

these for the record, deal with those instances where you have employees that do not perform their functions and responsibilities as intended and that they abuse the office or abuse individuals under their authority, and in those cases, frankly, I lose that sympathy I have for any human being to have the right to a fair and decent representation and trial and I still feel that they should have that but I think it's also a responsibility that they, themselves, should undertake and not the state. Let me give you a couple of examples. We had some cases over in the prison system where we had guards that had locked up an individual for a period of time without any sort of review. And, of course, that individual locked up brought some action and the guard involved, I believe, was found to have violated some rules and regulations. A claim was filed and...I'm trying to remember exactly how all this was handled, but it was approved up to the time it came to this floor for the state to pick up the fine or the penalty against that guard. And this Legislature said that individual didn't act in good faith, that individual abused their authority and neglected the rules. And we didn't approve that appropriation and it was quite a controversy. And I don't know if it was that case or a second case I'm thinking of where we ended up with the warden involved in some of these actions who then went around and had a voluntary donation mandated among employees and that warden got caught in that circumstance and was relieved of their job. But we have had a couple of bad instances where individual employees over in our correctional facilities, I think, and this Legislature felt as well, overstepped their lines of responsibility. And I am concerned about making sure that when an employee does that that we don't allow protection for that action. That's what I'm concerned about. I think this takes care of that. I would like Senator Warner or whoever can address that issue, but when we talk here about this...the Attorney General as representation, it doesn't allow for it under malfeasance or willful or wanton neglect of duty. I guess I would define the sort of actions I'm recalling under that and would not be covered. But, nevertheless, I would like to be sure about what we're talking about here. I would also throw out other examples. There are those, obviously, in the Commonwealth situation that feel Paul Amen and Paul Douglas abused their offices and, of course, they have been to court and I think had to represent themselves. Will that change under this...under this law, for instance? Would their action be considered malfeasance or willful or wanton neglect of duty and similar types of actions by employees that are questionable? I