

they have created for us an interesting mystery that I think I would like to pursue. In the first place, they overturned a longstanding significant precedent. The rules of this body for over thirty years indicated in the subject matters to be covered by committees that the Government Committee should be responsible for reapportionment bills. That was a part of the legislative rules for over thirty years. They also overturned the suggestion, the impartial decision by our staff, Jack Rodgers, who suggested that the Government Committee was the appropriate committee, and they chose to ignore that impartial staff member. Apparently they placed some credence in the fact that in 1970 this bill went to the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee, and those who were in this body at that time or who worked for the Legislature might well remember that the membership of that committee was very unique and probably was the determining factor as to why that bill went to Miscellaneous Subjects. Senators Mahoney, Skarda and others served on that body, and that aberration in 1970 might well have been politically motivated and now the Board wants to continue that politically motivated aberration. So we have an interesting problem here, the reversal of a longstanding precedent, the reversal of our own staff who has expertise and knowledge going back almost thirty years in legislative references. If you have a mystery, it is best to look at somebody who solves mysteries, and I was looking through Sherlock Holmes the other day for the way that he solved a mystery and he says, "When you eliminate everything that can't be true, what remains must be true". Well why did the Exec Board act the way they did? Is it because the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee is more experienced? Hardly. Forty percent of the committee has roughly three weeks of legislative experience. No member on the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee has ever worked on a reapportionment bill before or was even in the body when reapportionment was considered last time. So it could hardly be experience that justified the change. Is it interest? Well, the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee did not offer a bill for reapportionment; the Government Committee did, thought ahead, planned for it and introduced a bill, but not the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee. Now it is true that Ron Bowmaster has been working on this, but he could work with any committee. So I don't think we have any evidence of forethought or interest in this area necessarily that justifies the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee. Is it geographical breakdown? Well, we have a four-four rural-urban split on both committees. We also have an interesting problem, sort of a catch-22. You see we have more than one kind of caucus, and if you wanted to justify something, of course you could say