

January 9, 1986

after the deadline date. I believe it is set in the rules that there is a deadline date that you must be able to get those 25 votes to even have those public hearings which makes it worse than if it was your way. This is a type of a parliament English government. This is what Senator Johnson is trying to do, and in the past, he has kind of indicated he wouldn't mind this kind of a type of government. So we debated the thing. We all know how we feel. I wanted to clear up that point for you, Senator Johnson, so you wouldn't have to use it in your closing that there is a deadline date, that you have to have those 25 votes to even have that public hearing and if you should by some chance be gone, be ill, or couldn't get the 25 votes, then you have lost that shot to even have a public hearing on your bill. That just isn't the way to run a ship, so that makes it worse than ever. I'm glad this point has come out. So, Mr. President, members of the body, I urge you to defeat the rules change and let's go ahead.

**SPEAKER NICHOL:** Senator Higgins, did you wish to speak about this?

**SENATOR HIGGINS:** Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I would like Senator Vard Johnson in his closing, if he has time, to cover this. Just about everything I had intended to say Senator Chambers already has said. The only thing that I would like to address is if a committee decides that they will not hear X number of bills, what chance then are the members of the committee given to hear both sides of a bill? I know when I first came here for the first two or three years I would read a bill and I would think, boy, this is a good bill, this is really a good bill, and then after I went to the committee hearing and I heard the opponents then I thought I didn't realize that was in the bill. I didn't see that side of it. So if we allow committees to decide what bills will be heard and what bills will not be heard, then when do the committee members or the public at large get to know both sides of the story and then really make a decision that this is a worthy bill or it is not? It is by hearing it that the committee members will decide to indefinitely postpone or advance it to the floor. But let me say this in closing, for this session there is a definite need to shorten the time that we are going to spend in committee hearings. I wish Senator DeCamp's amendment had passed because at least everybody would have had a public hearing but those that the committee would have chosen might have