

but I'm going to. The bill was brought to this Legislature and once it's brought to us and submitted for our consideration, then we can do with it whatever we want to do. Enough of you all, despite how you feel, are going to vote to pass it, probably, but I'm going to have to make...I'm going to have to...I'm going to have made all of the efforts that I could to change some aspects of it that I find to be particularly unfair and particularly hypocritical. This is one of those which I would describe as hypocrisy par excellence. Senator Schimek and others have pointed out the inconvenience to rural letter carriers if they have to slide across the seat to put mail in somebody's letter box. I don't disagree with that. I think it's very inconvenient and it might be very unreasonable to make them put on a belt every time they get in the car and move it on the street or the highway, but that's what's being done to everybody else in disregard of how they drive. Suppose there's somebody who has some job in the city, like throwing newspapers, and they drive and sometimes they can drive maybe a half a block throwing the paper into people's yards without getting out of their car, then they have to stop the car, get out, walk up to the door and put the paper in a receptacle or on the front porch, get in their car, drive a little bit further, stop and do the same thing. Now I know people make fun of newspaper persons, meaning those who deliver papers, but is it any less inconvenient to them to have to stop frequently, get out of their car and make their deliveries than it is to the rural letter carrier? It's not. But this is not an honest bill, this is not a fair bill, it's a political bill. The one thing I will say about Senator Horgan, no matter how inconsistent or bad it may make him appear, he will give answers to questions and you might have to ask him the question several times before he answers it but he will wind up answering a question that doesn't make him look good. He will admit that the bill is supposedly for safety but he compromises it. He will admit that if he had two children and one was guilty of an offense and the other innocent, he wouldn't punish the innocent one and let the guilty one go, but that's what's being done here and it doesn't bother him. Most people won't say that, but he frankly admits it. What about the rest of you? And there's some of you all who are going to come more directly in contact with people who don't like this bill than I will, but I'm mainly opposed to it not just because of what people are going to say. But there are some principles that I think the Legislature ought to observe when it enacts laws and the first one is that the innocent ought not suffer for the guilty and that's what this law does. I