

session I would like to suggest a working order for the discussion on the floor. You might recall the story of the penitentiary where the guys stand up and say the numbers and everybody laughs because they have heard all of the jokes and they simply number the jokes. I would like to suggest that we have just several basic arguments that we hear over and over again, and one of them is there's been no public hearing. I would suggest that that is simply argument number one, okay. And then number two should be that is not germane. Okay, that should be argument number two. Number three is there is no fiscal impact statement in my book. Although it could be changed, 3(a) could be there is a fiscal impact statement, it is too low; or 3(b), there is a fiscal impact statement and the administrative office is trying to balloon the whole thing, it is way too high; or, 3(c) there is a fiscal impact statement and I can't read it. All of those are available. Number four I think should be it's a good idea, but not this year. And argument number five should be how does Moammar Khadafy feel about it. (Laughter.) I would like to suggest that with respect to that last arguments one and two apply in this case, and for that reason I hope that you will allow me to take this clean and well-negotiated bill and not make it into a turmoil when you all have the opportunity to use the bill introduction process for funneling your ideas so that they are your bill and not mine.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp, do you wish to close on the amendment?

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, let me review what the amendment was. I guess I thought it basically was something I couldn't imagine anybody would disagree with. What it does is it says this section of the law, that says the Accountability Commission is going to have the duty of being judge, jury and executioner over what we say, or what our opponent says, or anybody says, lobbyist or anybody else, about an issue as to whether it is "truthful" or not and thereby set up the process where anybody can file a complaint and start putting another person under the gun to hire and lawyers and everything because somebody disagrees with what they said, is simply not right, it is not even constitutional and it should be eliminated. I guess Vard Johnson was supposed to be here today and he was going to give the eloquent constitutional argument why I am right. But let me do something different. This is highly risky and