

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

April 12, 2006 LR 449

what is in the statute right now. At Section 32-1602, sub (2), there is a compelling state interest in preserving the integrity of the electoral process in state elections by ensuring that these elections are free from corruption and the appearance of corruption and that this end can be achieved if the sources of funding and the use of that funding in campaigns are fully disclosed. This is what the Legislature says is a compelling state interest. And even in Senator Bourne's vaunted test it says, something which is subversive of some fundamental or essential principle of government. Well, the Legislature stated that the integrity of the election laws is something in which the state has a compelling interest. That is the essential or fundamental part of government which Mr. Hergert subverted. But going beyond that, let us consider what it is that we're looking at here today. A man who has repeatedly violated the law. I'd like to ask Senator Bourne a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bourne, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR BOURNE: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Bourne, a person who has been convicted and a final judgment has been entered has 30 days to appeal. For the ease of making my example, let me say that the 30th day, the deadline, is the 15th of the month.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The person files the appeal on the 18th of the month. But the person can show that the papers were signed on the 14th of the month, which, if the filing had made then, would have been on time. When the papers are actually filed, is that when the court considers the filing to have occurred or the date that the person signed the appeal papers?

SENATOR BOURNE: Senator Chambers, you're not accurately stating in the way that I did. But I'll play your game...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.