

Gay-rights groups at odds over when to attempt repeal of same-sex marriage ban

There's consensus among national gay organizations to back a campaign to overturn Ohio's same-sex marriage ban. But unusual events yesterday showed there's no agreement on when that should happen. Minutes after a meeting of 11 state and national gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender organizations ended in Columbus yesterday, Ian James, co-founder of FreedomOhio, sent out a release saying his group will seek a statewide vote next year to overturn the ban Ohioans approved in 2004. "We have decided to be on the ballot in 2014 to allow for a continuing dialogue with voters across Ohio about why marriage matters," James said. But shortly after that email, several people who attended the meeting, including Elyzabeth Holford, executive director of Equality Ohio, disputed James' suggestion that there was consensus about next year — or any specific year. They accused James of "misleading characterizations" of the meeting. "There's quite a bit of work to be done in Ohio," Holford said. "Today was really the beginning. "We intend to win and will do everything necessary to secure fairness for same-sex couples and their families." Holford said it was "absolutely inappropriate for James to infer there was an agreement to move forward next year. ... We will move forward when the time is right." "Ian James must have attended a different meeting than the rest of us," Marty Rouse, national field director for the Human Rights Campaign, said in a statement. He said 10 organizations came away from the meeting with the understanding that no decision was made. "We're perplexed as to how FreedomOhio came away with a different understanding." Marc Solomon, of Freedom to Marry, added that the groups are "committed to winning marriage in Ohio as soon as possible ... in 2016 or, if possible, sooner." Gay marriage has been approved in 12 states and the District of Columbia, either through ballot issues or legislative action. James' group is well on the way to gathering the 385,253 valid signatures of registered Ohio voters needed to qualify for the ballot. But there has been indecision about the best time to put the issue to a vote. James responded to the criticism by saying his group voted to go to the ballot next year. "Our LGBT friends in state and nationally are welcome to join us or they can sit this one out. Either way, we are going to be on the ballot in 2014 and will run a robust and winning campaign. Period." Groups attending yesterday's meeting also included the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force, the Gill Action Fund, the American Unity Fund and the Ballot Initiative Strategy Center. Phil Burress, head of Citizens for Community Values, the Cincinnati-based conservative group that led the charge for the 2004 constitutional amendment that defined marriage as solely between one man and one woman, said he thinks an attempt at overturning the ban will be unsuccessful in any year. "Putting it on the ballot in 2014 spells victory for John Kasich," Burress said, referring to Ohio's Republican governor who will seek a second term next year. "People only need to look back to 2004 when Ohioans sent George W. Bush back to the White House because of this issue."

Columbus Dispatch. 6/4/13

When will gay marriage be back on Ohio's ballot? A closer look at the 2 most likely scenarios

A group [leading the charge to reverse Ohio's ban on same-sex marriage](#) has met resistance from many gay rights organizations supportive of the cause but not of the timeline. Moments after meeting last week with fellow advocates, [Ian James of FreedomOhio vowed to place a ballot measure before voters in next year's gubernatorial election](#). His pledge stunned others who had been a part of the discussion. "Ian James must have attended a different meeting than the rest of us," said Marty Rouse, national field director for the Human Rights Campaign and one of several who complained in a joint statement sent in response to James' announcement. "Representatives from 11 state and national organizations participated in today's meeting. Ten of them came away with a clear understanding that we would refrain from deciding on timing until it was responsible to do so." Though they are unwilling to commit to a date, those at odds with FreedomOhio seem to have reservations about 2014. One activist who signed on to the James rebuke suggested they might not be ready until 2016, "or if possible sooner." But James said gay couples in Ohio have waited long enough. It's been nearly a decade since voters amended the state constitution to ban gay marriage, and recent polls show opinion shifting in favor of allowing same-sex partners to wed. A narrow plurality of Ohio voters -- 48 percent to 44 percent -- supported gay marriage in an [April survey by Quinnipiac University](#). Support should grow as a younger generation less bothered by gay marriage joins the voting ranks. James said FreedomOhio, which has some of the state's top political talent at its disposal, will gather petition signatures with the goal of being on the November 2014 ballot. The group also will continue to monitor polls, and organizers ultimately could decide against going through with the campaign if they sense they won't be successful. The infighting underscores questions about how a fight to legalize gay marriage would play out under the two most likely scenarios. Odd-numbered years such as this one make little sense for proponents because local races top the ticket, turnout is low and well-funded groups opposed to gay marriage won't be spread as thin as they are in national cycles. So what might happen if it comes to the ballot next year? How about in 2016? The option James prefers would make gay marriage a key issue during Ohio's election for statewide offices. The top of the ballot will feature Republican Gov. John Kasich and, likely, Democrat Ed FitzGerald. Kasich opposes gay marriage. FitzGerald, the Cuyahoga County executive, [recently declared his support for it](#). Meanwhile, conservative Tea Party organizers in Ohio have branched out beyond their bread-and-butter focus on fiscal policy to advocate against gay marriage and other social issues. They see 2014 as a chance to assert their independence from the GOP establishment. John Green, director of the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics at the University of Akron, noted that history and the political climate are likely to favor the Republicans next year. [Since World War II](#), all Buckeye State gubernatorial contests run during the sixth year of a two-term presidency were won by the party that did not occupy the White House. While President Barack Obama, a Democrat, deals with scandals and intensified scrutiny in his second term, Kasich's approval ratings [are improving](#). So is the economy. If all trends continue, it could be a very tough year for Democrats. Polls show that Ohio Democrats overwhelmingly support gay marriage. But the question will be whether that support is strong enough to offset GOP turnout and any scrappy Tea Party campaign that might materialize as a conservative third party or challenge to gay marriage. The more values voters who cast ballots, the more likely the marriage ban will stand. Green said it is possible that public opinion will shift more decisively in favor of same-sex marriage by November 2014. But if the election were held today, Green does not believe that the effort to legalize it would be successful. "The intensity side would favor conservatives, who definitely would not want same-sex marriage," Green said. Phil Burress of Citizens for Community Values, a group the championed the ban, agrees. [In a statement last week](#), he said

having the issue on the ballot in 2004 helped re-elect Republican President George W. Bush. Renewing the fight next year "will guarantee victory for Gov. John Kasich and all those who support natural marriage," Burrell said. FitzGerald declined through a spokeswoman to speculate how the measure would affect his race. "As for the best timing to ensure success at the ballot, I believe that it is for the LGBT [lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender] community to decide," FitzGerald said in an email. "Whenever it reaches the ballot, I will vote for it." By 2016, support for gay marriage likely will have grown. "Things might be favorable in 2014, but they would be even more favorable in 2016," Green said. And typically the candidates at the top of the ticket fuel turnout -- especially in a presidential year. Democrats could have Hillary Clinton, whom [polls show](#) to be the early primary and general election frontrunner, as their presidential nominee. She [recently declared her support for gay marriage](#). So did a Republican likely to be on the Ohio ballot that year. Sen. Rob Portman will be up for a second term if he's not running for president or vice president. [Portman's announcement in March](#) that he now backs gay marriage angered conservatives. A lot can happen between now and then, but it would be interesting to see whether Portman would openly embrace the initiative or keep his distance. The opportunity to defeat Portman and a gay marriage measure in the same year might appeal to evangelical and Tea Party conservatives, but if they double down on the Senate race, they run the risk of tipping it to Democrats. And any hope of unseating Portman requires a credible primary challenge that would use up resources before the general election. Charles Tassell of Citizens for Community Values said 2016 would be no better than 2014 for gay rights advocates. "I don't think it matters which year they come in," Tassell told The Plain Dealer on Friday. Elyzabeth Holford, executive director of Equality Ohio, said it is wrong to surmise that her group and others squabbling with FreedomOhio fear that 2014 is too soon for the fight, though she offered no concrete timeline. "The time will be right in Ohio when we have the same consistent, robust and broad support that has helped us achieve marriage equality in other jurisdictions across the country," Holford wrote Friday in an email. "There is much work to do, but Equality Ohio and the other organizations in the room have the expertise, skill and capacity to do this."

Cleveland Plain Dealer. 6/9/13

Whole Foods faces boycott over English-only work policy

Whole Foods Market, threatened with a national boycott over its English-only language policy for workers on the job, said on Friday it was reviewing the rules after two Spanish-speaking workers in New Mexico claimed they were suspended for complaining. The Austin, Texas-based organic grocery chain is re-examining the policy "and it will be the topic of ongoing conversations at an all-leadership conference next week," company spokeswoman Libba Letton said in a statement. The move comes after two employees at an Albuquerque Whole Foods store said they were suspended for a day after recently complaining about a company rule that forbids them from speaking Spanish to each other while on the job. But Letton said the store launched an investigation based on the claims and determined the employees misunderstood and were not told that they couldn't speak Spanish. She said the two were suspended with pay for being "rude and disrespectful" in an office. "Their suspension was due to their behavior alone," she said. Ben Friedland, the company's Rocky Mountain region executive marketing coordinator, said the policy states that all English-speaking workers must speak English to customers and other employees while on the clock, unless the customer speaks another language. "Team members are

free to speak any language they would like during their breaks, meal periods and before and after work," Friedland said. He said the policy doesn't prevent employees from speaking Spanish if all "parties present agree that a different language is their preferred form of communication." News of the suspensions and the policy barring workers from speaking other languages while on the clock sparked outrage on social media and among advocates who started online petitions and called for the company to change the rule. At a news conference outside the Albuquerque store, Ralph Arellanes, state director of the New Mexico League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), threatened to launch a nationwide boycott of Whole Foods if the company does not change its policy within one week. "I will give them a period of seven days to implement a new policy...or we will hold them accountable," Arellanes said. He contends the Whole Foods policy violates New Mexico's state constitution, which protects Spanish and American Indian languages. Letton, the company spokeswoman, said that during the review of the policy, Whole Foods will speak with various civil rights groups. "We are also in the process of reaching out to groups like LULAC to discuss the issue and hear their perspective," she said.

Associated Press. 6/7/13

Supreme Court strikes down Arizona law requiring proof of citizenship to vote

The Supreme Court on Monday struck down an Arizona law that requires people to submit proof of citizenship when they register to vote. The vote was 7-2. Justice Antonin Scalia, writing for the majority, said that a 1993 federal law known as the Motor Voter Act takes precedence over the Arizona law because of its requirement that states "accept and use" the federal voter registration form. Justices Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito, two members of the court's conservative wing, dissented. Only a handful of states have similar laws, which the states say are meant to reduce voter fraud. Civil rights groups said the Arizona law was an effort to discourage voting by legal immigrants, and they worried that more states would have followed if the Supreme Court had upheld it. Groups opposed to the Arizona law said that the court had blocked an attempt at voter suppression. "Today's decision sends a strong message that states cannot block their citizens from registering to vote by superimposing burdensome paperwork requirements on top of federal law," said Nina Perales, vice president of litigation for the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Citizenship is a requirement to vote in any federal election, and the federal registration form requires people to state, under penalty of perjury, that they are American citizens. States can use their own forms, but they must be equivalent to the federal form. The Arizona law, known as Proposition 200 and adopted by Arizona voters in 2004, went further than the federal form by requiring applicants to provide proof of citizenship. Arizona has used the law to reject 30,000 voter applications, according to the Brennan Center for Justice. Challengers to the law argued that it put an extra burden on naturalized citizens. Using a naturalization document as proof would require an applicant to register in person, as opposed to through the mail, because federal law prohibits copying the document. A federal appeals court said that Arizona had gone too far and essentially rejected the federal form. Arizona said it was not a rejection of the federal form any more than asking for ID at an airport is a rejection of a plane ticket. The Supreme Court ruling pointed out that Arizona still has an option: It can ask the federal government to include state-specific instructions on the federal form, and go to court if the government says no. Three other states — Alabama, Georgia

and Kansas — have laws almost identical to Arizona’s and joined it in urging the court to uphold the additional requirement for proof of citizenship. At an oral argument in March, Thomas Horne, a lawyer for Arizona, told the justices that the state was within its rights to ask for additional information beyond the simple federal form. “It’s extremely inadequate,” Horne said. “It’s essentially an honor system. It does not do the job.” “Well,” answered Justice Sonia Sotomayor, “that’s what the federal system decided was enough.” The court’s conservatives had appeared sympathetic to the Arizona side. Scalia said during the argument that federal law clearly empowers the states to take additional action to assess a potential voter’s eligibility. “Under oath is not proof at all,” he said. “It’s just a statement.” Patricia Millett, a lawyer for groups opposed to the law, countered: “Statements under oath in a criminal case are proof beyond a reasonable doubt” in criminal cases that result in execution. “It’s a very serious oath,” she said. Arizona is known for its tough stance on immigration. Last year, the Supreme Court struck down some key provisions of a state law meant to crack down on illegal immigration. But it let stand the most controversial part — a requirement that police making traffic stops check the immigration status of anyone they suspect of being in the country illegally.

NBC News. 6/17/13

Current, former officials back secret surveillance

Current and former top U.S. officials on Sunday defended the government’s collection of phone and Internet data following new revelations about the secret surveillance programs, saying the operations were essential in disrupting terrorist plots and did not infringe on Americans’ civil liberties. In interviews on Sunday talk shows, guests ranging from White House chief of staff Denis McDonough to former Vice President Dick Cheney and former CIA and National Security Agency head Michael Hayden said the government’s reliance on data collection from both Americans and foreign nationals was constitutional and carefully overseen by executive, legislative and court authorities. All three branches of government, using “aggressive internal checks inside the administration, from inspectors general and routine audits, are overseeing how we do these programs,” McDonough said. He added, “I think that the American people can feel confident that we have those three branches looking.” The latest reassurances came as a new Washington Post report Sunday described the massive intertwined structure of four major data collection programs that have been set up by the government since the 9/11 attacks. The Post report follows earlier stories based on documents provided by NSA contractor Edward Snowden. Two secret programs, the Post reported in its new disclosures, are aimed at phone and Internet metadata, while two more target contents of phone and Internet communications. Metadata includes logs and timing of phone calls and lists of Internet communications, but does not include the actual contents of communications. Even without knowing those contents, intelligence officials can learn much from metadata, including likely locations and patterns of behavior. A previously reported surveillance program aimed at the phone logs and location information of millions of Americans is called Mainway, the Post reported. A second program targeting the Internet contact logs and location information of foreign users is called Marina. A third program, which intercepts telephone calls and routes their contents to government listeners,

is called Nucleon. A fourth program, Prism, exposed recently by Snowden, forces major Internet firms to turn over the detailed contents of Internet communications. Prism is aimed at foreign users but sometimes also sweeps up the content of Americans' emails and other Internet communications, officials have acknowledged. "The metadata story does touch upon Americans in a massive way with phone records but not the content. The Prism story is about foreigners and it is about content," Hayden said on NBC's *Meet the Press*. Rep. Mike Rogers, who heads the House Intelligence Committee, said that any phone metadata from Americans swept up in the surveillance is held under careful safeguards, kept in a "lockbox" that can only be accessed if it becomes relevant to terror investigations. U.S. officials also said Saturday that gathered data is destroyed every five years.

Associated Press. 6/16/13

Death penalty task force to propose prior review panel for capital cases; Former Justice speaks against executions

The Ohio Supreme Court's Death Penalty Task Force narrowly voted Thursday to recommend the creation of a committee that would review all capital punishment cases before they go to trial as a way to curb racial discrepancies. The death penalty charging committee would be set up within the attorney general's office and consist of AG staff members as well as former county prosecutors appointed by the governor, according to the recommendation. Before filing any charges against a defendant that could bring the death penalty, county prosecutors would have to submit the cases to the committee, under the recommendation. The Attorney General's office would approve or disapprove the charges, paying particular attention to the race of the defendants and victims. The task force, initiated by Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor, approved the recommendation by an 8-6 vote, according to the court. The approval followed a lengthy debate over whether the proposal would take away from elected county prosecutors' discretion to determine what charges to press. Under a different proposal approved by the task force, the death penalty could no longer be imposed in felony murder cases that involve kidnapping, rape, aggravated arson, aggravated robbery, or aggravated burglary. According to the recommendation, such specifications result in death verdicts only 7% of the time or less when charged as a death penalty case. The measure also aims to reduce the racial disparity of death penalty convictions. The recommendation passed 12-2, according to the court. The task force also voted overwhelmingly in favor of two additional recommendations, the court said. One recommendation, approved 11-1, would require that defendants who represent themselves in death penalty cases receive a "co-counsel" or a "standby" attorney who would assist with the proceedings and be ready to take over the defense's case if the defendant changes his or her mind. A second recommendation, passed 13-1, urges the passage of a Racial Justice Act allowing for claims of racial bias to be raised and developed in state court whether or not the client has any other basis for filing in that court. Task force Chairman James Brogan, a retired state appeals court judge, previously said he hopes to have the task force conclude its work in November with an eye to issuing a final majority and minority report in early December. The panel plans to meet again in August and also voted Thursday to schedule an additional meeting Sept. 26 at the Ohio State Bar Association headquarters in Columbus. Task force members also discussed holding an overnight meeting, tentatively scheduled for Nov. 7-8, at the Moyer Judicial Center in Columbus. Former Ohio Supreme Court Justice Evelyn Lundberg Stratton told

the task force during a presentation that she now opposes the death penalty, as it's "just not an efficient way to administer justice." The mental health advocate also called for establishing a list of certain mental health issues that would automatically disqualify a defendant from being assigned the death penalty. Ms. Stratton, a Republican who left the court in December, said during her 17-year tenure she voted in favor of the death penalty in numerous cases in keeping with the oath she took to consider capital punishment as an option. But during her last couple years on the court, she said, she increasingly felt that sentencing defendants to life without parole was a better alternative. She said she didn't have "strong personal feelings" about whether capital punishment is right or wrong. "I'm just troubled by how our system executes it," she said. "It's just not an efficient way to administer justice." Part of the problem, Ms. Stratton said, is that the capital punishment system can be a roller-coaster ride. Some liberal federal judges reverse every death penalty case that reaches them, she said, only to be overruled on appeal. She related how, in one case, a man was strapped to a gurney ready to be executed when news arrived that his conviction had been overturned. "If you went to life without parole for those cases, it would be much more efficient, it would bring closure to the family of the victim, it would allow the Innocence Project and those other things to still look at the issues that might affect the wrongfully convicted," she said. In addition, the former justice said, she hasn't seen a single instance in which the death penalty was a deterrent to criminals. Ms. Stratton also said there should be a clearer idea of when mental health issues should disqualify defendants from being put to death, similar to the U.S. Supreme Court's 2005 ruling in *Atkins v. Virginia* that it is unconstitutional to execute mentally retarded individuals. "I'm more in favor of sort of a bright line that says if they have a diagnosis of these four or five severe mental illnesses, it's a no-go," she said. Prosecutors would have discretion beyond that to determine whether to seek the death penalty in cases where mental health issues are present, she said. Ohio Public Defender Timothy Young told Ms. Stratton to expect disagreement over where to draw the line regarding mental health exemptions in death penalty cases. "That's what your big debate would be," he said. In an interview after the presentation, Ms. Stratton said she wasn't planning to be an advocate for establishing such lines, as she wants to focus on larger mental health issues.

Gongwer News Service. 6/14/13

Reform would limit death penalty to worst killers

Factors that can lead to a death-penalty case such as murders committed during robberies, burglaries or rapes should be stripped from Ohio's death-penalty law to focus on the worst of the worst killers, a task force studying changes to the law recommends. The proposal would limit capital prosecutions to cases involving multiple victims, killings of children younger than 13, slayings of police officers and crimes committed to eliminate witnesses, and other very serious crimes, according to the proposal approved this month by the Ohio Supreme Court committee. The recommendation was based on arguments that elements such as kidnapping and burglary rarely result in death sentences — and when they do, they often carry the greatest risk of racial disparity among defendants. Numerous Ohio inmates would never have gone to Death Row in the past 30 years had such a rule been in place, including five of the past 10 inmates put to death. The proposal would eliminate kidnapping, rape, aggravated arson, aggravated robbery and aggravated burglary as factors that could lead to a death penalty. The result, supporters say, is a racially neutral law that targets the most-heinous criminals. "By removing these, you not only get

rid of cases that are clearly not in society's eyes the worst of the worst, you also remove the greatest racial influence in the death penalty," said State Public Defender Tim Young, chairman of the subcommittee that made the recommendations. The proposal's chances are uncertain at best. Lawmakers would have to approve such a sweeping change, and it likely would face stiff opposition from death-penalty supporters and local prosecutors. The Supreme Court task force is scheduled to complete its work this year, meaning it likely would be 2014 before legislation could be introduced. Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor convened the task force last year, instructing it to look for ways to make the current law, enacted in 1981, more fair while making it clear that eliminating capital punishment was not up for discussion. The recommendation passed 12-2, though several members weren't present for the vote. Among those was Hamilton County Prosecutor Joe Deters, who said he strongly opposes the change. He points to a death-penalty case he brought last week in which a defendant allegedly pursued and shot to death the owner of a pizzeria as the owner tried to escape. Deters used the aggravated-robbery factor to elevate the killing to a capital-punishment case. "People who are that callous and murderous deserve the death penalty," Deters said. Committee chairman James Brogan, a retired state appeals court judge who voted for the change, said he supports the death penalty but also thinks it needs to be narrowed to the worst of the worst killers. Were the changes enacted, Ohio's law would more closely resemble those of Kansas or New Hampshire, which don't specify added factors such as robbery or burglary. Laws vary across the remaining 32 states with capital punishment, but both California — with the nation's largest Death Row — and Texas — with the country's busiest death chamber — have laws so broad that almost any killing could be prosecuted as a capital case. The task force also recommended the creation of a panel overseen by the state attorney general that would have the final say on bringing death-penalty charges in Ohio. That recommendation would likely face strong opposition, too.

Associated Press. 6/28/13

Husted wants online voter registration, touts voter fraud report and redistricting measure

[Secretary of State Jon Husted](#) on Wednesday urged lawmakers to create an online voter registration system, calling it a needed modernization to Ohio's election system. Speaking to the Ohio Elections Officials Conference in Columbus, Mr. Husted said it was "long past time" for the state to allow electronic voter registration, as it would be more convenient for voters, more accurate and secure than paper forms, and more cost-effective for elections officials. The secretary touted legislation currently pending in the House ([HB 78](#)), and soon to be introduced in the Senate, that would codify and expand on a directive he issued last year creating an online change of address system that allowed more than 106,000 Ohioans to update their information. With 3 million paper voting forms issued between 2010 and 2012, he said, local governments could have saved between \$1.5 million and \$3 million during that time if the General Assembly had approved online registration. "I constantly hear from people that say that 'We want to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse,'" Mr. Husted told reporters following his speech. "This is a way to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse." The system could be created internally without outside vendors, the secretary said, as his office already has an electronic data sharing system with the Bureau of Motor Vehicles - which verifies voter registration data - and local elections

officials. The only remaining holdup, he said, is the legislature. Mr. Husted said he's been trying for three years to get a bill passed, to no avail. [Rep. Michael Stinziano](#) (D-Columbus), the sponsor of the House bill, said in a statement that he's "gratified" to learn of Secretary Husted's support. "As the former director of the Franklin County Board of Elections, I believe online voter registration would boost convenience for voters, help election boards by cutting back on data entry costs and errors, and save taxpayers' dollars," the lawmaker said. Rep. Stinziano said least 14 states already offer or will soon offer a paperless online voter registration system. [Sen. Frank LaRose](#) (R-Copley Twp.) said in an interview that he plans to introduce legislation soon that includes online voter registration. The legislation, he said would also allow for online ballot requests and have Ohio join a multi-state compact that, among other things, would allow election officials to know when someone casts a vote in both Ohio and another state. In his speech to about 500 local elections officials and staff, Mr. Husted defended a report his office issued last month suggesting that voter fraud during the 2012 election was relatively infrequent. The secretary said that of 625 reported irregularities, 270 cases to date have been referred to law enforcement for further investigation and possible prosecution. He said his office has also referred 20 voters to the attorney general who are suspected of voting in both Ohio and another state last November. Mr. Husted the report should give Ohioans confidence that voter fraud is not epidemic in the state and refutes "wild stories" circulated after the election about voting irregularities. "It would not be good for any of us or for Ohio voters if unsubstantiated rumors, innuendo and hyperbole surrounding voter fraud and voter suppression were allowed to stand," he said. Secretary Husted also reiterated his support for a proposed constitutional amendment on redistricting reform reported out of committee on Tuesday. Asked whether he would prefer to see redistricting reform happen through that legislation ([SJR 1](#)) or through the Constitutional Modernization Commission, Mr. Husted replied, "Whatever one can get done first, that's the one I'm for. "Maybe they can race to see who can get done first," he said.

Gongwer News Service. 6/26/13