

February 19, 1991

wanted to make, and I will defer to him, but let me just say this. We are, as Senator Ashford mentioned, and as Senator Warner said, we are essentially acting as a court at this point. We have had this issue go to court and the court has ruled in favor of Mr. Korslund. That decision by the court was ignored and overturned by the Board of Canvassers who then seated Senator Byars, but that issue was then thrown back to us. And here we are acting in a legal capacity, I believe, not so much as a legislature, but as an appellate body to decide this matter. And as such, it would be nice to put aside some of the things that normally make decisions for us in terms of this body, in terms of policy, partisanship, personalities. Those sort of things have a big influence over us. Those things may be need to put aside and a little more focus in on the law. Now Senator Ashford is a lawyer, I am not, so I can't argue his point or others' point that may want to get into that issue, but it seems clear to me that if the law had said and if the Constitution had said that Mr. Byars ought to be the one seated, then Mr. Byars would have won those cases. Now Judge McGinn has ruled directly on this. The other judge in the other case I am referring to was the same set of circumstances down in Gage County where Judge Finn ruled similarly to Judge McGinn. Two judges, two similar cases, ruled consistently that the law is clear and the course of action that should be taken is clear. It seems to me that the Exec Board recognized that, followed along with it, and is adhering to it, but from the debate this morning, it seems apparent that many are going to choose to ignore that position. Now let me summarize what I see the issue as being. One side is saying, follow the law. The other is saying, ignore the law. That's really as quick and concisely as I can summarize it. The courts have said follow the law, the Executive Board has said follow the law, but now we are hearing arguments that we should ignore it. I feel that this body, as the lawmaking institution of this state, has a particular duty to try to see that we follow the law. If we choose not to, if we choose to say that this law we don't particularly agree with, or we have other reasons that we feel that we don't want to follow it, then the people may rightly ask which laws does the Legislature want us to follow and which can we ignore? At what point do we choose the laws which we want to take seriously and which can we ignore? And so it seems to me also that if this particular law is offensive to people, why is it that, as I understand it, no bill has been introduced to amend it? There is no bill in that I am aware of that would amend this section of law that is so offensive to people. If it is good law, if it