

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

January 10, 2000

attention, you've got the answer. I am going to be completely frank on this. My intent is to discuss it and discuss it and hold our feet to this fire that was not of my making. If a majority of you-all told the Rules Committee that you wanted to do this, where are all of you now speaking up in favor of this, and joining the discussion? If you've had second thoughts, acknowledge, as some of your colleagues have, that you've had second thoughts, and the members of the Rules Committee who are sitting here thinking that they've got everything their way will not be in that deceived position. They will know that it's time to fold 'em. Now I do know when to hold 'em, I do know when to fold 'em. But I might see that it's time to fold them sooner than somebody else, or that I can hold them longer than somebody else. But I do know when that time has come, but I may choose not to fold them anyway. I may choose to make you take everything off the table that I've got. But my colleagues are not like that. They want to salvage something. They don't want to go down to an inglorious defeat that might stain the rest of the session for them, because that's how they view these things. They view them as catastrophic and cataclysmic. When they have lost as many votes and as many issues as I have in this Legislature, they will learn how to pick themselves up, dust themselves off, and start all over again. It's not the end of the world. It's not the end of a day even, but they worry and they fret and they fume and they brood over this stuff. I wanted that and I didn't it. Well, so what? Your kids wanted things that you didn't give to them. So, we have to be mature, we have to be able to deal with the difficulties that confront us in a legislative setting. It is my responsibility, whether anybody else will assume theirs or not, to fight against something which I think is very unwise and inappropriate. This idea of changing the number of members on a committee just so it will be divisible by three is preposterous. See, if we had four carcasses, caucuses they say, if we have four caucuses then they'd want a number divisible by four, so the number would be eight or twelve. But, fortunately, six and nine are the only two numbers that we have to deal with. Nobody wants to go to twelve, which is divisible by three. Nobody wants to go to fifteen, which is divisible by three. So I'm going to say again from my colleagues on the Rules Committee, since I'm not sympathetic to those on the Judiciary Committee, all of you who are going to support what they've offered raise your hand. See?