

it ought to be passed. A couple of weeks ago I talked to the Governor as I do from time to time, sometimes on his request and sometimes on my own. As I have said I am not the Governor's man in this body, I'm a state Senator. I think that we are always in a position to compromise in every area of state government if we are going to succeed. Sometimes you have the votes and you can accomplish anything you want to do irrespective of the compromise. Now the purpose of this bill of course is to do away with DAS as it has been for years in the past. I think I have had as much if not more to do with the amending of that type of operation when it was originated than anybody in this body. I think it serves some good and to some extent it hasn't done what the introducers of the original bill and the amendment expected it to do. We might as well be frank about it, there are many people in this body, and I am one of them, who has not a great deal of admiration for Mr. Liskey, which is only a matter of opinion and maybe not based upon facts. I am one of those who doesn't believe that he even advised of the Governors extent that he should in the area of great importance. Again that is a matter of opinion and may not be a fact. Now I talked to the Governor a short time, two or three weeks ago on this bill and I suggested "Governor why don't you get rid of a lot of this stuff, it doesn't do you a lot of good, it encumbers your time in an area that could at least in my judgment done better by others than it is now being done." Now he indicated at that time that he did not say, he indicated then that his main concern was the composition of the commission which would operate and this comptroller's office. He indicated then, and I think that he indicated yesterday that if this body would be in the frame of mind to accept this amendment which will allow him to appoint to the commission as is the general procedure that he would go along with the rest of the bill even though in many areas he was not in agreement with. Which again is a compromise. Now we are confronted with a fact of facts of life that if this bill gets 33 votes and the emergency clause, which is one of the amendments that is either on there now or will be on there on select file, then I think that this body ought to understand that if you give 33 votes then, then put the emergency clause on their, you ought to give 33 votes to over ride his veto if he vetoes it. I think that he will. That is my opinion from my conversation with him. Although he never said that specifically, he is concerned about the invasion of his rights which I don't think this bill invades his rights, but he does. I think that we ought to look at this, really, if you are going to give this bill 33 votes to give the emergency clause lets have an understanding that if he vetoes the bill then we are going to give it 33 votes to pass over his veto. Now I hear a great many people say that they would like to take politics out of this. I don't want to take politics out of anything. Those who say they do for the most part don't really mean what they say. That is the way we live. I don't know if the commission is in this bill is the right commission or not, I think that only time a can tell. I would think that if you wanted to amend my amendment if you are going to consider it at all, it ought to so say that out of the 5 members three shall be from one party and 2 from another party. I don't think that it is material but if it satisfies the apprehensive of many people because irrespective of who you appoint, you are not going to eliminate politics

(end belt #5)