

March 5, 1973

the board. I think that if we do this then we had every right and every reason to consider the designation of other interested persons such as a businessman, farmer, lawyer, clergyman, any other area. I think that the authority is there to appoint anyone that they desire. I think it is good to point out that a low income person or a tenant could be a member of this board but I do think it is wrong for this Legislature to, by statute, require that it be placed in the law.

SPEAKER: Senator Epke, do you wish to be recognized on the amendment?

SENATOR EPKE: Mr. President and fellow Members, just briefly I would like to support Senator Schmit's amendment. Here again, I think permissive legislation would be much better than mandatory. I feel the word "may" fits much better than "shall." For this reason, I certainly would support Senator Schmit's amendment.

SPEAKER: Any further discussion of the amendment? Senator Simpson.

SENATOR SIMPSON: Mr. President and Members of the Legislature. I wonder if I might have the amendment read once more. I'm not sure I understood how many places you put in "shall", or "may."

SPEAKER: Clerk will read the amendment, please.

CLERK: Amendment read again.

SENATOR SIMPSON: Well, it would seem, first of all, to me that if we were going to change it to permissive legislation, the only necessary change would be, would be in line 17. There it might be a requirement. I think that the other things might be necessary if they are going to appoint such a person, I think then they shall have to do certain things. First, shall or may, may they decide where they want to and then they shall have to do certain things if they decide the appointment so I think my first point would be that shall in line 17 be changed--

(End of Belt #3)