

May 22, 1979

the various committees inasmuch as some committees are much more, if you will pardon the expression "prolific" than others. There are various things that some committees have to deal with. For example just to defend the Judiciary Committee, we have criminal justice bills, many of which each year come up that are unconstitutional, attorneys, judges, courts decide that they are wrong, that they should be changed, they have to be studied and corrected. We have the corrections institutions and deal with these people. We have domestic relations, divorces. Right at the moment some of the women's problems are very important to them and we should be doing things with that. We deal with the courts, the civil procedures require several bills almost yearly to take care of these things so that attorneys, courts, judges can act responsibly to the needs of each community. I really think before we pass this bill as it is, that it should be amended so that the various committees could have a more realistic amount than just saying ten for each committee. Senator Kremer's committee, I would hate to see be limited to ten bills. Maybe they need ten, maybe they don't need that many, if they don't, that is okay. But, when they do need them I think the door should be opened so that we can introduce those bills. I have spoken many times that too many bills are introduced and I think generally speaking that is true with all of us. But I really think we should leave the door open for some of these things that must be handled each year.

SPEAKER MARVEL: We are speaking to the committee amendment which is at the bottom of the first sheet of pending rule changes. Senator Simon, do you wish to be recognized on the committee.....Senator Kelly, do you wish to be recognized on the committee amendment?

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. I rise to oppose the committee amendments and support the position stated by Senator Carsten from Avoca. The reason that I do that is that the Senator from Avoca is right. If you are going to limit these bills then put a limit on them. If you are not going to limit the bills then quit playing the shell game and take the limits off and we will go back to whatever it would be 1969, when some members of the Legislature would enter 70 bills, they called them horse trading stock as I heard. Be that as it may I consider the committee amendment just a kind of a half way in between where we are and where we want to be. Maybe that is what we will have to do is take a half way step to reality. I would prefer just one step and do it with Senator Carsten's original rule change suggestion. Senator Nichol, you said are we interested