

January 9, 1986

would oppose the Abboud amendment and any attempt to limit bill introductions. I have always taken that position. I have always felt it was the right position to take. Senator DeCamp was talking about the football analogy, changing the rules in the middle of the ball game. It reminds me a little bit, if you want to have bill limitations, if you decided in football that we had too many running plays, and too many backs were gaining too many yards, and so you decided that we were going to limit to 20 carries a game anybody who wants to play football in college, and so in that way we have more passes and we spread the ball around more, and everybody is happy about that. Well, what about that person that can do more than that, can carry the ball more than 20 times, and can do a good job of doing it. The same with the bill introduction, some people don't want to introduce a lot of bills, some do. If they feel they can handle it and they want to do it, I think in representing their districts that is an option they should have. In our democracy, open access is what we try to encourage and so in my estimation having bill limits is counter to our democratic principles and not in the best interest of the general public. If you do have bill limits, I think as Senator Chambers has alluded to, you do have the strong and much more able to get bills introduced than the weak. The different interest groups are going to be much more able to get to senators to have them introduce bills than those who are just citizens with the concern out there, and that is bad. I think we want to have an equal playing field where all people have a chance to have their concerns heard and I think certainly bill limits engender a real concern about whether or not we can hear those people because we would never get the chance to even have a bill on their subject. Furthermore, what happens is you don't stop anything. You have the same number of issues, same number of problems, but instead of dealing with them one at a time in a clear distinct fashion, you merge bills together and get five bills drawn into one, or you just end up seeing that bill that looks close to what you want to do and you amend it, and it is all a lot harder for people to follow. You have a multipurpose bill. It is hard to fathom what exactly is in that piece of legislation versus five pieces that are clearly set out so you can follow this or that item which concerns you. So it is harder for the public to follow legislation when you have bill limits because you get bigger bills and you get more amendments to bills and that makes it harder for the public to follow the legislation. So for