

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

April 12, 2006 LR 449

report. I had been saying all along that if he broke the law when he was in office, that is something to seriously consider. I went back to the Nebraska Constitution and in Article XVII of Section 3 it says, no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the court of impeachment that clear and convincing evidence exists, indicating that such person is guilty of one or more of the impeachable offense. Knowing that beyond a reasonable doubt is the highest standard, preponderance of the evidence is one of the lowest standards, and clear and convincing was somewhere in the middle, and that the Legislature had consciously reduced that burden from beyond a reasonable doubt to clear and convincing in the mid eighties, following the Douglas fiasco, and our attorney says that there's enough evidence to meet that burden, I made the decision to vote to recommend impeachment. On page 25 of Mr. Mock's brief he states in a two-part test what it takes to convict somebody in the Supreme Court of impeachment. Part one, we've got that, with Mr. Mock's assertion that we have an impeachable offense here that was committed during office. Part two, was the offense related to the duties of the office? And this is where I had to do some thinking on my own, and take what Mr. Mock gave us and do a little analysis myself. Here we have a government actor that, according to Mr. Clarence Mock, our attorney, has met the burden of clear and convincing evidence for intentionally, knowingly filing a false, fraudulent report. Should we have civil/state actors that we elect to represent us as constitutional officers intentionally filing false reports? And Mr. Mock makes mention of this, that two courts in the state of Massachusetts have ruled, and you'll find this on page 37 and 38,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR FLOOD: that if it involves dishonest and felonious conduct knowingly committed by the defendant, that it's worth impeachment. The other case is found on page 38, and in the interest of time, I'll be brief and I'll quickly summarize. I did my own analysis. I used what Mr. Mock gave us as a brief, and I appreciate his work. It took me a long way down the road to making a decision. This is a serious decision, but it goes to the crime of honesty. If I am guilty of a felony involving a