

of that amendment and after that I can talk some more about the letter that was passed out. Maybe I should do that while I'm here. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, there is a letter been passed out to you which during the discussion of the preliminary budget, some months ago now I guess, the issue came up as one which has come up before as to if there was any constitutional issues involved and what states had or had not joined. And in the process at least, the suggestion was made that I should write for some advice from the Attorney General as to the appropriateness of an appropriation. What I did not realize until a couple of nights ago, that this letter, because it was not a request for an opinion in the effect that we usually do, but was an advisory type of request, consultation if you please, that because of that reason, why, the letter only came back to me and to the committee and was not printed in the Journal, and I had always just assumed it had been and everybody was aware of it. As it turned out that was not the case, so that's why it is being passed out. It does indicate what most of us know might be a constitutional issue as to the selection of the members by the Legislature and that is an issue that comes up from time to time and sometimes we tend to ignore it and sometimes we don't, and...forecast board for example, are selected both by the executive and the Legislature and I suspect that is not constitutional either. But...and there is a couple of others of those and there has been proposals for others, but the key line it seemed to me of this letter is in the last paragraph which others may discuss and which states, and this deals with the compact itself, that in such a case the validity of the appropriation would depend on a factual determination by the Appropriations Committee or the Legislature as to whether or not a state's failure to contribute to the financial support of the compact constitutes a sufficient breach of agreement between the states as the result in a state losing membership in the compact. And it was our feeling that because of the nature of the letter and some of the questions that have been raised, at least discussed, that it would be more appropriate that the Legislature as a whole make a determination whether or not they wished to make this appropriation and continue with the state's participation financially at least with the compact. I'm not sure...I don't think the failure to pay necessarily expels you from the compact, but obviously one would not be a participant either but it's...obviously to participate one would have to have an amount appropriate equal to the assessment that the compact eventually makes. That is an explanation of somewhat of the letter, at least on the last part, and...but the amendment