

March 7, 1979

bulk of the committee bills that are put in are directly related to appropriations, and the ones that we have put in that are not directly related to appropriations, there is no good reason why they couldn't be introduced by an individual within the first five or ten days, whatever time period that you pick. But I would oppose the...I understand the attractiveness of a pretending to reduce the number of bills by adoption of the rules and the benefit the body might have from that, but since we've had a limitation, the other two things I've noticed besides a large number of committee bills, that we also now include many items in a single bill. Back in the old days we had more bills, but there was one change per bill most frequently, and that was to the benefit of the public because LB so and so was tied to one change...they knew what it was. Now we get five or six or ten changes proposed in the same bill as another gimmick to get around. Now I agree with Senator Newell's one comment that the only possible benefit of a limitation on individuals is it gives you an excuse not to introduce a bill...not a reason, but it does provide you an excuse, but if you don't have the stamina to say no on it...

SENATOR NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...then you really probably shouldn't be here, and you really probably shouldn't need that crutch to help you make a decision or avoid making a decision. So I oppose the amendment and I would hope that one would come back from the Rules Committee or from other members that will directly address the committee problem as well as shorten the time period and make it more difficult to introduce bills after the initial ten day period.

SENATOR NICHOL: We still have ten lights on. Senator DeCamp is up next, and will be followed by Dworak, Fowler and Chambers. Is Senator DeCamp in the Chamber? While we're waiting for him, why don't...Senator Dworak, why don't you continue, please?

SENATOR DWORAK: Well, Mr. President and colleagues, what a tangled web we weave. We just seem to work ourselves in a bigger hole and a bigger hole and a bigger hole with these ill-conceived measures to try to straighten out a problem and we're going in exactly the opposite direction. I agree with Senator Warner a hundred percent. I don't need a crutch to tell someone no. That's my responsibility. I can make that decision as to whether I'm going to put my name on a bill, or not put my name on a bill. I think that argument is absolutely unsound. I think that if we adopt this particular rule, and we do not restrict the committee introduction of a bill, we're just kidding the public. We're going to run home and say, hey,