

January 13, 1986

committee that under one of the proposals would be moved to a Thursday and Friday. I am not too enthused about that either but the fact is some committees are going to have to meet on Fridays as well as Mondays when we occasionally are in recess. Now I would concur with Senator Barrett that it ought to be at least a two or three-day committee that has an opportunity to make that day up at another time. So I think the concern about the calendar ought not to cause anybody to oppose this particular idea simply because the calendar that is proposed they may not agree with. Once again, I am going to support this concept because I think it does begin to clarify some of the issues that we have got into in our attempts to reference bills. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR LAMB: The Chair recognizes Senator Hoagland to address the rule change followed by Senators Labedz, Hefner, Sieck, Morehead, Beutler, Hall, Hannibal, and I don't know who is on page 2.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Let me be brief, Mr. President, in light of all the people who want to speak on this thing. I can make my points quickly I think and then I would like to concede the rest of my time to Senator Beutler. I am also rising in support of this rule change because I think there are a number of changes here that we simply need to make. I think Senator Rupp made some good arguments that subjects don't necessarily have to be tied together to be heard by one committee but I think the process is improved if the committees handle jurisdictions that are more closely related than some of the jurisdictions we currently have. It is not necessary but I think it is desirable that the committees deal with subject matters that are as closely related to one another as possible. Now I think Senator Rupp and others have raised some particularly good arguments in the area of the constitutional amendment problem. Do we want them all in one committee so one committee can do a more active job of screening them or do we want to spread them among the Standing Committees so that the expertise experienced by that committee and the needs for amendments to the Constitution perceived by that committee are implemented? I guess I would opt for the latter. I don't see a problem of our proposing too many constitutional amendments to the voters and I am concerned when a committee because it has jurisdiction over all constitutional amendments arbitrarily imposes a limit of two or three or