

back to us on General File without ever having a public hearing. Now how can that serve our best interests to have this kind of approach done without the obligation of reporting our findings to the public and allowing them to react? If this bill or resolution was in committee and we were faced with a committee hearing, even that would ameliorate the necessity of public hearings. But we aren't. We are on General File. Unless we make this requirement to the group, then it seems to me we have no way of guaranteeing public input on the question. I would suggest that we open the doors wide open, that if these kinds of studies, recommendations, findings are made without public input, we will pay a price, not necessarily in how intelligent the decisions are, or the suggestions or recommendations, but how credible they will be to a skeptical public. Because this measure is on General File, there is no process guarantee in what we normally do to secure that public input. There is every reason in the world, I think, to mandate public hearings being held, to make sure that we allow a skeptical public to come in and give their thoughts on this matter as well. Lastly, I also object to additional language that is being stricken in Section 6. It currently reads that, "The task force shall report its progress, together with any findings or recommendations to date, by January 15, 1986, in time for the Legislature to consider any such recommendations this session." It seems to me that to do otherwise is to simply state that we will solve the problem by the proponents' deadline rather than we will conduct a study that is designed to do its work until it is done. If that work gets done March 1st, great, then they make a report. If it is done the 15th, great, they make the report and let it go at that. If it comes to the 25th and they are not done, they tell us what they know, they make whatever recommendations they can, whatever findings they can, but if they are not done they tell us they are not done. That way the study meets the obligation of studying the problem not the obligation to conform with the lobbyists' desire to move a bill. That is the appropriate deadline for the task force. You do the task force until it is done.

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: The language that is suggested by Senator Scofield, I think, cuts into that kind of freedom. For that reason, I oppose this second half of the Scofield amendment.