

March 7, 1979

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Warner is next, but before you speak Senator Warner, I'd like to introduce a guest of Senator Haberman. His name is Raleigh Trisdale from Ogallala. He's in the 8th Grade. Would you stand, Raleigh? Thank you. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President, I'd rise to oppose the proposed change to six votes...first the very logical effect of it, or practical effect, will be pure and simple. You will now increase the potential of committee bills four times forty-nine, and so we'd still have the one hundred ninety-six bills in, but in a...come in from a different route, and that's what really bothers me. I strongly support reducing committees, restricting committees in the number of bills that they might introduce with no limit on...in the individual. What we have now, we have committee bills which no one is responsible. Absolutely no one is responsible for that content of the bill. I've sat in committees. I probably have used the phrase myself on behalf of the committee we introduced it because we thought it ought to be discussed. I agree with the concept that the Legislature is the only public forum that exists for the discussion of problems, of new ideas. The introduction of legislation is not necessarily to pass a law. Frequently, it is done for no other reason than to resolve an issue without passing a law, and it can be and is frequently effective because of that. I would...I feel strongly we should not deal with this just alone as far as the number of bills the introducer can... or the individual can introduce. I think it should be...when it is before us, it should be all conclusive...inclusive as to what committees can do as well as what the individuals can do. As far as my suggestion that I would like to see, the most effective way that I know to reduce the number of bills is to cut down the time period for introduction, make it five days instead of ten, eliminate committee bills authorization but obviously with...require then thirty-three votes for the introduction of legislation, which would be consistent if it couldn't make it within the first ten days, then it presumably is an emergency matter, and as an emergency matter ought to require thirty-three votes to be put in. We get the bills...it's referred to...we get the bills dribbled in, the lobbyists are in no hurry, absolutely no hurry nowadays during the first ten days, because they can always find a committee or any other interest group. In the old days when the rule was pretty fast, even though it was twenty days long, everybody understood if the bill did not make it in those first twenty days, the probability of it ever being put in was pretty slim and they almost always were. With a requirement of thirty-three votes there's no problem for appropriations. Appropriations are emergency matters. As a matter of effective date of the act, the base, the