

January 24, 1973

wonder whether we can really constitutionally do this. If we can say the limit is ten bills that a senator can introduce, why can't we go the next step and say, for convenience sake, that it's one bill or why can't we even take the next step and say well in off years you can't introduce any bills.. You, thereby, have eliminated the power of the senator which is given him by the voters under the Constitution. Now I realize that the introduction of bills did reach a very serious problem and that was the legislature's reaction was to curtail the number of bills a senator could introduce. But once you've taken this very dangerous step, I think you have to realize that consequences can follow which may not be acceptable either to this legislature or to the people of Nebraska and so despite the fact that no limit on legislation does create some problems, I think the problem there and the dangers there are considerably less than the curtail that we have established. If too many bills are introduced, they can be handled by the committees. Yes, it takes some additional time and this type of thing but that's what we're here for and I really seriously question whether we have gone too far from a Constitutional standpoint in imposing limits on the power of a Senator.

SPEAKER: Senator Snyder.

SENATOR SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the body, just to follow up a little bit, I think that if some of the people who ran for office for state senator would have kept their mind on the business of the state business instead of trying to run Washington from the legislative floor, we would have got more of our state problems solved right here. The Executive Board has had a little discussion here in recent days. I'd like to add to that. I think maybe we should keep a limit on the bills because I think the Executive Board is been somewhat overworked and their dispersal and committee assignment of these legislative matters. There were three bills that were withdrawn this morning because I had an all-inclusive bill that was in this process of drafting when these came in. I am a little bit concerned, I don't know if it's quite as big a problem in the minds of the other members of the body but it is with me. One of the bills, mind you all these dealt with blind people or discrimination of aged or visually handicapped, et cetera, but one of the bills there all introduced within the four bills, three of them. One of the bills, went to Public Health, one went to Urban Affairs, and one went to Labor. I don't know if anyone else has experienced the same situation but maybe, if this be the case, we should just have a committee of the whole 49 and just meet out here for eight hours a day and forget about our committee hearings. I made--mentioned a few days ago about the way some of the bills went to committees. I disagreed. Senator Carpenter told me that I didn't know what I was talking about. I do think that when three bills that are germane end up in three different committees that maybe someone else can explain this to me but at the moment I am somewhat at a loss as to the procedure involved here. I would be happy to hear remarks from anyone else who has experienced a similar situation.

SPEAKER: Senator Carstens.

SENATOR CARSTENS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I don't know of anything that can do more damage to this Legislature than a flood of bills which result in ill-considered legislation which result in great and basic changes in our law that we do not understand when we vote on them, we do not understand when we pass the bill, we do not understand the effects or the ramifications of it. Now we have, at the present time, a bill introduced in this legislature, I believe it is #8, which is a complete revision of our Criminal Code. There is no member of the Legislature today who could understand and has the slightest idea of what is contained in that Code. I don't believe anybody with a few exceptions possibly in the