

May 1, 1975

perhaps literally. He's certainly big enough to do that. The way he blusters in here, in the Legislature, he has the temperament where he would do it. So they're not going to go to the Governor and order him to veto this bill. They go to the Legislature which, in the three-link chain of government in this state, is the weakest link. Go to the Legislature and bully and intimidate them, and tell them that what you were convinced of yesterday is all wrong. When you occupy that position you were stupid. Now I'm coming with wisdom and light and revelation. Let there be light, and there was light. Suddenly the Legislature saw the error of its ways, and is going to back up and do whatever the special group interest demands should be done. The bill was extensively discussed. Senator Bereuter was interrogated on this bill like I've seen nobody interrogated on any bill in the Legislature before. There have been hostile arguments back and forth where most of the discussion was not on the issues of the bill. People were trying to be clever, whitty, vindictive, or get their shots in. But most of the questions on this bill were directed to the material contained in the bill. That also makes it a unique situation. I don't believe that anybody who has listened to this bill, or has read it misunderstands what it contains. I don't think anybody who voted, whether they voted for or against it, voted on a basis of ignorance. Now that's my opinion and I could be mistaken. So it always amazes me how that in a very short span of time more information can come to certain individual senators then came to them during the entire consideration of the bill. Let me clarify something else. There could be a situation where something could be contained in a bill. Maybe the sentence structure or the words used to express an idea did not really do what the Legislature thought was being done, but there was no misunderstanding of what was intended. There was misunderstanding as to whether it was actually done. In that case where a correction of that type is to be made, I can see bringing the bill back. That is the better part of wisdom, to acknowledge an error and correct. But to try to take a second shot and a cheap shot, I think, is inexcusable. The Legislature ought to begin to set some standards. We ought to adhere to those standards. There have been bills which I have been opposed to that got over to the Governor's office and I voted against bringing it back on the basis of the Legislature's integrity, not the merits of the bill cause I felt the Legislature had acted properly and that action should not be undermined. As a result I voted against taking another cheap shot at a bill that I really was opposed to. Some issues cause others to become less important at that moment. Comparing the integrity of the Legislature to taking another cheap shot at a bill that you may be opposed to, I think, should cause us to vote for the integrity of the Legislature. I hope you'll notice very well that I have not said anything about what the bill contains, or its merits. I'm not rearguing the bill. I'm trying to argue the motion that has been made to bring it back. I think it is ill-advised. It is illconceived. For my part, I can't even waiver, I can't even consider bringing it back. I hope you'll see it the same way, or enough of you to defeat this motion.