

was more specific and more helpful to the industry so that made some sense. So the Public Works Committee did not reject in total, the advertising code as was recommended by the Audit and Review Committee but rather we went through the twenty-five sections of the advertising code to take a look at each specific section and we kept in mind the fact that the motor vehicle industry wanted to keep the code because they thought it was helpful. On the other hand it was obvious that certain of the provisions in that code were or would intend to be anticompetitive and, therefore, we went through those individually, looking at each one and asking the question, is it helpful because of its specificity, is it harmful because of its possibly anticompetitive? Using that analysis on the basis of those questions we eliminated six out of twenty-five of the advertising provisions and changed a couple more. Now I would hardly call that wholesale change. It is a significant change but I think it is a change that has some rationale behind it. Now as far as changing the composition of the board is concerned, you know, how many public members do you want on the board is a matter of philosophy. DeCamp says it works, why change it. I guess I would appeal to common sense. If you have a board that has eight members of the industry on it and one member who is not a member of the industry and this is the board that is regulating its own industry, obviously I think, common sense would tell you that these people are going to tend to have an interest in what they are doing. They are going to tend to be self-interested and on that rationale, it was the thought of the committee that it would not be at all harmful to have a couple more members of the public on the board and that is the reason that change was made. Now as far as Senator Keyes' remarks are concerned, there is nothing in the committee amendments whatsoever having to do with his concern. The other items in the committee amendments I don't believe any of them affect any major changes and a couple of those are going to be addressed by amendments that are now on the floor. So what I would ask of you is that you take a look at each individual amendment that is a part of these committee amendments and not buy this wholesale onslaught to reject the committee amendments. There are a lot of good things in these committee amendments. You may not agree with all of them. That is fine but at least take the time to go through them and reject out of them the portions that you don't like because I think there are a lot of good things. I don't see any reason why the Consumer Protection Act and the Deceptive Trade Practices Act should not apply to the motor vehicle industry just as it applies to every other industry in this state. That, I think is a very advantageous change. I think I would limit my remarks to those at this time, Mr. Speaker, thank you.