

January 17, 1995

is considered dilatory, no other senator can offer it at that stage of debate. What could be more reasonable than that? If it's dilatory when I offer it, how can it not be dilatory if Senator Bromm offers it? Regardless of how many amendments I offer, or whether you like it or not, you're not able to read my mind and determine why I offer an amendment. If I offer a kill motion and you all don't want to take up a kill motion and the introducer doesn't want to delay the bill for a day, then what are you going to do? Have the Speaker rule that it's dilatory because it obstructs what you all want to do? Anytime a kill motion is offered the aim not only is to obstruct, but to stop altogether what the body or the introducer, and sometimes a majority are trying to achieve. When I offer an amendment that goes in a contrary direction to that of whose offering the bill, I state that the purpose of my amendment is to stop what the introducer is trying to do, so that fits the definition of obstructing. English is not the indigenous language of people of my complexion, but I studied it, I know what words mean, I try to use them with some precision, and I don't do foolish things like a majority did this morning in adopting a rule that Senator Bromm, who was pushing it, said it does not do what the Rules Committee wants. That's why I mock the Legislature, that's why I say I wish The Bell Curve were correct and white people were genetically superior to me. Senator Bromm says people in his district ask him why cannot you talk about this particular issue. Well, we did debate the welfare bill. We did debate specific aspects of the crime bill. But you know what people ask me? Why would they say the rule doesn't do what they want it to do, but they adopt it? Why would they say they don't understand what it's saying, but they go for it? When it's black people, I say, well that's what superior people do. And inferior people, such as myself, have to sit there and try and learn how to go along with us, but I'm just not able to do it, I'm too inferior, I cannot see the sense of it. And we're not the ones, people of my complexion, who write books talking about inferiority of other groups. But I think there is something decidedly inferior in a process that attempts to work in the way that is being fashioned here today. But I will ask no quarter. And when you've adopted these bad rules and the session wears on, I will give none either. What this amendment says is if some people out in the lobby get offended and they want to stop Ernie from whatever he's doing, drag the Speaker out and tell him, next time we're not going to support you, or we're not going to do this or that, and put the Speaker in the middle of all this. And I'm going to tell you, you don't have a single