

opposition to Senator Avery's amendment and...look at the language that we're dealing with that I passed out. The language was put in place in the statute over 50 years ago. It's almost 54 years old, 1941 was the last time that these sections were amended except for one at the very end and it hasn't been amended for at least 14 years since 1981. The proposal is one that we could easily have done, as Senator Withem pointed out, through the legislative policy. The Executive Board could have done this, but we chose not to. We talked about it. There was much discussion by last year's Executive Board to say, well, let's just change the policy, that way we don't have to introduce the bill and we'll take care of it, listen to this, we'll take care of it before the upcoming session. And there were some of us on the committee that said, no, that frankly people are planning on that chairmanship being available, that really what we ought to do is we ought to wait, we ought to introduce a bill, we ought to have some discussion on it. When we had the bill before the committee, before the board, there was no discussion except for the introducer, Senator Withem, and then the board in exec session. There was no proponents, no opponents. It appeared to be a measure that no one was going to object to. And the Avery amendment really strips the bill of what it intends to do because it does, in effect, nothing because what you're doing is you're leaving in sections of statute that are inactive at present. They don't function and you're putting in...you're stripping out with the amendment those sections that do nothing. You're leaving in the Intergovernmental which, frankly, we could take care of by policy. We chose not to do that. I think that was the right decision. I think bringing the bill here, talking about it was one that makes every sense and that it is the kind of measure where the Legislature can stand up and say, look, there are enough Standing Committees, there is enough involvement and this is really nothing more than an administrative function. The appointment aspect should lie in the Speaker's Office. I trust that's where it ought to land and that's where it has traditionally been, that's where it is in virtually every other state in the country. With regard to the issue of what organizations we belong to, I echo Senator Chambers' comments and I also say that, again, I can't think of one instance where individuals were denied an opportunity to attend a function, whether it be a singular meeting or a convention, when they appealed that were denied and appealed that to the Executive Board, but if I'm wrong there I'd stand to be corrected. I very well could be. But it has always been my policy in the two and