

January 9, 1987

if you wanted to make a quick judgment you'd say that is discourteous to the public. What the public may not know is that during the lunch hour that senator was working on a bill, perhaps working on that committee hearing, meeting with constituents, meeting with lobbyists, doing any number of things. I would also suggest sometimes you may not have a quorum at a committee hearing because those senators who are on that committee did not have time for lunch, again, because they had to meet with constituents, or they had to meet with another senator over a bill they were co-sponsoring, for any number of legitimate reasons, and they would, therefore, step out of the committee hearing to go and eat lunch at two o'clock, at a quarter of two, at two-thirty, whatever. So, there are sometimes very legitimate reasons for senators not being there at a committee hearing. I would also suggest in my six years here there have been so many bills offered repeatedly. Senator Vard Johnson's bill for child care, Vard told me it took him seven years to get that bill passed. Each year it went before Public Health and Welfare. I would suggest that some of those senators on that committee had heard all of the arguments for and against it and felt that since they knew all of those arguments they could better spend their time sitting in their office catching up on their mail, or doing various other things. So, there are many things that you learn after you have been here awhile that at first blush are not quite apparent to us. So, again, I am offering this amendment for one purpose, to be sure that the public does have a public hearing on everything, to be sure that there is a guarantee of at least one hour hearing for each bill, however, less time if there are fewer people to debate the bill. At the same time it would take and help the chairman because he would be able to announce, we are only allowed, according to legislative rules, one hour on each bill. And the people would, that way, understand that it wasn't the chairman doing it or the committee, but the Legislature itself. And both sides would be heard, and the press would be there to hear both arguments. Often times I've seen committee hearings go so long that the press was only there long enough to hear the pros of it, and then it was their deadline so they had to leave. So, the reasons against it are not necessarily aired on the televisions, radio, or in the printed press. That, basically, is the amendment that I would offer. Strike the Rules Committee new rule that we do not have public hearings, even if 3 senators can't be found who want it. I would keep the public hearings with this amendment. I would limit it to one hour debate on each bill, and be sure that both sides were heard and that the senator presenting it would have a minimum of