

May 22, 1979

they are intermingled and I'll try to be brief. We have already reduced through our actions earlier in the year numbers of bills that we can introduce by 40%. Now we are looking at Senator Carsten's original proposal by reducing that by another two bills per member. That is not going to have a great deal of impact. Even when we consider that not everyone introduces those five or six bills. It is going to have very little impact at all. I think that we have to look at, the more important issue is the committee structure. Now I am for some sort of limit on the number of bills a committee can introduce. I believe in that. But to shackle every committee with that same limitation is not right. Senator Carsten says, why not? Because historically, Senator Carsten, you have more aggressive committees, you have committees... yes, it is true, Senator Carsten, you have more aggressive committees, they handle more legislation because they have perhaps a broader spectrum to deal with. Judiciary committee, for example, and I sit on there so I think that I can speak with some sort of authority, Judiciary Committee has been very aggressive in past years. Take the criminal code, the revision of the criminal code. That was eight years of work that went into that. That didn't result in one bill. That took four bills to get that accomplished, out of one interim study. Now we are saying that we are going to limit that committee to ten bills. We already have over a dozen resolutions in Judiciary Committee to study problems which people have come to us so far this year and said we have got a problem and we have got resolutions in there to study it so that maybe we can have some legislation to correct those problems. They deal with a wide scope of affairs, important affairs. To say that the Constitutional, Revision and Recreation Committee or the Ag and Environment Committee or Government or Urban Affairs or Miscellaneous Subjects have the same work load as Banking or Judiciary or Education or Public Works, we are not fooling anybody because they don't have the same work loads. The jurisdictions differ, the subject matters differ. I don't think that we can deal with the problem effectively by putting an arbitrary small number of... an arbitrary small number of bills that a committee can introduce all the way across the board. If we are going to do this I think that we should go back historically and look at what committees have done and arrive at a different formula depending upon the scope and the work loads of those committees in the past. I would hope in the interest of time, I would hope that we would forthrightly reject this amendment and reject the proposed rule change so as to not hamstring the legislative process and perhaps we can come up with a different formula rather than all the way across the board the same.