

January 6, 1982

or a hundred and fifty hours of unnecessary hearings which I have to sit through and listen. So there has to be some constraints. I think Senator Johnson argues, probably very eloquently that those constraints are personal constraints, limitations of the individual. I think that we ought to be practical, however, and say that there are need for some constraints when we have time constraints that are very severe. We've spent most of our time in this short session in committee hearings and if some committees are meeting while other committees are out then, in fact, it is an imposition on the entire Legislature and so I think from a very practical point of view and a philosophical point of view, that we ought to at least limit bills in the second session because the second session is the clean-up session. That is when we should be processing those that are left over from the first session. Now we have had a number of approaches to this problem. I think we need a bill limitation but if my senses are correct we had two proposals, two amendments that were killed primarily because we wanted to make this rules change infallible. I think basically the question of its infallibility is one of severe question and I predict this rules change will go down, not because there is not support for limiting bills but because we cannot agree to the one area or the one magic number on just how we might or when we might limit those bills. I would hope that someone would offer us that great wisdom since this debate is never ending and every session we go through it. I think there needs to be a compromise and if nothing else, I think that compromise ought to be on the second session and I think that we ought to be proposing that. I support this rules change even though I don't think it is going to go anywhere and even though it probably should have amended it so it did not apply for this year. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Burrows.

SENATOR BURROWS: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I think we're really clouding an issue when we limit the number of bills. All we're limiting when we limit the number of bills that are introduced are the number of issues that have a public hearing because the number of issues that come before the body will largely be the same if you tightly restrict the number of bills introduced only they'll come directly on the floor and in committee and especially on the floor without public hearing. They'll take a lot of time where they can be disposed of in committee through the regular bill process and I think it is our job to really present to the public what the issue is. It is that of limiting ideas of a public hearing. So I think even though sometimes people on the outside will say they resent the number of