

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

April 12, 2006 LR 449

impeachment process, in terms of what the constitution says and what the arguments are on one side or the other, a little bit actually. But I have passed out two things to you. The first thing is the article in the constitution that is the cornerstone of the impeachment process. It says, "All civil officers of this state shall be liable to impeachment for any misdemeanor in office." There's no question but that we have a civil officer; there is no question but that we have a misdemeanor. But what is in question is the language in that little phrase, in that little sentence, that says "in office." There are two ways of looking at this, and you need to look at them in both of these two ways. Was it in office, understanding that to be a point-in-time test? He came into office on January 6. There were events that occurred before January 6, and there were acts that occurred after January 6, and with respect to the acts that were after January 6 while he was in office, the first six articles of impeachment apply to that point in time, to those acts that were after he was in office. The other four articles of impeachment apply to acts that occurred during the election process and related to the election process, but before he actually was in office. So if "point-in-time" were the only test and not mixed together with a second test that I'll tell you about, then you would have six articles, clearly okay by the constitution, and four that may be suspect. The second test that comes through in the Nebraska cases is, was it in office, in terms of related to the office? Not a time test, but was it related to the office? And in discussing that question, there are three distinct categories of relatedness that might be logically considered. The first category is the category of official action; that is, when Governor Butler, back in 1860-something stole money from the Treasury, that's a...you know, he had access in his official capacity, his official act. There's no doubt about that. Everything that is an official action is clearly impeachable. On the other end of the spectrum, the third category, are personal actions, things that are very personal in nature, don't relate to the office at all. The Douglas case, several other cases that are far more ancient, indicate that if it's in that category, it may not be related to the office. It is not related to the office. So you have that category over there, you have the official action category on the other side, and in the middle you have the third category,