

January 16, 1986

looking at the Format II where they show the total bills that committees have. If you look at Business and Labor, you'll see they had only 120 bills. If you look at Urban Affairs, you see they had only 110. Now, if you look at Constitutional Revision and Recreation, you see they had 133. We did away with them. You could take Business and Labor and Urban Affairs and combine them and you'd have 230 bills, still less than what Education has of 244. You could have made that a two-day committee also. When I look at DWI being taken out of Judiciary and put under Transportation, I'd like to ask you a question. Is the problem with driving or is it a health problem with people who drink to excess and then drive? There is no problem with my driving if I have one glass of wine or one glass of beer, so why is DWI under Transportation? Driving is not the problem, it is a Public Health issue, alcoholism. The thing I am pointing out is I'm wondering why they look at the total number of bills and then they decide to do away with committees that have more bills than the committees that have less bills. Again I would like to repeat, the work load of the committees is the responsibility of the Committee on Committees, yet the Executive Board took it upon themselves to keep the Committee on Committees out of it. They broke their own rules, but, remember, the Executive Board keeps making the rules for us. We don't have a rule here that says new senators will not have legislative aides. The Executive Board decided that. I'm asking to you to look at this from a realistic standpoint. Do the rules mean anything? If they do, then the Committee on Committees should have been the first one invited, if you will, to join in this interim study, if you abide by the rules. It has been mentioned that sometimes some chairmen just are not authoritative enough to do these things. It has been mentioned that bills are held up in committee. I can guarantee you they are. My Child Pornography Protection Act was held up in the Judiciary Committee last year almost to the point where it would not get up for consideration and there was no reason for it, no reason whatsoever. The Child Support Law was held up in the Judiciary Committee until the last six days where it was crucial. It wasn't the work load. It was the same thing with my Child Protection Act. A half a dozen times the chairman of that committee came to me and said, can we make a compromise, will you lower the penalties on child pornography? So work load isn't the answer. It's the chairmen that choose to hold these bills up.