

January 6, 1982

days and days and days of public hearings on bills that will never become law in this state, so long as we're doing these things, we are doing, we are wasting our time in a ridiculous fashion. We need to limit the number of bills that are introduced. We need to do that so that we can all spend our time on the things that are serious, on the things that are going to go into effect and be operative on the people of this state. What is the answer to Terry Carpenter? What is the answer to the mechanism of introducing a lot of bills for compromise purposes, for purposes of forcing other senators into position on bills that you are really concerned about? I think you have to answer those questions. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, as you might anticipate I am opposed to any attempt to limit these bills and again, I notice a flaw in the rules if some bills are introduced only for the purpose of making a point public or for having a public hearing. The rules provide for an unlimited number of resolutions, period. Rule 4 tells you what kind of resolution to offer if you want it handled as a bill which means a public hearing and everything that happens as a bill except that you call it a resolution. You can try to amend constitutions or memorialize Congress to amend the Constitution and you could offer a proposition that you know Congress is not going to accept, that the public will not accept but you simply use that framework of a constitutional amendment, the form, in order to get the subject of your choice before a public hearing. You can do that with a resolution. So why should we always create a situation where you're forced to resort to a stratagem. Let the rule be an unlimited number of bills. Currently if you don't adopt this amendment we have an unlimited number of resolutions. We have an unlimited number of bills. Let's get an unlimited amount of time. Then we can deal with everything we have to. Now in order that people can spend the time here, you're not going to get a salary increase. I've retained an attorney to fight, to defend my right to be reimbursed for expenses. Now I've filed a voucher. I read in the paper that the new director of DAS is a runner and a gunner. I thought by now he would have runned down that voucher and run it back over here and I could go on into court with it but for some reason there is a delay. So if I'm able to vindicate my right to be given expenses during the session, remember I'm not asking this Legislature for any money. I didn't ask you to get a lawyer to defend me. Some of you voted against that expense bill because you said it would cost the Legislature. Now I am willing to risk it. It's a gamble but if the roll of the