

MINUTES
SENATE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DATE: Monday, March 20, 2023

TIME: 8:00 A.M.

PLACE: Room WW55

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Guthrie, Vice Chairman Bernt, Senators Winder, Anthon, Harris, Lee, Toews, Wintrow, and Ruchti

ABSENT/ EXCUSED: None

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: **Chairman Guthrie** called the meeting of the Senate State Affairs Committee (Committee) to order at 8:00 a.m. He announced that **H 206, H 221, and H 240** would not be heard today.

GUBERNATORIAL REAPPOINTMENT: Committee consideration of the Gubernatorial Reappointment of Shane Gehring of Nampa, ID to the Bingo-Raffle Advisory Board (Board) to serve a term commencing January 7, 2021 and expiring January 7, 2024. **Mr. Gehring** shared he had been a member of the Board for 15 years and was currently the secretary. He enjoyed the people he worked with and the jobs they did. He looked forward to continuing to work as a Board member.

Chairman Guthrie advised the Committee would vote on Mr. Gehring's reappointment at its meeting on March 22, 2023.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Chairman Guthrie passed the gavel to Vice Chairman Bernt.

RS 30651 **Relating to the Personnel System; Providing Legislative Intent - Amends Chapter 53, Title 67, Idaho Code.** **Senator Guthrie** briefly described **RS 30651** as relating to the employee compensation system. He said this legislation proposed three considerations: 1) The start date for salary increases would be July 1; 2) up to, and only, 15 percent of the workforce could work from home; and 3) a study committee could meet in the interim to handle human resources or employee compensation issues.

MOTION: **Senator Harris** moved to send **RS 30651** to print. **Senator Anthon** seconded the motion. The motion carried by **voice vote**.

PASSED THE GAVEL: Vice Chairman Bernt passed the gavel back to Chairman Guthrie.

S 1163 **PROTECTION OF MINORS - Adds to existing law to establish the Parental Rights Protection of Minors Act to protect minors from exposure to harmful materials on certain devices.** **Senator Cook** explained this bill enabled parents to make decisions for their children about what was allowed on their mobile devices. The proposal was to keep pornography from popping up on certain devices. He stated the bill had no impact on the provider or the retailer. The request was a requirement that the parental filters be turned on by default by the manufacturer when the device was activated in Idaho. The emphasis was on activation of the phone in Idaho, regardless of where you moved from, or if you bought the phone through the mail. As **Senator Cook** recalled, manufacturers were given a year from the effective date of the bill to activate the software to turn

on the filter. He provided the appended list of Idaho Mayors in support of the bill (Attachment 1).

Senator Wintrow presumed the filter he referred to was the regular filter already on phones. **Senator Cook** stated it was. He repeated there was no request to change the filter, create a new one, or for the buyer to purchase a different filter; it was the manufacturer's filter already on the phone. **Senator Wintrow** asked why it was necessary to point to definitions in Idaho Code versus what was defined in the filter. She asked how to reconcile the software and definitions in code. **Senator Cook** admitted pornography was hard to define. He referred to page 2, starting at line 41 in the bill, "Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 1 of this section, this section does not apply to a manufacturer that makes a good faith effort to provide a device that, upon activation of the device in this state, automatically enables a generally accepted and commercially reasonable method of filtration in accordance with the chapter and industry standards." He said the definition of what was harmful to minors was penned in 1976. He said thelawinsider.com defined harmful to minors as, "Quality of any description or representation in whatever form, or nudity, sexual excitement, sexual conduct, excess violence, or sadomasochist abuse." **Senator Cook** said that was almost word for word what was in Idaho Code from 1976 and he felt pornography was well defined. **Senator Wintrow** expressed concern from page 1 of the bill where Idaho Code § 18-1514 referenced homosexuality, not homosexual acts. She noted the word heterosexuality was not in the bill but homosexuality was. She cautioned that some organizations in the state used this verbiage to ban books. She claimed her only hesitation with the bill was the language and that reference in code. **Senator Cook** referred to Senator Wintrow's example and noted definition number three talked about the act of homosexuality and should probably include the words "act of heterosexuality" as well. He promised to work on language in the next session. **Senator Cook** explained children were not looking for pornography, he wanted to stop pornography from popping up on their phones. He urged consideration to keep innocent kids innocent.

TESTIMONY:

The following people electronically registered in support of **S 1163**: Jennifer Barrus, Jaco Booyens, Trent Clark, Craig Cobia, Steven Graham, Sheree Hastings, Chris McKenna, Catherine Nielson, Marilyn Nygard, Paul Prochko, Andrew Russell, Miki Scott, Sam Stoddard, Caitlyn Stokes, Marc Sunderland, Todd Thomas, and Thomas Tueller. The following electronically registered in opposition to **S 1163**: Brian Almon, Khara Boender, Emilie Jackson-Edney, John Foster, Gerry Keegan, Edward Longe, and Carl Szabo.

Appended are written comments submitted about **S 1163** (Attachment 2).

Marilyn Nygard identified as a missionary who worked in addiction recovery programs for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS). She reported seeing the effects of pornography daily at meetings. She self-reported a grandchild was exposed to pornography at a young age and continued to struggle with his attraction to it. She testified that youth did not understand what pornography did to their brains. She stressed protecting kids as best we could. She urged a yes vote on **S 1163**.

Dr. Edward Longe, of the James Madison Institute (Institute), said keeping children safe online should be paramount. While content filters were seen as something to protect children online, they were seen as a one size fits all. He said if a parent wanted to install a content filter on a child's device there were thousands of applications to choose from. Mandating a content filter being installed on a device would undercut options and deprive parents of choice. He saw this bill as a rejection of limited government and it implied the government was the best place to decide for parents. **Dr. Longe** said technology companies took great strides over the past few years to grant parents greater control over what was seen or done online. The Institute looked forward to working to make the internet safer for children.

Dr. Craig Cobia, co-founder of Citizens for Decency in Idaho, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization seeking to protect children from obscenity, relayed a story about a woman whose husband became addicted to pornography at a young age. He allegedly had an overwhelming desire to rape and kill his wife. Rather than do so, he took his own life. The surviving spouse encouraged Dr. Cobia to create something to protect families, which resulted in Citizens for Decency in Idaho. He advocated the passage of **S 1163** for the protection of children.

Khara Boender, State Policy Director of the Computer and Communications Industry Association (CCIA), testified in opposition to **S 1163**. She believed children deserved an enhanced level of security and privacy. She boasted CCIA's efforts to raise the standard for children's safety and privacy across the industry by creating new features and settings tailored to the developmental needs of young people. She felt requiring a state specific filter would present technical difficulties. Typically, internet providers governed which websites users could access. She claimed adults were the primary users of the devices the bill sought to regulate. She commented on products and services that were not designed for younger users, and talked about settings parents could enable to make appropriate choices about content for their devices. She believed **S 1163** would invite consumer confusion. CCIA recommended filters should be an opt in feature.

Senator Wintrow asked how the filtering process on an iPhone was different from what was proposed in the bill. **Ms. Boender** stated the user chose to activate the filters where as the proposal in **S 1163** mandated a filter by default, meaning you had to opt out of it instead of opting in. **Senator Wintrow** was concerned about where information was stored to turn off a filter and possible privacy concerns. **Ms. Boender** was concerned that a person would not have a choice to opt into having filters applied, they would be by default if the device was activated in the state.

Senator Winder said his understanding was the filter would occur when the phone was activated and apply the filter when the phone was turned on. **Ms. Boender** agreed, but noted the filter would be activated by default. Her concern was that manufacturers were not producing equipment with state specific filters. **Senator Winder** thought this was an optional use of the filter and the software required, not mandatory for anyone other than it would require the software manufacturer to have it as part of a startup application. **Ms. Boender** understood it would be a mandatory default filter that would be activated in the state. This bill would remove personal preference to have a filter implemented by default.

Jennifer Barrus talked about her son's addiction to pornography from age 11. She admitted she did not know how to activate filters on her phone and as a result her son accessed pornography on her phone. She expressed fear for children and society because of the effects of porn. She likened pornography to a dark plague and urged support for **S 1163**.

Gerry Keegan, of Cellular Telephone Industries Association (CTIA), a trade association for the wireless industry, testified in opposition to **S 1163**. He claimed the wireless industry was at the forefront of promoting online safety for parents and guardians. Growing Wireless was a campaign that provided tools, resources, and information on filtering technology so parents could make informed decisions to keep children safe online. He felt **S 1163** was unnecessary legislation since filtering technology was already available on devices. Mandating Idaho specific technical requirements on devices sold nationally was unworkable. Technology was not designed on a state by state basis and this legislation would add complexities and create confusion for consumers. He reported the wireless industry in Idaho contributed \$1.7 billion to the state's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) with over 22,000 wireless related jobs accounting for a billion dollars in paying benefits to Idaho residents.

Senator Ruchti asked about other states that implemented legislation similar to this. **Mr. Keegan** claimed the state of Idaho passed legislation with a triggering law before the effective date. He stated there was no state with laws on the books that was currently in effect. **Chairman Guthrie** clarified the reference was to the State of Utah.

Senator Lee acknowledged industry efforts to provide filters but she saw no widespread campaign. She asked, if not this legislation, what more could the industry do in Idaho to help move this forward rather than just oppose efforts to protect children. **Mr. Keegan** repeated, the wireless industry was at the forefront and cited CTIA's campaign Growing Wireless. He referred people to CTIA's website. **Senator Lee** asked about concerted, overt efforts to use the finances the industry contributed on an intensive advertising campaign marketed to parents looking for this information. She believed that would be a beneficial effort for the industry to make.

Senator Toews asked a way the filter could be activated only for minors, not everyone. He noted device restrictions up to certain ages and then parental notification that restrictions were coming off. **Mr. Keegan** responded that manufacturers did not know who used the device. He claimed the wireless providers and device manufactures had help sites parents could access for step by step instructions to enable filtering technology.

Senator Wintrow suggested a sticker or printed material shrink-wrapped on a device with easy instructions to turn on filters. **Mr. Keegan** said devices were shipped on a national basis, not state specific. Package labeling was not possible for individual states.

Senator Winder asked how much money the wireless industry made off of pornography. **Mr. Keegan** stated the industry did not make money off of pornography. He suggested if the goal was to tackle pornography, the pornographers should be pursued. He asked why the legislature put a band-aid on the device manufacturer or service providers who had nothing to do with pornography. He continued, there were states looking at other laws (Louisiana) that went after pornography websites and required the identification to keep minors from that information.

Senator Anthon explained the efforts to understand why, if a default setting came from the factory that allowed pornography, why could the default setting not deny pornography viewing. He questioned if the setting was not driven by an industry that made money off of the setting not being set as a default. **Mr. Keegan** denied that was the industry's motivation. He stated default settings were not that simple.

The functionality and activation processes would have to be changed for devices sold in Idaho. Also, this was not about an on/off switch. He said this was also about what was in the bill. The definition of harmful to minors was broad. He suggested if the State of Idaho or the author could not define pornography, why or how did device manufacturers decide what was pornographic. **Senator Anthon** heard that for the manufacturer it was too difficult or complicated to activate the filter at the factory, but when the parent got the device, the set up was easy. **Mr. Keegan** answered that the challenge with the manufacturers was that they shipped devices nationally, not specifically to an individual state. If a parent had an issue about turning on filtering technology, the industry was there to help with the information. The challenge for him was not an off/on switch, it was the bill.

Senator Bernt asked why not change the policy at a national level rather than individual states. **Mr. Keegan** said he believed the tools and resources were accessible for parents to make informed decisions for their children. He opposed a mandate by the government.

Senator Lee referred back to labeling. She asked why the industry did not label devices as a proactive, responsible step. **Mr. Keegan** agreed to take back to his members the question of online safety in Idaho. He said packaging challenges were significant. It was not practical to have labels that crossed all types of boundaries.

Trent Clark, Idaho Families, Inc., said this was not a First Amendment or denial of rights issue. He stated this was simply a duty of care issue. His example of duty of care was a health savings card he received via mail. He could not use it until he activated it by a code. Duty of care was to prevent harm and inform about a product. He provided the appended handout in support of his testimony (Attachment 3).

Senator Ruchti admitted he struggled with this issue and appreciated the complexities. Once something like a debit card was activated, the bank had no right to make decisions about where the money was spent. Trying to emphasize individual responsibility, limit government, and enable free market seemed to be violated by this bill. **Mr. Clark** claimed the worldwide industry making money on pornography was a \$97 billion industry. Yet it was the only industry that avoided any duty of care. He heard the supply chain for a piece of technology was very complex, so who could be held responsible. Society's answer was that responsibility was at the point of sale. He suggested in this case, whoever activated the phone that could connect to the internet and deliver porn to the eyes of child, had a duty of care. For him, that was consistent with the assignment of duty of care in every other case.

Senator Bernt wondered how the liability components with the bill related to duty of care. **Mr. Clark** believed **S 1163** was a bill that the technology industry would one day look back at as a standard of care. He suggested parents of children whose lives were destroyed by pornography would one day say they wanted to sue someone. He believed at a point in time there would be lawsuits on standard of care. He felt this bill provided some guidance for an appropriate standard of care.

Senator Wintrow stated her belief everyone was against violent pornography and kids looking at it. She suggested there needed to be better definitions or a congressional solution. **Mr. Clark** said the impetus for potential litigation was the harm. He referred to his handout describing documented harm. He offered a good faith effort on the part of the industry selling the devices would be a good place to start.

John Foster said he was testifying as a parent of four and his family's information technology (IT) director. He opposed **S 1163**. He learned the only way to prevent kids from accessing some content was to withhold giving them a phone. When he set up a device he was asked if it was for a child. After answering affirmatively, he was prompted to pair that device to his phone. Then he set up limits on his phone for the child's phone. He managed the child's device through his phone. He then conversed with his child about the right way to use the device. He had control over adjusting the limits and teaching the child how to responsibly use the phone. He felt **S 1163** would eliminate those tools and his ability to use that approach. The bill mandated the content filter be on the child's phone instead of his. Then the manufacturer would decide the appropriate limits for content, not the parent. He stated 70 percent of parents already used parental controls and those parents did not think it was someone else's responsibility. He suggest working together to protect kids without taking away parental rights or personal privacy. He asked the Committee to hold the bill or to vote to amend it.

Senator Wintrow asked what other ways the bill could be improved, or parents could be helped to better understand the filtering. **Mr. Foster** reminded there was a law on the books in Louisiana that had not been challenged legally. It stated providers of pornography websites were required to have age verification before accessing the content. He stated he would help Senator Cook pass such a law in Idaho because it identified the problem at the source.

Senator Lee asked him about a packet of opposition he provided earlier. She asked Mr. Foster what companies he represented in this matter. **Mr. Foster** responded he represented Tech Net, T Mobile, Apple, and a wide variety of companies in the technology industry. He appreciated being able to control the filters on his phone instead of trusting a manufacturer. **Senator Lee** asked what he did since last year to help improve this issue. **Mr. Foster** said last year he did not know about the Louisiana bill. He believed it was a better solution for the concerns people raised because **S 1163** would only apply to handheld devices with a cellular connection. He stated people had browser access on multiple devices, such as television. He encouraged focusing on the Louisiana bill.

Senator Ruchti wanted a sense of the effect on products sold in Idaho. If an onerous requirement was placed on the manufacturer for Idaho, could a company like Apple refuse to sell products in Idaho. **Mr. Foster** suggested key points in the bill included a trigger, meaning it would not be applicable unless other states passed the law. Also, there were mountains of legal challenges in passing this bill.

Catherine Nielson shared her personal history working with children in pornography recovery programs. She shared she worked with and sponsored women in 12-step programs as a result of exposure to pornography at young ages. She relayed the victims struggled to overcome guilt, shame, and feelings they would never have normal relationships within a marriage. She urge support for the bill.

Brian Almon, Communications Director for Idaho Freedom Foundation (IFF), testified from an IT background. He agreed pornography was harmful to young children and did not believe legislation could be passed on intention. He said the bill only applied to the browser and search engines. He claimed mobile phone users spent a lot of time in applications (apps). He stated the bill did not stop apps from offering pornography. He suggested it was like mandating locks on a doors while leaving all the windows open. He stated there would never be a perfect filter or surefire way to protect children. He expressed concerns about privacy. He claimed any filtering apps recorded data about the device it was on and the bill had no provision for protecting the privacy of children or adults.

Senator Winder was perplexed by the stance of the IFF on this bill. He recalled for the last several years the IFF was adamant about pornography in public schools or libraries. He wondered why this bill was different when the highest risk for a child was on a cell phone. **Mr. Almon** declared public schools and libraries were public, taxpayer funded, open to everyone. In this case, a telephone was a conduit of information. He felt the best defense was the parents' responsibility in their own home.

Senator Ruchti suggested the best defense for protecting children from harmful things was the parents. **Mr. Almon** agreed. He said there was no substitute for parenting. He felt this bill might give parents a false sense of security thinking the problem was taken care of.

Paul Stark, Executive Director of the Idaho Education Association, stood in support of **S 1163**. He acknowledged the issue was complicated. He drew attention to the declaration of the policy in which the legislature recognized the importance of mental health in the growth of minors. He referenced page 1, line 21 that declared it the policy of the state to promote the mental health of minors. **Mr. Stark** thought this bill was a step in addressing the mental health of children. He noted Senator Wintrow's comments and the bill's sponsor to remove discriminatory language from Idaho Code § 18-1514.

Senator Cook closed noting most opposition came from technology companies with the most to lose with this bill. They declared there were already filters available. **Senator Cook** asked that the filter already on the mobile device be turned on or enabled. He acknowledged the trigger law related to this bill and cited Utah and 10 other states were in the process of implementing something similar. As far as a phone working for one state and not another seemed incongruent when phones automatically changed time throughout the nation but not in the state of Arizona, who did not participate in daylight savings. IFF stated **S 1163** would infringe on property rights by forcing consumers to purchase devices that automatically turned on content filters. **Senator Cook** noted when he traveled across time zones, the mobile device changed time. He asked if that meant his constitutional rights were violated. The default ring tone was annoying to him. He asked if that meant his consumer or constitutional rights were violated. He continued that the first time he used the browser on his mobile device, it went to a default, liberal webpage. He asked if that meant his constitutional rights were violated. When he purchased a mobile device for his child and pornography popped up, even when he was not looking for it, was the child's constitutional rights violated. **Senator Cook** stated software engineers configured software so the consumer could configure it the way it worked best for them. He was asking manufacturers to enable this device in the State of Idaho. Regarding the Louisiana bill, **Senator Cook** noted Mr. Foster was working on a bill that would bring the Louisiana bill to Idaho. He defined what was harmful to minors using the same section of Idaho Code proposed by Senator Cook. **Senator Cook** suggested the Louisiana bill put the fox in charge of the henhouse by asking the

pornography industry to monitor itself. He concluded that his bill was not perfect, but he guaranteed it would save some of our kids. He quoted John Adams, "Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." **Senator Cook** asked for an aye vote.

MOTION: **Senator Harris** moved to send **S 1163** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. **Senator Anthon** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Toews** was in support of protecting children from pornography. He stated his children did not have cell phones because of his concerns. He agreed to support the motion, but reserved his right vote either way on the floor. He was not sure this bill was the solution to the problem. He noted in testimony that parents said children accessed content on the parent's phone. This bill would not fix that. If parents removed some filters and children accessed their parents' phones, the children could still access content. There was evil in the world and parents needed to be educated about how to protect their children technologically.

Senator Harris spoke to his motion. He recognized **S 1163** as a noble cause and that was why he moved to send it to the floor.

Senator Bernt liked the idea of receiving a phone and opting out instead of opting in with regard to filters. He admitted he had a lot of questions and he did not feel he had all the answers he wanted yet. He stated he would vote against the bill because the bill needed more polishing to be made better.

Senator Ruchti said he would vote against the bill. He worried that this was not a limited government solution. He thought it was heavy handed to tell manufacturers to solve a problem for the parents. It ignored solutions offered by free markets with apps available. For him, individual responsibility was important. He said this solution did not teach parents how to monitor their children's use of the internet. It gave them a device on which kids could probably quickly learn how to turn off the filters.

Senator Lee agreed this was not a perfect bill. She stated it would at least get the industry's attention. Moving the bill forward would possibly keep the industry concerned about providing remedies to help families address these issues. She encouraged keeping the bill to engage the industry in being a better partner for the State.

Senator Anthon supported the bill. He shared he never heard in Committee to let the market take care of the tobacco concerns related to children. He noted the tobacco and alcohol industries marketed to children. Yet in Committee he was hearing let the market dictate. He proposed we knew what the market was doing, it was actively trying to get children addicted to pornography. He said he was ready to support this bill.

Senator Toews asked if we wanted manufacturers to do this for Idaho, why not encourage manufacturers do this only for minors. He said he would be in favor of sending the bill to the amending order.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE:**

Chairman Guthrie noted the motion before the Committee was to send **S 1163** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendations. He asked for a roll call vote. The motion carried by a **roll call vote**.

S 1173

PREVENTION OF PUBLIC OFFENSES - Amends existing law to provide for the defensive display or declaration of a firearm and to provide that the defensive display or declaration of a firearm shall not be required in certain instances. **Senator Lakey** explained that **S 1173** addressed the lawful scenario of stopping short of use of force. He shared he worked with attorneys and the National Rifle Association (NRA) to add to Idaho Code § 19-202, resistance by a threatened party. The intent was to allow and clarify the ability to take reasonable steps to protect yourself or others against a threatened or actual use of force. It was described as a defensive declaration or display of a firearm and subject to the same reasonable person standard as applicable in firearm laws. It had to be tied to unlawful, attempted use of force. **Senator Lakey** requested the bill be sent to the amending order for possible amendments.

Senator Wintrow referenced how Idaho Code § 18-901, for example, defined assault. She was curious how this bill coordinated with the definition of assault and how would anyone know, or prove, the display or declaration would de-escalate. **Senator Lakey** shared the assault statutes were part of the intent in drafting this bill. He defined assault as a threat of violence by act or word. From his perspective, this provided the opportunity to de-escalate because he was not drawing a firearm. **Senator Wintrow** recounted a television show in which Man A showed a firearm because he felt threatened and Man B shot him. She asked again how this helped de-escalate and what about domestic situations. **Senator Lakey** stated this required the reasonable person standard familiar in case law. The person who displayed a firearm had to do so in response to a threat or act of force against him.

TESTIMONY:

Emilie Jackson-Edney and Bonnie Shuster electronically registered their opposition to **S 1173**.

Appended are two letters in opposition to **S 1173** (Attachment 4).

Marsha Bravo spoke against **S 1173** because she felt legislation should be 100 percent clear and this was not. She asked for an understanding of self-defense. In Idaho Code Titles 18 and 19 the terms human behavior, actions, and firearms were mixed with different interpretations. She questioned when self-defense was justifiable or unlawful. After a shooting, it was too late for a judge to decide who or what was reasonable. What some thought of as defensive might be a threat to someone else. She believed declaring a firearm was a first step in action. She saw the bill as flawed and that it justified escalation of conflict and promoted a wild west mentality with potentially tragic consequences.

Aoibheann Cline, State Director for the NRA, shared the NRA worked with Senator Lakey on this issue for many year. Use of force was allowed in Idaho in defense of self and family. What was not allowed, was under this bill. She stated the bill was a de-escalation tool, just short of use of action. She encouraged people to take an NRA firearm class. She believed this was a good bill and she wanted to make sure it was consistent with self-defense statutes. She said law enforcement was neutral in this case.

Senator Lakey closed by repeating the bill provided clarity to a situation short of use of force. He said Section 4 was not being changed, it was consistent across self-defense statues and in the Stand Your Ground provisions.

MOTION:

Senator Anthon moved to send **S 1173** to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. **Senator Lee** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Wintrow** remained concerned about assault being in conflict with this legislation. If a person died and there were no witnesses, how would a judge determine intent. She asked if this gave an excuse to kill someone if there were no witnesses. She was not sure how this would increase public safety and was concerned about the wild west comment. She stated she could not support this legislation.

Senator Ruchti expressed concern that someone could be emboldened by this. He suggested, after a few drinks at a bar someone could make comments that would normally be resolved in a parking lot fight. Instead, the person could put their hand on a pistol. He imagined several scenarios where someone could use this law inappropriately.

VOICE VOTE: The motion carried by **voice vote**. **Senator Wintrow** requested to be recorded as voting no.

H 206 **ADMINISTRATIVE RULES - Amends, repeals, and adds to existing law to revise provisions regarding the legislative review of administrative rules.**

H 240 **EDUCATION - Amends existing law to revise provisions regarding elections for a school board of trustees.**

H 221 **ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT - Adds to existing law to prohibit the name of any public official or any electioneering message from appearing on tax commission correspondence or county property tax correspondence.**

MINUTES APPROVAL: **Senator Ruchti** moved to approve the minutes of March 10, 2023. **Senator Anthon** seconded the motion. The motion carried by **voice vote**.

Senator Winder said Wednesday was the shut down date but he would approve the Committee taking extra days to get things through the process.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, **Chairman Guthrie** adjourned the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Senator Guthrie
Chair

Joyce Brewer
Secretary