

about, which happens to be considered weak compared to the one that is dominating. Then the same arguments that those of us who are offering today, and have offered in the past, in behalf of these weak groups you will begin to offer. Then the irony of the situation will be readily apparent when somebody stands up and says that is what we were trying, so hard for so many days, to get you to consider and you refused. So why, now that there is a group that you feel concerned about, should the principles be changed? Why should we not apply today to your group the principles that you applied so heavy-handedly to other groups because there was a special interest segment that wanted it that way? We are dealing now not with just a bill, not just with legislative procedures, but with the integrity of the system itself. The reason I'm glad that Senator Higgins' amendment was not adopted is because she made a concrete proposal, discussed with the Legislature what it concerned, and the Legislature knowingly and willfully rejected the amendment. The reason I asked whether or not the bill, as it stands, is a restriction on what legislators can do is to at least raise the question. The Constitution is not going to allow an enactment by this Legislature or any other one to impair the ability of legislatures to legislate. The way this Legislature, which is sitting now, prevents certain bills from passage is to prevent them from going through the system by voting against them, but not by enacting a law that says a senator must go through an outside committee before having the authorization to introduce a bill into the Legislature. If that is what the current legislation does, I want it to stay just the way that it is, and show how many senators can be led by the nose by a special interest group, a group which can tell them you shouldn't listen to any more discussion on this issue, it has been settled, we decided this is the way it's going to be, now you trot out there and rubber stamp it. That is what the Legislature, apparently, intends to do. I think today, as I thought in the beginning, that it is very unwise and it is very unfair. You have a fox who is going to look after the hen house, and you say that in order that the fight is fair every time we put a chicken on the committee we're going to put another fox on the committee.

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: As though a chicken, under any circumstances, can have a fair go with a fox when the