

January 13, 1986

they should go hand in hand. I think the committee structure the way it is hasn't been too bad. I haven't heard of too many complaints. The General Affairs Committee which will replace the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee of which I am Chairman of, well, I realize that maybe we could find a better name for Miscellaneous Subjects Committee but it hasn't been all that bad because we certainly have had a variety of subjects to hold hearings on. The General Affairs Committee meets one day on Friday and many times we are in recess on Friday so I think this would take a problem. I would suggest that one-day committees should perhaps be held in the middle of the week like Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursdays. Also it deletes campaigns from this and I think that campaigns should be in the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee or the General Affairs Committee. It takes campaign issue and moves it over to Government Committee and adds one more day. So I really don't see the advantage there. We do have a...the proposal calls for a new committee of Natural Resources. Also calls for a new one on Transportation which I think perhaps would be okay. Let me just talk a little bit about the Constitutional Revision Committee. I feel that we need some committee to put a limit on these constitutional amendments that we will be putting on the ballot. I am told that it costs 25 to 50 thousand dollars to put this on the ballot, and if we have too many, we certainly are going to increase the cost of this. I feel that we also need a limit because the public out there just has about so much time to study these, and if we have too many, I am afraid we are going to alienate the citizens in the state, cause confusion, and they won't know exactly what they are voting on. Also when we put these constitutional amendments on the ballot, we should explain them fully. You can do this if you only have three, or four, or five in an election, but you have 15 or 20 and this would be very hard to do. So I guess at this time I would suggest to the body that we do not take action on this, maybe study it a little bit more, and come up with a proposal next year. Thank you.

SENATOR LAMB: The Chair recognizes Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President, members of the body, at this time I am going to have to oppose this procedure or this rule change. I look at the Revenue Committee and you haven't deleted any bills on that. We are still going to be as busy as we always have been. I can see Judiciary still