

uncomfortable if we pass this legislation with nothing in this kind of provision. We can argue about what those words might be, but in my opinion there needs to be, as a matter of state policy, a justification for an act that later on can be used to assist in interpretation of specifics. The first that I know that I can recall where there was what we sometimes call an intent section or in this case Legislature defines that I can recall was in 1969, it may have been before that. But I know that there was substantive legislation that contained several pages of these kinds of things which I know has been used over the years to assist in looking at the statutes because it did spell out, in a broad sense, what the objective of the legislation was. And I, personally, believe that that is desirable. Now if there's some particular item that is offensive to someone or feels that it is a discredit to the state, I'm certainly willing to look at that. But I do believe that it is desirable that there is a public policy statement that is included in this kind of legislation that lays kind of the groundwork for the interpretation of the specifics, and in many cases it's in fact the justification for the specifics. Certainly, if I was just to read one of them which acknowledges that various states continue to enhance their business climate through the enactment of competitive economic growth programs initiatives, I can tell you very frankly that I would not be voting for this bill, as I did not vote for many others in the past. If it wasn't that I understand that my position is totally noncompetitive, uncompetitive, and I don't like the situation we're in, but it's important from my viewpoint that we recognize in that intent statement that we're doing some of these things because that's the competitive nature of the world, and you either join in that or you get left out is the way it's working. May not be desirable but that's how it is. And I would indicate I won't disagree with the striking at this point, as far as the introducer is concerned. But I would be of the opinion it would be very poor policy not to include appropriate wording for the justification of the act as a whole.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Is there any further discussion of the Bernard-Stevens amendment to the committee amendments? Seeing none, Senator Bernard-Stevens to close.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you. And I appreciate Senator Withem's support of the amendment, and I hope the body would support it as well. I think it will save us time this morning. And I would like to point out to Senator Warner that the one