

January 13, 1986

constitutional amendments because we won't have that severe screening process, that one starting point for all these constitutional amendments. Again, I have mixed emotions on this rule change. There is some good in there and some bad. I think it is good that we are discussing it. I guess at this point I would probably reluctantly oppose it if we are taking it all as a package. I think we should discuss it again every year and again do it a little bit at a time, not in all one fell swoop. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. I have several...seven speakers lined...eight speakers lined up. Senator Beutler first, Senator Barrett second, Senator Schmit third. Now we have nine. Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I hope you will not pass up a unique opportunity because this is a unique opportunity to balance the workloads in the Legislature in a way that they should be balanced. They really need balancing at this point in time. I hope you will take a look at the figures. The rule change before you today basically does two or three things. First of all it would reinforce the standing committee concept. It is a concept that I think we almost unanimously believe in. We believe in the idea, and our whole Legislature is structured around the idea that we should take certain subject matter and put it off in a particular committee and get people on that committee who develop expertise in that subject matter, who understand the subject matter as a whole, how it relates part by part, and that by that means we will have a better chance of producing quality legislation than if we just allowed committees to have no jurisdiction and if we just allowed members to deal in committee with all different sorts of things. We all recognize that with the time limitations that we have in the Legislature, as individuals, that it is necessary for us to concentrate on particular subject matter, to become good at it, to understand it. The whole idea of a Constitutional Revision Committee is contrary to that concept. It basically says we are going to put people over here in the Constitutional Revision Committee and they are going to deal with every subject in the world, and we all know and understand and, by adopting the standing committee system, acknowledge that that is not a workable proposition. Those members of the Constitutional Revision Committee simply cannot have the same level of expertise on a particular subject matter as the members of