

emphasize to the body that right now we're just dealing with the first part of my proposed amendment, which simply again says that rather than the DAS Director developing and approving enterprise-wide goals for technology, he is to develop and recommend to the Legislature and the Governor enterprise-wide goals, guidelines, and priorities. And I think this is meaningful because I think it reminds our heads of some of our departments that this is still and should be the policy-making body. We are accountable to the voters. If we develop a policy that is harmful to them or makes it hard for them to access state government information, or makes it expensive for them to access state government information we are accountable. If a director does that they just say, I'm sorry, I shouldn't have done that. And unless the Governor or somebody has the fortitude to replace that individual or severely reprimand them, we go on down the road on our merrily way as if nothing happened. And that's what Senator Chambers was getting at, last night and yesterday, and he's absolutely right. Now I'm not trying to micromanage, I don't think, when I say that enterprise-wide goals to enter the year...the century, the twenty-first century with technology should be recommended to this body and the Governor rather than having an individual in state government who isn't directly accountable to us determining what those goals are and implementing them just like that. Now this part of the amendment I think should be relatively uncontroversial. The next part is controversial, and the next part I'm probably going to ask the body to reject or I'll withdraw and we'll substitute some different language, because I wanted the discussion, but I think there are some constitutional problems with the next part of the amendment. But this part of the amendment I don't hear a good argument against doing this, against having the Director of DAS recommend enterprise goals rather than just deciding what those goals are himself and implementing them, and then having us come along later and decide that maybe it wasn't the wisest course of action. So again it's not my intent to delay the project, not my intent to follow up the procedural aspects of the project, but we're talking about some pretty big concepts here. We're talking about concepts that are going to head us down the road of technology for years to come, so it's not asking too much to ask a department head to make recommendations rather than giving them the blank check to decide what the priorities are and to spend the money as such. So I would ask the body to consider approving Section 1 of this amendment, and then we'll deal with