

January 16, 1986

suggest my reasons for relooking at this and at least ask you to give some consideration. The first thing you do when you restructure everything is look at the reasons why. You've heard the reasons. The reasons were, at least officially supposedly, the work load of committees needed to be equalized. So let me just quickly go through what the major changes were and whether we are dealing with form over substance. One of the major changes was to basically cut in half the Ag Committee. If ever there was a time, I think, where agriculture is a priority, and something that should receive attention, and has a lot of involvement, it is now. So what is the first action we take? Cut that committee in half, basically eliminate it. Another major change was Judiciary, more personnel, more time. Those of you who have been here awhile, think back. A few years ago Judiciary was in a sense the premier committee and dealt with the heaviest issues of all which are now processed, rewriting the entire Criminal Code, rewriting the entire Probate Code, redoing the entire Civil Rules of Procedure, criminal procedure, redoing the entire court system of the state. The major things were done, processed apparently with no trouble back not many years ago. What do they deal with primarily today? No criticism intended but primarily, primarily changing things within these major things that have already been done. Another change, Public Health. Supposedly their work load, as measured by number of bills I guess, is so heavy, yet on the very day that we said it is so heavy that we have to change that and add more time we created another committee outside the Legislature and said and the chairman of Public Health should also run this most important committee. If there was such an incredible work load that you had to completely change the committee structure, then what logic does it make to then double the individual's work load otherwise. How about Constitutiona' Revision and Recreation? I had the same inclination as everybody else, and I still have mixed feelings. But bottom line, maybe Senator Rupp brought up the best argument. There needs to be a gatekeeper over the single biggest thing we have, the Constitution. Maybe there has to be one gatekeeper that watches all the people, all the groups trying to tamper with it. When the Banking Committee looks at that Constitution, they look maybe from the perspective of finance. When the Judiciary Committee looks, they look from their particular perspective. Is anybody, on the fundamental law that all the others fall under and are supposed to be controlled by, is anybody looking at the overall picture? That is what