

SCR

1

BILL FILE LOG

BILL # SCR1

1/15/85 Original bill
1/15/86 - Ferguson says do not schedule at
this time

ALASKA STATE SENATE

PATRICK RODEY
SENATOR

POUCH V
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
(907) 465-3793
(907) 465-3754



MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Frank Ferguson

FROM: Senator Pat Rodey, Chairman
Senate Judiciary Committee *Pat*

DATE: April 12, 1985

RE: SCR1 Proposing an amendment to the Uniform Rules
limiting the number of bills a member may introduce.

SCR1 is currently in the Senate Judiciary Committee. For the purpose of possible future calendaring, please contact me regarding your intentions concerning this resolution.

During the second session of the 13th Alaska State Legislature, 2,472 versions of bills and resolutions were printed. These varied from 1 - 200 pages in length. Printing costs exceeded \$244,000. This did not include the cost of printing journals, schedules or calendars.

These costs would be greatly reduced if we placed a limit on how many bills each legislator could introduce.

As of April 22, 1985 more than 682 bills have been introduced.

Of these bills introduced 188 bills were introduced by persons who had exceeded the proposed 10 bill limit.

ALASKA CLIPPING
SERVICE

The Peninsula
Clarion
Kenai, AK

JAN 25 1985

The Ferguson diet

A pair of intriguing resolutions have been introduced into the 14th Alaska Legislature by Sen. Frank Ferguson, D-Kotzebue. Both aim at limiting state government.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 proposes limiting each legislator to the introduction of 10 bills in two years. Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 proposes limiting possible increases in annual state government operating funds and in the number of employees on the state payroll. The second, SJR 2, is co-sponsored by Edna DeVries, R-Palmer.

From the outside looking in at the Capitol, it's not always easy to tell what's for show and what's real, but these resolutions deserve consideration.

What the new 120-day session limit might not accomplish, if the Legislature proves balky, SCR 1 could help accomplish simply by limiting the amount of nonsense that could be introduced.

The premise of the session limit, as it is generally understood, is that citizen legislators should convene only a few months every year to handle essential legislative business. In other words, the idea is to avoid spending six months in session and processing hundreds of bills and resolutions.

Ten bills per legislator per Legislature still allows for 600. Each Legislature lasts two regular sessions,

or two years. As a practical matter, 300 bills per session is about all the Legislature manages to process anyway.

All Ferguson's bill says, in other words, is cut out the tomfoolery with all the excess baggage that gets thrown into the hopper for the sake of appeasing voters back home.

Among the threadbare traditions of legislative politicking are bills filed with no expectation of passage — just to demonstrate concern for the folks at home or to win bragging chips for the next election campaign. Ferguson's resolution would limit that game. Once a legislator filed 10 bills, he could file a new one only by withdrawing another or by getting someone with an unused quota to be the prime sponsor. This would be, by the way, without any limit on the numbers of resolutions.

Any legislator who protests Ferguson's proposal too much should automatically be suspect.

The other resolution, SJR 2, proposes a less-than-perfectly-clear formula for limiting operating budget increases. That formula might be subject to correction or revision. The other end of the proposal, however, is aimed clearly and simply at the burgeoning size of state government.

It says the employees of the state and its agencies, including the University of Alaska, "may not exceed four percent of the population of the state as determined under this section... In this section 'popula-

tion' means total resident population of the state computed under the method of computation used in the most recent federal decennial census."

Does that meaning using the federal census figure, or only its method of computation applied to today's data? The last federal census count, 400,331, would allow for 16,013 employees (or "full-time equivalent" employees). If updated to 1985, the population might be about 510,000 — or enough for 20,400 employees.

Ferguson and DeVries are being generous. There are 15,000 full-time state employees now, so there would be room for substantial growth. The Legislature could consider making it tougher.

A recent federal report listed Alaska as already having the highest ratio (891.3 to 10,000) of state employees to residents.

If the Legislature adopts SJR 2, the proposal will go before the state's voters for approval as a constitutional amendment.

Quotables

□ The worse the society, the more law there will be. In Hell there will be nothing but law, and due process will be meticulously observed.

Grant Gilmore, quoted in *New York Times*, 1977



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
RESEARCH AGENCY

Pouch Y, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3991

March 22, 1983

TO: Representative Abood
FROM: Leslie Longenbaugh, Research Staff
RE: Cost of Producing a Bill
Research Request Number 83-86

Carol Horos asked that we furnish information regarding the cost to the State of producing a legislative bill. In addition, she asked which other states limit the number of bills that are introduced by each legislator.

COSTS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Ms. Horos asked us to address all costs of bills up to their introduction. However, because of the nature of the information that is available, we are unable to separate the costs before introduction from those incurred afterward, e.g., for producing sponsor and committee substitutes.

In researching the cost of legislation, we reviewed the bills and resolutions that were introduced during the 1981 and 1982 legislative sessions. We looked at three components of the cost of a bill:

- background research and analysis, such as that conducted by personal and committee staff and the House Research Agency;
- legal research and drafting, such as that performed by the Division of Legal Services; and
- printing, including actual printing, collating, and the cost of the paper.

In researching the cost of an "average" bill or resolution, we immediately found that there exists no average bill. Bill length ranges from the most common one-, two- and three-page measures to those that are over 200 pages long.

This wide variation in length is matched by differences in the complexity of bills. The amount of legal and professional research that goes into production of a bill ranges from almost none, as in the case of a simple appropriations bill, to years of staff time, as when an entire statutory title is revised.

Representative Abood
March 22, 1983
Page 3

Drafting

The primary function of the Division of Legal Services is to draft legislation at the request of legislators and legislative committees. Legal Services also performs other services for the legislature, such as bill analysis, legal opinions, and revision of the statutes. In addition, the legislative reference library is a part of the Division of Legal Services.

Billy Berrier, Director of Legal Services,² has estimated that his staff of nine legislative counsel, two statute revisors and several support personnel spend about 90 percent of their time year-round writing or researching legislation. They write virtually 100 percent of the bills and resolutions, other than the governor's, that are introduced during a legislative session.

Two hundred and seventy-seven of the 2,138 bills and resolutions that were introduced during the 1981 and 1982 legislative sessions were written by the executive branch. This leaves 1,861 bills and resolutions that were drafted by Legal Services. In addition, Mr. Berrier estimates that some 25 percent of the bills and resolutions his staff worked on were never introduced. If, using this estimate, we add 610 measures to the 1,861, we find that Legal Services staff worked on approximately 2,470 bills and resolutions during the two sessions. Legal Services staff also help to draft committee and sponsor substitutes.

The total expenditures of the Division of Legal Services, not including the expenditures of the legislative reference library, was \$1,126,735 in FY 81 and \$1,182,348 in FY 82, for a total of \$2,309,083 during the two fiscal years.

Although we have assembled the information described above, we hesitate to assign an average cost per bill because bill length varies so dramatically. For example, Mr. Berrier stated that a simple appropriations bill, usually less than a page long, takes about an hour of staff effort and costs around \$30 to write. By contrast, bills such as SB 1 and HB 172, the revisions to the municipal code, have consumed about two years of staff time and involved roughly \$60,000 to \$70,000 in staff costs.

²Billy Berrier, Director, Division of Legal Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, Juneau; telephone: 465-3867.

Representative Abood
March 22, 1983
Page 2

In short, a calculation of the average cost per bill or resolution is virtually impossible and would not be very meaningful if it were produced. However, this memorandum does provide estimates of the cost of printing and drafting all bills and resolutions that were considered by the Twelfth Legislature.

Research

Bill-related research costs include: the time of personal, committee and nonpartisan research staff such as this agency's; the efforts of personnel from the other branches of government; and library, computer and other technical services provided within the legislature.

The two houses of the legislature have separate research divisions, the House Research Agency and the Senate Advisory Council. According to Pete Jeans, the Senate Advisory Council performs approximately 75 percent of its research during the legislative session in response to requests from individual senators. Much of this research is directly related to proposed legislation.

It is difficult to define precisely the proportion of the House Research Agency budget that is expended for researching bills. Susan Brody, Director of the agency, has calculated that of the 157 research requests to which we responded during the 1982 session, 37 were directly related to bills. Some of these requests related directly to analysis of bills that had been introduced, a few were performed specifically to determine the need for bills that in some cases were never introduced, and several provided information regarding provisions or impacts of particular bills, especially for committees.

The 37 requests that related directly to legislation required 760 hours, or 21 percent of the 3,590 hours of staff time that was spent by the agency on research requests during the 1982 session. The House Research Agency budget for the 1982 session, including not only research staff salaries but support and administrative staff, travel, contractual, and supplies, was approximately \$260,000. Because research requests constitute almost our entire activity during legislative sessions, it could be said that roughly 21 percent of our \$260,000 budget, or approximately \$54,600, was spent on research that related directly to bills.

¹Susan Brody, Director, House of Representatives Research Agency, Juneau; telephone: 465-3991.

Printing

As noted above, during the Twelfth Legislature, a total of 2,138 bills and resolutions were introduced by members of the two legislative bodies. These measures cost approximately \$391,150 to print, including paper, printing, collation and one master sheet for each page. We determined this cost by looking at the length of each version of all of the bills and resolutions that were introduced during the 1981 and 1982 sessions and applying the cost formula provided by Sam Pekovich, Manager of the legislative print shop.³

The 2,138 bills and resolutions of the Twelfth Legislature led to 3,600 versions, including the original draft and subsequent sponsor and committee substitutes. This is an average of 1.68 versions for each bill and resolution.

As you know, the legislature's print shop prints bills and resolutions of two or more pages using both sides of each 8 1/2" x 11" sheet of paper.⁴ The shop prints 1,125 copies of each version of each measure. Approximately 43 percent of the 3,600 different versions of bills and resolutions that were introduced during the Twelfth Legislature were one page in length, occupying one side of a single sheet of paper. Using the cost estimates provided by Mr. Pekovich, we calculated the printing costs of a one-page bill or resolution to be \$22.00. This amount includes \$1.75 for the master sheet, from which all offset printing is done, and \$20.25 for the paper and printing.

Another 24 percent of the versions of bills and resolutions (including committee and sponsor substitutes and technical corrections) used both sides of a single sheet. The cost of a two-page bill is \$44.00, or double that of the one-page measure.⁵

³Sam Pekovich, Manager, Duplicating Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, Juneau; telephone: 465-3806.

⁴It has been suggested that the Alaska legislature cut its cost of paper and collation by printing bills on folded letter-sized paper as many other states now do. (The Journals are printed in this manner.) We asked Mr. Pekovich whether the print shop can print using this method; he responded that the shop has recently acquired equipment that prints this way. When asked about document storage, Mr. Pekovich noted that the documents room has run out of space during each of the last three legislative sessions; he estimated that a change to the smaller size would mean that the room could accommodate 500 to 600 additional bills.

⁵Although the use of a single sheet of paper should mean that the paper costs the same as for a one-page bill, the print shop's formula for estimating costs which we used here provides an average cost per page.

Of the 3,600 different versions of bills and resolutions from the Twelfth Legislature, 23 percent are four pages or longer. Printing of these measures cost \$286,127, or 73 percent of the total printing costs (\$391,150) for bills and resolutions during the two sessions. The cost of printing grows as the length of a piece of proposed legislation increases, not only because of the added paper and printing but also because of the cost of collating. Collation, needed only for measures that require two or more sheets of paper, costs \$.75 per hundred sheets (not pages). For example, the cost of printing a five-page bill would be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{printing and paper} & = & .018 \times 5 \times 1,125 \\ \text{collation} & = & \frac{3 \text{ sheets} \times 1,125}{100} \times \$.75 \\ + \text{master sheets} & = & 5 \times \$.75 \\ \hline \text{total cost} & = & \$135.31 \end{array}$$

Table 1, attached, shows the costs of printing bills and resolutions of between one and thirty pages in length and the costs of the occasional longer bills of up to 200 pages.⁶

OTHER STATES' LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF BILLS

We contacted the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)⁷ regarding state laws that limit the number of bills a member may introduce. Staff at NCSL told us that an absolute limit on the number of bills that a legislator may introduce probably would be an unconstitutional infringement on the legislator's right to free speech. According to their information, no state imposes an absolute limit of this sort.

Nebraska, which up until two years ago limited to six the number of personal bills, now limits only the number of bills which committees may introduce.

Four states -- Colorado, Indiana, Montana and Tennessee -- limit the number of bills that legislators may introduce during the legislative

⁶Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 172, which would revise the municipal code, are the longest bills that have been introduced during the present legislative session. The two versions of SB 1 are 204 and 205 pages long, and HB 172's one version to date is 204 pages. At 204 pages, each of the bills costs \$5,348.63 to print every time it is amended.

⁷National Conference of State Legislatures, 1125 17th Street, Suite 1500, Denver, 80202; telephone: 303/292-6600.

Representative Abood
March 22, 1983
Page 6

session. These states avoid the problem of constitutionality by placing no limit on the number of pre-filed bills.

Another type of limit on the number of bills is the deadlines for the introduction of personal bills imposed by Alaska and several other states.

Many states limit the number of personal resolutions, similar to Alaska's legislative citations, that usually congratulate or offer condolences. In a few states such resolutions are introduced, heard and passed just as a more substantial piece of legislation would be, and their cost is often high. The Alaska legislature does not limit the number of legislative citations that are introduced by members; however, like several other states, Alaska has shortened the formalities and time involved in issuing legislative citations.⁸

NCSL staff are sending us additional information concerning other states' limits on bill introductions. We will forward these materials as soon as they arrive.

* * *

If you have any questions or further needs for research, please call.

LL

Attachment: Table 1 - Cost of Printing Bills and Resolutions

⁸Autumn Jackinsky at the Legislative Affairs Agency estimates the total cost of each legislative citation at \$100. During the 1982 session, legislators commissioned approximately 250 citations.

Table 1
 Cost of Printing
 Bills and Resolutions

Number of Pages (not sheets)	Cost per Version
1	\$ 22.00
2	44.00
3	88.87
4	104.37
5	135.31
6	157.30
7	187.75
8	209.75
9	240.19
10	262.19
11	292.63
12	314.63
13	345.06
14	367.06
15	397.50
16	419.50
17	449.94
18	471.94
19	502.38
20	524.38
21	554.81
22	576.81
23	607.25
24	629.25
25	659.69
26	681.69
27	712.13
28	734.13
29	764.56
30	786.56
31	817.00
32	839.00
33	869.44
34	891.44
35	921.88
50	1,310.94
60	1,573.13
70	1,835.31
80	2,097.50
90	2,359.69
100	2,621.88
150	3,932.81
200	5,243.75

Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of Nature, and of Nature's God, a new and separate station, with the consent and approval of their superiors, a solemn appeal to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation, and that they should state the principles which they have adopted, that all eyes may be directed to the same.

STATE LEGISLATIVE REPORT

An Information Service of the National Conference of State Legislatures — Earl S. Mackey, Executive Director

Vol. 4, No. 5

DECEMBER 1979

LIMITING BILL INTRODUCTIONS: THE LEGISLATIVE PAPER CHASE

The paper chase in state legislatures has accelerated. More and more legislation clogs the system, as constituents and interest groups insist "there ought to be a law" for each and every public problem. The steady increase in the number of bills introduced and enacted by state legislatures has led some observers of the lawmaking scene to label legislatures as "bill factories" or "legislative assembly lines."

In response to this concern, many legislatures have experimented with ways to limit the number of bills entering the system, and in a past issue of the State Legislative Report, these efforts were noted. With this issue, the National Conference of State Legislatures has updated that information and has attempted to explore the impact of bill limitations in those state legislatures which have adopted them. The three most common methods have been the use of deadlines to encourage early introduction of bills, proposed bills or short-form bills and specific limits on the number of bills a member may introduce.

USE OF DEADLINES

Deadlines are probably the most common means of limiting bill introductions by facilitating and regulating the flow of bills through various steps of the process. In all, 35 state legislatures establish a deadline for the introduction of bills. In addition, Alaska establishes a deadline only during the second regular session of the biennium. Another 22 states also establish cut-off dates for bill drafting requests made of their legal staffs. The most detailed deadline systems (for example Oklahoma) provide for cut-off dates for the drafting requests, bill introductions, committee action in the house of origin, final action in the house of origin and similar steps in the second chamber.

In an effort to address the number of bills entering the process, the Florida House has set one of the most stringent deadline provisions. In the 1979 session, the deadline for introducing bills was set for noon on the first session day. Florida's constitution

allows the Legislature to meet for an organizational session immediately following the legislative elections, then the legislature reconvenes for a 60-day session in early April. The intervening period is devoted to committee work and bills may be introduced by members and committees during that time.

The effect of the House rules change in 1979, along with Speaker Hyatt Brown's emphasis on committee bills, was to reduce the number of House introductions from 1800 in 1978 to 1300 bills and resolutions. Allen Morris, Clerk of the Florida House, in a speech delivered at the Southern Legislative Conference this past summer, indicated that other rules changes have contributed to the reduction including short-form bills, use of subcommittees to hear bills and emphasis on committee-initiated bills.

Interestingly in the 1972, 1974 and 1975 legislative sessions, the Florida legislators debated and rejected various proposals to limit the number of bills a member could introduce. Most of the proposals included some kind of surcharge for each bill over the limit that a member introduced.

SHORT-FORM BILLS

The principle behind short-form or "skeleton" bills is three-fold. First, skeleton bills are designed to reduce drafting responsibilities demands placed on the bill drafting staff. Second, most skeleton bill processes emphasize the role of the committee in initiating legislation after considering the general merits of a preliminary proposal. Third, short-form bills are often seen as a device allowing members to introduce an idea which may be requested by a constituent or a lobby group, but without committing the legislator to sponsoring a measure with which they are not enthusiastic.

Six states provide for some kind of short-form bill procedure, however only Connecticut uses the mechanism very extensively. Since 1973, members have been restricted to introducing only proposed bills which are typically one or two paragraph statements of intent or purpose. The proposal is then referred to a standing committee which must decide before a certain deadline whether the proposed bill should be "raised" or drafted as a full bill. Committees may also initiate legislation, a power which is particularly important during even-year sessions when members are restricted to introducing proposed bills on only limited topics. The following chart indicates the number of proposed bills and committee bills introduced in recent sessions:

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY Bill Introductions by Session

	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
Proposed bills	4585	885	4396	400	3825
Committee bills or raised bills	3273	1361	2094	1267	1989

(Figures provided by the Office of Legislative Commissioners.)

The number of bills has gradually decreased under the proposed bill procedure, however the number of legislative proposals and fully-drafted legislation remains high. Some observers feel that the standing committees generally acquiesce to the requests of members to raise bills and do not exercise their authority to limit the number of fully-drafted bills. Another problem in Connecticut appears to be the limited time for committees to review and decide which bills to have drafted. Because of the time crunch, committees tend to authorize drafting of bills which have not been fully considered. Interestingly, two legislative proposals have been filed for the 1980 session to place a specific limit on the number of proposed bills a member may file.

NUMERICAL LIMITS ON BILL INTRODUCTIONS

Perhaps the most direct approach to limiting bill introductions is by allowing members only specified number of bills. Only four states have experimented with this mechanism. Concern is often raised as to the constitutionality of restricting a member's rights, but so far no legal challenges have been raised in those states with numerical restrictions. At least two of the states with bill limitations, Indiana and Nebraska, have followed the provisions for several years without a challenge.

In those states with bill limitations, the experience has some common themes. First, some kind of "escape valve" is often necessary to allow for emergencies. Second, such a policy requires some kind of monitoring procedure to insure that members do not exceed their allowance of bills. Third, the "escape clause" often leads to ways to circumvent the intent of the limitation.

Nebraska has the strictest rules regarding bill introductions. Since 1972, the Unicameral has limited the number of bills a member can introduce to ten measures per session. At the end of the 1979 session, the rule was tightened to 17 bills per member during the biennium and a ten-bill limit on standing committees. The committee limitation can be topped by approval of four-fifths of the legislature. Legislation proposed by the governor, interim committees or the Appropriations Committee are not covered by the limit. Members had previously prevailed upon committees to introduce bills once they had reached their individual limitation, and the committee limitation is seen as a mechanism to block this route. Nebraska does not have pre-filing of legislation, and all bills a member sponsors or cosponsors count toward the 17-bill limit.

Interestingly, Nebraska has fewer bills introduced than most of the 49 other state legislatures, but observers argue that the unicameral system requires even more deliberation since the checks provided by a second chamber are not available. Nebraska averages some 600 bills each session. In the 1978 and 1979 sessions, fewer than half of the senators introduced the maximum of ten bills. At least two of the major committees introduced close to 40 bills in the 1979 session and others were well over the ten-bill mark. The new committee limitation clearly will have a direct impact in the upcoming session.

The Indiana General Assembly has taken another route in the limitation of bills. The House and Senate rules vary somewhat, however the intent has been the same. The rules were designed to avoid the logjam or balloon of bills which are inevitably introduced near the filing deadline, and secondly, the rules were adopted to insure that the second regular session of each biennium would be a short session as promised to the electorate when they approved annual meetings of the legislature.

Neither house limits pre-filing of bills, and both chambers allow members to file two bills per day up until the introduction cut-off date in the first session. During the second session of the biennium, state representatives are limited to a total of five introductions each, while senators may introduce one bill per day until the deadline on the fourth legislative day.

As an escape mechanism, the House and Senate rules provide for 25 "vehicle bills" to be introduced by the Rules and Legislative Procedure Committees. In effect, these measures have no substance and may be amended by the leadership to deal with emergencies.

The Indiana rules have kept the rate of bill introductions at a fairly steady level. During the short session, the number of introductions has averaged about 1100 bills and resolutions, while in the long session the number reaches about 2200. Most members appear to be satisfied with the provisions and conform to the rules, however there is no real policing mechanism. The bill drafting staff notifies a member if he or she has reached the limit, but the notification is a courtesy rather than an enforcement policy.

The Colorado Assembly has taken yet another approach to the bill flood problem. Like Indiana, Colorado rules encourage prefilling of bills, but place a specific ceiling on the number of bills a member can introduce during the session. The six-bill limitation is specified in the joint rules. Detailed deadlines for various legislative actions are set. To allow for emergencies, a Committee on Delayed Bills is established. The committee, composed of the presiding officer and two party floor leaders, approves late introductions, but in practice few late bills have been allowed. Bills introduced after the deadline are excluded from the limitation.

The Colorado situation in 1979 is revealing. In previous years, less than ten percent of all bills were prefiled, however under the limitation rule, the number of prefiled bills in 1979 soared to 25 percent of the total. While the total number of bills was not reduced, the need for early introduction thus maximizing committee and floor work early in the session. The Colorado legislature has encountered some problems in accurate counting of prefiled bills and those bills introduced during the session.

The Tennessee has adopted rules similar to those in Colorado. Prefiled bills are not limited, but a bill restriction is in effect during the session. The rules were adopted in 1978 and in the first session the rule was not adhered to strictly. The major weakness in the Tennessee situation is that House rules do not provide for any limitation. Tennessee also uses a Committee on Delayed Bills to deal with emergencies. Legislators anticipate that the real test of the rules will come in 1980 and 1981. The rules have addressed the logjam of bills which are introduced at the deadline date. In 1978, out of a total of almost 1500 bills were introduced on or near the deadline date.

CONCLUSION

While many states are experimenting with means of throttling the flow of legislation, the increase in bills appears to be uninhibited. More than one bill drafting director commented that the efficiency of modern legislative drafting technology has encouraged more and more introductions. Capacity of the system has accommodated the increase in constituent group demands. A similar conclusion was reached by Alan Rosenthal and in a 1978 article in Legislative Studies Quarterly. They concluded, "The greater the system's capacity -- at least up to a certain point -- the more ideas will emerge, bills will be drafted, and the more legislation will be introduced to start on its way to becoming law."

Almost uniformly, states which have limitations on introductions indicated that legislators were limited because it provides them with a means to avoid constituent or lobbyist pressure. In many legislatures, however, lawmakers see their primary jobs as introducing, drafting and passing legislation, and that job translates into more and more bills.

To legislators in many states, limitation of bills cannot be successfully controlled by rules alone. Florida House Clerk Morris focused on the need for both procedural and leadership strength and concluded that reduction of bill flow in the 1979 session due to three factors: "First, the nature of the Florida Legislature and its tradition, the personality and ability of the Speaker and his key leadership; and second, the development by the leadership of a legislative program and a systematic plan for its enactment." Individual legislator restraint and strong leadership are probably the most effective tools to curb the legislative flood of bills.

MECHANISMS FOR LIMITING BILLS

	Deadlines		Proposed or Short-Form Bills	Limitation on Number of Introductions
	Drafting Requests	Bill Introduction		
ALABAMA		x		
ALASKA		(1)		(5)
ARIZONA		x		
ARKANSAS		x		
CALIFORNIA			(4)	
COLORADO	x	x		(6)
CONNECTICUT	x	x	x	
DELAWARE	x			
FLORIDA	x	x	(2)	
GEORGIA		x		
HAWAII		x	x	
IDAHO		x		
ILLINOIS	x			
INDIANA	x			(6)
IOWA	x	x	(A)	
KANSAS	x	x		
KENTUCKY		x		
LOUISIANA		x		
MAINE	x	x		
MARYLAND	x	x		
MASSACHUSETTS		x		
MICHIGAN				
MINNESOTA				
MISSISSIPPI	x	x		
MISSOURI	x	x		
MONTANA	x	x		
NEBRASKA		x		(7)
NEVADA	x		x	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	x			
NEW JERSEY				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK	x	x		
NORTH CAROLINA		x		
NORTH DAKOTA		x	→	
OHIO	x			
OKLAHOMA	x	x		
OREGON	x	x		
PENNSYLVANIA				
RHODE ISLAND	x	x	x	
SOUTH CAROLINA		(2)		
SOUTH DAKOTA	x	x		
TENNESSEE	(3)	x		(6)
TEXAS		x		
UTAH		x		
VERMONT	x	x		
VIRGINIA	x	x		
WASHINGTON	x	x		
WEST VIRGINIA		x		
WISCONSIN		(x)		
WYOMING	x			

- (1) Deadline in second regular session only.
- (2) Rules apply to House only.
- (3) Rules apply to Senate only.
- (4) Short-form provision is seldom utilized though it is available.

- (5) Limit applies to prefiled bills only.
- (6) Limit applies to bills filed during the session but not to prefiled bills.
- (7) Member and committee bills are both restricted in number.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Morris, Allen. "New Approaches in Florida to Bill Limitation." A speech delivered to the Southern Legislative Conference, Louisville, Kentucky, July 19, 1979.

Rosenthal, Alan and Forth, Rod. "The Assembly Line: Law Production in the American States," Legislative Studies Quarterly, III, 2, May 1978.

NOTE: For additional information, additions or corrections, contact Alice Anneberg or Cindy Simon of the NCSL Denver office (303) 623-6600.



**National
Conference
of State
Legislatures**

Headquarters
Office
(303) 623-6600

1125
Seventeenth
Street
Suite 1500
Denver,
Colorado
80202

President
Richard S. Hodes
Speaker Pro Tempore, Florida
House of Representatives

Executive Director
Earl S. Mackey

February 4, 1981

ADDENDUM

RE: "Limiting Bill Introductions: The Legislative Paper Chase"
NCSL State Legislative Report
December 1979

Since the publication of this report, changes have occurred in several states and should be noted.

- 1) The Nebraska Unicameral no longer restricts a member to an absolute limit on the number of bills he/she can introduce. However, bill introductions by committees will be limited to eight bills per session. Previously, Unicameral members were allowed to introduce only 17 bills in each two-year session.
- 2) Montana lawmakers may introduce only five bills once the session has begun. However, the limit does not apply to prefiled bills prior to the session; interim committee bills; state agency bills; or resolutions.
- 3) In the Washington House there is a ten-bill introduction limit per term for each representative. Although the limit applies to all bills, including prefiled measures, lawmakers may suggest an unlimited number of short-form bill proposals which can be adopted as committee bills.

MECHANISMS FOR LIMITING BILLS

(Updated February 1981)

	Deadlines		Proposed or Short-Form Bills	Limitation on Number of Introductions
	Drafting Requests	Bill Introduction		
ALABAMA		x		
ALASKA		(1)		(5)
ARIZONA		x		
ARKANSAS		x		
CALIFORNIA			(4)	
COLORADO	x	x		(6)
CONNECTICUT	x	x	x	
DELAWARE	x			
FLORIDA	x	x	(2)	
GEORGIA		x		
HAWAII		x	x	
IDAHO		x		
ILLINOIS	x			
INDIANA	x			(6)
IOWA	x	x	x	
KANSAS	x	x		
KENTUCKY		x		
LOUISIANA		x		
MAINE	x	x		
MARYLAND	x	x		
MASSACHUSETTS		x		
MICHIGAN				
MINNESOTA				
MISSISSIPPI	x	x		
MISSOURI	x	x		
MONTANA	x	x		x
NEBRASKA		x		(7)
NEVADA	x		x	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	x			
NEW JERSEY				
NEW MEXICO				
NEW YORK	x	x		
NORTH CAROLINA		x		
* NORTH DAKOTA		x		
OHIO	x			
OKLAHOMA	x	x		
OREGON	x	x		
PENNSYLVANIA				
RHODE ISLAND	x	x	x	
SOUTH CAROLINA		(2)		
SOUTH DAKOTA	x	x		
TENNESSEE	(3)	x		(6)
TEXAS		x		
UTAH		x		
VERMONT	x	x		
VIRGINIA	x	x		
WASHINGTON	x	x		(2)
WEST VIRGINIA		x		
WISCONSIN				
WYOMING	x			

- (1) Deadline in second regular session only.
- (2) Rules apply to House only.
- (3) Rules apply to Senate only.
- (4) Short-form provision is seldom utilized though it is available.

- (5) Limit applies to prefiled bills only.
- (6) Limit applies to bills filed during the session but not to prefiled bills.
- (7) Only committee bills are restricted in number.

*Senators cannot introduce more than three bills as prime sponsor after 10th legislative day, and cannot introduce any bills after 15th legislative day.



Backgrounder

States Information Center
 The Council of State Governments
 Iron Works Pike
 P.O. Box 11910
 Lexington, KY 40578
 (606) 252-2291

Date: August 1982
Topic: Reducing Bill Introductions
Infokey: LEGISLATURES

Clearing the Logjam: Reducing Bill Introductions

The problems associated with legislative bodies introducing more legislation than they can effectively handle have been with democratic law making for some time. It was the custom of the Greek colony of Locria, for example, to reduce introductions by requiring that the proposer of a new law stand before the public assembly with a noose around his neck, to be tightened if the assembly, upon learning his reasons, did not adopt his proposal.¹

Not surprisingly this attempt at reducing legislation did not gain wide acceptance. But many believe that some sort of attempt at reducing introductions and consideration of new legislation is important. Table A, on the following page, indicates the slow but steady rate at which bill introductions have increased during the past 20 years.

There have been numerous explanations given as to why introductions have increased. These include longer legislative sessions, more full-time legislatures, more active legislators, and a greater number of problems requiring legislative solutions.

Two researchers² have indicated that societal needs, political demands, and institutional imperatives have been the main causes for increased legislative production. They have noted that states showing large numbers of introductions tend to meet the following criteria:

Societal needs

- large populations
- greater urbanization
- high levels of industrialization

Political Demands

- high participation of citizens in government
- active organization into issue related groups
- partisan control of state government³

Note: *Backgrounder* information is the latest available at the time of publication, but for updates, you should contact the appropriate state or federal agency directly. This material does not represent the position of The Council of State Governments. Information is included based on relevance to the topic. Some material, as noted, is copyrighted and may not be reproduced further without permission of the original author.

TABLE A: Bill Introductions by State by Year

	<u>1961</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1979b</u>
Alabama	2,385	4,150	1,772
Alaska	463	717	1,625
Arizona	638	573	800
Arkansas	1,175a	1,438	1,964
California	4,703	4,738	5,556
Colorado	756	1,035	1,148
Connecticut	4,194a	6,696	4,672
Delaware	1,114a	1,079	1,858
Florida	4,487	3,925	2,996
Georgia	1,264a	1,448	1,393
Hawaii	3,173a	2,950	3,584
Idaho	651	660	599
Illinois	2,630	5,084	4,381
Indiana	1,128a	1,688	1,706
Iowa	1,337	1,337	1,269
Kansas	897	1,064	1,204
Kentucky	1,048a	1,156	1,366
Louisiana	310	432	3,049c
Maine	1,489	1,772	1,602
Maryland	1,649a	2,214	2,945
Massachusetts	3,905	8,155	8,951
Michigan	1,120	2,951	2,272
Minnesota	3,749	6,012	1,643
Mississippi	1,753a	2,244	2,637c
Missouri	1,171	1,368	1,463
Montana	824	963	1,448
Nebraska	737	1,042	635
Nevada	821a	1,505	1,441
New Hampshire	709	1,356	1,181
New Jersey	1,138a	2,395	4,047c
New Mexico	1,142	1,018	1,086
New York	8,837	15,193	21,682d
North Carolina	1,776a	2,622	2,328
North Dakota	865	1,072	1,183
Ohio	1,715	1,452	1,258
Oklahoma	1,572	874	906
Oregon	2,824a	1,911	2,288
Pennsylvania	3,052a	3,042	3,294
Rhode Island	1,601	2,541	2,692
South Carolina	673	1,755	1,337
South Dakota	922a	630	614
Tennessee	2,052a	2,690	2,919
Texas	1,721a	2,928	3,598
Utah	634a	599	773
Vermont	660a	446	611
Virginia	1,079	1,624	1,117c
Washington	1,429	2,065	2,642
West Virginia	785	1,202	1,308
Wisconsin	1,731	2,284	1,920
Wyoming	528	692	702

a) Includes resolutions and memorials as well as bills; b) 1979 Session is last odd number session available; c) for 1981 session; d) for 1979 and 1980 session. Data from The Book of the States Vols. 14 (1962-63), 19 (1972-73), and 24 (1982-83).

Institutional Imperatives

--As indicated by the size and capacity of the legislature. Generally speaking, the larger the legislature and the greater the capacity, the more introductions.

Generally legislatures have taken two approaches to reducing bill and resolution introductions. For the purpose of this review we group them as limitations and improved process.

Limitations

The most common mechanism for reducing the number of introductions is the establishment of a deadline date for submitting legislation. Currently only six states (California, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin) have no provision for a deadline date to limit bill introductions.⁴ The following table from the 1982-83 edition of The Book of the States outlines these limits and the exceptions granted to them.

Several states have attempted to limit total introductions by limiting the number of bills an individual legislator could introduce. Seven states (Alaska, Colorado, Indiana, Montana, Nebraska, Tennessee, Washington) have experimented with this approach.⁵

In states with this type of limitation there is usually some kind of "escape valve" (which often leads to ways to circumvent the intent of the limitation) for emergencies and some sort of policy is required for the monitoring of members to see that they do not exceed the limit.

Nebraska has had the strictest rules regarding bill introductions. From 1972-1980 Nebraska limited the number of bills a member could introduce to ten measures per session. At the close of the 1979 session, this was reduced to 17 bills per member during the biennium with a ten-bill limit on standing committees. Currently Nebraska places no restriction on the number of bills a legislator can introduce, though introductions by committees are limited to eight bills per session.⁶

Legislatures have also reduced the number of introductions by limiting the matters which the legislature must consider. For instance local legislation has been responsible for many enactments in several states, such as Alabama, Florida, Illinois, and South Carolina.⁷ By passing home-rule statutes the number of necessary introductions could be reduced. Occasionally the number of appropriations acts that make up a state budget raise the total substantially.⁸ By instituting an Omnibus Appropriations Bill these separate acts can be eliminated. Legislatures could also eliminate "by-request" bills which carry the connotation that the sponsor is introducing the bill as a political courtesy, which California did a number of years ago to reduce the mounting number of introductions.⁹

LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE: TIME LIMITATIONS ON BILL INTRODUCTION

<u>Time limit on introduction of legislation</u>	<u>Exceptions granted to time limits on bill introduction</u>
1st L. day.	House: 4/3 vote of quorum present and voting. Senate: must suspend rules.
1st session only. 33rd C. day.	2/3 vote of membership. Standing committees. Governor's legislation introduced through the Rules Committee.
Regular session: 29th day. Special session: 10th day.	Permission of Rules Committee.
Appropriation bills: 40th day; other bills: 35th day.	2/3 vote of membership.
Emergency bills, except legislative schedule established for committee work.	Legislative schedule may be waived by approval of Rules Committee and a vote of 2/3 of the House.
1st session: 40th L. day. 2nd session: 30th L. day.	Committee on Delayed Bills. Appropriations bills.
Waived by legislature when adopting rules for the biennium.	Bills at request of governor for emergency or necessity. Emergency legislation designated by presiding officers. Legislative session and omnibus sanitation acts.
1st session of each house.	2/3 vote. Recommendation of Rules Committee.
1st session: noon 1st day of regular session, except for bills and resolutions sponsored by a standing committee. Senate: 1st day, except for general appropriations bills, local bills and joint resolutions.	House: 1/2 vote. Senate: 2/3 vote.
2nd session: 30th L. day. Senate: 33rd L. day.	2/3 vote.
Constitutional limits: after 19th day and before the mandatory recess held between the 20th and 40th days. Actual deadlines established during the session.	Speaker may designate any committee to serve as a privileged committee either temporarily or for the remainder of the session.
1st day for individual house members and 12th day for individual senators. 35th day for committees except—House: Appropriations, State Affairs, Revenue and Taxation, and Health and Safety; Senate: Finance, State Affairs, Judiciary, and Rules.	House rules governing limitations on the introduction of bills may not be suspended. Senate rules may be suspended by affirmative vote of a majority of senators elected, or if suspension is approved by a majority of Rules Committee, or by a majority of senators present.
1st session: odd year, April 8 except Senate bills in House. Even year: all bills except committee bills and appropriation bills referred to Rules Committee. Senate: odd year, April 11, even year, bills allowed by the Rules Committee and bills implementing state budget or introduced by standing committees.	House: 2/3 vote. Senate: consent of Rules and Legislative Procedure Committee.
2nd session: odd year, 16th session day; even year, 4th session day. Senate: odd year, 12th session day; even year, 4th session day.	Committee sponsored bills: Majority vote of membership unless written request for priority in bill was submitted before drafting. Senate bills introduced by majority vote of the majority and minority floor caucuses.
Individual legislators: House: odd year, Friday of 2nd week, even year, Friday of 3rd week; Senate: odd year, Friday of 2nd week, even year, Friday of 3rd week. Committees: House: 11th week, even year, 9th week.	By resolution, either house may make specific exceptions to the drafting for committee bills. Ways and Means and Federal State Affairs Committees not subject to deadline.
Individuals: 31st C. day. Committees: 45th C. day. Either house, by resolution, may set an earlier date.	Majority vote of the membership.
Introduction during first 10 days of session.	2/3 vote of elected members of each house.
1st session: 16th day. 125-day session: 51st day.	2/3 vote of elected members of each house.
2nd session: 16th day. Even year: 30th L. day.	4/5 vote. Request of governor, secretary of administration and finance, special commission or committee with specific reporting dates and home rule petitions.
Drafting requests: individuals, 10th day; committees, 15th day. Introductions: individuals, 18th day; appropriation revenue bills, 21st day; committees, 40th day.	2/3 present and voting. Revenue, local and private, and appropriation bills.
Emergency bills.	Majority of elected members. Request of governor. Appropriation bills.
Drafting request only: 30th day.	2/3 vote. Appropriations bills.
Drafting request only: all drafting requests must be filed by 5 p.m. Jan. 31; must be approved by signature by April 5 for action as House bills. Senate: April 12.	Request of governor. With approval of majority of members of a committee and 3/4 elected members of legislature.
	House: 2/3 present. Committee bills.
	2/3 vote of membership or approval of Joint Rules Committee.

State or other jurisdiction	Time limit on introduction of legislation	Exceptions granted to time limits on bill introduction
New Mexico	Odd year only: 30th L day. Appropriations bill: final passage in house of origin by 40th C day, second house by 5th C day, even year: final passage 16th and 21st C day.	Odd year: At request of governor.
New York	Assembly: 1st Tuesday in March for unlimited introduction; each member may introduce up to 10 bills until the last Tuesday in March. Senate: temporary president may designate a final date but not prior to first Tuesday of March; bills recommended by a state department or agency must be submitted to the temporary president by the 1st day of March.	Assembly: unanimous vote except for Fridays; Committee on Rules, by message from Senate; bills from governor, Senate, members elected at special elections after 1st Tuesday in March; Friday introductions only. Senate: bills by governor, attorney general, comptroller, Dept. of Education or the Office of Court Administration must be to the temporary president by the 1st Tuesday of April.
North Carolina	House: local bills and state agency bills by April 1. Senate: local bills and state agency bills, by April 1; all resolutions except those honoring deceased persons, by April 1.	2/3 vote.
North Dakota	Bills: 15th L day. State agency bills: none introduced after Dec. 15 prior to a session except upon approval of a majority of Committee on Delayed Bills. Resolutions: 18th L day. Resolutions proposing constitutional amendments or Legislative Council studies: 33rd L day.	2/3 vote or approval of majority of Committee on Delayed Bills.
Ohio	House: after March 15 of the second regular session, a resolution to end introduction of bills may be passed by a majority vote. Senate: no bills can be introduced after April 30 of first regular session or after last day in February of second regular session.	Majority vote on recommendation of bill by Reference Committee.
Oklahoma	1st session: none. 2nd session: 19th L day.	2/3 vote. Revenue and appropriation bills.
Oregon	House: 29th C day. Senate: 36th C day following the election of a Senate President.	Approval of House Committee on Legislative Rules and Operations, Senate Rules Committee, Speaker of House, Joint Committee on Ways and Means, substitute measures sponsored by a committee, priority bills and measures requested to be drafted by counsel no later than 36th C day and received by the senator no later than the 30th C day.
Pennsylvania	None.
Rhode Island	Senate: 4th L day, House: 38th L day. Except for private and local bills and certain resolutions.	Senate: Majority members present. House: 2/3 members present.
South Carolina	House: April 15, or if received from Senate prior to May 1. After April 15, introduction and committee reference only. Senate: received from House prior to May 1.	House: 2/3 vote. General or deficiency appropriations act or joint resolution approving or disapproving state agency regulations. Senate: 2/3 vote.
South Dakota	40-day session: 14th day. 35-day session: 10th day. All committee bills one day later.	2/3 vote. General appropriations act.
Tennessee	House: general bills, 27th L day. Senate: general bills, 10th L day. Resolutions, 30th L day.	House: 2/3 vote. Senate: unanimous consent of Committee on Delayed Bills or 2/3 vote.
Texas	60 C days.	4/5 vote. Local bills. Emergency appropriations. Emergency matters by governor.
Utah	30th C day.	Majority vote.
Vermont	House: odd year, 3 weeks except proposals delivered to the Legislative Drafting Division by that time, then 12 weeks; even year, by agreement of Rules Committee may be prefixed by Sept. 1 of odd year for next year. Senate: odd year, 53rd C day, even year must be filed with the Legislative Drafting Division 25 days before session begins. (a)	2/3 vote. Consent of Rules Committee. Appropriations and revenue bills. House only: committee bills introduced within 10 days after 1st Tuesday in March.
Virginia	Deadlines are set during the session. Municipal charter bills must be introduced on the 1st day of session.	Unanimous vote. At request of governor.
Washington	Committee: by 5th day. Senate: bills: as established by concurrent resolution at beginning of each session. 1981 limit: no resolution after 57th day, introduced by 36th day. Senate: 4th day.	2/3 vote of elected members.
West Virginia	House: 3rd C day. Senate: 41st C day.	House: 2/3 vote of all members of appropriate house present and voting.
Wisconsin	None.
Wyoming	Odd year: 18th L day. Even year: 5th L day.	Senate: unanimous vote of elected members. House: 2/3 vote.
American Samoa	House: 15th L day. Senate: 15th L day.	2/3 vote of elected members.
Guam	None.
Puerto Rico	6th day.	Majority vote.
Virgin Islands	None.

Any: L— legislative day
C—Calendar day.
(a) For 1982 session only, and for House bills only; the deadline for introductions will depend on date of submission of draft requests. If received prior to second Monday in December 1981, it will be drafted in long form (normal); if after, will be drafted only in short form (narrative). Dates for introduction have changed to 10 days following town meetings, which is first Tuesday in March.

Another means of reducing the number of introductions is by placing limits on duplicate bills. This can be done as simply as requiring that duplicates be identified as such, so that members are clearly aware that they are acting on duplicates and may penalize duplicates not so identified by their sponsors, or allowing co-sponsorship between both houses, which California and Oregon have done.¹⁰

A more substantive method of reducing duplicate or similar legislation is through the requirement of bill proposals, short form bills, or skeleton bills. This requires the submission of concise English or plain language versions of bills rather than bills in their full form.¹¹ In this way if 25 bills are submitted dealing with the same aspect of the banking industry, they can be consolidated into one bill.

Several states have provided some sort of bill proposal procedure, however Connecticut has been the main user of the bill proposal approach. This procedure has three other benefits: it reduces the drafting responsibilities of the bill drafting staff; it emphasizes the role of the committee in initiating legislation after considering the general merits of the proposal; and it allows members to introduce an idea which is requested by a constituent or lobby group without committing the legislator to sponsoring the measure.

Improved Process

Several suggestions have been made in the past to reduce the legislative logjam by making changes in the legislative process.

These include such pre-session activities as holding organizational sessions, holding interim committee meetings, and establishment of a bill pre-filing process.

There have also been suggestions that the powers of committees be increased to partially solve the problem. Some analysts have charged that weak standing committees can cause too many bills to reach the floor.¹³ The rules of some legislatures (Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Utah) have allowed committees to kill legislation.¹⁴ Others have allowed committees to report bills out unfavorably and empowered the committee on rules and calendar to report to the chamber a special order calendar listing all bills to be considered. Only bills included in the special order calendar could be considered thus making the regular calendar become only a shelf list of bills available to the rules committee.¹⁵

It has also been suggested that the tremendous amount of legislation handled late in the session could be reduced if deadlines were set at which time certain phases of legislative activity must be completed. It is argued that this would be a particularly effective way of controlling the number of committee bills.¹⁶

Non-Traditional Approaches

Arguments have also been proposed for some changes in state legislative structures which would limit bill introductions in non-traditional ways. While these approaches have been discussed, they have not been adopted or adopted on such a small scale that their effectiveness has not been the subject of analysis.

These approaches include:

- The consideration of a legislative cabinet system on the British Model. Within this system only measures proposed by the parliamentary leaders of the party, or the coalition in power are considered. Private bills, or bills introduced through some special dispensation given by the cabinet to individual members, may be introduced.¹⁷
- Establishment of a reference committee, such as the one established in the Ohio House of Representatives in 1921, with authority to determine whether bills are frivolous, irrelevant, introduced in bad faith or are duplications. If so, they are sent back to their authors and if not they are sent on to the appropriate committees.¹⁸
- In 1922 Robert Luce, who recommended the use of screening committees, suggested that legislators be required to pay a filing fee for the introduction of each bill, "a fee no larger than that for beginning a suit in one of the lower courts."¹⁹ Measures which included service charges for excess bills were introduced in the Florida legislature in 1974 and 1975.²⁰
- Afford members the opportunity to have non-controversial bills considered by use of a consent calendar. The consent calendar offers the outlet for handling such bills on a no-debate no-substantive amendment basis.²¹
- Submit subjects by petition to committee for the preparation of a bill. This approach is indirectly related to the bill proposal or skeleton-bill and was used by the U.S. Congress until 1810.²²

In this case the appropriate committee is presented with a request that it consider a situation that needs remedy rather than with a bill which it is claimed represents the remedy. The Committee then may choose the situations it believes must be resolved and drafts committee bills which rectify them.

Since the right of bill introduction is deeply rooted in American legislative practice, it is clear that any suggestion offered to reduce the number of introductions is practical only if the legislators accept the proposal as a means of improving the quality of legislative practice. In the end the solution may not lie in the working of committees or the operations of legislative rules and procedures as much as in the self-discipline of the individual legislator and the realization that the legislative bill, drafted as a law-to-be, is inherently a poor vehicle for communication of thought.

Notes

1. Robert Luce, Legislative Problems (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1935), p. 659.
2. Alan Rosenthal and Rod Forth, There Ought to be a Law! (New Brunswick, NJ: Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, Sept. 1977), pp. 7-8.
3. Rosenthal and Forth comment on page 8 that, "Generally speaking, a state's ability to generate political demands and the control of both branches of government by Democrats result in more introductions and more enactments."

Notes (Continued)

4. Council of State Governments, The Book of the States 1982-83 (Lexington, Ky.: Council of State Governments, 1982). p. 214-215.
5. "Limiting Bill Introductions: The Legislative Paper Chase", State Legislative Report (Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, Dec. 1979), p. 3.
6. Addendum to State Legislative Report of December 1979. Feb. 4, 1981.
7. Rosenthal and Forth, Op Cit, p. 9.
8. Ibid., p. 9.
9. Council of State Governments, Lawmaking in the West: A Summary of Legislative Bill Passing Procedures in Thirteen States (San Francisco: Council of State Governments Western Office, May 1967), p. 36.
10. Ibid., p. 35.
11. Alan Rosenthal, Legislative Life: People, Process, and Performance in the States (New York : Harper and Row, 1981), p. 66.
12. State Legislative Report (Dec. 1979): p. 2.
13. "Committee Consideration of Bills", State Legislative Report (Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, Jan. 1979), p. 1-3.
14. Ibid., p. 2.
15. "New Approaches in Florida to Bill Limitation." Unpublished speech presented to the Southern Legislative Conference meeting in Louisville, Kentucky, July 19, 1979.
16. Ralph Craft, Strengthening the Arkansas Legislature (New Brunswick, NJ : Eagleton Institute of Politics, 1972), p. 140-146.
17. Robert M. Kamins, A Proposal for Taking the Legislative Bill out of Mass Production. Unpublished research monograph (1956), p. 6.
18. State Bar of Michigan, The Legislative Structure and Procedure of Michigan (1947 mimeo), p. 45. Hawaii's Senate made use of a "screening committee" during a brief special session in 1954, when the leadership of the Senate was desirous of limiting bills to statehood matters. No measures were introduced in the Senate before they were cleared by the Committee.
19. Robert Luce, Legislative Procedure (NY: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922) p. 659.
20. Rosenthal, Legislative Life (1981): p. 66 and New Approaches in Florida to Bill Limitation (1979).
21. National Conference of State Legislatures, State of the Legislatures: A Summary of Legislative Improvement and Policy Initiatives (Denver : NCSL, July 1, 1978), p. 6.

Backgrounder - Clearing the Logjam: Reducing Bill Introductions
Page Nine
August 1982

Notes (Continued)

22. Kamins, A Proposal . . . (1956): p. 9-11.

This backgrounder was compiled by E. Norman Sims, States Information Center.

PRICE: \$3.50