concerns with the committee's financial privacy bill draft include that the definition of customer would disadvantage North Dakota financial institutions that have out-of-state facilities; the exceptions to the North Dakota financial privacy law do not include the operating exceptions that are incorporated in the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act; and the bill draft would negatively affect North Dakota chartered banks such as Community First Bankshares and US Bank.

Ms. Foss distributed a copy of a bill draft relating to the scope of North Dakota's financial privacy law, a copy of which is on file in the Legislative Council office. Ms. Foss said the bill draft respects the referral vote on Senate Bill No. 2191 and North Dakota Bankers Association member banks report that this bill draft is workable. Under the bill draft, she said, the state's financial privacy law would be limited in application to customers who reside or are domiciled in North Dakota. She said customers would include business entities as well as individuals. She said an alternative to her bill draft, accomplishing the same thing, would be to change the definitions of customer and financial institution and to create an exception for data processing centers.

Ms. Foss said Representative Mahoney's financial privacy bill draft does not include a joint marketing exception and appears to inadvertently be missing Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act Section 502e language pertaining to personal representatives and fiduciary capacity.

Ms. Foss said that Representative Mahoney's bill draft establishes a requirement for a confidentiality contractual agreement between parties and she prefers a statutory requirement for confidentiality. She said she supports incorporating the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act Section 502e exceptions into state law. Although the Section 502e exceptions are broader than North Dakota's financial privacy law, she said she does not view them as controversial. She said there are a variety of federal laws that require a disclosure of financial information.

In response to a question from Representative Kasper, Ms. Foss said that in the past, banks were able to do business under North Dakota's financial privacy law; however, there is now a heightened sensitivity to financial privacy and the state's law is being scrutinized closely. She said she is not certain whether making a distinction between customers who are North Dakota citizens and those who are not raises a constitutional issue. As a practical matter, she said, banks will likely adopt policies and systems that treat all customers the same, regardless of the state of residence. She said she has not requested an Attorney General's opinion regarding the constitutional issues because she is not authorized to make such a request under state law. The orders of the State Banking Board and State Credit Union Board

are stopgap measures to address immediate concerns; however, she said, legislative action would be favorable.

In response to a question from Representative Klemin, Ms. Foss said under Representative Mahoney's bill draft, she would prefer statutory language requiring confidentiality such as what exists under NDCC Section 6-08.1-02(11) instead of a contractual obligation.

Representative Ruby said all the discussion relating to the disadvantages and disincentives for the financial industry is really only an issue if a financial institution intends to share a customer's information.

Ms. Foss said because so many financial institutions operate nationwide, and because North Dakota does not have a large enough population base to warrant special treatment, financial institutions may choose to refrain from doing business in North Dakota.

Chairman Mahoney called on Mr. Gregory W. Tschider, North Dakota Credit Union League, for comments regarding the financial privacy study. Mr. Tschider said the primary issues in the financial privacy discussion are exportation and exceptions. He said relating to the exportation issue, although this is a very important issue, because credit unions do not disclose or sell customer information, he does not have a position on this issue. However, he said, the legislative branch is the best branch to address this issue instead of leaving it to the courts to decide. He said the concerns of credit unions in the area of exceptions focus on the ability of credit unions to be able to sell mortgages on the secondary market.

In response to a question from Representative Kasper, Mr. Tschider said when a credit union sells a mortgage on the secondary market, the credit union releases the borrower's information to the potential purchaser of the mortgage and then that potential purchaser decides whether it is an acceptable risk and whether to purchase the mortgage.

In response to a question from Representative Ruby regarding whether a credit union would disclose customer account balance information to a merchant, Mr. Tschider said although it is possible banks may be disclosing this information, he has given the credit unions a legal opinion not to share this information with merchants.

Representative Kasper said he is concerned that the financial privacy bill drafts being considered by the committee do not define nonaffiliated third party, and he is also concerned that the bill drafts are essentially reverting back to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

Ms. Foss said under current North Dakota financial privacy law, agents of a financial institution are not required to keep customer information confidential; whereas, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act does require this confidentiality. She said in that respect, Gramm-Leach-Bliley appears to provide greater consumer protection than North Dakota's law.

Mr. Karsky said current North Dakota financial privacy law does not define agent and it is not clear whether an agent is required to keep customer information confidential.

Chairman Mahoney called on Ms. Charlene Nelson, Cochairman, Protect Our Privacy, for comments regarding the financial privacy study. Ms. Nelson said the financial privacy bill drafts being considered by the committee are fixing problems that do not exist. She said legislative action by the committee is counter to the vote of the people on Senate Bill No. 2191.

Ms. Nelson said the committee should be cautious because the lobby for the financial institutions was wrong during the 2001 legislative session. Additionally, she said, the recent financial privacy opinions of the Attorney General provided clear guidance that should be adequate for the Department of Financial Institutions.

Ms. Nelson said under the committee's financial privacy bill draft, she is opposed to the addition of exception language pertaining to disclosure of customer information to nonaffiliated third parties.

Ms. Nelson said she opposes Representative Mahoney's financial privacy bill draft. She said the addition of the language from the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is unacceptable and is contrary to the vote of the people.

Ms. Nelson said the concern regarding processing centers is not valid if these processing centers are not sharing information. She said if a financial institution does not want to receive permission to disclose a customer's information, that financial institution should not enter the state because the citizens do not support this behavior.

Ms. Nelson said if the committee chooses to adopt and recommend financial privacy bill drafts, there is a strong perception by the people that the committee is disregarding the 74 percent opposition referral vote. She said although a number of interested parties have been meeting to discuss the committee's financial privacy bill draft, Protect Our Privacy was not invited to any of these meetings. She said Protect Our Privacy seeks to increase the privacy of North Dakota citizens both through prohibiting affiliate sharing of customer information and prohibiting governmental sharing of citizen information.

In response to a question from Representative Mahoney, Ms. Nelson said in addressing the exportation issue, she supports treating all North Dakota chartered institutions identically and treating all customers who do business with North Dakota chartered institutions identically.

Chairman Mahoney called on Mr. Donald Forsberg, Independent Community Banks, for comments regarding the financial privacy study. Mr. Forsberg said his perception of the referral vote on Senate Bill No. 2191 was whether the state should recognize an opt-in or an opt-out system of protecting customer information. He said the fact there are

changes being sought to the other areas of financial privacy law is not disrespectful of the vote of the people but instead addresses the fact that circumstances change and laws need to change in order to deal with this. He said his concern with the state's financial privacy law is the future of the state and the ability of the state to compete. He said change happens and needs to be dealt with responsibly.

In response to a question from Representative Delmore, Mr. Forsberg said he supports the vote of the people choosing opt-in; however, because he is new to his position with the Independent Community Banks, he was not involved in lobbying this issue during the 2001 legislative session.

In response to a question from Representative Klemin, Mr. Forsberg said the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act Section 502e exceptions are necessary.

Chairman Mahoney called on Mr. Earl Jarolimek, Community First Bankshares, for comments regarding the financial privacy study. Mr. Jarolimek said he supports the bill draft proposed by Ms. Foss because it provides clarity regarding how the state's law applies to North Dakota residents. He said 92 percent of Community First's customers reside outside North Dakota.

In response to a question from Representative Mahoney, Mr. Jarolimek said he does not view the state's more stringent financial privacy laws as a tool for marketing North Dakota.

In response to a question from Representative Kasper, Mr. Jarolimek said Community First Bankshares does not sell customer information.

Representative Mahoney said he is not certain whether he is ready to support Ms. Foss's bill draft. He said he seeks to honor the vote of the people.

Representative Klemin said he thinks the financial privacy bill drafts require additional work and therefore should be reserved for the legislative session by which time this work should be completed.

Representative Kasper said he agrees with Representative Klemin. He said he supports the committee bill draft adopted at the July meeting; however, he does not support the last minute bill drafts introduced at this meeting.

Representative Wrangham said because the financial privacy issue is an evolving issue, time may help in resolving the issues raised at the meeting.

It was moved by Representative Wrangham, seconded by Representative Kasper, and carried on a roll call vote that the committee bill draft relating to exceptions to the financial privacy law be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

Chairman Mahoney called on committee counsel for comments regarding the committee's bill draft relating to restrictions on the information a business may include on an electronically printed credit card

receipt. She said copies of the bill draft were distributed to interested persons and none of the interested persons were interested in being placed on the agenda to discuss the bill draft. She said the interested persons did not appear to oppose the bill draft.

Representative Klemin said he supports the bill draft and recognizes many retailers are already limiting information on credit card receipts.

It was moved by Representative Klemin, seconded by Senator Thane, and carried on a roll call vote that the bill draft relating to restrictions on the information a business may include on an electronically printed credit card receipt be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

ADMINISTRATION OF CHILD SUPPORT STUDY

Chairman Mahoney called on committee counsel to present the study resolution drafts [33016.0100] and [33017.0100] regarding the impact of the loss of taxable property on the ability of local communities to fund social services and regarding the state and county funding of social services. She said both resolution drafts are in response to the testimony received at the July 2002 committee meeting. She said one resolution draft provides for a study of the loss of tax revenues from flooded property and from previously taxable property that is purchased by tax-exempt entities, including ownership in trust for Indian tribes, and the impact of the tax status of these properties on the ability of local communities to provide social services, including child support enforcement services. The other resolution draft, she said, provides for a Legislative Council study of state and local funding obligations for social services, including child support enforcement services.

It was moved by Representative Ekstrom, seconded by Senator Christenson, and carried on a roll call vote that the concurrent resolution draft regarding the study of the loss of tax revenues from flooded property and from previously taxable property being purchased by tax-exempt entities be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

It was moved by Representative Ekstrom, seconded by Representative Delmore, and carried on a roll call vote that the concurrent resolution draft relating to the study of state and local funding obligations for social services be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and

Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

Chairman Mahoney called on Mr. Mike Schwindt, Director, Child Support Enforcement, Department of Human Services, for comments regarding the status of federal rules addressing child support services provided to Indians, the state administration of a child support bill draft, and the possibility of charging child support obligors fees. Mr. Schwindt provided written testimony, a copy of which is on file in the Legislative Council office.

Mr. Schwindt said the Department of Human Services supports the concept of state administration of the child support enforcement program but cannot afford to support the bill draft unless it is revenue neutral to the general fund. He said under the committee's state administration of child support enforcement bill draft, the counties are required to continue to pay the same amount for child support enforcement services as the counties spent for the services during calendar year 2001. He said under the committee bill draft state administration of the child support enforcement program would neither aggravate nor eliminate the problems experienced by counties in which there is an Indian reservation. Additionally, he said, under the bill draft state administration would have little effect on the role of county commissioners in the administration of the program.

Mr. Schwindt said the costs associated with child support enforcement are going to continue to grow. He said federal mandates and performance measures along with increasing caseloads demand that more resources be dedicated to the program. With the additional efficiencies of state administration, he said, it may be possible to avoid or at least delay these increased costs. He said without the efficiencies that would result from state administration, the counties will have to spend more money on administration of the program in future years than they spent in fiscal year 2001.

Mr. Schwindt said the child support enforcement interactions with the state and the Indian tribes are in a state of flux. Specifically, he said, federal regulations that would govern how tribes may provide child support enforcement services and draw federal funds to cover these costs have been pending for nearly two years. Until these federal regulations are finalized, he said, much of what can or should be done at the state level cannot be implemented. Additionally, he said, the Indian tribes in the state have expressed a desire to work with the Department of Human Services; however, an agreement has not yet been formalized at this time.

Mr. Schwindt said the Department of Human Services has been participating in a national work group addressing the issue of Indian tribe child support enforcement issues, as well as working with the

state's Indian tribes. He said the Department of Human Services will not commit state resources to the provision of child support enforcement services on the Indian reservations without first knowing the financial impact, which in part depends upon finalization of the federal regulations.

Mr. Schwindt said although fees of various amounts may be charged for child support enforcement services, the area is fraught with risk. He said the Department of Human Services does not charge an application fee, even though federal law provides it can charge up to \$25. He said because the federal government gets 66 percent of the application fee, counties would have to do the work and the state would reap the 34 percent benefit. He said Montana's experience with charging a fee was negative, as it was recognized there was an adverse reaction from the custodial parents. Mr. Schwindt said South Dakota has several fees, ranging from \$5 to \$25. Minnesota, he said, charges a \$25 application fee as well as a \$15 per month fee for non-IV-D income withholding cases. He said the effect of this monthly fee is to move more people to the IV-D program under which the costs of handling the cases is shared with the federal government. He said if North Dakota were to implement a fee for child support enforcement services, he would prefer the fee be based on a system similar to Minnesota's. Ultimately, he said, if the Department of Human Services charges a fee for child support enforcement services, it is preferable that the issue be addressed by the Legislative Assembly as a matter of public policy.

It was moved by Representative Ruby, seconded by Representative Ekstrom, and carried on a roll call vote that the bill draft relating to state administration of the child support enforcement system not be approved and recommended to the Legislative Council. Representatives Mahoney, Delmore, Ekstrom, Kasper, Klemin, Ruby, Sandvig, and Wrangham and Senators Christenson, Dever, and Thane voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

It was moved by Representative Kasper, seconded by Representative Delmore, and carried on a voice vote that the chairman and the staff of the Legislative Council be requested to prepare a report and the bill drafts recommended by the committee and to present the report and recommended bill drafts to the Legislative Council.

It was moved by Senator Christenson, seconded by Senator Thane, and carried that the meeting be adjourned sine die.

Jennifer S. N. Clark
Committee Counsel

ATTACH:1