

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

June 2, 2005

LR 98

leeway to run off without any restriction or guidance. The Legislature will make the ultimate decision as to whether anything else is done. Adoption of this resolution, with Senator Bourne's amendment, will do nothing other than tell Mr. Hergert that the Legislature says he should resign. That is the active ingredient. The other steps will follow if that step is not taken by Mr. Hergert. I support Senator Bourne's amendment with the provisos that Senator Stuhr added. I don't see where it goes that much contrary to what Senator Flood, Senator Foley and others talked about, but what Senator Foley's amendment would have done is to take away any alternatives or action that could be taken if Mr. Hergert refuses to resign. I believe this is a very reasonable, reasoned, and prudent approach. I support the amendment and I also will support the resolution. But I just have to make one other comment. When people talk about what the constitution says relative to impeachment, don't keep misquoting it by saying "while in office." The constitution does not say "while in office." It says "in office," and those words easily can embrace "in office or in connection with procuring the office." I had mentioned to Senator...how much time do I have, Mr. President?

SENATOR CUDABACK: About 2, 41.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. I had mentioned to Senator Flood how the Nebraska Supreme Court created out of whole cloth a constitutional right in this state that was not found in the constitution. That principle or right is equal protection of the law. Nebraska's Constitution had no such explicit requirement, so the Nebraska Supreme Court declared that under the provisions of the constitution that deal with no special legislation being enacted, it was going to construe those words to have the same meaning as the words "equal protection of the law" or "under the law," such as would be found in the U.S. Constitution and other state constitutions. That's what the Supreme Court did by creating, through construction and interpretation of the constitution's language, because constitutions are meant to be general statements of principle. They provide elasticity and flexibility so that new circumstances could be considered. There was nothing that the founders and drafters of the constitution could have known about