

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Day	Hottinger	Krentz	Pappas
Beckman	Finn	Johnson, J.B.	Marty	Sams
Chandler	Flynn	Kiscaden	Morse	Spear

So the bill passed and its title was agreed to.

Pursuant to Rule 10, Mr. Moe, R.D., Chair of the Committee on Rules and Administration, designated S.F. No. 2630 a Special Order to be heard immediately.

SPECIAL ORDER

S.F. No. 2630: A bill for an act relating to state government; restructuring functions and groups related to ombudspersons for families; amending Minnesota Statutes 1992, sections 257.0761, subdivision 1; 257.0762, subdivision 2; and 257.0768; Minnesota Statutes 1993 Supplement, section 257.0755.

Was read the third time and placed on its final passage.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 61 and nays 0, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Flynn	Laidig	Neuville	Sams
Beckman	Frederickson	Langseth	Novak	Samuelson
Belanger	Hanson	Larson	Olson	Solon
Benson, D.D.	Hottinger	Lesewski	Pappas	Spear
Benson, J.E.	Janezich	Luther	Pariseau	Stevens
Berg	Johnson, D.E.	Marty	Piper	Stumpf
Bertram	Johnson, J.B.	McGowan	Pogemiller	Terwilliger
Betzold	Johnston	Merriam	Price	Vickerman
Chandler	Kelly	Metzen	Ranum	Wiener
Cohen	Kiscaden	Moe, R.D.	Reichgott Junge	
Day	Knutson	Mondale	Riveness	
Dille	Krentz	Morse	Robertson	
Finn	Kroening	Murphy	Runbeck	

So the bill passed and its title was agreed to.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS - CONTINUED

Without objection, remaining on the Order of Business of Motions and Resolutions, the Senate reverted to the Orders of Business of Executive and Official Communications, Messages From the House, Reports of Committees, Second Reading of Senate Bills and Second Reading of House Bills.

EXECUTIVE AND OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received.

March 28, 1994

The Honorable Allan H. Spear
President of the Senate

Dear President Spear:

I have vetoed and I am returning Chapter 381, Senate File 844/House File

2228. The bill as passed represents an unwarranted widening of the generally accepted understanding regarding leave status for employees who are designated by the exclusive representative of their bargaining unit as having responsibilities with that unit which qualify for leave.

The bill further imposes an undue burden on public employers of all types and levels in Minnesota, without any known analysis of economic or other operational impact. Granting leaves for purposes other than provided by current law is deliberately and wisely left to the discretion of the governing boards of these jurisdictions.

If there is a general problem with the definitions in current law, it is not widely known. There has been no discernible public discussion or debate about such a problem, nor have any proponents of this amendment sought the counsel of my office over this matter. If, on the other hand, this bill seeks redress of the frustration of a limited number of persons, perhaps even a single individual, that is an example of legislative micromanagement that disappoints the general public.

On the other hand, if the language of an amendment were carefully restricted to a specific structural circumstance and limited as to the number of eligible persons in a given bargaining unit, I would be open to reconsideration.

Warmest regards,
Arne H. Carlson, Governor

Mr. Luther moved that S.F. No. 844 and the veto message thereon be laid on the table. The motion prevailed.

April 21, 1994

The Honorable Allan H. Spear
President of the Senate

Dear President Spear:

I have vetoed and I am returning Chapter 481, Senate File 1694/House File 2088.

The bill as originally presented and heard received substantial support as a measure to clarify and improve procedures for the administration of neuroleptic medications to mentally ill persons. However, an author's amendment passed on the floor of the House on a voice vote, significantly changes the impact of the bill and makes it unacceptable policy.

The intent of the bill was to grant to guardians and conservators the authority to consent to the administration of these medications. The last-minute amendment imposes the requirement of a court hearing for this consent to be valid. This change was not subjected to any hearings, testimony, or fiscal analysis.

It seems clear that its effect at least would create enormous legal costs for the state and for counties, as well as for private wards and conservatees. There are at least 11,000 persons on Medical Assistance residing in nursing homes or