

the child's honest way said, "The Emperor has no clothes," and exposed verbally what these shysters had exposed literally. That is what you are doing now. You are playing the Emperor's new clothes game. You are saying that because the Governor is a wimp, a wishy-washy, a cowardly, shilly-shallying dodger of the issues, the Legislature is going to duplicate that conduct and do the same thing but what would be the effect of ignoring this communication which I feel is a veto? It means that based on the facts of the situation and the law, the bill has been vetoed. If these bankers out here are foolish enough to play a game among themselves, let them do so. Let them start buying up other banks and taking a lot of stupid acts, relying on whether or not this is a bill or not. Then when they find out that it was vetoed, then anything that they had done based on the authorization of this will have to be undone so if they want to do that, fine. If the Governor wants to try to hide under stones, fine, but I am not going to do it. There are a couple of things I want to be sure and touch on. The issue that I am raising is not whether the Lieutenant Governor was a member of the Legislature and thereby his vote constituted a valid twenty-fifth vote. I am saying that the Governor offered a veto. He could give a thousand reasons for vetoing a bill and every one of them could be wrong. The Constitution does not require the Governor to be intelligent. It does not require him to be correct. It does not require him to be literate or anything else. All it says is he has to return the bill with his objections, without his signature and that is what even Senator Beutler would have to admit, but I am not going to run him through those hoops of answering these questions because he knows. Now, I have to give an example from the law for the lawyers. If you are brought before a court and you want to challenge the jurisdiction of the court and you feel there is no jurisdiction you can enter what they call a special appearance. That means your only reason for coming before the court is not to give them jurisdiction over you which you say the court doesn't have, but to show why the court doesn't have jurisdiction. Now you can characterize your being there as a special appearance but if you begin to go into the merits of the issue then despite the fact that you said this is a special appearance, it becomes what they call general, meaning that you are there to litigate the issue and by your action you have given the court jurisdiction. So, despite how you characterize what the Governor has done or how he characterizes it, the facts will speak for themselves and determine what we have before us and it is a veto no matter what you call it. I don't think the Legislature can afford to refuse to act in this case. On page 2367 of the Journal we have a record of the vote and the Lieutenant Governor is mentioned as one of the voters. That is the official record of the Legislature. On page 2375 the Journal points out that the bill was presented to the Governor.