

ALASKA CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

PART 2

Proceedings: December 13, 1955 -- January 9, 1956

Alaska Legislative Council

Box 2199 — Juneau, Alaska

on the floor, the Committee did not ask to withdraw it, but I think Mrs. Hermann raised a very valid point. If this word is inserted now, we can't move later during the course of the debate to strike it. I would move that the rules be suspended and that the Committee be allowed to substitute its unanimous amendment with the thought in mind that we can then later remove it if during the course of the debate it appears to be the wish of the body to do so.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chair stated it could not be removed and the Chair would stand corrected to a certain point on that statement, that is by a suspension of the rules or rescinding of the action of course you could do it.

WHITE: I so move, Mr. President, and ask unanimous consent.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. White, please state the motion.

WHITE: That the rules be suspended and that the Committee be allowed to submit its proposed amendment as though a part of the Committee report.

KILCHER: Point of information. Could it possibly be handled in such a manner as to have the report reconsidered and recommitted and come out again a second time?

PRESIDENT EGAN: The effect of Mr. White's motion under suspension of the rules would accomplish that. Mr. Riley

RILEY: Mr. President. I think this is in line with Mr. White's suggestion that this article of this proposal now before us be considered under a suspension of the rules, simply as a committee substitute for the same article. I think that would put the thing in motion.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Right, and have the word "educational" placed before the word "institution".

RILEY: That would enable us to work either way from that word afterwards.

V. RIVERS: That would cover my objection. I have no objection to that.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection then, then it is so ordered, and the word "educational" has been inserted before the word "institution" as if this were a substitute committee report. Now, Section 1 is open for amendment. Mr. Hurley.

HURLEY: Mr. President, I would like to ask a question of the Chairman of the Bill of Rights Committee. Would your Committee consider in using the terminology "direct benefit" whether or not that would be a directive or a license to the legislature to appropriate money for the indirect benefits? If so, what was their conclusion?

AWES: I don't think it is a direct order to the legislature to do anything. I think we prohibited what we wanted to prohibit. I don't think that tells the legislature they are supposed to do anything else.

METCALF: I have an amendment.

COGHILL: I rise to a point of order. I submitted an amendment to this section before the noon recess, and it has never been recognized, and I was recognized by the Chair.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Were you recognized for that purpose before the noon recess? If you were, then the Chief Clerk may read the proposed amendment as offered by Mr. Coghill. The Chair feels sorry about that, Mr. Coghill.

CHIEF CLERK: "Section 1, line 7, after the word 'direct' insert the words 'or indirect'."

COGHILL: I move and ask unanimous consent.

R. RIVERS: I object.

METCALF: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT EGAN: It has been moved and seconded that the words "or indirect" be inserted after the word "direct" in line 7, Section 1.

WHITE: Point of order. I believe there was a letter presented to the Convention the other day that the Convention agreed to defer the reading of until we reached this section. It seems to me proper we hear it before we consider any business.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Is there such a communication? The Chief Clerk might read the communication that was referred to before we act upon this amendment.

CHIEF CLERK: (A letter from Mr. Don M. Dafoe, Commissioner of Education, enclosing a statement on Section 1 of the article on health, education and welfare to the effect that he believed the statement somewhat oversimplified and setting forth seven points which he believed should be included in the constitution, was read.)

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Armstrong.

ARMSTRONG: Mr. President, the Committee has asked me to speak to this section, and seeing it has been amended I hope you will liberally construe that I am talking to the amendment, but the Enabling Act that we have before us says on page 3, "The provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a

system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said state and free from sectarian control." Mr. President, your Committee on Health, Education and Welfare approached this whole subject of education with great care and consideration. Many methods were sought out to provide and protect for the future of our public schools. We had to recognize that the public schools were our responsibility and that it was our duty to provide for all children of the state in matters of education. The Convention will note that in Section 1 that the Committee has kept a broad concept and has tried to keep our schools unshackled by constitutional road blocks. May I draw to your attention further the fact that we have used the words "to establish and maintain by general law". This is a clear directive to the legislature to set the machinery in motion in keeping with the constitution and whatever future needs may arise. Your Committee has also spelled out the fact that all children shall have the opportunity of schools, and that if the need arises for vocational schools, rehabilitation centers, schools for the retarded and other forms of education, that it is completely possible under this proposal. It is not only wise but mandatory under the Enabling Act to spell out that schools are operated in the public interest by the state and kept from sectarian control. In the third sentence of this section it deals with the public funds. This term was used because we felt that state funds may at times go through many hands before reaching the point of their work for the public, and so the term "public funds" was then used as a guide to every portion of our state financing, borough, city or other entity for the disbursement of these monies. In this third sentence we have used the word "direct". It was spelled out that the maintenance and operation or other features of direct help would be prohibited. This was not intended and does not prohibit the contracting or giving of services to the individual child, for that child benefits as his part of society. This section gives the education department, or other departments, the right to seek out the child, independent of his religious affiliation, to help him to become a strong and useful part of society wherein it touches health and matters of welfare. We would also point out in the light of letters that have come to this floor relevant to the disbursement of funds to denominational or other private institutions, that this does not prohibit the use of funds in other educational matters, and I am sure that no one on the Committee would object to the inclusion of this word as we have given the amendment here to clarify this one statement. Now it reads as it has been amended by the Committee, "No money shall be paid from public funds for the direct benefit of any religious or other private educational institution." We did this to take any doubt away on the part of this Convention of our motives, and we state that where there are welfare cases for children in homes and when there are indigents in hospitals that we do not wish to interfere with that practice of helping to serve people

through those institutions. It is the feeling of the Committee, after long work and thorough study, that these basic recommendations that we have given here on this section on education should be accepted by the Convention.

V. FISCHER: May I ask the delegate a question?

PRESIDENT EGAN: You may, Mr. Fischer, if there is no objection.

V. FISCHER: The article on finance, the proposal on finance, has the following Section 7: "No tax shall be levied or appropriation of public money made or public property transferred, nor shall the public credit be used, except for a public purpose." Now, that is the article and proposal on finance which would govern not only education but all expenditures of the state, and unless there is a very special reason for having separate and different language here, we probably should treat financial matters only in the finance article, so my question to you is, is there a special reason why we should have the third sentence of Section 1 in the health, education and welfare article?

ARMSTRONG: Your Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare discussed this prior to coming to the floor this afternoon. I believe it was our unanimous feeling that this should be taken as a part of education so that it could always be clarified in relationship to this subject. We realize there are two other matters in proposals that deal directly with finance, but we felt that when we came to those things they would have to be correlated with our action at this point. I feel that this matter needs to be clarified here and that was the action of the Committee and their reason for retaining it here instead of postponing it to the finance section.

R. RIVERS: I speak directly to the proposed amendment to the section. As I understand it, or remember it after all this general discussion --

PRESIDENT EGAN: Before you proceed, it seems that some of the delegates don't realize what the proposed amendment is. After the word "direct" insert the words "or indirect". You may proceed.

R. RIVERS: The standard approach is that no public funds shall be disbursed for the direct benefit of any religious institution or parochial schools. The word "direct" is the standard treatment of that subject. Now when you get into the wording "or indirect", then you are getting into an argument as to whether you can even contract with a private institution for the rendering of certain public services because they might say they might make a profit. Now I agree that it might not be interpreted that way, but you are only stirring up an argument when

you talk about prohibiting the disbursement of money for an indirect benefit to a parochial or private institution. You are reaching clear out to ad infinitum in the realms of logic and association. You don't treat it that way, you don't stir up that kind of an argument. If there is a public purpose for which money is to be expended it does not matter if some of it does result in an indirect benefit to some private concern, which may be a contractor, so I definitely don't want to see the words "or indirect" inserted in this section.

COGHILL: Speaking in defense of my proposed amendment, I would first like to say I am very prone to the problem of putting any religious persecution into the Constitutional Convention or among the delegates. It would be the same thing as me trying to convince Mr. Ralph Rivers of the principles of the Republican party, and he in turn of the party he belongs to. I don't believe that is the problem at all. I think that they certainly have a right, a private right or a religious right, or a parochial right under our constitution to have schools. However, I believe that the way our government was set up 175 years ago, that the founders felt that public education was necessary to bring about a form of educating the whole child for civic benefit through a division of point of the home taking a certain part of the child, the church taking a certain part of this education, and the government or state through public schools taking the other part. I adhere to that principle, and I might say that I am the president of the Association of Alaska School Boards and one of the formers of that twelve-point program we developed in Anchorage last October. I think that the problem could probably be well misconstrued here as to the motive and intent. However, I feel that the intent of public education is primarily a state function and does not belong to any private or any one particular group, whether they are in the minority or the majority. I believe we should take direct steps to maintain a free public education not encroached upon by any quarter. I think it might be well to bring out in the argument for the direct or indirect benefit of public funds for education is the matter that is now being faced in Europe and in particular in the Netherlands where they have what is called the form of educational pacification, where the government is splitting the tax dollar among some 500 different church groups providing for a parochial school benefit on an indirect basis, and in a community where there is maybe 500 school children there will be as high as seven or eight small schools scattered out throughout the community, not providing for the fullest benefit in the educational field as far as having a good complete centralized program. I think that sectarianism segregation in our educational system is bad for the children. I do not deny the right of people to have their own schools. However, I think that we should always look to the interest of the founders of our nation when they brought about the separation of church and state. The

problem was brought, and it was brought about by Thomas Jefferson quite well when he said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in the state of civilization, it expects something that never shall be". Therefore out of his deliberations with John Madison they brought about a form of free public education starting in Virginia, and it has come forward ever since under the intent of having the tax dollar only brought to the public educational system. I know there have been many law cases on it, Supreme Court rulings and what not, and I think that the matter still is divided as far as the general public is concerned, as between the sects of religion and not on the principle of preserving the free public education as an instrument of the state.

RILEY: Mr. President, I should like to address a question, if I may, to the Committee Chairman, but meanwhile I wish to commend Mr. Coghill on quoting with favor, Thomas Jefferson. Miss Awes, it runs in mind and I have not the delegate proposal before me, that there was a delegate proposal submitted in language substantially the same as this would read if Mr. Coghill's amendment were adopted. Could you tell me what your experience was in Committee, what the Committee thinking was in rejecting that language?

AWES: That I believe, if I recall rightly, was Proposal No. 2 and submitted by Mr. Johnson. It was carefully considered by the Committee, and Mr. Johnson was requested to come in and speak with us on it. We considered both the words "direct" and "indirect" and we felt that the words "or indirect" would, as Mr. Rivers said, reach out into infinity practically, and probably it is not even known what the results of that might be. We did feel it would shut out certain things that should not be prohibited. For instance, the welfare department was giving certain free care to the children of the community, and it might be administered through the schools. Well, we feared that "indirect" would make it impossible to give any of these welfare benefits, for instance, to children who were in private schools, and we did not feel that any prohibition should go that far, and so the Committee did carefully consider that word and unanimously agreed we should not use it.

RILEY: It has been said the Committee gave it correct attention and rejected it permanently?

AWES: That is right.

RILEY: Thank you.

METCALF: Mr. Chairman and delegates, I very much favor the inclusion in this section of the words "or indirect". As I read the section, it refers to our school system, and in this book, "Constitutions of the States", there are 16 states that have sections in their constitutions preventing public tax dollars

from being spent for private schools in any way, shape or form. Here is the section from the State of Missouri. The constitution was drawn in 1945, which some of you may have read. It says that, "No money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister, or teacher thereof as such, and that no preference shall be given to or any discrimination be made against any church, or any form of religious faith or worship." I am a firm believer in freedom of religion, and we have been aware in the progress of history, medieval times down to colonial times, that at times there have been persecutions practiced. Those are unpleasant things and they have gone past into history. I am for the free public school system, being a licensed teacher and having taught in public school systems in the Territory. I am also a firm believer in the complete separation of church and state, especially with the use of state money and state property. As I said again, I don't believe that the state property or taxes should be used and transferred to a religious group to be used directly or indirectly to the economic or political religious detriment of some other group or individual, and all activity should be on a free and competitive basis, and if I may just have a few minutes, I have a situation in Seward where a religious group have been given the use of the building and land by the Territory, and they are in competition, economic competition to my economic detriment. It is an actual fact, and I not only speak for myself but I speak for four or five people who happen to be affected similarly, and that is why I am trying to point out that I do not like to see state property or money transferred over to religious groups because persecution often times can come about. In this instance here, they have a Territory land, building valued around 60,000 dollars, and they are in active competition with private enterprise, and they have other advantages -- free snow removal, cheap help, no taxes, and I just point out these little things here that make me very much opposed to the use of state money or property in any way, shape or form by religious groups. I therefore favor the inclusion of this phrase "or indirect".

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Smith.

SMITH: Mr. President, I had the opportunity to talk rather at great length with the superintendent of schools in Ketchikan during the Christmas recess on this very subject. He had suggested that the word "indirect" be inserted here, but during the course of the conversation he also said that the public school people were desirous of providing that the standards in the parochial schools be in some manner made equal to those in the public schools. Of course, the only way that could be provided would be through supervision by the State Board of Education. I pointed out to him that the insertion of the word "indirect" here would defeat that purpose and he immediately

said that he agreed and he did not want the word "indirect" inserted.

McCUTCHEON: Mr. President, will the Chair permit a question through the Chair to Mr. Coghill?

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chair will permit a question through the Chair to Mr. Coghill.

McCUTCHEON: Mr. Coghill, could you cite me at least a few instances how indirect benefit might accrue. Are there specific types of instances within your knowledge of how this would apply? Because of your delivery here a few moments ago I assumed that there must be various types of specific indirect benefits which you would wish to prohibit. I would like to know what they are.

COGHILL: Through the Chair to Mr. McCutcheon, I believe by putting the indirect benefit clause in there that any social welfare, health arrangements that might be made with the state with any private or parochial institution would be on a contractual basis and would be providing a service to the public and not to the institution, and that is the purpose of the indirect clause in there. It would allow them to have a contract to produce or to show full value for the value of money received from the tax coffer, from the funds. In other words, to provide a hot lunch program with Territorial money or to provide a health program in a school, I do not deny that to the private schools because I feel that that is an instrument of public benefit because the child is benefiting from it from a public standpoint, and a contractual agreement between the organization and our organized state would therefore be in effect. Does that answer your question?

McCUTCHEON: In part. Your intent would be then that if some private institution of one nature or another were to supply this particular service under contract to the state that there could be no profit in that as it extended to that institution? That is, they would have to supply that service at the actual cost? That there could be no profit derived from that particular transaction. Is that the point you are making, that it would not prohibit supplying these various types of welfare programs, hot lunches, etc., but there could not be a profit factor involved?

COGHILL: That is correct, because we in the public school system, we are not allowed to make profit on such things.

KILCHER: I think that the position is not clear at all. What Mr. McCutcheon brought up is not clear at all, a benefit is not the same as a profit, so if they don't want any profit, why don't they mention it. I can see where a private school is benefited by getting nonprofit assistance. If, for instance, it is possible

for a private school to get lunch money assistance on nonprofit basis for its children, it may make the difference for them to be able to operate or not. If they are not getting lunch money or such things, they might not be able to operate, so by getting these nonprofit assistances for the children, they are getting benefited greatly. As a matter of fact, the benefit is so great it means survival or not, so I think the issue is not clear. On the principle I think I should be against the amendment because it does not clear the issue at all in that respect.

COGHILL: Maybe to clarify a point for Mr. Kilcher, one thing we want to keep in mind is the fact that the state has set up a public educational system for all children. The people that are sending their children to private, parochial, or any other type of institution are segregating themselves from the public and therefore they should not derive the benefit from the tax dollar. We are providing it. We have spent thousands, hundreds of thousands to provide a good educational system, and if we go to the pacification plan, we are destroying that principle and that in turn answers your interpretation of profit or benefit.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Gray.

GRAY: If I may ask Mr. Coghill, in reference to your remarks, does your state guarantee to offer a complete educational system?

COGHILL: It certainly will, Mr. Gray, after we write the articles on the legislation.

GRAY: You feel you have a complete educational system today?

COGHILL: I certainly think so.

GRAY: I think there are a lot of areas where a lot of children have no opportunity for public education.

COGHILL: I feel that it is quite a privilege to be a part of a public educational system and be able to criticize it, to be able to criticize our methods and our procedures and to work on those. I will agree with you wholeheartedly, Mr. Gray, that there are lots of things we have to do. However, in my recent trip to Washington, D. C., and being a conferee on the White House Conference on Education, we found with the exception of one disgruntled person, we found that our educational system in Alaska was far above the educational systems of the states. We have a progressive educational system in the sense that we are moving forward. I think one of our biggest thorns is the Alaska Native Service, if that's what you are referring to.

TAYLOR: There has been a lot of sparring around here on this subject. Everybody seems to duck the issue, and I am going to

ask Mr. Coghill a question if I may, through the Chair.

PRESIDENT EGAN: You may, Mr. Taylor.

TAYLOR: Mr. Coghill, what-in the event that the word "indirect" was inserted into this measure, what effect would that have on the school bus law that is now in effect?

COGHILL: What effect would that have on the school bus law? I know I am up against a pretty good attorney, but I think that will in turn not affect too much of the school bus system in Alaska because it can be on a public work contractual basis, take it completely out of the educational picture, put it on the welfare picture.

AWES: I would like to make one statement. Mr. Coghill suggested that we insert the words "or indirect". The Committee very carefully considered that word "indirect". We were not sure of the far-reaching effects it would have. Mr. Coghill now proposes that he explains what it means. I can't agree with his interpretation in any respect, and he would have us believe from the explanation he has given so far that it means precisely nothing. I don't believe that any court would so interpret it, and I think he should either give us some reason for having it in there or else if it doesn't mean anything, then I think we should take it out, but I am not satisfied with any explanation he's given yet.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. McCutcheon.

MCCUTCHEON: Since the Committee considered this at considerable length about this matter of "direct" or "indirect" wording in this particular section, you must have in mind several specific instances where "indirect" might apply in some fashion in a derogatory manner. If you do have such an idea or some particular questions how this word "indirect" might affect adversely to thinking upon your particular section here, I would like to hear some of them. If your Committee has gone into this so thoroughly, there must have been one or two problems that have arisen where there would be some question about including the word "indirect".

AWES: I have already given one very good example, and that is this question of welfare services which are often administered to children through the schools. Mr. Coghill says that the word "indirect" would not prevent these. I very definitely think that the word "indirect" would prevent them. I think that is one very good example.

POULSEN: May I ask Mr. Coghill a question?

PRESIDENT EGAN: You may, Mr. Poulsen.

POULSEN: If the word "indirect" is put in, would that mean there is such a thing as subsidy to hospitals would be eliminated?

COGHILL: Mr. Poulsen, this is an educational article with the educational institution.

POULSEN: It still comes under public welfare, matching funds for instance.

COGHILL: Mr. Poulsen, if you will note that the Committee amended their proposal to have "educational" inserted before institutions, and so this is strictly an educational article, sir.

WHITE: May I direct a question to Mr. Coghill?

PRESIDENT EGAN: You may, Mr. White.

WHITE: Mr. Coghill, are there children's homes, foster homes in the Territory which provide any education at all to the children who are entitled to admission to those homes?

COGHILL: The children's homes that have schools with them, is that what you mean?

WHITE: Are there any such institutions in the Territory of Alaska that provide any education at all to the children admitted to them?

COGHILL: Yes, there is.

WHITE: What would happen to them under your proposed amendment?

COGHILL: What would happen to these institutions now operating?

WHITE: Do any of these receive any public funds either from the Federal government or the Territorial government?

COGHILL: I don't believe they do because the contract schools went out before 1900. They had a form of contract for schools and that went out. I think that all your foster homes would be deriving an indirect benefit or some sort or another, and there are plenty of them.

WHITE: I think your statement could be corrected, but I'm not the one to do it. I'll defer to someone else, but in the event it is corrected, I would like to hear your answer to the question as to what would happen to them under your amendment.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Sundborg.

SUNDBORG: I have here a copy of a memorandum from Henry A. Harmon, Director of the Department of Public Welfare of the Territory to the Attorney General on this very subject, listing

a number of schools operated by private and religious organizations to which the Territory now pays funds through the Department of Public Welfare. They show that such institutions not only include a few Catholic institutions, but also Seventh Day Adventists, Moravian, and Presbyterian. It is very brief. I wonder if I might ask to have it read.

PRESIDENT EGAN: If there is no objection the communication can be read. Mr. Fischer.

V. FISCHER: I think it should be read only if it covers educational institutions.

SUNDBORG: It does only that.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chief Clerk may read the communication.

(This letter giving information as to payments made by the Territory to various children's institutions in the Territory was read by the Chief Clerk.)

ARMSTRONG: Mr. President, there are several sources of income in the private institution. First of all, an institution can apply for a surplus of food, and upon the signature of the administrator, that food is made available in a limited quantity. I might give an example of butter, beans, and staples of that type. I think that is given on the basis that no Territorial agency is able to give a large enough sum to a private institution to support that child. I might give you an example of one institution that probably is receiving 900 dollars a year from the Territory, but the actual cost breakdown without new buildings and capital expenditures run in excess of 1300 dollars a year to adequately take care of that child. In that institution there was no educational facilities, that is just housing. Another source of income would be then this Territorial grant of 50 dollars which is in lieu of home care. The child as a ward of the Territory and as such must be put into a foster home or into a private institution. They choose, wherever possible, to put the child in a foster home and let that child go to the private school. If a family situation is so complicated, they want to keep that family structure together and hold that family, the child is placed in a private home. There are a few, very few of the schools that have boarding facilities and educational facilities, but there are some that exist, Mr. White, in the Territory, and most of the grants by the Territorial Department of Welfare are given for the boarding home facilities and not for the education, and I think that could be borne out by the fact that they are looking for a holding situation for the child. The educational facilities are incidental at that particular point, but there are a number of places that are together. I hope that will help.

BUCKALEW: Mr. President, I don't think the question has been answered yet by any of the persons who have spoken on this subject.

If the word "indirect" is in there, it is going to eliminate almost any kind of aid. It will, for example, eliminate the free lunch, eliminate bus transportation, eliminate, for example, if we had a school or an institution where they had a school, it would eliminate the state giving any support to the child because that would be indirect support to the institution. I think when the members vote on it, I think they ought to understand the word "indirect" cuts out everything, just eliminates all kinds of support, and I don't think there is any question about it.

PRESIDENT EGAN: Mr. Rosswog.

ROSSWOG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I cannot agree with Mr. Coghill that contracts would not be indirect help. I believe you could construe them to be indirect help. I believe that we should leave these words out of the section, and I believe the Committee has done a very good job. They have considered all angles of it, and I would like to say that I support the Committee resolution.

COGHILL: In closing the argument, I might just leave the thought with the delegates that on this particular subject of the direct or indirect benefit to the private or religious educational institution, would guarantee every citizen of the new State of Alaska that any money diverted from the public funds to any such organization in complete competition with your public institutions, if you will, that there will be a sound contractual agreement between your government and this private institution to provide public service and not to the benefit of the individual institution.

UNIDENTIFIED DELEGATE: Question.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chief Clerk will please read the proposed amendment.

CHIEF CLERK: "Section 1, line 7, after the word 'direct' insert the words 'or indirect'."

JOHNSON: I request a roll call.

KILCHER: I am sorry to take another minute. There is one problem that has not come up in this discussion. I am a father of seven children, five of which have had the Calvert course for several years with good results. I understand that the Calvert course could possibly be construed not to be available anymore either if indirect help were not available to a private school. The Territory pays it. My children go to a private school, or most of them. The biggest ones though hike over the road, and the Territory pays an indirect system. It could possibly be construed to include the Calvert course, which is a great problem in Alaska.

COGHILL: I might answer that, being familiar with the Calvert course, that the Territorial Department of Education, that is one of their recognized correspondence courses for the outlying areas, and if any family on a CAA remote station or someone on a remote part of the Yukon River, etc., would want to further the education of their children, write to the Commissioner of Education and they are referred to the Calvert course, and in higher institutions it would be the correspondence courses from the University of Nebraska.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The question is, "Shall the proposed amendment as offered by Mr. Coghill be adopted by the Convention?" The Chief Clerk will call the roll.

(The Chief Clerk called the roll with the following result:

Yeas: 19 - Barr, Boswell, Coghill, Collins, Cooper, Cross, Harris, Hilscher, Hinckel, Johnson, King, Knight, Laws, McCutcheon, Metcalf, Nerland, Poulsen, Robertson, Sweeney.

Nays: 34 - Armstrong, Awes, Buckalew, Davis, Doogan, Emborg, H. Fischer, V. Fischer, Gray, Hellenenthal, Hermann, Hurley, Kilcher, Lee, Londborg, McLaughlin, McNealy, McNees, Marston, Nordale, Peratrovich, Reader, Riley, R. Rivers, V. Rivers, Rosswog, Smith, Stewart, Sundborg, Taylor, Walsh, White, Wien, Mr. President.

Absent: 2 - Nolan, VanderLeest.)

CHIEF CLERK: 19 yeas, 34 nays, and 2 absent.

PRESIDENT EGAN: So the "nays" have it and the proposed amendment has failed of adoption.

WHITE: I have an amendment to Section 1.

PRESIDENT EGAN: The Chief Clerk will please read the proposed amendment as offered by Mr. White and Mr. Fischer.

CHIEF CLERK: "Section 1, strike the last sentence."

WHITE: I move the adoption of the amendment.

V. FISCHER: I second it.

ARMSTRONG: I object. Mr. President, I feel that we will complicate our finance situation by trying to write this into a later report for clarification. I think here in one sentence you pinpoint it; you clarify it once and for all, but when you start to define this thing again in a larger amendment, you