

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

April 12, 2006 LR 26, 98, 449

conversation that he and I have had in order to preserve the identity of his middle name that has been thrown around for other members of the Legislature. (Laughter) The interesting part about this is if you read the Mock opinion, okay, you can come to the idea that won't be convicted. But the Mock opinion doesn't say that I'm right and the other opinions are wrong. Specifically in the opinion, it says, these are supplemental. My opinion is supplemental to those of Senator Chambers and Senator Flood. Ironically, Senator Flood's opinion at that time was similar to what Senator Mock's (sic) opinion is at this time. And Senator Chambers' opinion has been the same throughout this process. So from the standpoint of ignoring or whatever, the reality is what Senator Louden pointed out and what Senator Brashear pointed out. You can shop for the opinion you want to defend what you want to do, and that's what's always going to happen in the legal profession, and if you can get a judge to go along with it, you're going to win. I do find it interesting that as we go through this process and you look at the actual articles, that there are attempts made to expand the language of the constitution. And how far would the expansion be? Well, it's the expansion of LR 26CA, which simply adds the language that any misdemeanor related to the election by which such officer was elected to the office. That is new language, in addition to what's already in Article IV, Section 5, relating to the impeachment, who is liable for impeachment. So as you go through and you read the articles, the argument was made by Senator Beutler effectively on the floor last year during the debate on LR 98 that you can't argue that we can only impeach Drew Miller; you can't argue that because they're both held to the same standards because it logically could be concluded that it should extend to those running for office as well. Fair enough. And as has been pointed out, we're making that logical conclusion here; however, we're ignoring the factual conclusion that we could have impeached another. We have members of the university, student body of the university, or in fact we have a student regent with us today, and I have yet to hear him stand before the Board of Regents and say that he believes that what Mr. Miller did was cheating. And we've had this discussion. Matt and I have had this discussion over lunch the other day. And he says, well, if we would add Mr. Miller to our resolution, would you support it then? I said, at least it would be more