

May 22, 1995

it's obvious you're going to be involved in one thing or another. But when the strongest argument can...that can be made in behalf of a person is that he is a devout Christian, that is not a recommendation in my mind in any way, indicating a person's suitability to fill a public office. As a matter of fact, it might militate against that because the person is going to bring to bear his religious biases, his religious prejudices, and if he thinks that somebody is in prison because they violated the law of man and the law of God and should be punished for it, then we've got maybe a Cotton Mather sitting on the Parole Board and not a person of judicious, fair temperament. I still am not going to vote for Mr. Pearson's confirmation, and I just hope that he is as great a person as everybody who has spoken on this floor says that he is. But I want him to know, and everybody else to know from the record, that I object to his appointment, that my basic reason for objecting is that it gives an inappropriate overbalance to law enforcement. The Parole Board is not an adjunct to law enforcement and I think this was a mistake on the part of the Governor. He is converting the Parole Board into, as Senator Schmitt jokingly indicated, the Patrol Board. But I don't think it ought to be a retirement village for parole...for patrol officers. I think, and digressing for an instant on that issue, there are too many instances of people who have held jobs with the state who, when they retire, are given these kind of cushy appointments, but this that I've said constitutes my reasoning for being opposed to Mr. Pearson's appointment to the board and I'm going to ask for a call of the house and a roll call vote to see just who all is in favor of Deacon Pearson and who will be opposed.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schmitt.

SENATOR SCHMITT: Yes, Madam President, and members, I am not going to speak very long on this again. I guess I just wanted to make one comment. In my experiences with Colonel Pearson, and not directly because he was not my direct supervisor, but in knowledge that I knew about Jim in his supervisory capacity I guess, with the contacts that I had of him and the knowledge that I had with different issues that he dealt with, if I was to be judged, if I was coming out on parole, which I hope I never am, but if I was. I think within the State Patrol organization I would probably just as soon have Colonel Pearson be my judge as anybody in that organization. Thank you.