

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE

Second Regular Session, 100th GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-FIFTH DAY, WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

Speaker Haahr in the Chair.

There was a moment of silent prayer.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was recited.

SIGNING OF HOUSE BILLS

All other business of the House was suspended while **SCS HB 1330, HB 1386, HCS HBs 1387 & 1482, SS SCS HB 1467 and HB 1934, HCS HB 1711, CCS#2 SS SCS HB 1768, SS#2 SCS HCS HB 1854, SS SCS HCS#2 HB 1896, SS#3 SCS HB 1963, HCS HB 2001, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2002, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2003, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2004, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2005, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2007, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2008, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2009, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2010, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2011, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2012, SCS HCS HB 2013, HCS HB 2017, HCS HB 2018, CCS SS HCS HB 2046, and SS SCS HCS HB 2120** were read at length and, there being no objection, were signed by the Speaker to the end that the same may become law.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS

Representatives offered objections to **SS SCS HCS HB 1414, SCS HCS HB 1655, SS SCS HCS HB 1682, CCS SS SCS HS HCS HB 2006, and HCS HB 2019**, which were appended to the bills.

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1414

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

The original purpose of SS SCS HCS HB 1414 was “relating to protection of children.” While the bill’s title was not changed, one significant change was made during deliberation in the Senate which the House bill handler admitted to not being vetted. The amendment broadened the scope of the legislation.

Keeping with the bill’s original purpose of protecting children, amendments were added to include the protection of foster children, homeless youth, child care facility background checks, children of military families, foster care reform, and foster parent’s rights.

The Senate amendment added the topic of a substance abuse treatment waiver. During House debate, no substantive explanation was offered to justify the inclusion of the subject in the bill.

Article III, Section 21 states, “. . . no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.” What is the purpose of the addition of the substance abuse treatment waiver was not clearly defined.

As such, it appears that SS SCS HCS HB 1414 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1655

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title. . . .”

The original purpose of SCS HCS HB 1655 was “relating to the secretary of state.” The original bill requires the Secretary of State to allow public inspection of the original rolls of laws passed by the General Assembly.

During the amending process, the bill was changed to include provisions “relating to official documents.” This new purpose added at least 10 separate elements related to the responsibilities of public notaries.

Article III, Section 21 states, “. . . no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.” Clearly, responsibilities and functions of the Secretary of State are different as separate from public notaries.

As such, it appears that SCS HCS HB 1655 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1682

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

The original purpose of SS SCS HCS HB 1682 was “relating to permissible usage of vapor products in public schools.”

During the amending process, the bill was changed to include provisions “relating to health care.” This new purpose designated the month of May as Mental Health Awareness Month, July as Minority Mental Awareness Month, August as Minority Organ Donor Month, and September as Deaf Awareness Month and Infant and Maternal Mortality Awareness Month. Clearly these additions do not have anything to do with vaping in government schools!

Additional amendments include the “Long-term Care Dignity Act,” the requirement for training in CPR using an automated external defibrillator, do not resuscitate orders, the “Postpartum Depression Care Act,” telehealth, long-term care, controlled substances, prescription drugs, marijuana, epinephrine injectors, opioid settlements, hospital district dissolutions, personal care assistants, pharmacies, nursing home licensing requirements, speech pathologist, audiologists, health care reimbursements, cancer screening insurance, health care contracts, credentialing of health care practitioners, health record confidentiality, health testing, and mental health waivers.

Article III, Section 21 states, “... no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.”

During the Fall of 2019, I conducted an exercise in a Lawrence County High School class. The exercise included a mock bill passage which offered the students an opportunity to introduce and amend a bill. Amendments offered were purposely broadly related, however, not specifically related to bill’s original purpose. A final amendment required changing the original title (purpose). During the exercise, several students questioned the direct relationship between the amendments and the original bill.

Following the exercise, the students were informed about Article III, Sections 21 and 23 of the Missouri Constitution and asked whether or not the law was violated. The students overwhelmingly answered, “YES!”

If high school students, untrained in the law, are wise enough to understand our State Constitution, we should be able to do so as well.

Due to the wide-ranging scope, it appears that SS SCS HCS HB 1682 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

RE: Appropriation Bills 2006 and 2019

Dear Clerk Miller:

Conference Committee Substitute for Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 2006 and House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 2019 contain appropriations for the Department of Conservation that directly conflict with Article IV, Section 43(b) of the Missouri Constitution, which states that Conservation Commission funds “shall be expended and used by the conservation commission, department of conservation, for the control, management, restoration, conservation and regulation of the bird, fish, game, forestry and wildlife resources of the state, including the purchase or other acquisition of property for said purposes, and for the administration of the laws pertaining thereto, and for no other purpose.” The appropriations in House Bill No. 2006 and House Bill No. 2019 are unconstitutional to the extent they contain items that direct, limit, or prohibit the use of conservation funds by the Conservation Commission in ways that were not requested or approved by the Conservation Commission.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Kip Kendrick
State Representative, District 45

SIGNING OF HOUSE BILLS

All other business of the House was suspended while **SS SCS HCS HB 1414, SCS HCS HB 1655, SS SCS HCS HB 1682, CCS SS SCS HS HCS HB 2006, and HCS HB 2019** were read at length and were signed by the Speaker to the end that the same may become law.

Having been duly signed in open session of the Senate, **SCS HB 1330, HB 1386, HCS HBs 1387 & 1482, SS SCS HCS HB 1414, SS SCS HB 1467 and HB 1934, SCS HCS HB 1655, SS SCS HCS HB 1682, HCS HB 1711, CCS#2 SS SCS HB 1768, SS#2 SCS HCS HB 1854, SS SCS HCS#2 HB 1896, SS#3 SCS HB 1963, HCS HB 2001, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2002, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2003, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2004, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2005, CCS SS SCS HS HCS HB 2006, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2007, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2008, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2009, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2010, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2011, CCS SCS HS HCS HB 2012, SCS HCS HB 2013, HCS HB 2017, HCS HB 2018, HCS HB 2019, CCS SS HCS HB 2046, and SS SCS HCS HB 2120** were delivered to the Governor by the Chief Clerk of the House.

SIGNING OF SENATE BILLS

All other business of the House was suspended while **CCS HCS SB 551, SS SB 600, SS SB 644, CCS HCS SCS SB 653, SCS SB 739, and SB 913** were read at length and, there being no objection, were signed by the Speaker to the end that the same may become law.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS

Representative Moon offered objections to **SS SCS SB 569, SS#2 SCS SB 591, HCS SCS SB 599, CCS SCS SB 631, HCS SB 656, HCS SB 676, and SS SCS SB 718**, which were appended to the bills.

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – **Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 569**

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

The original purpose of SS SCS SB 569 was “relating to evidentiary collection kits.”

During the amending process, the bill was changed to “relating to victims of sexual offenses” in order to include the “Justice for Survivors Act,” the “Sexual Assault Survivor’s Bill of Rights” and, the creation of the “Missouri Rights of Victims of Sexual Assault Task Force.”

Article III, Section 21 states, “... no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.”

While the amendments relate to victims of sexual assault, the additions to the bill broadened the scope of the bill (necessitating the change of title), it appears that SS SCS SB 569 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – **Senate Substitute No. 2 for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 591**

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

The original purpose of SS#2 SCS SB 591 was “relating to punitive damages.” The bill’s purpose was changed to “civil action” in order to broaden the scope of the legislation.

Amendments added to the original bill's focus of general and medical malpractice (punitive damages) include unlawful merchandising practices for new residents.

As such, it appears that SS#2 SCS SB 591 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – House Committee Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 599

Missouri's Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title...."

The original purpose of SB 599 was "relating to investments in linked deposits by the state treasurer." The bill's subject title was amended by House Committee Substitute to "relating to financial instruments" in order to broaden the scope of the legislation.

During the amending process, the bill was amended to include the uniformity of convenience fees charged by installment loan lenders. There appears to be no relationship between these entities and the office of the state treasurer.

Article III, Section 21 states, "... no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose."

Due to the changes made in the bill, it appears HCS SCS SB 599 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – Conference Committee Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 631

Missouri's Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title...."

In addition, in Article III, Section 21, “no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.”

The original purpose of SCS SB 631 was “relating to the political activity of certain state employees.” The bill’s subject title was amended by Senate Committee Substitute to “relating to elections” in order to broaden the scope of the legislation.

As the bill was moved through the legislative process, amendments were adopted to include “political committees, candidate financial disclosures, absent uniformed services voters, absentee voting, voter identification, and initiative and referendum petitions.” While the amendments may merit passage by both Houses as independent bills, they do not fit under the original purpose of the bill.

As such, it appears that CCS SCS SB 631 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 656

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

In addition, in Article III, Section 21, “no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.”

The original purpose of HCS SB 656 was “relating to the designation of the Missouri Korean War veterans memorial.” The bill’s subject title was amended by Senate Committee Substitute to “relating to veterans” in order to broaden the scope of the legislation.

As the bill was moved through the legislative process, amendments were adopted to include “Ghost Army Recognition Day,” “Buddy Check 22 Day,” the official recognition of “Gold Star Memorial Monuments,” legal aid to military families, military family teacher certificate reciprocity, long-term care for veterans in Missouri Veterans Homes, MO Healthnet coverage for military families, abuse and neglect of children of military families, license plate designations for Purple Heart recipients, Military Honor flight, and Meritorious Medal honorees, and CCW permits for military family members. While the amendments may merit passage by both Houses as independent bills, they do not fit under the original purpose of the bill.

As such, it appears that HCS SB 656 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 676

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

In addition, in Article III, Section 21, “no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.”

The original purpose of HCS SB 676 was “relating to property tax assessments.” The bill’s subject title was amended by Senate Committee Substitute to “relating to taxation” in order to broaden the scope of the legislation.

As the bill was moved through the legislative process, amendments, unrelated to the original purpose, were adopted to include income taxes, taxation of partnerships, and a provision to offer tax relief for victim who die as a result of a terrorist attack.

As such, it appears that HCS SB 676 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 718

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 23, “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title....”

In addition, in Article III, Section 21, “no bill shall be so amended in its passage through either house as to change its original purpose.”

The original purpose of SS SCS SB 718 was “relating to military families.” The bill’s subject title was amended by Senate Committee Substitute to “relating to military affairs” in order to broaden the scope of the legislation.

As the bill was moved through the legislative process, amendments were adopted to include the designation of the month of November as “Military Family Month,” “Buddy Check 22 Day,” requiring the Attorney General to assist military families in retaining legal counsel, the creation of the state Military Forces department, military family teacher certificate reciprocity, addresses concerns for the long-term care for veterans in Missouri Veterans Homes,

MO Healthnet coverage for military families, abuse and neglect of children of military families, and motor vehicle insurance for state military force members. While the amendments may merit passage by both Houses as independent bills, they do not fit under the original purpose of the bill.

As such, it appears that SS SCS SB 718 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

SIGNING OF SENATE BILLS

All other business of the House was suspended while **SS SCS SB 569, SS#2 SCS SB 591, HCS SCS SB 599, CCS SCS SB 631, HCS SB 656, HCS SB 676, and SS SCS SB 718** were read at length and were signed by the Speaker to the end that the same may become law.

LETTER OF OBJECTION

May 27, 2020

Dana Rademan Miller
Chief Clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives
State Capitol, Room 310
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Mrs. Miller:

I hereby object that **House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended**, which was truly agreed and finally passed by the Senate on May 14, 2020, was not presented to me, as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for my signature.

House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended, having been approved by a majority of the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, was truly agreed and finally passed. Article III, Section 31 of the Missouri Constitution requires that “every bill which shall have passed the house of representatives and the senate shall be presented to and considered by the governor”. Any bill not returned by the Governor within the time limits prescribed in that Section shall become law in like manner as if the Governor had signed it. The Senate failed to present House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended and ordered enrolled to the House of Representatives, thereafter to be delivered to the Governor for his consideration.

As you know, House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782 was taken up by the House of Representatives on May 13, 2020, amended, and was read the third time and passed. Such action was reported to the Senate and recorded in the Senate journal the same day.

On May 14, 2020, House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended, was read the third time and passed by the Senate in a vote of 28-3. The President declared the bill passed and the bill was ordered enrolled. The House of Representatives thereafter received a message from the Senate that House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended, had been truly agreed and finally passed. No further message from the Senate was received.

Thereafter, the Senate purported to reconsider the vote by which House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782 was third read and finally passed. Such action, however, is not allowed. Article IX of the Rules of the Senate is entitled “Final Passage – yeas and nays” and details the procedures to effect the final passage of a bill and certain actions that may be taken after final passage. Senate Rule 66 states that “if a majority of the senators elected vote in favor thereof, the bill shall be declared passed. No senator shall be allowed to cast or change his or her vote after the

senate's action on said question is announced by the president". As mentioned above, the President of the Senate declared House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended, passed. Therefore, any vote cast or changed after such action was invalid.

To reiterate the point, the Rules of the Senate only allow for a motion to reconsider when a bill is put upon its final passage and it fails to pass. Senate Rule 67 states "When a bill is put upon its final passage and, failing to pass, a motion is made to reconsider the vote by which it was defeated, the presiding officer shall briefly state the nature of the bill. Thereupon the vote on the motion to reconsider shall be immediately taken..." Other Rules of the Senate relating to reconsideration, such as Senate Rule 92, are only applicable to bills before their third reading and passage and are certainly not applicable to bills after their final passage. The actions taken by the Senate after House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended, was truly agreed and finally passed are invalid and of no legal consequence.

The extreme and unprecedented actions by the Senate after a bill's final passage are alarming. It appears that such an action has not been taken by either chamber in 100 general assemblies and for good reason. As its name implies, to truly agree and finally pass a bill is the final action by the General Assembly in regards to legislation. No further actions are allowed other than to deliver the bill to the Governor for his approval, or to a vote of the people in the event of a referendum or Constitutional amendment.

Please note my objection to the Senate's failure to deliver House Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 782, as amended, which was truly agreed and finally passed, to the House of Representatives in the House Journal.

Sincerely,

/s/ Elijah J. L. Haahr
Speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives

SIGNING OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION

All other business of the House was suspended while **SS#3 SJR 38** was read at length and was signed by the Speaker to the end that the same may become law.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS

Representatives offered objections to **SS#3 SJR 38**, which were appended to the resolution.

Dear Colleagues:

Pursuant to Article III Section 30 of the Missouri Constitution, I write to express my objections to **Senate Substitute No. 3 for Senate Joint Resolution No. 38** ("SJR 38") as unconstitutional and against public policy, for the following reasons:

SJR 38 would directly undo the will of the Missouri voters. In 2018, Missourians overwhelmingly voted in favor of Amendment 1, which passed with 62 percent of the vote, and garnered popular support in 149 of 163 of the Missouri's House districts (many of which have Republican majorities). SJR 38 would undo many of the changes instituted by Amendment 1—changes that Missourians voted for *less than two years ago*.

SJR 38 significantly weakens protections afforded to communities of color. Amendment 1 provided robust state-law protections for communities of color, ensuring that minority communities would be able to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice. SJR 38 significantly weakens these protections, leaving communities of color more vulnerable to being underrepresented in the redistricting process.

SJR 38 undermines the independence of the map-drawing process. Amendment 1 made Missouri’s redistricting process more independent by entrusting the map-drawing process to a nonpartisan demographer, who would be selected on a bipartisan basis by Democrats and Republicans. SJR 38 would reverse course by reinstating map drawing by partisan demographers that, as history has taught us, will likely result in a deadlocked process.

SJR 38 enables partisan gerrymandering. Amendment 1 prioritized partisan fairness. By contrast, SJR 38 deemphasizes it, demoting it to the bottom of the list of redistricting criteria to be considered. Thus, instead of requiring districts to be drawn as fairly as practicable, SJR 38 permits map drawers to engage in partisan gerrymandering. This is precisely what Missourians overwhelmingly voted to change in 2018.

SJR 38 might be construed as allowing children and noncitizens to be excluded when district lines are drawn. SJR 38 would erase language in Missouri’s Constitution that expressly requires districts to be established on the basis of total population. Instead, the resolution provides that districts be drawn on the basis of “one person, one vote.” This language appears in no other state constitution and, because some have argued that it allows for districts to be drawn based on citizens or adult citizens, would open the door to efforts to disregard children and others when district boundaries are drawn.

SJR 38 would discriminate against communities of color if map drawers choose an apportionment base other than total population. Use of an apportionment base that only includes eligible voters would be discriminatory. Over 90 percent of the Missourians who would be excluded from such narrow apportionment base would be children who are United States citizens—many of whom will become voters before the decade is out. This would have an overwhelmingly disproportionate impact on communities of color. While only 21 percent of the members of Missouri’s white communities are younger than eighteen, 26.7 percent of the members of our Black communities and 37 percent of the members of our Latino communities are. This means that over one-quarter of Missouri’s Black community, and more than one-third of Missouri’s Latino community, would not be counted if SJR 38 is interpreted to allow for the exclusion of people under eighteen-years-old from the apportionment base.

Further, under Missouri’s current Senate map, two out of the four districts that elected members of the Missouri Legislative Black Caucus would become more underpopulated under adult citizen-based apportionment. This would make it significantly more difficult for Missouri’s communities of color to elect candidates of their choice and secure equal representation. Over time, Missouri’s maps would shift representation away from communities of color and discriminatorily favor older white communities with fewer children.

Likewise, as we have heard from experts, even if children were counted, apportioning on the basis of citizens alone would mean that Missouri’s 130,000 noncitizens—who pay taxes and contribute to their communities just like everyone else—would be completely ignored in the redistricting process, even though as elected representatives we serve every resident of our districts and not just those eligible or registered to vote. An apportionment base that counts citizen children but excludes noncitizens would expose as mere pretext any defense of SJR 38 as giving more weight to “people that are able to vote.” It also would violate one of the fundamental tenets of our country: “no taxation without representation.” Simply put, there is no justification for excluding noncitizen individuals from the apportionment base that is not rooted in a discriminatory, anti-immigrant sentiment.

SJR 38 would be a step backwards for the state of Missouri. It threatens communities of color, invites partisan politics back into the redistricting process, and invites the drawing of maps that are less fair and less representative of Missouri. For these reasons, we strongly oppose the passage of this resolution.

Sincerely,

/s/ Representative Peter Merideth
Missouri House of Representatives - District 80

May 27, 2020

Dana Miller
Chief Clerk of the House
Room 310
201 Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, MO 65101

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – Senate Substitute No. 3 for Senate Joint Resolution No. 38

Missouri’s Constitution states in Article III, Section 50, “... Petitions for laws shall contain no more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title...”

The original purpose of SJR 38 was “relating to regulating the legislature to limit the influence of partisan or other special interests.” Although broad, the purpose of the bill requires Missouri voters to decide multiple questions with only one answer.

The measure presented to voters will include whether or not a ban on all lobbyists gifts should be instituted, whether or not further restrictions on campaign contributions should be implemented, and decisions on legislative district boundaries.

These ballot questions will require a single vote of “yes” or “no.” Voters may indeed support or reject all questions. However, if a voter supports one and rejects another, a simple “yes” or “no” will not suffice. SJR 38 will place an unwarranted burden on Missouri voters by requiring a single answer for multiple questions.

As such, it appears that SJR 38 is in violation of the provisions authorized by the state Constitution.

/s/ Mike Moon
District 157

COMMITTEE CHANGES

May 18, 2020

Ms. Dana Rademan Miller
Chief Clerk
Missouri House of Representatives
State Capitol, Room 310
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Ms. Miller:

I hereby remove Representative Kathryn Swan from the Joint Committee on Education and appoint Representative Doug Richey.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

/s/ Elijah Haahr
Speaker of the House

The following members' presence was noted: Bangert, Baringer, Basye, Bondon, Bromley, Brown (70), Brown (27), Busick, Chipman, Christofanelli, Clemens, Coleman (32), Coleman (97), Deaton, Dohrman, Evans, Falkner, Fishel, Fitzwater, Francis, Gray, Green, Griffith, Haahr, Haden, Haffner, Helms, Hurst, Ingle, Kelley (127), Kendrick, Kidd, Kolkmeier, Mackey, McGaugh, Mitten, Moon, Muntzel, Pike, Pogue, Pollitt (52), Price, Proudie, Razer, Reedy, Remole, Ruth, Schnelting, Sharp (36), Sharpe (4), Shawan, Spencer, Stacy, Toalson Reisch, Trent, Veit, Vescovo, Washington, Windham, Wood, Wright, and Young.

ADJOURNMENT

The Speaker declared the House of Representatives of the One-hundredth General Assembly, convened in the Second Regular Session on January 8, 2020, adjourned sine die as of midnight, May 30, 2020, in accordance with the Constitution.

ELIJAH HAAHR
Speaker of the House

DANA RADEMAN MILLER
Chief Clerk of the House

(This page intentionally left blank)