

opportunity to discuss some of the issues as they come before us. Senator Ashford mentioned the notorious and infamous crime bill which did not pass Congress the past session. That had nothing to do with the lawyers, it had to do with politicians who were posturing for the benefit of their respective constituencies. For example, everybody was in a race to see who could come up with the most offenses for which the death penalty would obtain. They got specific like they used to do in England. For example, there was one that said if a poultry inspector is killed while inspecting poultry there would be a death penalty. The Department of Agriculture said their inspectors are not even attacked so there is no need for that. Some guy down in Louisiana or someplace in that part of the country, if it is still a part of the country, had indicated that if a person is murdered on an oil rig located in the Gulf of Mexico, that would carry the death penalty. That's how specific they got so each one could say they created an offense for which the death penalty would be applied. So it was a silly, nonsensical bill and the Senators and Congressmen debating it knew that it would not pass. The President even got involved and further muddied the waters so anybody who just reads the paper, let alone analyzing and paying close attention to the provisions of the bill would have known that turkey was dead from the time of its conception. Senator...Senator...who is that guy back there? Senator Haberman had had some concerns about the Executive Board permission and, Senator Haberman, there is an attempt to put some mechanism of control so that everybody wouldn't have carte blanche authority to go to this council and do and seek any and everything that might occur to a person. There have been instances when senators have come to me complaining as I had complained about seeking Attorneys General Opinions and not getting them, and the reason I'm making Attorneys General plural because it wasn't just one with whom this was a problem. With the current Attorney General, and I have a feeling that some of the Republicans in the body may have discussed it with him and be concerned about him as an individual, and I may be wrong and Senator Pirsch can correct me, but I think that is why she said that there may be some Attorney General bashing. If that is the case, it shows why we need counsel because sides are chosen even on a bill such as this based on who the current Attorney General is and the political party he represents and he does represent a political position. What we need, Senator Haberman, when we talk about the lawyer-client privilege is a restriction on what the counsel is able to release. If I hire an attorney, I am the client