

ETHICS

4-24-03

1. Continuation of meeting
2. Roll
3. Explanation

Received evidence now evaluate

Charges in complaint

Push - happy to discuss publicly

∴ public discussion

proceed under Rules (history)

Murphy - asks Deb McKnight to review rules and role of committee:

probable cause now —

failure to find = dismiss complaint

Push - impressions - discuss - drafted into rule. Discipline of members

House Rules. Review of tapes (1994)
Sviggum on Bertram (?)

2nd

∴ Find probable cause and move on to second stage

(2)

ETHICS

4-24-03

Rhodes - listened to proceedings
speech / decorum issue
Noted - questioning of motives in public
vs. on House Floor
hurtful? hateful? impact on decorum

David - Bertram case was about more
than free speech —
asked Deb to refresh facts

> Complaints were strong on denial
of Holocaust (part) was denial of
whole Holocaust. Bothersome.
Lindner questioned numbers

Pugh - respond. offensive outrageous
especially

Struggled w/ terminology —
revisionist comments

Rhodes - response - Holocaust happened
— perhaps dispute on number.

Pugh - noted response from public
and media

Murphy - needed to know more from historical perspective - I took time to research

Remarks were hurtful
we need to deal with that

When Lindner was challenged he "dug his heels in" and was defensive

People hurt by repetition

Chair - hurtful things said against members?

Murphy - NO... but comments are hurtful to

Chair - cited comments on House Floor in Right to Know discussions - hurtful to some members - no apologies

Mahoney - debate on House Floor - use of terms used in mainstream papers -
comparing apples vs. oranges

(4)

ETHICS 4-24-03

Davidson - I don't know what was said - outrageous - But -

Recent example - use of "liar" and "white lies" was used on floor 6 times at least -

Will charges be brought up ?

What this brings House into disrepute -

Hurtful - hurt feelings -

Noted the charge of committee did he say the comments?

Issue: No. 2 - does it warrant disciplinary action?

Pugh - conduct on Floor -

I have run for office - "signed up"
I know the conditions - have rules / Minutes / speaker

Here, we have comments that offend many people outside of House. There is a difference more impact

Dauids - I was outraged too —
But where do we go from here —
where does it stop?

Instead of Hansen's deadline —
perhaps better for people in
Lindner's district to decide
next Fall (election)

Huge issue: freedom of speech —
is standard whether one "hurts"
someone?

Mahoney - "Liar" comments on floor —
an procedural issues — was
not a dispute of facts

on "election" being solution —
I had many calls from my
constituents who were offended

Custom/usage?

Purpose of Committee perhaps is
to engage brain before mouth

(6)

ETHICS

4-24-03

Dauids - comments on terms used to describe (called a "slime-ball") - facts were wrong (in paper)

Editor wrote later that facts were wrong

I don't respond to slurs -

Referred again to the recent use of "liar"

Have given this much thought -

I have not deemed comments as frivolous.

I appreciate the charges brought forth

Erickson - Pugh once called me "Gen. Custer" in an interview - I tried to turn that around - Custer did some good things

> I was a teacher of over 30 years - taught students about research - Elie Vesel and "Nisut" by ↑

(7)

ETHICS 4-24-03

Erickson - contd.

Teaching students about
WWII — and Holocaust

Need to have sources that
are well-documented —

There is revisionist history
going on — on the right
and on the left —
cited Shakespeare-authenticity
debate

Important to look at good
writings —
Don't want to criticize Lindner
for not being thorough —

But I want to some reputable
sources — we do need to be
concerned about HIV in Africa —
we fear.

May disagree w/ Lindner on
issues — homosexuals — but the
concern w/ Africa is genuine

(8)

ETHICS

4-24-03

Mahoney - unless we make a statement here - take a stand - we will have ability to say other outrageous things on Home Floor.

Erickson - done ever say untrue things on Home Floor

Mahoney respond

Erickson - problem w/ discipline on Home Floor - appalled at behavior on Floor - we don't stay in seats

Noted Rules on p. 11 -

Rhodes - get back on point - need to find probable cause

Where are we going.

Erickson - asked Deb to clarify
Deb - reviewed rules of procedure

(9)

ETHICS

4-24-03

Pugh - if facts are more likely true or not - and disrepute

2 prong test -
#1 seems to be met

#2 discipline?

We are all struggling

we can bring in people - experts -
to help us at the disciplinary
step.

This rises to level affecting
many people outside of Home

Dauids - what happens if I move
to find probable cause -

if vote fails proceedings end

I believe Lindner's comments are
wrong - BUT he has right
to say what

DAVIDS - move to find probable cause

Pugh - should chair be voting? —
per points raised by complainant?

Erickson - cited life experience

See no reason to recuse
myself — professional
person.

David - what was the complaint

Erickson - clar. find

Mahoney - I brought it up —
at first meeting — noted too both
Chair and David's authored bill

Erickson - not about a bill

David — Karen Clark asked me
to take name of Bill —
and I did — early on

Pugh - sought response — and chair
gave it.

11

ETHICS

4-23-03

Erickson - I removed my name
w/respect to my Jewish
friends

Rhodes - name on

Daniel - removed

	X	N	
Pugh	1	1	Erickson
Murphy	1	1	Daniels