

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

January 10, 2000

Looks to me like that, from my perspective, would be a little bit difficult to accomplish. You'd have a Judiciary Committee that no member could serve on the two-day committees and no member could serve on one of the one-day committees if they were on Judiciary Committee. I don't know how you could get around that. I, too, agree that some of the changes that were spoken of earlier should not have been there. I think that the extension of committee membership to nine members, I'm not sure that's necessary. I think that the eight-member committees have worked very well, and have the seven-member committees, and I think that if you have a bill introduced before your committee the person that had that bill introduced has the right to have as many people look at that bill in committee as anybody else's bill would have, so to give that to a six-member committee I think would be somewhat of a slight to those people that are normally used to seven- and eight-member committees. Sometimes, and I think Senator Hudkins mentioned this, toward the end of the day the committees get...the committee hearings become somewhat sparse for membership. The member...a number of the committees have difficulty holding their members there for that committee hearing, and the more committee members we have the better off we would be with that. I object also to eliminating the Agriculture Committee, per se, and putting it with the...merging it with the Natural Resources Committee. I think there are a number of reasons and mainly the reason is that we serve two different purposes. We aren't as closely aligned as a lot of people would like you to believe. There are some things that I think could be done to provide the Ag Committee with more business. We could have more bills referenced to us. I think this little handout I gave you was done actually about three years ago, I think, or two years ago, or some time other...earlier when we were discussing the same...this same issue. And if you look on the second page behind the front page, it gives you jurisdiction that the Ag Committee has as far as topics are concerned, and I think we've even expanded that jurisdiction a little bit over the last three or four years, and I think we could expand it more, and I give you some of the reasons there, when you look at how we might be able to handle recreational trails, which goes to Natural Resources now, and light density rail assistance. Rural economic development I think would be handled very well in the Ag Committee. I just am telling you some things that I think could be done reference