

January 14, 1992

mention but was discussed and is, in fact, true is the fact that the six-person committee would guarantee...maybe some people don't want this kind of a guarantee, but would guarantee that all of the eight-people committees would have an even balance between urban and rural, even more of an imbalance for rural because one of the urban districts is, in fact, not an urban district but an urban-suburban district. Think about that. For any of you who are from outstate and have, I guess, probably convinced yourself you should support something other than the three or the six, think about that. There is, under the proposition for four, no guarantee that that will happen. In fact, there is no guarantee at all for anything, I guess, because the opportunity under the rule for six, the rule for three and the rule for four still provides for the caucuses to trade where there are options and opportunities to do that. If Senator Lamb was here, I would ask him if, for example, four is magic because we have committees of eight, what do you do with the two committees that are seven and one that's nine? He didn't mention that, of course. But that is, in fact, a problem. Please understand that I know and you know, in your heart, the reason for the four. And so when Senator Lamb said, without cracking a smile, it has nothing to do with power or control, you know, he had to be laughing on the inside because that's, obviously, the reason for it. And so for those of you that insist on the four, please sometime on the floor explain why, other than the stupidity of the numbers, why it's justified for us to violate the one-person, one-vote rule in the reorganization of ourselves for committees. That's all. Help us understand that. Help me understand that. And I hope you understand that we shouldn't think about things like that when we develop these kinds of rules. It makes sense for us to do this for the right reasons and I'm afraid we're on a path of reorganizing for just the opposite. It makes sense, it really makes sense for us to reorganize with the six and I intend to support it, to be completely frank, as I liked it better than the three. We talk about things being divisible, was going to say this when I close, but keep this in mind, divisible, what's divisible by what? Was our concern the number of committees that have eight, the number of committees that have seven, the number of committees that have nine? That has nothing to do with anything. It's how people are represented from their Congressional districts in this Legislature for organizational purposes. When you take out the nine members of the Appropriations Committee and you take out the Speaker who can serve those ten people on no other committee, how many people do