

January 15, 1981

they have stood here on the floor and changed that rule without going through the Rules Committee. I hope that that hypocrisy hits everybody right between the eyes. I would also say just on the question of how many votes it now takes to do this or to do that, Senator Wesely's motion has been rejected. The proper motion now is a motion for reconsideration, another of the rules which we have always used which requires thirty votes. So whether you go one way or whether you go the other, there is a thirty vote requirement unless the Speaker makes the decision that we are not operating under any rules whatsoever right now and formulates new rules. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to express my personal feeling, I think the personal feeling that everybody I worked with on this issue, that we are very, very willing to compromise this issue. Offers of compromise were extended to everybody known to be on the other side yesterday and there was absolutely no offer in return to compromise. So I guess I kind of feel bad that our side is being put in the black hat side, that we are somehow doing something improper, that we are not willing to compromise when, in fact, if everyone is willing to compromise there is no reason why we can't send this back to committee, quickly compromise the one sticky issue and be done with this tomorrow morning on a unanimous vote. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, as probably most of the body knows my wife is what, half Chinese and half Vietnamese. In other words, she is an Oriental and I have learned something living with that gal and living in the Orient quite a bit and maybe it explains what is happening here today. The Orientals take saving face, saving face, as maybe one of the most fundamental things there is and I guess I have never understood it completely but you may remember the famous Vietnam peace talks. They spent a month arguing about the shape of the table, whether it should be a square table or a round table that they sat at. It had nothing to do with the substance of the issue whatsoever, but winning that point at the very beginning meant everything to both sides. Americans don't understand that very well but I really think maybe that is what is going on here today on Side A, B, C and D and I will tell you why I think so. The arguments against the limitations have been something like, there is going to be a flood of bills this year; we are protecting against this onslaught of introductions; there isn't