

January 13, 1986

argument against having a Constitutional Revision Committee that deals with all different subject matter and the only argument that you have heard today, the only argument that you have heard today in support of the way we are doing it is the gatekeeper argument, the argument that there will be fewer constitutional amendments provided to the public to vote on if we have a gatekeeper.

SENATOR LAMB: Thirty seconds, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Now you may or may not agree with that concept, but even if you do agree with that concept, does it comport with the facts and it does not. I took the statistics from 1956 up until the present date and in 1972 we had the Constitutional Revision Committee, and if you take the data from pre-Constitutional Revision Committee and compare it to the data for post-Constitutional Revision Committee, curiously enough, the two-year average on the number of amendments proposed is 10.5 in each case.

SENATOR LAMB: Your time is up, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So what I am suggesting to you is that the gatekeeper argument has no validity whatsoever when viewed in light of the facts that have existed.

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Labedz.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise with a lot of misgivings about the reorganization of some of the committees. I dare say that I will not stand up here and try to argue whether water or environment should be under Agriculture or Public Works because I have never been on either one of the committees. But I would say that there is danger in weakening the Agriculture Committee especially at this time when there are so many problems with agriculture and I think the committee should be able to retain some of the things that were going to be transferred to Public Works inasmuch as Agriculture is probably now and will be in the next few years probably the most important committee that we have had. I hate to reiterate what Senator Rupp said and Senator Barrett says, but as a former Chairman of Constitutional Revision and Recreation, I, too, stand and am a little bit optimistic about taking the constitutional amendments away from that committee. I can recall when I was chairman I believe there might have been