

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

June 2, 2005

LR 98

And maybe we don't have any teeth left, but we'd never find out. So I support the Bourne amendment. I will not discuss this until my option...till my opportunity to close on the main bill. Thank you, Senator Bourne.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schrock. On with discussion. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Howard.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I would go along with whatever the body says with regard to this amendment, but let me finish the argument with regard to the impeachment matter. Remember again that what the opposition to the resolution is asking you to adopt is a narrow interpretation of this language, "misdemeanor in office." Now, consider the implications of that language if you...if you require that to mean a misdemeanor committed while in office. First of all, harkening back to Senator Friend's amendment, you may recall that he put Drew Miller's name in the place of Hergert's name in terms of suggesting that Miller is subject to impeachment but Hergert is not. The theory was that Miller was subject to impeachment because, you see, he was an incumbent and in office at the time that the election for his second term took place. So if you give the law that interpretation, then an incumbent who runs for a second term is subject to impeachment because he's in office when he's running, and one who's not an incumbent is not subject because he's not in office when he's running, or she. So that's not an interpretation that should be adopted where it treats two different people differently, subjects them to the law or not subjects them to the law, because one is an incumbent and one is not. That's just an impossible interpretation of that law. Secondly, what if a felony is committed in December, before a person takes office in January? What if, in fact, he has stuffed the ballot box or rigged a computer and, while he was in office, he was convicted of that felony offense, or maybe some other kind of felony offense committed in December, before he was in office but not while in office? How do you get rid of him? You can't. You can't, under their interpretation, and that's another major flaw in adopting that interpretation of the constitution. Now there's another provision of the constitution that says you can't stand for office when you've been convicted of a felony, but it