

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

February 13, 2003 LR 16

effectively. I still have concerns about the language, and especially involving, as an example, the University Board of Regents. Would Senator Schimek yield to a question?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Schimek, would you yield?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: Senator Schimek, "political subdivision" has varying definitions. I mean, I think we've already arrived at that. Do you know of another place in the constitution that would basically preclude...you know, given the passage of this proposed language, let's assume that it's there, what language would you rest on saying that someone, a senior administrator, for example, at the university, could not run for the Legislature?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: That's in the constitution?

SENATOR SMITH: Is there an area of the constitution that would preclude that? Or...I mean, obviously you're comfortable with this language, political subdivision.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank goodness for legal counsel. (Laugh)
Article II, sec...

SENATOR SMITH: (Laugh) Wish I had one on my side.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Article II, Section 1 talks about the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and says that no person or collection of persons being one of these departments shall exercise any power properly belonging to either of the others, except as hereinafter expressly directed or permitted. So Article II, Section 1.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. Thank you. What...I'm beginning to think that the objective of this language can already be met without this language. And listening to the debate today. Is there a specific part of the Conway decision, in the terminology or subsequent Attorney General's Opinions...what part is it that you feel is in error, or that this would address to change it?