

January 10, 1980

caucus for the Committee on Committees, a three-district caucus for something else, did not seem to make sense in our current structure and therefore for simplification we would try and keep the same caucuses for both functions. I think that this has merit. I plan to support it although I won't have to chair the Rules Committee after these go into effect, and I think that we in the Rules Committee hope to present some other suggestions to perhaps reduce the number of committees, particularly special committees and so on, because there is a real fragmentation of the committee structure in the Legislature and I think that that is reaching the point of being burdensome to the process. So I would support this amendment of Senator Newell's.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: First a question, are we considering this a whole package? Is the motion for all of this, or Senator Newell's, or is it...the whole thing?

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President...

PRESIDENT: Proceed.

SENATOR WARNER: I think I would oppose the proposal. As I hear it discussed, it seems to me that the object is to reduce the size of Committee on Committees and there may be some advantages to that. We could have two from each of the four districts plus one at large. That would be nine, which would be even better than ten in terms of reducing the size. It seems to me the only issue here is the number of districts going from three to four, and personally I think it is preferable to retain the four-district concept for committee makeup for generally the geographic distribution around the state of the committees and, as a matter of fact, we do not necessarily abide by that right down the line as it works out but I think historically it has been preferable and I would urge...there are other parts of the amendment that might have merit in terms of reducing size and reducing committees, but I don't think this particular proposal of going to three districts instead of four is one that would be advantageous.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion? Senator Newell, do you wish to close on your amendment? Did Senator Marvel...do you want to speak?

SPEAKER MARVEL: Do we have a copy of this amendment?