

# JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE

## VETO SESSION

First Regular Session, 98th GENERAL ASSEMBLY

---

FIRST DAY, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

Speaker Richardson in the Chair.

Prayer by Msgr. Robert A. Kurwicky, Chaplain.

*Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear to my supplications. – Psalm 143*

We thank You, O Lord, for this moment of prayer when we turn our hearts to You and in all sincerity of mind and heart receive the guidance of Your good spirit during this Veto Session.

Let not the glory of this day, nor the glow of good health, nor the glamour of our position blind us to the seriousness of our tasks and deceive us into thinking that we can depend upon ourselves alone. All we are and all we have is a trust, O Lord, from You. Help us to be wise stewards of Your gifts and to use them for Your glory and to make more secure the freedoms and responsibilities of our state.

Bless these Representatives with Your gracious favor, our people with the fruits of Your loving spirit and all of us together with the faith in democracy that never falters and never fails despite human weaknesses.

And the House says, "Amen!"

The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was recited.

## LETTER OF RESIGNATION

July 28, 2015

The Honorable Jeremiah W. "Jay" Nixon  
Governor  
State Capitol, Room 216  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Governor Nixon:

Pursuant to RSMo. 21.090, I hereby submit my resignation, effective at 2:30 p.m., on July 28, 2015, as state representative for the 36<sup>th</sup> District.

Sincerely,

/s/ Kevin McManus  
State Representative  
District 36

## MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

June 26, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Conference Committee Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 42**, entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal sections 163.011 and 163.031 as enacted by house bill no. 1689, ninety-seventh general assembly, second regular session, and sections 160.011, 160.400, 160.403, 160.405, 160.410, 160.415, 160.417, 160.425, 162.081, 162.1250, 163.018, 163.036, 167.121, 167.131, 171.031, and 210.861, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof fifty-one new sections relating to elementary and secondary education, with an emergency clause.

I disapprove of Conference Committee Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 42 (House Bill No. 42). My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

In its original form, House Bill No. 42 focused on attempting to solve the well-known problems of Missouri's existing student transfer law, and address several major difficulties that plagued last year's attempt at a legislative solution. However, as the legislative process unfolded, House Bill No. 42 mandated expensive educational experiments, neglected accountability, and evaded the major, underlying difficulties in the transfer law. The unacceptable results are that House Bill No. 42, in its final form, introduces private vouchers without meaningful oversight, builds a larger, more expensive, and unnecessary bureaucracy, and imposes gratuitous requirements and restrictions on local schools. It does so, while once again failing to find fair solutions for children attending school in any of Missouri's unaccredited districts. As such, House Bill No. 42 cannot become law.

### **Vouchers for virtual schools**

House Bill No. 42 would require taxpayers to pay for private vouchers for virtual education. I have been resolute in my opposition to the use of public funds to pay for private education, and this bill is no exception. Moreover, House Bill No. 42 would authorize the expansion of virtual schools far beyond what is necessary to solve the existing transfer problem. Indeed, this bill would require taxpayers to foot the bill for vouchers for virtual education in the St. Louis Public Schools, any school district in Jackson County, and any school district in St. Louis County, regardless of their accreditation status. Taxpayers in these school districts, many of which include some of Missouri's highest performing schools, would be obligated to pay the tuition for virtual schools chosen by parents/students, without accountability for student performance being imposed on the virtual programs themselves.

The broad expansion of virtual schools contemplated by House Bill No. 42 is a dramatic departure from the responsible manner in which virtual education is currently offered in Missouri through the Missouri Virtual Instruction Program (MoVIP) or through virtual education courses offered by local districts. In both cases, there is considerable public oversight of the courses, either through the State Board of Education or locally elected school boards, assuring a level of quality that taxpayers should demand. Such oversight is nowhere to be found in the virtual school voucher system that House Bill No. 42 would seek to introduce. Regardless of how poorly a student may perform in the virtual courses authorized by House Bill No. 42, taxpayers of that school district would be forced to pay for that student's continued enrollment. On top of this, House Bill No. 42 could greatly increase the cost of virtual education. Currently, a full-time year of courses through MoVIP costs \$3,600 per student. However, a similar schedule of potential House Bill No. 42 virtual courses could cost more than \$6,000 per student. Thus, under House Bill No. 42, private vendors can reap greater profits underwritten by Missouri taxpayers without any assurance that the students in these courses receive a high-quality education.

### **Expensive mandates and a bigger bureaucracy**

House Bill No. 42 is crammed full of new committees, special task forces, bureaucratic agencies, and idiosyncratic mandates that are unnecessary, unproven and expensive. Consider that the bill would create from whole cloth three new "educational authorities" to oversee student transfers. This bill also would impose a host of new mandatory obligations on local schools.

The legislature obviously recognized that the multitude of House Bill No. 42 dictates would be costly. Consequently, it found it necessary to create a grand total of ten new funds: the "Missouri Charter Public School Commission Revolving Fund;" the "Supplemental Tuition Fund;" the "School District Improvement Fund;" the "Student Transfer Transportation Fund;" the "St. Louis Area Education Authority Fund;" the "Kansas City Area Education Authority Fund;" the "Statewide Education Authority Fund;" the "Extended Learning Time Fund;" the "Parent Portal Fund" and the "Reclamation and Demolition Fund." The nominal existence of these funds belies their actual value; although ten new funds were created, not a single dollar was appropriated to any of them. If funds were to be appropriated at some later date, it would siphon financial resources away from K-12 education statewide.

### **Failure to include a tuition cap**

The failure to provide for a reasonable limit on the tuition that can be charged by a school district receiving transfer students would result in House Bill No. 42 draining resources from the schools that are struggling the most. These districts cannot improve the education of the children who choose to remain in their districts if they are forced to pay tuition rates for students who transfer that greatly exceed what the school district expends in funding on a per student basis, in addition to the costs of busing the students to receiving districts many miles away.

The legislature's unwillingness to establish reasonable tuition costs for sending and receiving districts evades fundamental issues of access and fairness. The lack of a tuition cap would exacerbate the already severe budgetary challenges currently faced by the Normandy Schools Cooperative and Riverview Gardens school districts for the 2015-2016 school year.

Consider that last year, receiving districts charged the two unaccredited sending districts tuition amounts as high as \$20,000 per student, greatly exceeding what these sending districts expended on students in their own schools. As a result, Normandy laid off more than 100 teachers and staff members in order to afford the cost of transfers; both unaccredited districts struggled financially. The absence of a tuition cap would perpetuate budgetary strain and uncertainty, and would not serve the best interests of Missouri's children or its taxpayers. Reasonable tuition rates are necessary for unaccredited districts to be able to improve student performance while remaining financially viable.

### **Denying hundreds of current transfer students the right to continue in their current schools**

Rather than establishing a tuition cap, House Bill No. 42 would try to reduce the costs of transfers by denying hundreds of current transfer students their legal right to continue being educated in the receiving districts. Under this bill, students who transferred from Normandy and Riverview Gardens during the 2013-14 or 2014-15 school years, but who did not attend a public school in those districts for the semester prior to the transfer, would be denied the opportunity to continue receiving an education in their new school.

If House Bill No. 42 were to become law, these students - a group that includes new residents as well as those who may have attended private schools - would not be permitted to transfer for the 2015-16 school year. Instead, the legislature would require them first to attend school for a semester in the unaccredited districts, trapping them in exactly the school setting this legislation is intended to avoid.

Sending these students back to unaccredited districts would be disruptive and counterproductive. Families should not be penalized simply for pursuing the transfer opportunities that Missouri law has provided them. Furthermore, the continuity of strong relationships with teachers, administrators, coaches, classmates and parents plays a major role in helping sustain students' academic progress and social development.

House Bill No. 42's attempt to control tuition and transportation costs by denying continuing transfer status to current students who did not attend their home school in the unaccredited district for a semester would put them at risk of losing ground both academically and developmentally.

Rather than solving the problems with Missouri's current school transfer law, House Bill No. 42 exacerbates them. Consequently, it should not become law.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **Conference Committee Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 42** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

June 4, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill Nos. 116 & 569** entitled:

“AN ACT”

To amend chapter 290, RSMo, by adding thereto one new section relating to labor organizations, with penalty provisions.

I disapprove of Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill Nos. 116 & 569. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill Nos. 116 & 569 (House Bill No. 116) is a so-called "right to work" law that would prohibit employers from requiring the payment of "any dues, fees, assessments, or other similar charges however denominated of any kind or amount to a labor organization" as a condition of employment or continued employment. It would also prohibit employers from conditioning employment or continued employment on an employee or applicant becoming or "refrain[ing] from becoming a member of a labor organization."

The "right to work" moniker is a misnomer. Right to work laws create a less skilled workforce, drive down wages and directly interfere with a business owner's right to contract. House Bill No. 116 takes this ill-advised policy one step further by also subjecting employers and others to state criminal prosecution and unlimited civil liability. House Bill No. 116 is wrong for workers, wrong for business owners and wrong for Missouri.

There are three specific reasons for my veto.

#### **I. House Bill No. 116 Is Bad for Our Economy**

House Bill No. 116 is misguided legislation designed to undermine labor organizations that produce highly skilled workers for Missouri employers. This attack on working Missourians would stunt economic growth by reducing workforce training opportunities and driving down wages. For generations, the right to collectively bargain has yielded benefits for all workers. Labor organizations, through training, apprenticeships and other programs - paid for by their members - play a valuable role by providing the skilled workers that businesses need to compete in the global economy. House Bill No. 116 would curb the ability of labor organizations to make these critical investments. Here in Missouri, we have seen the benefits of a skilled workforce, where large employers with organized workers have added thousands of jobs and made massive capital investments. Talented, union-trained workers are a key asset in attracting such investments and creating good paying jobs. House Bill No. 116 would thwart this momentum by reducing training

resources which will, in turn, result in fewer skilled workers for our businesses and create a more difficult environment for employers and labor organizations to expand our economy.

House Bill No. 116 would also drive down wages for all workers, regardless of whether such workers are members of a labor organization. On average, workers in so-called "right to work" states make considerably less per year than workers in non-right to work states. Paying workers less, whether members of labor organizations or not, and giving them fewer opportunities to learn the skills necessary to succeed, will not move our state forward.

## **II. House Bill No. 116 Constitutes Unwarranted Governmental Interference Into the Operations of Missouri Businesses**

House Bill No. 116 constitutes unwarranted governmental interference into Missouri businesses. Currently, the only way that union membership or dues payment are required as a condition of employment is if an employer agrees to that condition. Absent the *employer's* agreement, there can be no such condition. Accordingly, at its core, a so-called "right to work" law is a government-mandated prohibition directed against an *employer's* right to contract. Through this governmental interference, House Bill No. 116 would take away the rights of an *employer* to decide for itself how to run *its* business. This attack on the freedom and autonomy of Missouri employers cannot become the law of this state.

## **III. House Bill No. 116 Exposes Businesses to Criminal Prosecution and Unlimited Civil Liability**

House Bill No. 116 would subject employers to state criminal prosecution and unlimited civil liability for using labor organization membership as a condition of employment. These penalty provisions were added in a Senate committee after the bill had initially passed the House. Not only would this new crime and new liability ensnare businesses that desire to require their employees be union members, it would also authorize sanctions against businesses that attempt to condition employment on an employee "refraining" from becoming a member of a labor organization.

House Bill No. 116 would create a broad new crime, a class C misdemeanor, for any person who "directly or indirectly violates" the provisions of the bill. It would give each of the 115 local prosecuting attorneys and the attorney general sweeping authority to launch investigations into complaints of "violation or threatened violation" of its provisions, and to use "all means at their command" to enforce compliance. It is not infrequent during labor organizing campaigns, for example, for disputes to arise over an employer's hiring and firing decisions, i.e., conditions or continuation of employment, allegedly made on the basis of support for the labor organization. Under the terms of House Bill No. 116, such allegations could expose an employer to criminal prosecution. The bill would also criminalize a bargained for agreement that includes a union security clause that an employer is now free to make under current law.

On the civil side, House Bill No. 116 would expose business owners to lawsuits seeking "any and all damages of any character" that result from a "violation" or "threatened violation" of its provisions. This government overreach, enforced with the threat of criminal prosecution and civil damages, would inject new uncertainty into the operations of Missouri businesses without any positive impact on our economy.

## **IV. Conclusion**

Missouri's greatest assets are its highly skilled, well-trained workers. These Missourians produce goods and services that are consumed around the world. Their efforts and talents allow our companies to expand while also attracting new businesses to locate or move to the Show Me State. They are our relatives and our neighbors. They are the backbone of our economy.

House Bill No. 116 would represent a significant step backwards for Missouri. It would reduce wages, limit training opportunities, undermine business owners' autonomy, and expose employers and others to the threat of state criminal prosecution and unlimited civil liability. This is not a path Missouri should follow. I stand with the workers of Missouri and reject this wrongheaded legislation that will hurt our economy, our families and our businesses.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill Nos. 116 & 569** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 10, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **House Bill No. 326** entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal section 105.666, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof one new section relating to defined benefit pension plans.

I disapprove of House Bill No. 326. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

House Bill No. 326 makes a change that will impact the board of trustees of over 30 public employee retirement systems. These boards make decisions that affect over 8,000 current and former public employees, including firefighters, police officers, and county hospital workers. Because these dedicated public servants deserve educated stewards of their retirement systems, I cannot approve House Bill No. 326.

Since 2008, public retirement plans have been required to establish board member education programs to educate new board members on topics such as ethics, governance, pension plan design and administration of benefits, investments, legal liability, the sunshine law, actuarial principles, and the role of staff and consultants in plan administration. Board members are also required to annually complete continuing education programs. Last year, House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1882 added enforcement provisions to ensure compliance with these educational requirements.

House Bill No. 326 would abandon this progress by inexplicably excluding board members of defined contribution plans from these commonsense educational requirements. Retirement plans are complex entities that deal with complicated issues. Board members have a responsibility to be educated in all areas relevant to their service. That responsibility currently exists and will continue with my action today.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **House Bill No. 326** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 10, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 618** (House Bill No. 618) entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal sections 193.015, 193.145, 194.119, and 214.208, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof four new sections relating to human remains.

I disapprove of House Bill No. 618. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

House Bill No. 618 would place expediency over accuracy in the performance of the important duty of determining cause of death, a function reserved by current law for licensed physicians and duly elected officials. By allowing more individuals to certify cause of death, House Bill No. 618 presents a risk that these vital records may have inaccurate information. For these reasons, House Bill No. 618 cannot receive my support.

Death certifications are considered vital records for a reason – they provide definitive evidence of a person’s cause and manner of death and have important ramifications. Current law requires that medical certifications attesting to a person’s cause of death be completed by a physician, medical examiner, or coroner – referred to as “medical certifiers” –and then officially reported to the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS). House Bill No. 618 would also allow physician assistants, assistant physicians, and advanced practice registered nurses to determine cause of death and submit that information to DHSS. Death certificates include such things as the cause and manner of death, the place of death, the interval between a diagnosis and death, and other significant contributing conditions. All of these are important pieces of information that often have significant consequences. Decisions regarding whether a crime has been committed, whether life insurance should be paid, and how to dispose of assets, all depend on determinations regarding the decedent’s cause of death. Given the gravity of these decisions, we should not be expanding the group of individuals authorized to make that determination in the way that House Bill No. 618 does.

Moreover, House Bill No. 618 would grant immunity to the individuals authorized to determine cause of death, thus preventing anyone harmed by inaccuracies from holding that individual civilly liable absent gross negligence or willful misconduct.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 618** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 7, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **House Bill No. 629** entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal sections 86.1270, 86.1630, 169.291, and 169.450, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof four new sections relating to retirement systems.

I disapprove of House Bill No. 629. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

House Bill No. 629 makes changes to the law relating to three public employee retirement systems. These changes include two problems that will impact the Board of Trustees of the Public School Retirement System of St. Louis including the absurd requirement that a teacher or administrator from a Kansas City charter school serve on the board. Given the important role that the Board of Trustees of the Public School Retirement System of St. Louis plays in overseeing the pensions of thousands of retired teachers and employees and over 900 million dollars in assets, I cannot approve House Bill No. 629.

The Public School Retirement System of St. Louis is governed by an eleven member board of trustees. That board is responsible for managing assets of approximately \$937 million. The board oversees the retirement and disability benefits of approximately 4,689 retired teachers and employees and 4,880 active teachers and employees of the St. Louis Public Schools District and a number of charter schools located in the St. Louis Public Schools District.

Currently, five of the trustees are elected by a vote of employee members. Four of those positions are dedicated to teachers and nonteachers and, under a separate provision, a trustee position is slotted for a school administrator. House Bill No. 629 would provide that, beginning in 2016, one of the teacher/nonteacher slots would be filled by “a person employed as a teacher or administrator at a charter school, as ‘charter school’ is defined in section 169.270...” The term “charter school” as defined in section 169.270 refers to charter schools in Kansas City.<sup>1</sup> As a result of this misdirected definitional reference, House Bill No. 629 would require the members of the Public School Retirement System of St. Louis to elect a charter school teacher or administrator from Kansas City to serve on their board. While presumably unintended, the consequence of this language is clear and cannot become law.

House Bill No. 629 would also result in a conflict between the current composition of the board and the composition required by the statute. House Bill No. 629 eliminates the requirement that “nonteachers” be represented on the board, by changing the board’s composition from requiring two “nonteachers” to “not more than one.” There are presently two elected members on the board who are “nonteachers” and their terms continue through December 2017 and December 2018, respectively. The limitation of “not more than one” nonteacher would be effective August 28, 2015, prior to the end of those elected board members’ terms. House Bill No. 629 makes no provision for reducing the number of elected “nonteachers” serving on the board and would result in an illegally constituted board of trustees for more than two years.

It is important to note that charter school teachers are already eligible for election to the Board of Trustees of the Public School Retirement System of St. Louis. My action today does nothing to prevent them from being elected and serving on the Board.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **House Bill No. 629** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

<sup>1</sup> Specifically, section 169.270 defines charter school as, “any school established pursuant to sections 160.400 to 160.420 and located, at the time it is established, within the school district.” (emphasis added) “School district” is defined as “any



school district in which a retirement system shall be established under section 169.280.” 169.270 (22) RSMo. Section 169.280, RSMo includes a demographic description that applies to Kansas City and excludes the City of St. Louis.

---

July 10, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Senate Substitute No. 2 for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 722** (House Bill No. 722) entitled:

“AN ACT”

To amend chapters 260 and 285, RSMo, by adding thereto two new sections relating to prohibited ordinances by political subdivisions.

I disapprove of House Bill No. 722. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

House Bill No. 722 is a clear example of unwarranted government intrusion – in this case, interference with the policymaking of local governments and the abandonment of the principle of local control. Proponents of this legislation believe that their views should supplant the decisions of elected local officeholders on matters traditionally within the purview of local government, ranging from policies affecting the local standard of living to the more granular question of “paper or plastic.” Because I support local control, I will not approve House Bill No. 722.

Specifically, House Bill No. 722 would prohibit local governments from establishing a minimum wage or employment benefits that exceed state or federal law, and from banning or imposing a fee on plastic bags used by retailers for packaging the goods they sell. In doing so, this bill would inject the heavy hand of state government into issues typically addressed through the local democratic process. Missouri is a diverse state. In many instances, local elected officials may be best suited to determine the appropriate – and local – priorities for the citizens who elected them. And, it is important that local governments have the ability to build on the minimum standards that are set at the state level. House Bill No. 722 instead usurps local control and supplants it with edicts emanating from Jefferson City.

Local elected officials are directly accountable for their actions. If a city passes an ordinance with which the voters disagree, those local officials will be held accountable at the next election. Healthy and important debate on issues addressed by this bill has been occurring, illustrating the importance of local governments’ ability to respond to local needs. Moreover, the issues impacted by House Bill No. 722 are *local* issues. How is St. Robert affected if St. Louis passes a minimum wage higher than that required by state law? What difference does it make in Cabool if Columbia bans plastic bags? Under House Bill No. 722, cities are prohibited from providing for earned sick or bereavement leave, or extending other employment benefits that build upon minimum state standards.

The extent of governmental overreaching in House Bill No. 722 is epitomized by the plastic bag ban. Irrespective of whether one favors paper or plastic, of all of the issues facing Missouri families today, it is highly questionable that the bagging of groceries is one that warrants intervention by the long arm of state government. To be sure, there are areas that should remain the province of state law, but the limitations on local governments imposed by House Bill No. 722 do not rise to the level of a blanket statewide prohibition.

With its passage of House Bill No. 722, the General Assembly is telling local voters that legislators in Jefferson City – not they – know best how to address the local issues that their local communities face. I disagree. Local voters ought to have the right to decide these issues. Just as there should be an appropriate allocation of responsibilities between federal and state governments, so too should the precept of local control apply to the relationship between state and local governments. The power grab embodied by House Bill No. 722 clearly violates that principle.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **Senate Substitute No. 2 for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 722** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 10, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 799** (House Bill No. 799) entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal sections 67.320, 211.393, 476.083, 478.170, 478.191, 478.430, 478.433, 478.463, 478.740, 488.2206, and 600.042, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof sixteen new sections relating to judicial circuits.

I disapprove of House Bill No. 799. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

House Bill No. 799 would authorize more court fees to fund an array of local capital projects. In doing so, it continues what has evolved into a regular legislative exercise of imposing additional court fees. Local capital projects should be funded through existing local revenues or, with voter approval, new revenue sources rather than through a back-door tax in the form of court user fees. For that reason, House Bill No. 799 cannot receive my support.

House Bill No. 799 would authorize new court fees and expand existing court fees in specific judicial circuits to be used by jurisdictions identified in the legislation. These new and expanded court fees, ranging from ten to fifty dollars, would be in addition to the myriad of court fees already imposed in criminal and civil cases across our state. Moreover, these court fees would not be limited to state courts. House Bill No. 799 would authorize these fees be imposed on many county and municipal ordinance violations. The cumulative impact of these court fees is harmful to those that find themselves involved in court proceedings and could pose a barrier to court access for civil litigants.

The proliferation of excessive court fees is recasting the role of the courts into revenue generators for special projects. Court fees and surcharges should not be used as an alternative form of taxation. If a local government wants to raise revenue for its building projects, that question should be submitted to the voters for their approval rather than using the courts as a back-door revenue source. The increasingly common practice of looking to the courts to raise funds must stop. I previously approved Conference Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 5 based on the belief that our courts should serve justice rather than generate revenue, and for those same reasons the court fee increases in House Bill No. 799 will not receive my approval.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning you **Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 799** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 10, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 878** (House Bill No. 878) entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal section 590.750, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof one new section relating to corporate security advisors, with an existing penalty provision.

I disapprove of Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 878. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

As a result of legislation I approved last year, individuals may obtain a private corporate security advisor license from the State of Missouri if they satisfy the required training, education, and experience. House Bill No. 878 would significantly expand a licensed corporate security advisor’s authority and would have the Director of the Department of Public Safety confer on those individuals a “commission” if the Director deems their qualifications appropriate and they are licensed peace officers. Under current law, a “commission” is more than a paper certificate – it is a grant of authority to act as a peace officer. This bill, therefore, would give an individual working for a private company the power to arrest, the power to search, and the power to seize property. House Bill No. 878 cannot receive my approval.

In Missouri, the authority to act as a peace officer has rightfully been reserved for officers employed by recognized criminal justice agencies created by state or federal statutes and with clearly defined jurisdiction and authority. For example, county sheriff departments, municipal police, railroad police, and the Missouri State Highway Patrol have the power to enforce criminal laws but only within the jurisdictional boundaries and limits provided by their authorizing statute. Thus, officers employed by those agencies are commissioned to act as peace officers to carry out those duties and, as a result, are empowered to make arrests, conduct searches, and seize evidence within the confines of their agencies’ statutory powers.

The authority to arrest and seize personal property is the ultimate exercise of power in our democracy and should only be bestowed in the most narrow circumstances. House Bill No. 878, however, would confer on private corporate security advisors the same powers and authority as a commissioned peace officer, such as a city police officer or deputy sheriff, without any of the jurisdictional restrictions imposed on those officers and without any clear limits on their authority. Thus, commissioned corporate security advisors employed by domestic or foreign corporations would be cloaked with police authority to search a private car or residence anywhere in Missouri. For example, this bill would give a corporate security advisor working for a company in St. Louis the power to arrest someone in Kennett. That cloak of authority would provide a basis to detain and question anyone that came under their suspicion, regardless of whether that person was on corporate property. Their power of arrest would go well beyond that provided to city police and deputy sheriffs since they would not be limited by jurisdictional boundaries within Missouri. In all, these powers would far exceed a corporate security advisor’s current authority.

Even more troubling, there is no assurance that actions taken against citizens by commissioned corporate security advisors working solely on behalf of their private employers would be subject to the same constitutional restrictions that are imposed on officers working for government law enforcement agencies. Throughout American history, limitations on the use of police powers have been a cornerstone of our constitutional jurisprudence for good reason: Seizing private property and confining people against their will should only be done with strict adherence to the constitutional rights that protect personal freedom and liberty. However, the protections provided to citizens by the constitution, such as the right to be free from unreasonable searches, seizures and arrests, apply only to governmental actions.

If a commissioned corporate security advisor’s actions are deemed purely non-governmental, a citizen may rightfully assert a violation of their personal freedom or liberty, yet not receive the benefit of constitutional protection because the violation involved a private corporate security advisor. For example, a teenager who finds himself the subject of an investigation for trespassing on corporate property could be interrogated by a commissioned corporate security advisor without the benefit of Miranda warnings and be unable to successfully raise a constitutional challenge in criminal court. Private emails and correspondence could be confiscated and the owner would not have the ability to successfully

challenge those seizures as a violation of the Fourth Amendment. And, property owners may not be justified in relying on state laws allowing them to stand their ground if a commissioned corporate security advisor cloaked with police authority comes onto their property.

If, on the other hand, a commissioned corporate security advisor is considered a state actor, they and their employers would potentially be subject to federal civil rights claims under 42 U.S.C. 1983 for violation of constitutional rights. While the proponents of this legislation may not have contemplated the potential for federal civil rights liability, those remedies would provide little solace to individuals that are held or interrogated against their will on behalf of a corporation's interest. Because I cannot condone such a broad grant of police authority to private individuals, this bill cannot receive my approval.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 878** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 10, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **House Bill No. 1022** entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal section 379.470, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof one new section relating to authorized return of premiums paid by insureds.

I disapprove of House Bill No. 1022. My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

House Bill No. 1022 is an effort to tilt the scales against Missouri consumers by providing insurance companies legal cover to not disclose the details of their premium refund programs. House Bill No. 1022 represents a step backwards for Missouri consumers and cannot receive my approval.

House Bill No. 1022 would exempt insurance refund or rebate programs from the protections afforded consumers under Missouri's Unfair Trade Practice Act. Currently, under the Unfair Trade Practice Act, a return of premium program must be “specified in the contract” to avoid illegal rebating. Section 375.936(9)(a), RSMo. If House Bill No. 1022 were to become law, an insurance company would no longer be required to include the refund program's terms and conditions in its customer's policy – and in fact, incredulously, the law would impose no requirement on an insurance company to provide notice of program details to its insureds.

An insured should be required to look no further than their insurance policy to find the details of their coverage, exclusions, and other relevant content including the particulars of a return of premium program. This is not an area to be left to guesswork. Full disclosure is essential and details matter. Missouri law must demand that insurance companies inform consumers in plain, clear and understandable terms the rules and parameters of all aspects of their policies. Instead, House Bill No. 1022 journeys in the opposite direction, benefits insurance companies, harms consumers and cannot become law.

Missourians deserve fairness and transparency in their laws and in the terms of their insurance policies. House Bill No. 1022 fails on both counts and does not receive my approval.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **House Bill No. 1022** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

---

July 7, 2015

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Herewith I return to you **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098** entitled:

“AN ACT”

To repeal section 362.600, RSMo, and to enact in lieu thereof one new section relating to trust companies.

I disapprove of Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098. My reasons for disapproval are as follows: Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098 makes changes to the operational parameters and reciprocity criteria applicable to out-of-state trust companies seeking to conduct business in Missouri. The legislation would permit out-of-state trust companies to operate in Missouri under more favorable rules than those applicable to Missouri-based trust companies. While the changes contained in Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098 may have been motivated by a desire to provide Missouri-chartered trust companies greater reciprocity opportunities in other states, it would accomplish this by lowering capital requirements for out-of-state trust companies wishing to operate in Missouri. This legislation is a step backwards for Missouri and does not receive my approval.

Missouri chartered non-depository trust companies must satisfy a one million dollar capital requirement. The same capital requirement is applicable to non-depository trust companies chartered in a different state seeking reciprocity to operate in Missouri. This capital threshold provides a measure of the entity’s financial stability and protection to its customers in the event of a breach of the trust company’s fiduciary obligations. Although Missouri’s one million dollar minimum capital requirement is less than the national average, it is nevertheless higher than some of our neighboring states including Kansas, which has only a \$500,000 capital requirement – one of the lowest amounts in the nation.

Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098 would allow Missouri regulators to accept a lower capital requirement from non-depository trust companies chartered in states that impose capital requirements below Missouri’s statutory limit. This provision would permit less capitalized out-of-state entities to conduct business in Missouri under more lenient standards than those imposed on Missouri-based trust companies. While the impetus behind this provision might have been to assist Missouri chartered trust companies to more easily gain reciprocity in other states, this should not be accomplished by lowering our standards and financial protections.

In accordance with the above stated reasons for disapproval, I am returning **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098** without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon  
Governor

## HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

Representative Cierpiot offered **HR 1**, which was read.

### HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-eighth General Assembly, First Regular Session, inform the Governor and the Senate that the House is duly convened and is now in session in the 2015 Constitutional Veto Session and ready for consideration of business.

On motion of Representative Cierpiot, **HR 1** was adopted.

## VETOED HOUSE BILLS

The Speaker read the following House Bills vetoed from the First Regular Session: **CCS SCS HCS HB 10, HB 326, HB 629** and **HB 1022**.

**HB 1022**, relating to authorized return of premiums paid by insureds, was taken up by Representative Gosen.

Representative Gosen moved that **HB 1022** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Speaker Pro Tem Hoskins assumed the Chair.

On motion of Representative Gosen, **HB 1022** passed by the following vote, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding:

AYES: 122

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Burns	Chipman	Cierpiot
Conway 104	Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford
Cross	Curtis	Curtman	Davis	Dogan
Dohrman	Dugger	Eggleston	Ellington	Engler
English	Entlicher	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144	Fitzwater 49
Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin	Frederick	Gannon
Gosen	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen	Harris
Hicks	Higdon	Hill	Hinson	Hoskins
Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst	Johnson
Jones	Justus	Keeney	Kelley	Kidd
King	Koenig	Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair
Lant	Lauer	Leara	Lichtenegger	Love
Lynch	Marshall	Mathews	McCaherty	McDaniel
McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Montecillo	Moon
Morris	Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson	Pfautsch
Phillips	Pietzman	Pike	Pogue	Redmon
Rehder	Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads	Roden
Roeber	Rone	Ross	Rowden	Rowland
Ruth	Shaul	Shull	Shumake	Solon

Sommer	Spencer	Swan	Taylor	Vescovo
Walker	White	Wiemann	Wilson	Wood
Zerr	Mr. Speaker			

NOES: 038

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Butler	Carpenter
Colona	Conway 10	Dunn	Gardner	Green
Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick	Kirkton	Kratky
LaFaver	Lavender	May	McCann Beatty	McCreery
McDonald	McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten
Morgan	Newman	Nichols	Norr	Otto
Pace	Peters	Pierson	Rizzo	Runions
Smith	Walton Gray	Webber		

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 000

VACANCIES: 003

Speaker Richardson resumed the Chair.

## MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 1

BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate that the Secretary of Senate inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is duly convened and is now in session as provided by Article III, Section 32 of the Constitution and is ready for consideration of its business.

### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 2

BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate that the rules of the Senate, as adopted by the Ninety-eighth General Assembly, First Regular Session, be declared to be the rules of the Veto Session of the Ninety-eighth General Assembly.

## VETOED HOUSE BILLS

The Speaker read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SCS HB 1098**.

**SCS HB 1098**, relating to trust companies, was taken up by Representative Crawford.

Representative Crawford moved that **SCS HB 1098** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 118

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter

Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 104
Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross
Curtis	Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman
Dugger	Eggleston	Engler	English	Entlicher
Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144	Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker
Franklin	Frederick	Gannon	Gosen	Haahr
Haefner	Hansen	Hicks	Higdon	Hill
Hinson	Hoskins	Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht
Hurst	Johnson	Jones	Justus	Keeney
Kelley	Kidd	King	Koenig	Kolkmeyer
Korman	Lair	Lant	Lauer	Leara
Lichtenegger	Love	Lynch	Mathews	McCaherty
McDaniel	McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Montecillo
Moon	Morris	Muntzel	Neely	Nichols
Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips	Pietzman	Pike
Redmon	Rehder	Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads
Roden	Roeber	Rone	Ross	Rowden
Rowland	Ruth	Shaul	Shull	Shumake
Solon	Sommer	Spencer	Swan	Taylor
Vescovo	Walker	White	Wiemann	Wilson
Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker		

NOES: 042

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Burns	Butler
Carpenter	Colona	Conway 10	Dunn	Ellington
Gardner	Green	Harris	Hubbard	Hummel
Kendrick	Kirkton	Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender
Marshall	May	McCann Beatty	McCreery	McDonald
McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten	Morgan
Newman	Norr	Otto	Pace	Peters
Pierson	Pogue	Rizzo	Runions	Smith
Walton Gray	Webber			

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 000

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SS#2 HCS HB 722**.

**SS#2 HCS HB 722**, relating to prohibited ordinances by political subdivisions, was taken up by Representative Shaul.

Representative Shaul moved that **SS#2 HCS HB 722** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Speaker Pro Tem Hoskins resumed the Chair.

Speaker Richardson resumed the Chair.



On motion of Representative Shaul, **SS# HCS HB 722** passed by the following vote, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding:

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 114

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 104
Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross
Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman	Dugger
Eggleston	Engler	English	Entlicher	Fitzpatrick
Fitzwater 144	Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin
Frederick	Gannon	Gosen	Haahr	Haefner
Hansen	Hicks	Higdon	Hill	Hinson
Hoskins	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst	Johnson
Jones	Justus	Keeney	Kelley	Kidd
King	Koenig	Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair
Lant	Lauer	Leara	Lichtenegger	Love
Lynch	Marshall	Mathews	McCaherty	McDaniel
McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Moon	Morris
Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips
Pietzman	Pike	Pogue	Redmon	Rehder
Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads	Roden	Roeber
Rone	Ross	Rowden	Rowland	Ruth
Shaul	Shumake	Solon	Sommer	Spencer
Swan	Taylor	Vescovo	White	Wiemann
Wilson	Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker	

NOES: 046

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Burns	Butler
Carpenter	Colona	Conway 10	Curtis	Dunn
Ellington	Gardner	Green	Harris	Hough
Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick	Kirkton	Kratky
LaFaver	Lavender	May	McCann Beatty	McCreery
McDonald	McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten
Montecillo	Morgan	Newman	Nichols	Norr
Otto	Pace	Peters	Pierson	Rizzo
Runions	Shull	Smith	Walker	Walton Gray
Webber				

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 000

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SCS HCS HB 618**.

**SCS HCS HB 618**, relating to human remains, was taken up by Representative Fraker.

Representative Fraker moved that **SCS HCS HB 618** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 123

Alferman	Allen	Anders	Anderson	Andrews
Austin	Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard
Bernskoetter	Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin
Brown 57	Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot
Conway 10	Conway 104	Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo
Crawford	Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman
Dugger	Eggleston	Engler	English	Entlicher
Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144	Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker
Franklin	Gannon	Gosen	Haahr	Haefner
Hansen	Harris	Hicks	Higdon	Hill
Hinson	Hoskins	Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht
Hurst	Johnson	Jones	Justus	Keeney
Kelley	Kendrick	Kidd	King	Kirkton
Koenig	Kolkmeier	Korman	Kratky	LaFaver
Lair	Lant	Lauer	Lavender	Leara
Lichtenegger	Love	Lynch	Mathews	McCaherty
McCreery	McDaniel	McGaugh	Messenger	Miller
Montecillo	Moon	Morris	Muntzel	Parkinson
Peters	Pfautsch	Phillips	Pietzman	Pike
Redmon	Rehder	Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads
Roden	Roeber	Rone	Ross	Rowden
Rowland	Ruth	Shaul	Shull	Shumake
Solon	Sommer	Swan	Taylor	Vescovo
Walker	Webber	White	Wiemann	Wilson
Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker		

NOES: 035

Adams	Arthur	Burns	Butler	Carpenter
Colona	Dunn	Ellington	Frederick	Gardner
Green	Hubbard	Hummel	Marshall	May
McCann Beatty	McDonald	McNeil	Meredith	Mims
Mitten	Morgan	Neely	Newman	Nichols
Norr	Otto	Pace	Pierson	Pogue
Rizzo	Runions	Smith	Spencer	Walton Gray

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 002

Cross                      Curtis

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SCS HCS HBs 116 & 569.**

**SCS HCS HBs 116 & 569**, relating to labor organizations, was taken up by Representative Burlison.

Representative Burlison moved that **SCS HCS HBs 116 & 569** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Representative Keeney assumed the Chair.

Speaker Richardson resumed the Chair.

Representative Burlison again moved that **SCS HCS HBs 116 & 569** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was defeated by the following vote:

AYES: 096

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57	Brown 94	Burlison
Chipman	Cierpiot	Cookson	Cornejo	Crawford
Cross	Curtis	Curtman	Davis	Dogan
Dohrman	Dugger	Eggleston	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 49
Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin	Frederick	Gosen
Haahr	Haefner	Hansen	Hill	Hoskins
Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst	Johnson
Jones	Justus	Keeney	Kelley	Koenig
Kolkmeier	Lair	Lant	Leara	Lichtenegger
Love	Lynch	Marshall	Mathews	McDaniel
McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Moon	Morris
Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips
Pietzman	Pike	Pogue	Redmon	Rehder
Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads	Roeber	Rone
Ross	Rowden	Rowland	Shaul	Shull
Shumake	Spencer	Swan	Taylor	Vescovo
Walker	White	Wiemann	Wilson	Wood
Mr. Speaker				

NOES: 063

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Black	Burns
Butler	Carpenter	Colona	Conway 10	Conway 104
Corlew	Dunn	Ellington	Engler	English
Entlicher	Fitzwater 144	Gannon	Gardner	Green
Harris	Hicks	Higdon	Hinson	Hubbard
Hummel	Kendrick	Kidd	King	Kirkton
Korman	Kratky	LaFaver	Lauer	Lavender
May	McCaherty	McCann Beatty	McCreery	McDonald
McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten	Montecillo
Morgan	Newman	Nichols	Norr	Otto
Pace	Peters	Pierson	Rizzo	Roden
Runions	Ruth	Smith	Solon	Sommer
Walton Gray	Webber	Zerr		

PRESENT: 001

Berry

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 000

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SS SCS HB 799**.

**SS SCS HB 799**, relating to judicial circuits, was taken up by Representative Roeber.

Representative Roeber moved that **SS SCS HB 799** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Speaker Pro Tem Hoskins resumed the Chair.

On motion of Representative Roeber, **SS SCS HB 799** passed by the following vote, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding:

AYES: 111

Alferman	Allen	Anders	Anderson	Andrews
Austin	Bahr	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 10
Conway 104	Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford
Cross	Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman
Dugger	Eggleston	Engler	English	Fitzpatrick
Fitzwater 144	Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin
Gannon	Gosen	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen
Hicks	Higdon	Hill	Hinson	Hoskins
Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Jones	Justus
Keeney	Kelley	Kidd	King	Koenig
Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair	Lant	Lauer
Leara	Lichtenegger	Love	Lynch	Mathews
McDaniel	McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Montecillo
Moon	Morris	Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson
Pfautsch	Phillips	Pietzman	Pike	Redmon
Rehder	Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads	Roden
Roeber	Rone	Ross	Rowden	Rowland
Ruth	Shaul	Shull	Shumake	Solon
Sommer	Spencer	Swan	Taylor	Vescovo
Walker	White	Wiemann	Wood	Zerr
Mr. Speaker				

NOES: 044

Adams	Arthur	Barnes	Burns	Carpenter
Colona	Dunn	Ellington	Frederick	Gardner
Harris	Hubbard	Hummel	Hurst	Johnson
Kendrick	Kirkton	Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender
Marshall	May	McCann Beatty	McCreery	McDonald

McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten	Morgan
Newman	Nichols	Norr	Otto	Pace
Peters	Pierson	Pogue	Rizzo	Runions
Smith	Walton Gray	Webber	Wilson	

PRESENT: 001

Green

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 004

Butler	Curtis	Entlicher	McCaherty
--------	--------	-----------	-----------

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker Pro Tem read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session:  
**SCS HB 878.**

**SCS HB 878**, relating to corporate security advisors, was taken up by Representative Rhoads.

Representative Rhoads moved that **SCS HB 878** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 115

Adams	Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews
Austin	Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard
Bernskoetter	Berry	Black	Bondon	Brown 94
Burlison	Burns	Butler	Chipman	Cierpiot
Conway 104	Cookson	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross
Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman	Dugger
Eggleston	Engler	English	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144
Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin	Frederick
Gannon	Gosen	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen
Harris	Hicks	Higdon	Hill	Hinson
Hoskins	Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst
Johnson	Jones	Justus	Keeney	Kidd
King	Koenig	Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair
Lauer	Leara	Lichtenegger	Love	Lynch
Mathews	McCaherty	McCreery	McDaniel	McGaugh
Meredith	Messenger	Miller	Mitten	Montecillo
Moon	Morris	Muntzel	Neely	Nichols
Parkinson	Pfautsch	Pietzman	Pike	Redmon
Rehder	Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads	Roden
Roeber	Rone	Ross	Rowden	Ruth
Shaul	Shull	Shumake	Solon	Sommer
Spencer	Swan	Taylor	Vescovo	Walker
White	Wiemann	Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker

NOES: 040

Anders	Arthur	Brattin	Brown 57	Carpenter
Colona	Conway 10	Corlew	Dunn	Ellington

22 *Journal of the House*

Gardner	Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick	Kirkton
Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender	Marshall	May
McCann Beatty	McDonald	McNeil	Mims	Morgan
Newman	Norr	Otto	Pace	Peters
Phillips	Pierson	Pogue	Rizzo	Rowland
Runions	Smith	Walton Gray	Webber	Wilson

PRESENT: 002

Green                      Kelley

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 003

Curtis                      Entlicher                      Lant

VACANCIES: 003

Speaker Richardson resumed the Chair.

The Speaker read the following House Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **CCS SCS HCS HB 42**.

**CCS SCS HCS HB 42**, relating to elementary and secondary education, was taken up by Representative Wood.

Representative Wood moved that **CCS SCS HCS HB 42** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

The motion to pass **CCS SCS HCS HB 42**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding, was withdrawn.

## HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

Representative Cierpiot offered **HR 2**.

### HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 2

BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives inform the Senate that the House, having been duly convened as provided by Section 32, Article III of the Constitution, made no motion to override the Governor's vetoes on **CCS SCS HCS HB 10**, **HB 326**, and **HB 629**, when the bills were called by the Speaker.

On motion of Representative Cierpiot, **House Resolution No. 2** was adopted.

On motion of Representative Cierpiot, the House recessed until 6:15 p.m.

## EVENING SESSION

The hour of recess having expired, the House was called to order by Speaker Richardson.

**RECESS**

On motion of Representative Cierpiot, the House recessed until 7:15 p.m.

The hour of recess having expired, the House was called to order by Speaker Richardson.

Representative Cierpiot suggested the absence of a quorum.

The following roll call indicated a quorum present:

AYES: 044

Alferman	Allen	Basye	Bondon	Brown 94
Burlison	Cookson	Cross	Curtman	Fitzwater 144
Fraker	Franklin	Frederick	Gannon	Gosen
Hansen	Harris	Hoskins	Houghton	Hubbard
Hubrecht	Hurst	Keeney	Kelley	Koenig
Korman	Kratky	Lichtenegger	Love	McDaniel
McGaugh	Montecillo	Morris	Rehder	Reiboldt
Rizzo	Ross	Rowden	Shull	Taylor
White	Wilson	Wood	Zerr	

NOES: 003

Barnes	Curtis	Marshall
--------	--------	----------

PRESENT: 103

Adams	Anders	Anderson	Andrews	Arthur
Austin	Bahr	Beard	Bernskoetter	Berry
Black	Brattin	Brown 57	Butler	Chipman
Cierpiot	Colona	Conway 10	Conway 104	Corlew
Cornejo	Crawford	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman
Dugger	Eggleston	English	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 49
Flanigan	Gardner	Green	Haahr	Haefner
Hicks	Higdon	Hill	Hinson	Hough
Hummel	Johnson	Jones	Justus	Kendrick
Kidd	King	Kirkton	Kolkmeyer	Lair
Lant	Lauer	Lavender	Leara	Lynch
Mathews	May	McCaherty	McCann Beatty	McCreery
McDonald	McNeil	Meredith	Messenger	Miller
Mims	Mitten	Moon	Morgan	Muntzel
Neely	Newman	Nichols	Norr	Otto
Pace	Parkinson	Peters	Pfautsch	Phillips
Pierson	Pietzman	Pike	Pogue	Redmon
Remole	Rhoads	Roden	Roeber	Rowland
Runions	Ruth	Shaul	Solon	Sommer
Spencer	Swan	Vescovo	Walker	Walton Gray
Webber	Wiemann	Mr. Speaker		

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 010

Burns	Carpenter	Dunn	Ellington	Engler
Entlicher	LaFaver	Rone	Shumake	Smith

VACANCIES: 003

**MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE**

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Bill No. 20**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Bill No. 20**.

AYES: 28

Brown	Cunningham	Curls	Dixon	Emery
Hegeman	Holsman	Kehoe	Kraus	Libla
Munzlinger	Nasheed	Onder	Parson	Pearce
Richard	Riddle	Romine	Sater	Schaaf
Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt	Sifton	Silvey
Wallingford	Wasson	Wieland		

NOES: 4

Chappelle-Nadal	Keaveny	Schupp	Walsh
-----------------	---------	--------	-------

In which the concurrence of the House is respectfully requested.

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Substitute No. 3 for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 142**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Substitute No. 3 for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 142**.

AYES: 24

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger	Onder
Parson	Pearce	Richard	Riddle	Romine
Sater	Schaaf	Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt
Silvey	Wallingford	Wasson	Wieland	

NOES: 8

Chappelle-Nadal	Curls	Holsman	Keaveny	Nasheed
Schupp	Sifton	Walsh		

In which the concurrence of the House is respectfully requested.

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 224**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.



Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 224.**

AYES: 24

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger	Onder
Parson	Pearce	Richard	Riddle	Romine
Sater	Schaaf	Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt
Silvey	Wallingford	Wasson	Wieland	

NOES: 8

Chappelle-Nadal	Curly	Holsman	Keaveny	Nasheed
Schupp	Sifton	Walsh		

In which the concurrence of the House is respectfully requested.

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 345**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 345.**

AYES: 26

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Holsman	Kehoe	Libla	Munzlinger	Nasheed
Onder	Parson	Pearce	Richard	Riddle
Romine	Sater	Schaaf	Schaefer	Schatz
Schmitt	Silvey	Wallingford	Walsh	Wasson
Wieland				

NOES: 6

Chappelle-Nadal	Curly	Keaveny	Kraus	Schupp
Sifton				

In which the concurrence of the House is respectfully requested.

### VETOED SENATE BILLS

The Speaker read the following Senate Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SB 20.**

**SB 20**, relating to a sales tax exemption for commercial laundries, was taken up by Representative Jones.

Representative Jones moved that **SB 20** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 110

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter	Berry
Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57	Brown 94
Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 104	Cookson
Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross	Curtman
Davis	Dogan	Dohrman	Dugger	Engler
Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144	Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker
Franklin	Frederick	Gannon	Gosen	Haahr
Haefner	Hansen	Hicks	Higdon	Hill
Hinson	Hoskins	Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht
Hurst	Johnson	Jones	Justus	Keeney
Kelley	Kidd	King	Koenig	Kolkmeier
Korman	Lair	Lant	Lauer	Leara
Lichtenegger	Love	Lynch	Mathews	McCaherty
McDaniel	McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Moon
Morris	Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson	Pfautsch
Phillips	Pietzman	Pike	Redmon	Rehder
Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads	Roden	Roeber
Ross	Rowden	Rowland	Ruth	Shaul
Shull	Shumake	Solon	Sommer	Spencer
Swan	Taylor	Vescovo	Walker	White
Wiemann	Wilson	Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker

NOES: 046

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Barnes	Butler
Carpenter	Colona	Conway 10	Curtis	Dunn
Eggleston	Ellington	English	Gardner	Green
Harris	Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick	Kirkton
Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender	Marshall	May
McCann Beatty	McCreery	McDonald	McNeil	Meredith
Mims	Mitten	Montecillo	Morgan	Newman
Nichols	Norr	Otto	Pace	Peters
Pierson	Pogue	Rizzo	Runions	Walton Gray
Webber				

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 004

Burns	Entlicher	Rone	Smith
-------	-----------	------	-------

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker read the following Senate Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SS#3 SCS SB 142**.

**SS#3 SCS SB 142**, relating to implementation impact reports, was taken up by Representative Ross.

Representative Ross moved that **SS#3 SCS SB 142** be passed, the objections of the Governor

thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 114

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 104
Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross
Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman	Dugger
Eggleston	Engler	English	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144
Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin	Frederick
Gannon	Gosen	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen
Harris	Hicks	Hill	Hinson	Hoskins
Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst	Johnson
Jones	Justus	Keeney	Kelley	Kidd
King	Koenig	Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair
Lant	Lauer	Leara	Lichtenegger	Love
Lynch	Marshall	Mathews	McCaherty	McDaniel
McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Moon	Morris
Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips
Pietzman	Pike	Redmon	Rehder	Reiboldt
Remole	Rhoads	Roden	Roerber	Ross
Rowden	Rowland	Ruth	Shaul	Shull
Shumake	Solon	Sommer	Spencer	Swan
Taylor	Vescovo	Walker	White	Wiemann
Wilson	Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker	

NOES: 039

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Butler	Carpenter
Conway 10	Curtis	Dunn	Ellington	Gardner
Green	Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick	Kirkton
Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender	McCann Beatty	McCreery
McDonald	McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten
Montecillo	Morgan	Newman	Nichols	Norr
Otto	Pace	Peters	Pierson	Pogue
Rizzo	Runions	Walton Gray	Webber	

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 007

Burns	Colona	Entlicher	Higdon	May
Rone	Smith			

VACANCIES: 003

The Speaker read the following Senate Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SCS SB 224**.

**SCS SB 224**, relating to eligibility criteria for reimbursements from the A+ schools program, was taken up by Representative Fitzpatrick.

Representative Fitzpatrick moved that **SCS SB 224** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Representative Keeney resumed the Chair.

Representative Cierpiot moved the previous question.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 112

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 104
Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross
Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman	Dugger
Eggleston	Engler	English	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144
Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Frederick	Gannon
Gosen	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen	Hicks
Hill	Hinson	Hoskins	Hough	Houghton
Hubrecht	Hurst	Johnson	Jones	Justus
Keeney	Kelley	Kidd	King	Koenig
Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair	Lant	Lauer
Leara	Lichtenegger	Love	Lynch	Marshall
Mathews	McCaherty	McDaniel	McGaugh	Messenger
Miller	Moon	Morris	Muntzel	Neely
Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips	Pietzman	Pike
Redmon	Rehder	Reiboldt	Remole	Rhoads
Roden	Roerber	Ross	Rowden	Rowland
Ruth	Shaul	Shull	Shumake	Solon
Sommer	Spencer	Swan	Taylor	Vescovo
Walker	White	Wiemann	Wilson	Wood
Zerr	Mr. Speaker			

NOES: 036

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Butler	Carpenter
Colona	Curtis	Dunn	Ellington	Gardner
Green	Harris	Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick
Kirkton	Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender	McCann Beatty
McCreery	McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten
Morgan	Newman	Nichols	Norr	Otto
Pace	Pierson	Rizzo	Runions	Walton Gray
Webber				

PRESENT: 001

Pogue

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 011

Burns	Conway 10	Entlicher	Franklin	Higdon
May	McDonald	Montecillo	Peters	Rone
Smith				

VACANCIES: 003

On motion of Representative Fitzpatrick, **SCS SB 224** passed by the following vote, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding:

AYES: 114

Alferman	Allen	Anderson	Andrews	Austin
Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard	Bernskoetter
Berry	Black	Bondon	Brattin	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 104
Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford	Cross
Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman	Dugger
Eggleston	Engler	English	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144
Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin	Frederick
Gannon	Green	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen
Harris	Hicks	Hill	Hinson	Hoskins
Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst	Johnson
Jones	Justus	Keeney	Kelley	Kidd
King	Koenig	Kolkmeier	Korman	Lair
Lant	Lauer	Leara	Lichtenegger	Love
Lynch	Marshall	Mathews	McCaherty	McDaniel
McGaugh	Messenger	Miller	Moon	Morris
Muntzel	Neely	Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips
Pietzman	Pike	Redmon	Rehder	Reiboldt
Remole	Rhoads	Roden	Roeber	Ross
Rowden	Rowland	Ruth	Shaul	Shull
Shumake	Solon	Sommer	Spencer	Swan
Taylor	Vescovo	Walker	White	Wiemann
Wilson	Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker	

NOES: 037

Adams	Anders	Arthur	Butler	Carpenter
Colona	Conway 10	Curtis	Dunn	Ellington
Gardner	Hubbard	Hummel	Kendrick	Kirkton
Kratky	LaFaver	Lavender	McCann Beatty	McCreery
McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten	Montecillo
Morgan	Newman	Nichols	Norr	Otto
Pace	Pierson	Pogue	Rizzo	Runions
Walton Gray	Webber			

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 009

Burns	Entlicher	Gosen	Higdon	May
McDonald	Peters	Rone	Smith	

VACANCIES: 003

Speaker Richardson resumed the Chair.

The Speaker read the following Senate Bill vetoed from the First Regular Session: **SCS SB 345**.

**SCS SB 345**, relating to financial transactions, was taken up by Representative Dugger.

Representative Dugger moved that **SCS SB 345** be passed, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Which motion was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 114

Alferman	Allen	Anders	Anderson	Andrews
Austin	Bahr	Barnes	Basye	Beard
Bernskoetter	Berry	Black	Bondon	Brown 57
Brown 94	Burlison	Chipman	Cierpiot	Conway 10
Conway 104	Cookson	Corlew	Cornejo	Crawford
Cross	Curtman	Davis	Dogan	Dohrman
Dugger	Engler	English	Fitzpatrick	Fitzwater 144
Fitzwater 49	Flanigan	Fraker	Franklin	Frederick
Gannon	Gosen	Haahr	Haefner	Hansen
Harris	Hicks	Hill	Hinson	Hoskins
Hough	Houghton	Hubrecht	Hurst	Jones
Justus	Keeney	Kelley	Kidd	King
Koenig	Kolkmeyer	Korman	LaFaver	Lair
Lant	Lauer	Leara	Lichtenegger	Love
Lynch	Mathews	McCaherty	McDaniel	McGaugh
Messenger	Miller	Moon	Morris	Muntzel
Neely	Nichols	Parkinson	Pfautsch	Phillips
Pietzman	Pike	Redmon	Rehder	Reiboldt
Remole	Rhoads	Roden	Roeber	Ross
Rowden	Rowland	Ruth	Shaul	Shull
Shumake	Solon	Sommer	Spencer	Swan
Taylor	Vescovo	Walker	White	Wiemann
Wilson	Wood	Zerr	Mr. Speaker	

NOES: 037

Adams	Arthur	Butler	Carpenter	Colona
Curtis	Dunn	Eggleston	Ellington	Gardner
Green	Hubbard	Hummel	Johnson	Kendrick
Kirkton	Kratky	Lavender	Marshall	McCann Beatty
McCreery	McNeil	Meredith	Mims	Mitten
Montecillo	Morgan	Newman	Norr	Otto
Pace	Pierson	Pogue	Rizzo	Runions
Walton Gray	Webber			

PRESENT: 000

ABSENT WITH LEAVE: 009

Brattin	Burns	Entlicher	Higdon	May
McDonald	Peters	Rone	Smith	

VACANCIES: 003

### MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill**

**No. 618**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 618**.

AYES: 26

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger	Nasheed
Onder	Parson	Pearce	Richard	Riddle
Romine	Sater	Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt
Schupp	Silvey	Wallingford	Walsh	Wasson
Wieland				

NOES: 6

Chappelle-Nadal	Curls	Holsman	Keaveny	Schaaf
Sifton				

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **House Bill No. 1022**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **House Bill No. 1022**.

AYES: 29

Brown	Chappelle-Nadal	Cunningham	Curls	Dixon
Emery	Hegeman	Holsman	Kehoe	Kraus
Libla	Munzlinger	Nasheed	Onder	Parson
Pearce	Richard	Romine	Sater	Schaaf
Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt	Silvey	Wallingford
Walsh	Wasson	Wieland		

NOES: 3

Keaveny	Schupp	Sifton
---------	--------	--------

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 1098**.

AYES: 26

Brown	Cunningham	Curls	Dixon	Emery
Hegeman	Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger
Nasheed	Onder	Parson	Pearce	Richard
Riddle	Romine	Sater	Schaaf	Schaefer
Schatz	Schmitt	Silvey	Wallingford	Wasson
Wieland				

NOES: 6

Chappelle-Nadal Walsh	Holsman	Keaveny	Schupp	Sifton
--------------------------	---------	---------	--------	--------

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 878**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 878**.

AYES: 26

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger	Nasheed
Onder	Parson	Pearce	Richard	Riddle
Romine	Sater	Schaaf	Schaefer	Schatz
Schmitt	Silvey	Wallingford	Walsh	Wasson
Wieland				

NOES: 6

Chappelle-Nadal Sifton	Curly	Holsman	Keaveny	Schupp
---------------------------	-------	---------	---------	--------

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **House Bill No. 150**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **House Bill No. 150**.

AYES: 24

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger	Onder
Parson	Pearce	Richard	Riddle	Romine
Sater	Schaaf	Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt
Silvey	Wallingford	Wasson	Wieland	

NOES: 8

Chappelle-Nadal Schupp	Curly Sifton	Holsman Walsh	Keaveny	Nasheed
---------------------------	-----------------	------------------	---------	---------

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

August 6, 2015

Mr. D. Adam Crumbliss  
Chief Clerk  
Missouri House of Representatives  
State Capitol Building  
Jefferson City, MO 65101



Dear Mr. Crumbliss:

Pursuant to House Rule 22, I hereby remove myself, Speaker Todd Richardson, as Chairman of the Ethics Committee and appoint Representative Mike Cierpiot to serve as chairman.

If you have any questions regarding this communication, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

/s/ Todd Richardson  
Speaker  
Missouri House of Representatives

### RECESS

On motion of Representative Cierpiot, the House recessed until such time that the House receives a message from the Senate on SS#2 HCS HB 722, or until the Senate adjourns, whichever comes first, and then stand adjourned sine die pursuant to the Constitution.

### MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed **Senate Substitute No. 2 for House Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 722**, the objections of the Governor thereto notwithstanding.

Also, the attached is a certified copy of the Roll Call on **Senate Substitute No. 2 for House Committee Substitute for the House Bill No. 722**.

AYES: 23

Brown	Cunningham	Dixon	Emery	Hegeman
Kehoe	Kraus	Libla	Munzlinger	Onder
Parson	Richard	Riddle	Romine	Sater
Schaaf	Schaefer	Schatz	Schmitt	Silvey
Wallingford	Wasson	Wieland		

NOES: 9

Chappelle-Nadal	Curly	Holsman	Keaveny	Nasheed
Pearce	Schupp	Sifton	Walsh	

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has taken up and passed **Senate Resolution No. 19**.

### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 19

BE IT RESOLVED by the Senate that the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives that the Senate, having been duly convened as provided by Article III, Section 32 of the Constitution, made no motion to override the Governor's veto of **Conference Committee Substitute for House Committee Substitute for Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 67** when the bill was called by the president.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Pursuant to the motion of Representative Cierpiot, the Veto Session of the Ninety-eighth General Assembly, First Regular Session, adjourned sine die pursuant to the Constitution.

TODD RICHARDSON  
Speaker of the House

D. ADAM CRUMBLISS  
Chief Clerk of the House