

January 9, 1986

the Chairman or you are not giving these people long enough for a hearing. You effectively killed their bill because you didn't let them go all day but I guess that is really kind of the direction that we are tending to go. So I am saying, okay, maybe the middle ground is to give committees this incredible new power such as is manifested in three, four, and five, but also to make that power a little more flexible. And the flexibility I would add would be, yeah, they can vote not to have a hearing and that is it, just as is proposed, or the committee can stipulate these five bills will each have a ten minute hearing or a thirty minute or whatever. The problem has been, if you recall, and I think most of you have experienced it, a bill will get up there and it will go on for two, or three, or five hours. It will go into the evening and it kind of disrupts the process. I will be honest with you. That has not occurred in Banking. As I say I have been criticized for it and the reason it hasn't occurred is because of arbitrarily taking the power and implemented basically these rules. But I think that is a middle ground and, as I say, the proposal says, yeah, you can vote to kill them or you can vote and say this one has got a thirty minute time limit and that is it, up or down. The very indication that you are giving it a public hearing and giving it a time limit says you care enough to listen in case there is some merit, but, boy, the merit had better show up awful quick and you have doubts from the offset or from the onset. I think if you just did these three sections of the proposal without putting further restraints such as how many bills the committee can ultimately put out, but if you did these three sections with the time limitations imposed, the forcing the committees to get their processing done, forcing them and giving them the power to kill bills pretty arbitrarily, and put the little amendment I have suggested on, you wouldn't have too terrible a program to experiment with in trying to get better processing done. And I think this system would probably work better than any attempts at bill limitations, and maybe more important than that, it is the first time you would have tried this idea. It is the first time you would have tried an approach like this. It is the first time you would have gone direct kind of into the substance rather than the artificial thing of setting an artificial number of limits on bills or something like that. So I am going to support this amendment, and I am supporting this limited section of this proposal, and I am also suggesting that this limited Section 3, 4, and 5, in and of themselves would be enough to