

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1489

2007 HOUSE JUDICIARY

HB 1489

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1489

House Judiciary Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 1/22/07

Recorder Job Number: 1525

Committee Clerk Signature <i>A. Penrose</i>

Minutes:

Chairman DeKrey: We will open the hearing on HB 1489.

Rep. Dan Ruby: Sponsor of bill. I'm here to offer my version of how I think ND's law dealing with abortion should be. You have that bill before you. It is similar in many respects to the bill I offered last session. There have been some changes made to this. Many of those changes are improvements. One area deals with some of the opposition that was heard last session. This is a pretty simple bill. This basically sets clearly that any person, who intentionally destroys, terminates the life of a preborn child is a class AA felony. That is a consistent law that we have on the books for murder in ND's laws. As I stated last session, this also is similar to a penalty that you would be given if you murdered a pregnant woman, you could be charged with two AA felonies, as was the case in California a couple of years ago. This simply gives the same status to the unborn child as a separate human being from the mother, as any of us walking around. I think that is consistent and correct. I think it is only just. This bill toughens up the penalties a little bit. As technology advances, whether for better or worse, there are new ways of performing abortions through drugs, other devices, other things that may be self-induced or self-inflicted. This adds a provision that says "a person who knowingly administers to, prescribes for, or sells to any pregnant individual, with a specific intent of causing or

abetting the termination of a preborn child is guilty of a class AA felony as well. There has been criticism that this is going to affect and attacks the most common forms of birth control. My understanding of birth control is to prevent pregnancy not to end it. So the intent is to end the pregnancy, this is where that makes that distinction. Then last session there was a lot of discussion that the mother could be included in the penalty for a class AA felony. This bill does not explicitly expressly include or exclude the mother. The reason for the opposition to that last session, because the position of a couple of groups that the mother is a secondary victim in this process. As I asked for more understanding of that, and a little more clarification as to why, I was told that because of the manipulations of society, of people in the medical field, or family members that women could be coerced or pressured into doing this. Another level has been added to this bill, that a person who intentionally or knowingly, aids, abets, facilitates, solicits or incites a person to intentionally destroy or terminate the life of a preborn child is guilty of a class C felony. I think that addresses anybody who would intentionally pressure or coerce a woman to have an abortion. With the mother being a secondary victim to this, and being included in the penalty, the reason I don't have it included or excluded, is because according to the information I have received, I have been told that even in states where there laws that expressly included the mother on any penalty, whether it was a lesser degree or the same, she was never prosecuted. Nobody has ever been able to find where a mother has been prosecuted for having an abortion. So if the language remains as it is, I don't see a problem with that. I don't think prosecutors are going to be going after the mother, when they need her testimony to go and convict the person who is performing the abortion.

Rep. Klemin: The other bills that we had, refers to the term "unborn" child, whereas in this bill it is referred to as "preborn" child. Is there a reason why you specifically used preborn child rather than unborn child?

Rep. Dan Ruby: I don't have any agenda or reason why the terms were used. There may be some others that are more legal minded that may have some reason for that. I don't see any real difference, in unborn or preborn child; it is the same to me.

Rep. Delmore: With the use of the term "preborn", I'm just wondering if this bill does indeed, cover birth control as well as abortion. I need clarification as to what is included in the term "preborn".

Rep. Dan Ruby: I would assume that before we could end a life of an unborn and preborn child, there would have to be life there, and if contraception prevented the pregnancy to begin with, there wouldn't be life there. I don't see how they could go after contraception, unless the intent of that contraception, or as some call it, the emergency contraception (which would mean that there is probably already a pregnancy), and it would terminate that, that is the intent to make sure that doesn't happen. The most common is the RU486, the morning after pill, as it's called. I guess if they were taking a contraception beforehand, that prevented the pregnancy, there is no proof that there was a life or pregnancy in place at the time. It may even be difficult with the emergency contraception to prove that there was already a life there. As devices and drugs develop that we'll have to deal with this in another term, that's the intent of this legislation, is to prevent that.

Rep. Wolf: Are you going to be getting a fiscal note.

Rep. Dan Ruby: In the two sessions that I've introduced similar bills, there has never been a fiscal note that has been required by any agencies that would be affected. Generally, when you introduce a bill that would have a fiscal impact, there would be a fiscal note that would be attached. I requested one but one hasn't been required before.

Rep. Wolf: If you are going to be incarcerating people who are committing abortions, there may be an impact on the prison system in the State.

Rep. Dan Ruby: I guess with our laws that deal with crime, we always assume that there is going to be a certain amount of court costs, costs to the penal system. Those are all costs that society accepts that are necessary to protect the citizens, just as we have for murder, DUI, etc. As far as a significant number of people that will end up prisons, I really don't see that there would be a huge increase in the volume of people that are going to be tried. I think most people will avoid being considered a criminal and would cease doing what they are doing at the time.

Rep. Dahl: Could you clarify again for me why you did not include or exclude mothers, but then you also mentioned that in cases where mothers weren't charged, would that still be an option left up to the court.

Rep. Dan Ruby: It is left open for some interpretation in that there may be a case where it may be needed, and that would be some level of penalty; realistically I don't see why that would be a problem because when they expressly added language that dealt with that, none were ever prosecuted. The side that says that we should make sure that it expressly excludes the woman, there is concern that it shouldn't be there, because it hasn't been a problem in the past. But to have a simple bill, that just makes the case that we are being consistent of treating the life of that baby the same as we would after it is born, I think that is what we are looking for at this time. I don't know of any simpler way of saying that. It is just left up to the prosecutors and history has shown that before Roe vs. Wade before 1973, when states did have the different levels of penalties, some had them and some didn't. But when they did, it was never used for the mother.

Rep. Klemin: On this particular issue, do you think that a woman that voluntarily aids in the abortion would fall within the scope of aiding and abetting or facilitating the abortion, such as make them liable to a Class C felony.

Rep. Dan Ruby: To be honest with you, possibly. That is a lesser penalty, but possibly. I don't know when that would ever be used, because of the past experience. Quite possibly, and that's why it is stated the way it is.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Rep. Chuck Damschen: Support. I have some wording for an amendment to be drafted which I haven't had a change to do yet. It would change the wording for the mother, that the crime would be a class B misdemeanor. I think every one of the sponsors finds that acceptable. I would like to make a couple of comments. Usually the arguments center on choice and there are some choices that can be made, before abortion becomes an option. The other thing that really bothers me about that is how many rights anyone can exercise if they don't have the basic right to be born. There is some debate on when life begins, whether it begins at conception or not. I don't think there is anyone in the room whose life didn't begin with conception. I would say that my belief is that life begins at conception. If there is a question in our minds about that, I think that, with very few exceptions, medical procedures err on the side of life. You don't go into the emergency room and want to hear somebody say; you might not make it, so let's give you an injection and let you die. I would encourage this committee to support this bill.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Tim Lundgren, State Director of ND Life League: I here to speak in favor of HB 1489. I've been working on this bill for two decades now; starting quite some time ago and we worked through various penalties and so on and I did hand out a brochure. HB 1489 is written for the purpose of challenging the 1973 Roe vs. Wade ruling. This ruling identified the weakness in pro-life thoughts throughout the country at the time of the court's ruling. I think obviously the ruling was stretched and in order to bring about the decriminalization of abortion. Justice

Blackman wrote that pro-life laws were inconsistent in treating unborn children as persons in law, by either allowing some abortions, i.e. exceptions for various reasons or by having a lesser or no criminal punishment for the pregnant mothers to obtain an abortion. It's obvious if we want to protect life and protect the unborn children, this is the criteria that Justice Blackman and the Supreme Court, as a body, told us that we have to do. We have to protect each child without exception and the penalty must be consistent. In ND we had a class A misdemeanor prior to 1973. That is a historic or at least history would support that in ND that is something that we had previously. We are attempting to pass a bill that will provide us with specific criteria outlined in Roe v. Wade asking the court to recognize the unborn child as a legal person, afforded the same legal protection in law that we have as living persons. This was our reason for the language in this bill, so that there are no exceptions and that the penalty is consistent. By specifically stating the maximum penalty for the pregnant mother, the bill could not be construed or at least deemed to the extent possible, to be too harsh. I am asking the committee to amend this bill, and specifically state that the maximum penalty be a class A misdemeanor. The bill is actually, technically exactly what the Supreme Court asked for, but because we have a significant growth of people that support outlawing abortion, who are as concerned about the penalty, that's our reason for supporting the class A misdemeanor is to accommodate them without violating the criteria that Justice Blackman set forth, that there cannot be any abortions allowed and that the penalty must be consistent. I urge you to consider carefully amending this. Rep. Damschen is planning on writing an amendment that he will bring here, and I would urge you to give it carefully consideration towards moving this bill, while maintaining the principles we need, to challenge it at the Supreme Court level, but at the same time gathering as much support as possible from the supporters of those who value and respect human life. You will most likely hear testimony asking for no penalty or to

maintain the current language. By setting the maximum penalty of a class A misdemeanor, you are meeting the requirements of Roe, I believe at a minimum and we're addressing the concerns of those who want no penalty at all. When talking about a penalty, for those who want no penalty, I want to take a couple of minutes to address that, if I could. If abortion is outlawed, there should be a deterrent, to protect women and to protect the unborn child, both. If a mother is going to abort her child, basically the position of no penalty at all, means that you support legal abortion for women. I don't think that is the right option with the technology today, as Rep. Ruby, talked about, there is technology whereby women could actually induce abortion themselves with chemicals or devices or other means. That wouldn't afford total protection for preborn child; neither would it protect the mother as a deterrent. There may be those who will say that this bill is outlawing contraception. This is untrue, and I merely restate this for the record, the bill merely prevents the use of drugs or devices whereby the intent is to terminate or destroy the life of a preborn child. There also has been previous testimony on another bill today, parties that would like to amend the bill to allow abortions for a variety of reasons, such as rape or incest or to prevent the death of the mother, or to protect the life of the mother. Again, with the penalty, the Roe opinion set the criteria for the preborn child to be acknowledged by the courts as a person, the law must not allow any abortions. So therefore, seeing as this bill's intention is to change the Roe vs. Wade ruling, this is the requirements, that there must not be any abortions allowed. I think that most people understand that with rape or incest, although we have empathy for the mother for the circumstances, there is still another human being there to be considered and protected. Where it gets even more difficult, is with protecting the life of the mother, and with that I would like to say that when one allows abortion to protect the life of the mother, or prevent the death of the mother, abortion grinds up the baby to pieces. The way most abortions are done today, is the suction evacuator which

tears the baby apart, limb from limb. It's quite another story, as a secondary effect unintended, that a treatment for a mother would have an unintended effect cause the death of an unborn child. That way the baby might die, but you're doing your best to save them both in the case, which this bill does require, and it's not something whereby you really need that exception in there; because it's not abortion if you treat the mother and it's unintended that the child should be aborted. So that is not abortion, so that is the reason that there isn't a need for life of mother and Justice Blackman specifically mentions this. This is the requirement that we need to make. With that, I hope I made myself clear. (see attached testimony).

Rep. Griffin: I know you say that to overturn Roe vs. Wade, that there cannot be exceptions and that the penalty needs to be consistent. What happens in cases where they banned late term abortions and of course, decided that to hold them constitutional, that they have had exceptions? Would you perceive that for the Supreme Court to overturn Roe that those same exceptions would have to be in place?

Tim Lundgren: In answer to that, it is true. But there has not been a law passed yet that I'm aware of that does not include exceptions for certain cases which sets a different criteria. So a lot of times you might see the Supreme Court and they might reject this, and that is true. There is one thing that hasn't been tried yet, because each bill that goes before them, has included these exceptions and our reason for doing this, is that maybe the court will take it and look at it because it is different than these other cases, because they don't meet the criteria that the Roe vs. Wade ruling set forth. That is that you don't allow any abortions. And when they don't meet it, they can be rejected straight out, based on that. They could throw it back to the States, just saying that. It's true that you could reasonably argue that their reasoning for rejecting the bills might not give this a very good chance, but on the other hand, we have to try

it. That's what the court asked for and there are states that are working on this collectively around the country and this is one that I think needs to be tried.

Rep. Klemin: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Tom Freier, ND Family Alliance: (see attached testimony).

Rep. Delmore: You would support criminalizing the mother, charging with at least a misdemeanor or felony.

Tom Freier: I think we'd want to make sure that we understand the language, before we commit ourselves to that. Your terms of criminalizing I think are a little bit greater than I think we're interested in. We believe that if we look at the primary source of our protection here, being that preborn, we can also look at the woman, the mother in this case. The protection for that woman as well. I think we can accomplish all of those things.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support of HB 1489.

Peter Crary: (see attached testimony). Give all 14th amendment rights to the preborn.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Sharon Wald: Support. My battle with this has been four decades. Because as a young medical technologist working at St. Alexius Hospital in 1961 when the pill came out, the magic pill that was going to fix everything. Only one doctor in Bismarck wouldn't prescribe it and that was Dr. Cleary. The emergency room was right down the hall and every night there could be a rape case coming in and there was a rape protocol that was moral. We didn't need the pill; we didn't the emergency contraceptive, which is such a lie, such a deceptive term. They had a spermicidal douche, because they can kill that sperm, there's nothing wrong with that. They can even scrape the uterus so that it can't implant if there quite sure that ovulation has not

taken place and that there's no baby there. There are 12, 13, 14 15 year old girls going into the Prairie Rose Center in Dickinson, to get their morning after pill. Their parents don't know,

they're not given the right to know. You take all the parental rights away and hide behind privacy. These little girls are having abortions. They're starting to get facial hair because their hormones are getting so messed up. This has got to stop. I know that there are powers that be in this state, in both parties, that do not want to take this to the Supreme Court, they do not want to start a case. We certainly know that the pharmaceutical companies that are making billions of dollars and these other companies making these devices, making billions, they don't want to stop the killing. Somebody has to do something about this. In this state, you know that there is a pervasive pro-life view. We're begging you, have the courage to do it. Send it to the Court. Let's show the nation that ND has great people. We are killing unborn people.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

John Knowle: I support this bill. We are not even giving the unborn children a chance to come into our society and make it a better society. We're not even giving them a chance. I think this is ridiculous. You people come from different communities. You know that school boards are having problems because of the number of unborn children being killed. We are in a war against people who have no respect for life.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

David Hanson: (see attached testimony). Support.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Nadia Smetana: I am in support of this bill. I am a nurse that works in Minot and I have three grown children. The main reason I am in support of this bill, because it is time we end the double standard of how we treat humans in our country. We have good laws that protect the life and liberties of persons from birth to death. But we have a different standard when it comes to the unborn. This standard leaves the protection up to the woman and her doctor, and maybe her family. It is up to their opinion, their personal preference, whatever their

convenience and I do realize and don't minimize the impact that an unwanted pregnancy can have. I think that we need to have more measures in place to support women who do face an unwanted pregnancy to help them bring them child to term. I am not minimizing their anxiety or their problem. I don't think that they have the right to terminate that pregnancy, this is not just a piece of tissue growing inside of them. I am a nurse, I work at the campus center in Minot. When I think of a piece of tissue I think of something that is diseased that is taken out of a person. If you take a tumor out of a person or appendix taken out of a person, that tissue has the same DNA as the mother. It was a part of her body. A preborn child is not a part of a woman's body, it is located in the woman's body and it is dependent on that woman for life, but it isn't a part of her life or a piece of tissue. It has a different blood type, the blood of the mother and the blood of the fetus does not mix, the oxygen and nutrients are passed between but the blood supply is not mixed. There is different genetic makeup, it could be different gender, and these are biological facts. These are not personal opinions, so why do we leave the protection of the unborn up to the preference of someone when it isn't her body. I think it's time to end this double standard and offer the same protection that we do for born people to the preborn. This is not based on my personal opinion either. We often hear that, if you're against abortion, don't have one. But why restrict other people from having one. This is a very common viewpoint. But biology shows that this is not part of the woman's body. It is a separate human person that deserves the same protection of liberty and life, such as born people have. The evidence that shows that there are only four differences between the child inside the mother and the child that is already born. One of those is the acronym called SLED that helps identify these differences. None of these differences are big enough that we shouldn't protect the unborn child. S stands for size; L for level of development; E for environment, only 6" are between being born and being in the womb; and D is the degree of

dependence on the mother. I think we have to come to terms in this country with what really is. An unborn child is just as valuable as a born person. I think the earlier bill this morning (HB 1466) is a wimpy bill, I think we need to have the courage to do what's right, even though there isn't a consensus right now from the courts. I ask that the pro-life organizations have the courage to do it, even if we don't have the money to defend it in court. I think all of that will be provided if we do what is right. I would like to address the issues of rape and incest. I do not feel that there should be an exception in this law for rape and incest. I do sympathize with victims of rape or incest. Why add to the tragedy by destroying a human life. I don't think that for most women, that that would be a very healing thing. I think sometimes if you add to the tragedy by destroying the child, it could be a destructive thing for the woman instead of a healing. I think a lot of that would depend on how it's presented to her and the support she would receive to carry that child to term, give it up for adoption if she wishes. We certainly have many people that have been conceived by rape that have gone on to become productive citizens. We should the child pay capital punishment for the crime of their father. We don't do that for any other crimes.

Rep. Delmore: Do have any friends or family that this has happened to.

Nadia Smetana: I know of people yes. But not in my family, no.

Rep. Onstad: If this bill is passed, do you think that abortion will go underground.

Nadia Smetana: That could happen. Before Roe vs. Wade, there were backstreet abortions and the numbers were much less than the propaganda said. I think doctors would be very reluctant to perform abortions if this passed. I think if we had good services in place, to help women who had an unwanted pregnancy, this would help.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Karen Hanson: Support. I believe this is a stronger bill than the previous bill, HB 1466, and stand in support of it. I did not have a formal testimony written out. I just jotted down some notes. Science says that the DNA is different between the mother and child, also such as different heartbeats, etc. Many abortions are not safe right now, but women still get them. We have five children of our own, and a couple of miscarriages. We did miscarry in January of 2000, at approximately 12 weeks. We saw the amazing details of the muscles and how they worked together, we saw all parts of the little baby. St. Alexius were so kind to me and allowed me to hold the baby, and the baby fit into my palm, 30 grams; equivalent to 30 paper clips in your hand and 11 cm long. Nothing is added to the baby except time and nutrition. Everything is already in place when they are conceived. After conception, the baby knows the mother's voice in the womb. This is the opportunity to do the right thing for ND. This is a historic situation. ND could be a leader and make a difference. Doing something worthwhile is not necessarily easy. Let's protect the most vulnerable population.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Sharon Wald: I would like to address the concern about the back alley or underground abortions. That has always been the case. If a woman came in for hemorrhaging and you thought perhaps that they had had an abortion, you didn't know. You had to treat her, the woman and the baby, that you are going to lose it. You try to save it but if you can't, you can't. That can't be a concern. Breaking the law has always happened. You have to have it in the law to protect life.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Stacey Pflieger, ND Right to Life Association: (see attached testimony).

Rep. Koppelman: Your reference to the effective date, are you saying that you would like to see a trigger mechanism in the bill, in order to support it, or what are the differences.

Stacey Pflieger: Yes.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Christopher Dodson, ND Catholic Conference: Support. It is our understanding that the bill was not to punish the woman in anyway and we would be supportive of an amendment to make that clear and then we'd be able to support the bill.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support. Further testimony in opposition.

Tim Stanley, Planned Parenthood: (see attached testimony).

Rep. Kretschmar: If HB 1489 were to amended to include what is being called a trigger mechanism, would you comment then on the constitutionality.

Tim Stanley: Then it would still be unconstitutional but I think that they would still be able to pass the law, it would still go into effect as there is another state that has a similar law as well on the books and they are called trigger mechanisms so that it would only be enacted upon the overturning of Roe, or when the Supreme Court rules such as this law would be found to be constitutional.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in opposition.

Katy Korynta: Opposed. There are many reasons why people are opposed to this bill, and I agree with them. One thing growing up is that this is America. We are all free and freedom of religion, so this isn't about opposing people's beliefs and if they believe in God and think they are offending or playing God by having an abortion; then they don't have to do that. But others don't, we have that freedom of religion. We also have freedom of choice.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in opposition. All those who registered opposition in the first hearing (HB 1466) copies of your testimony will be placed in the record.

Luwann Goetsch: I am opposed to HB 1489 because of the language in it about class AA felony for the mother. I am a Catholic and there should be a penal penalty plus an excommunication. I don't think that young girls should be treated the way this bill is stated. I believe there should be some punishment so that it would be a deterrent. If women knew that they were going to be punished, that it would be some sort of a crime, they wouldn't coerce these young women into having abortions; but at the same time, it needs to have some punishment. There are laws in this state that children can go to places where they can get RU486 without parental permission. I don't think it's right that the parents don't know. We need to discourage our kids from doing the things they do to get pregnant.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in opposition. We will close the hearing.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1489

House Judiciary Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 1/24/07

Recorder Job Number: 1847

Committee Clerk Signature

Naun Penrose

Minutes:

Chairman DeKrey: We will take up HB 1489.

Rep. Meyer: I think that we should amend it so that the woman isn't given a Class AA felony. I just don't think it's right to criminalize the woman.

Rep. Kingsbury: Didn't Rep. Damschen talk about making that a Class A misdemeanor.

Chairman DeKrey: Here is the Damschen amendment (#1) and another amendment (#2) (read the attached amendments).

Rep. Onstad: I move a Do Not Pass without any amendments.

Rep. Griffin: Seconded.

Chairman DeKrey: Discussion.

Rep. Koppelman: Just a question, we just looked at the amendments. If it is the intention of some to criminalize the woman, shouldn't we adopt that amendment to change that.

Chairman DeKrey: Nobody moved it, and we have a motion on the floor. I would only say that the people who brought this bill were quite adamant about the penalty phase of it, because they said the Justice that wrote the opinion, it said the reason why this bill is unconstitutional, is because we didn't have like penalties for all people involved. So, obviously one of these two

amendments would soften the bill up, but then it obviously wouldn't be the intent of the sponsors.

Rep. Klemin: Isn't this the bill that was introduced so that this could be challenged all the way up to the US Supreme Court. The whole idea is to overturn Roe vs. Wade. So there would probably be a little money involved here too.

Rep. Koppelman: Is this essentially the bill that we looked at last session.

Chairman DeKrey: This is the bill that the Legislature defeated overwhelmingly last session.

Further discussion on the bill? Clerk will call the roll.

13 YES 0 NO 1 ABSENT DO NOT PASS CARRIER: Rep. Wolf

70509.0301
Title.

Prepared by the Legislative Council staff for
Representative Damschen
January 22, 2007

/

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1489

Page 1, line 13, after the underscored period insert "A pregnant individual who intentionally destroys or terminates the life of her own preborn child is guilty of a class A misdemeanor."

Renumber accordingly

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1489

Page 1, after line 15, after period insert: "Nothing in this Act subjects the pregnant mother upon whom an abortion is performed or attempted to any criminal conviction and penalty."

Renumber accordingly

Date: 1-24-07
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1489

House JUDICIARY Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Not Pass

Motion Made By Rep. Onstad Seconded By Rep. Griffin

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Ch. DeKrey	✓		Rep. Delmore	✓	
Rep. Klemin	✓		Rep. Griffin	✓	
Rep. Boehning	✓		Rep. Meyer	✓	
Rep. Charging			Rep. Onstad	✓	
Rep. Dahl	✓		Rep. Wolf	✓	
Rep. Heller	✓				
Rep. Kingsbury	✓				
Rep. Koppelman	✓				
Rep. Kretschmar	✓				

Total (Yes) 13 No 0

Absent 1

Floor Assignment Rep. Wolf

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
January 24, 2007 4:47 p.m.

Module No: HR-16-1156
Carrier: Wolf
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1489: Judiciary Committee (Rep. DeKrey, Chairman) recommends DO NOT PASS
(13 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1489 was placed on the
Eleventh order on the calendar.

2007 TESTIMONY

HB 1489

