

RESEARCH RESPONSE

PATRICK D. O'GRADY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

GOVERNORS' IMPEACHMENTS IN U.S. HISTORY

Overview

Fourteen governors have been impeached, including two who were impeached twice. Of those impeached, seven governors were convicted. This Research Response describes the impeachments of governors, including the legislative procedures used to impeach and try them. It also describes Illinois' constitutional provision on impeachment.

Table 1 on the next page lists the governors who have been impeached, and the outcomes of their impeachments. Appendix A to this Research Response describes articles of impeachment against the governors, by type of charge. Appendix B lists states' impeachment procedures; Appendix C lists the same information by similar types of procedures. Appendix D lists states' grounds for impeachment. Appendix E lists time lines for governors' impeachments; Appendix F lists the same information from the longest to the shortest duration.

Copies of articles of impeachment and other related documents are also enclosed.

Prepared by Melissa S. Cate, Thomas Bazan, and Jonathan C. Eastvold,
Research Associates; and Brook DeMoisy, Stephanie Moulton, and

Kristin Nisbet, Research Assistants

File 11-081, July 8, 2008

LRU 
LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH UNIT

222 SOUTH COLLEGE • SUITE 301
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62704-1894
PHONE: 217-782-6851 • FAX: 217-785-7572

Table 1: Impeachments of Governors from Most to Least Recent

<i>Governor</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Year impeached</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Evan Mecham	Arizona	1988	Convicted
Huey Long	Louisiana	1929	Acquitted
Henry Johnston*	Oklahoma	1929	Convicted
Henry Johnston	Oklahoma	1928	Acquitted
John Walton	Oklahoma	1923	Convicted
James Ferguson	Texas	1917	Convicted
William Sulzer	New York	1913	Convicted
William Kellogg	Louisiana	1876	Acquitted
Adelbert Ames	Mississippi	1876	Resigned
Harrison Reed*	Florida	1872	Acquitted
Henry Warmoth	Louisiana	1872	Term ended
David Butler	Nebraska	1871	Convicted
Powell Clayton	Arkansas	1871	Acquitted
William Holden	North Carolina	1870	Convicted
Harrison Reed	Florida	1868	Acquitted
Charles Robinson	Kansas	1862	Acquitted

Note

* Henry Johnston and Harrison Reed were both impeached twice.

Source: The Council of State Governments, *The Book of the States*, vol. 36, 2004, p. 152.
(That source lists an impeachment and later acquittal for Henry Horton (TN) in 1931, but House journals show that the House voted against his impeachment.)

**Evan Mecham
(Arizona, 1988)
Convicted**

Evan Mecham (R) was elected with only 40% of the vote; two Democratic candidates split the remaining 60%. Arizona's Constitution did not require a runoff election.¹ In December, before Mecham took office, the Mecham Watchdog Committee registered as an official political action committee with the Secretary of State and handed out 500 "Recall Ev" bumper stickers.²

In July 1987, the Mecham Watchdog Committee changed its name to the Mecham Recall Committee, which was formed to collect sufficient petition signatures to force a recall election. (This was 6 months after Mecham took office, the first day a recall drive could begin.) Mecham responded with an attack on the leader's sexual preferences and dismissed the effort as supported only by "militant liberals and the homosexual lobby."³ The Committee collected 46,000 signatures in the first 10 days; 100,000 in the first month.⁴ In September, the leader of the Recall Committee released a letter from Mecham to conservatives across the nation. It asked them to "pick up and move to Arizona." It later said, "[w]ithout your contribution I will risk being crushed by the millions of dollars the militant liberals and the homosexual lobby plan to spend against me."⁵ The next month, former U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, a member of Governor Mecham's party, suggested that Mecham should resign.⁶

On October 21st, Governor Mecham received a subpoena, ordering him to appear before the Arizona State Grand Jury to answer questions about a charge that he had failed to report a \$350,000 campaign loan from Barry Wolfson, a developer who later recommended individuals for appointment to a state board. The Attorney General was already investigating the loan.⁷ The same day, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee (Representative Jim Skelly) delivered a letter to the Speaker of the House (Representative Joe Lane) asking that the Speaker have House legal staff look into "possible courses of action" in light of the allegations about the Governor's conduct.⁸

The next day, the Speaker met with the Attorney General to see how his investigation was going; the Speaker assumed he would be briefed on the investigation and would thereafter be kept informed of progress in the investigation. The Attorney General said that was not possible and the House could go ahead on its own investigation.⁹

House leaders met to discuss candidates for special counsel; the list was narrowed to three, but one was tied up in a trial that had just begun. Former Superior Court Judge William French was interviewed first.¹⁰ On October 26th, the Speaker interviewed French; they discussed what French would be investigating, French's fee, and French's political affiliation. French was then offered the job.¹¹ The Attorney General "was delighted when French told him [later] that he would be conducting a broad investigation and would not be limiting its scope to just the Wolfson loan. He gave French a list of twenty-seven other allegations."¹²

By early November, the Mecham Recall Committee filed petitions signed by 387,285 Arizona voters—far more than the 216,746 needed. More people signed recall petitions than voted for Mecham the previous year.¹³

On November 11th, a state court declined jurisdiction in a suit by the Governor's attorney against the Speaker and his Special Counsel over the House's investigation.¹⁴ Later in November, press reported that William French had signed a recall petition. A judge overseeing the state grand jury had previously removed himself from the process because he had signed a petition. The Speaker said he didn't like it and would not have

hired French had he known, but saw no problem with allowing French to continue.¹⁵

Also in November, staff of the Arizona Legislative Council and the Arizona House of Representatives prepared a report (enclosure 1) for legislators on the state's impeachment procedure.

On December 2nd, a court ruled that the Attorney General could turn over transcripts of the grand jury proceedings to French, as long as French kept them confidential. French met with the Speaker and other House leaders and told them there was enough information for impeachment.¹⁶

On January 8, 1988, the Arizona State Grand Jury indicted Mecham on six felony counts for perjury; willful concealment; and filing a false campaign contribution and expenses report, and a false personal finance disclosure form in connection with the \$350,000 Wolfson loan.¹⁷ Soon afterward, Governor Mecham released a 3-page letter of apology. It was printed in the *Arizona Republic*, a Phoenix newspaper. Mecham also had delivered to legislators a letter claiming he had done nothing wrong and requesting he be allowed to address House members after the French Report was released.¹⁸ (He was later dissuaded from doing so.)¹⁹

On January 15th, the French Report was printed and distributed. He presented it to the House, and charged the Governor with:

- (1) obstructing the Attorney General's investigation into a threat made against a grand jury witness. (The witness was to testify on the topic of the Wolfson loan);
- (2) falsifying campaign finance statements, concealing a \$350,000 loan from Barry Wolfson; and
- (3) borrowing from the Protocol Fund early in his term to loan money to Mecham Pontiac Corporation.²⁰

The leader of the minority caucus (Democrats) hired special counsel for the caucus.²¹

Later, the Speaker appointed a Special House Select Committee on Impeachment comprised of 10 representatives. The Committee heard testimony, asked questions, and developed information independent of counsel; it did not take a vote on the substance of the testimony or issue a report. The Committee was designed to help House members draw conclusions; House members were encouraged, but not obligated, to attend Committee hearings. Hearings were held around the House schedule, to accommodate members' other duties.²²

On January 20th, the House Select Committee issued 12 rules (enclosure 2) to govern its hearing of evidence.²³ The House Select Committee heard 9 days of testimony, culminating with the Governor's.²⁴ Late in January, the Secretary of State certified there were enough valid signatures to order a recall and notified Mecham that he could either resign

from office within 5 days or face a special recall election.²⁵ The Governor notified the Secretary of State that he would not be stepping down.²⁶ The Secretary later scheduled the election for May 17, 1988.²⁷

February 1st, the Governor was to testify before the House Select Committee. He was to be allowed a 30-minute introduction rather than 10 minutes for other witnesses, and he announced he would stay for questions from House members only (not from the House's lawyers). The chairman adjourned the Committee until the Governor would agree to comply with the Committee's rules allowing the House's lawyers to question witnesses.²⁸ House members met with respective counsel the next day (the Republicans and Democrats had separate counsel) to prepare for the following day's hearing, where members, rather than counsel, would question the Governor.²⁹ The Governor testified under oath before the House Select Committee. His testimony continued the next two days, and ended by inviting impeachment and attacking the Committee chairman's character.³⁰

On February 5th, the House amended House Resolution 2002 (enclosure 3) to impeach the Governor and to form a Board of Managers who would prepare articles of impeachment for approval by the House and prosecute the articles before the Senate. The resolution passed 46-14.³¹ Three days later, the House Managers reported the articles of impeachment to the House (enclosure 4). They had been written by counsel for the two caucuses and included 17 accusations in 3 articles. The Managers' report passed 42-18.³²

On February 11th, the Senate convened as a Court of Impeachment. Immediately after convening, Senators met behind closed doors to discuss the Rules of Procedure (enclosure 5); they returned to the floor and passed the 27 rules without debate (neither counsel was given an opportunity to challenge the proposed rules).³³ The Senate scheduled the hearing of testimony to begin February 29, 1988, allowing a new attorney for the Governor to prepare for the trial.³⁴

The trial began on February 29th.³⁵ In a March 9th opinion of the Supreme Court of Arizona (enclosure 6), the Court refused jurisdiction to stop the impeachment trial, and denied that the Senate's trial impeded the criminal trial.³⁶ On March 16th, the Governor began his testimony.³⁷ Articles 1 and 3 were considered first; Article 2 was considered last, because the Senate needed to determine how to proceed on it—the Governor's argument that he shouldn't testify because it could impact criminal proceedings had support among the Senate.³⁸ Before beginning his presentation of testimony on Article 3, the Governor's lawyer argued to delay the trial until after the Governor's April 22nd criminal trial. His argument was rejected by the Judge overseeing the trial.³⁹

Following testimony on Article 3, a motion was made to dismiss Article 2 with prejudice (and before any testimony was heard). It passed 16-12. The motion was supported by an odd mix of Senators: (1) Democrats, who voted to dismiss in hopes that the impeachment could hurt the Republicans in the recall election (which would likely not take place before the end of testimony on the complicated Article 2); and (2) Republicans who wanted to protect the Governor.⁴⁰

Dismissing Article 2 ended the trial on March 30th and forced a vote on Articles 1 and 3.⁴¹ On April 4th, the Senate sustained Article 1, 21-9, and Article 3, 26-4. However, it did not vote to disqualify the Governor from further office; the motion needed two-thirds, but received only 17 of 30 votes.⁴² An index of motions filed at the impeachment trial (enclosure 7) shows 102 total motions made in the Court of Impeachment.

**Huey Long
(Louisiana,
1929)
Acquitted**

Huey Long's (D) populist policies, and allegedly casual approach to legality, deeply divided the Louisiana electorate between those who approved of his redistributive policies and those who did not (whether out of principle or vested interest).

In the summer of 1929, Long called the legislature into session to consider an occupational tax on the oil industry; while this was popular with Long's base and would have generated considerable revenue, it was seen by the oil interests that had dominated the state during the previous several years as a direct attack. After the first three days of the special session, Long's supporters in the legislature realized that they were unlikely to succeed with the tax and that anti-Long forces might use the occasion of the special session to pass bills opposed by Long, or even to move for Long's impeachment.⁴³

On the fourth legislative day of the session, an anti-Long legislator rose on a point of personal privilege to allege that Long had conspired to assassinate one of Long's opponents in the House. Rather than recognizing him, however, the pro-Long House Speaker recognized a Long supporter, who moved to adjourn *sine die*. When the roll call vote was taken, members who had voted against adjournment were horrified to see their votes cast in favor of adjournment. Precisely why this happened is a subject of historical debate. The culprit seems to have been the recently-installed electronic voting system in the Louisiana House, which—whether through operator or machine error—failed to reset properly after the previous vote and showed members' votes on the last question (whether to approve the previous day's journal). In that politically-charged atmosphere, however, it was interpreted as deliberate vote-fixing by the pro-Long House Speaker, and anti-Long opponents cried foul. The Speaker, observing that the requisite number of aye votes had been cast to adjourn, declared the motion passed, adjourned the House, and left the chamber. At this point a melee broke out on the House floor in which at least one legislator was slightly injured. A Long opponent took control of the Speaker's vacant chair, gavelled the chamber to order, and conducted a second vote on the motion. This time, the motion to adjourn *sine die* failed and the House adjourned instead until the next morning.⁴⁴

On the following morning, the Speaker opened the day's proceedings with an apology for the previous night's chaotic events and an explanation of how the voting machine had malfunctioned. A Long supporter moved to adjourn *sine die*, but this motion also failed. At this point, Long opponents introduced a flurry of resolutions condemning Long's actions—including a resolution to impeach him based on 19 articles (enclosure 8).

The following day, Long transmitted to the House a proclamation supplementing his earlier call for a special session (to run from March 20 to

April 6, 1929) to enact laws to care for and fund schools, people with disabilities or mental illness, the state's charity hospitals, tuberculosis patients, and the poor.⁴⁵

Impeachment supporters moved to refer the 19 articles of impeachment to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration; a Long supporter objected, raising a point of order that because impeachment was not one of the subjects specifically enumerated in Long's special session calls, proceeding with impeachment was unconstitutional.⁴⁶ The Speaker ruled against this point of order, arguing that it was "not well taken at this stage of proceedings," and the Committee of the Whole meeting was scheduled for the next day.⁴⁷

On Thursday, March 28th, the Committee of the Whole designated a subcommittee of 12 members to "formulate rules and regulations under which proceedings [related to impeachment] . . . are to be conducted."⁴⁸ After considering some non-impeachment-related business, the House adjourned until the following Monday.

Meanwhile, Long had launched a massive public relations campaign designed to portray the impeachment effort as an attempt by Standard Oil and other wealthy interests to eliminate the threat to their hegemony posed by Long's championing of the people's interests. He alleged that Standard Oil and its co-conspirators had "bought," through bribes and other inducements, a significant portion of the legislature.⁴⁹ The opening sentences of one circular framed the conflict in starkly moral terms:

I had rather go down to a thousand impeachments than to admit that I am the governor of the State that does not dare to call the Standard Oil Company to account so that we can educate our children and care for [the] destitute, sick, and afflicted. If this state is still to be ruled by the power of the money of this corporation, I am too weak for its governor.⁵⁰

On Monday, April 1st, the subcommittee of 12 made its report, which recommended that the House designate the Committee of the Whole to investigate the charges against Long and proposed a set of rules (enclosure 9) to govern the committee's proceedings.

On Saturday, April 6th, the Committee of the Whole approved the first of eight impeachment charges (enclosure 10) that were actually passed and sent to the Senate by the House. The Committee of the Whole's proceedings continued until April 26th, at which point the eighth and final article of impeachment was transmitted to the Senate, and the House adjourned.

Once the first article of impeachment had been approved by the House, the House appropriated \$100,000 for the cost and preparations of the impeachment.⁵¹ It is not clear whether all of the money was used, but it is probable that it was not because of the brevity of the Senate trial, which lasted 3 days rather than the projected 6 weeks.⁵²

The Senate trial was delayed until May 14th in order to give the lawyers on both sides time to prepare. Meanwhile, Long continued his public relations offensive. The first two days of the trial were spent debating

demurrers filed by Long's defense team alleging that the charges offered by the impeachment managers were defective. These demurrers were rejected by a one-vote majority.

On May 16th, a senator loyal to Long filed a "Round Robin" document signed by himself and 14 other senators stating that because they believed the proceedings were unconstitutional and invalid, they would vote to acquit. The document was known as a "Round Robin" because the signers' signatures were arranged around the page in a circular pattern that made it impossible to tell which senator had signed it first. Because the 15 signers comprised more than one-third of the Senate, it was impossible for the anti-Long forces to gain the two-thirds margin necessary for conviction, and the Senate voted to adjourn *sine die*.⁵³

Many historians and contemporaries of Long have noted that the impeachment proceedings transformed Long into a more ruthless politician.⁵⁴ A case in point was the preparation of recall petitions against several of the legislators who had attempted to impeach him.⁵⁵

**Henry Johnston
(Oklahoma, 1928
and 1929)
Acquitted;
Convicted**

Complaints against Governor Johnston's (D) personal secretary, Mrs. O.O. Hammonds, alleged that Hammonds had too much influence over Johnston's actions and politics, such as making executive decisions and controlling appointments, and concerns grew that Johnston was incompetent.⁵⁶ He also proposed to enlarge the State Highway Commission from 3 to 5 members, which was apparently an unpopular proposal.

The legislature planned to meet as a special session to investigate Johnston. However, the State Supreme Court ruled the special session unconstitutional. Legislative leaders ignored the court ruling and went to the state capitol anyway, only to be blocked by the Oklahoma National Guard. The legislature moved to the Huckins Hotel in downtown Oklahoma City on December 13, 1927. The House adopted articles of impeachment against Johnston charging him with incompetency, but the Senate later acquitted him of the charges.⁵⁷

Trouble began again for Johnston after he campaigned with the Democrats for Alfred Smith of New York in Smith's presidential campaign. When Herbert Hoover was elected, Republicans took several Oklahoma state offices, and gained a near majority in the House and substantial seats in the Senate. The Democrats held Johnston responsible for their party's losses in Oklahoma.⁵⁸

The second impeachment effort against Johnston began in 1929. In January, the House presented the Senate with 13 articles of impeachment (enclosure 11); the Senate accepted 11 for consideration.⁵⁹ Six of 11 counts charged unlawful issue of deficiency certificates; 2 charged illegal appointments; one charged unlawful use of the military to prevent an assembly of the Legislature; one charged corrupt use of pardon power; and one charged general incompetency.⁶⁰

Johnston was suspended from office on January 21, 1929 and his trial began in February. On March 20th, the Senate voted 35-9 to remove Governor Johnston from office⁶¹ on the charge of general incompetency. All other charges against Johnston were dropped.⁶²

The Chief Justice who presided over the impeachment trial administered the oath of office to the new Governor, and hurried to prepare his own defense to impeachment charges against himself and two other State Supreme Court justices.⁶³

Johnston had been a state senator before being elected Governor, and was re-elected to the state Senate after his impeachment. He served from 1933 to 1937.⁶⁴

**John Walton
(Oklahoma,
1923)
Convicted**

Even before John Walton was (D) inaugurated, there was a rumor that he would be impeached. His immediate unpopularity was the result of his opposition to the Ku Klux Klan. Many members of the Oklahoma Legislature were either members or supporters of the Klan.⁶⁵

In an effort to reduce Klan violence, Walton declared martial law in Tulsa on August 13, 1923. Several days later, the Governor extended martial law to Tulsa and Okmulgee Counties. On September 1, 1923, Walton declared the state under martial law and suspended the right of habeas corpus.⁶⁶

Walton had also pressured the presidents of the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma A&M to resign and replaced them with his allies.⁶⁷

During the month of September, Walton used the Oklahoma National Guard to keep the legislature from meeting. In return, the legislature petitioned the state's citizens, asking to amend the state's constitution to allow the legislature to convene itself through a petition signed by the majority of its members.⁶⁸ While it is unclear from available sources whether the petition passed, Walton called the legislature into session and impeachment proceedings started almost immediately.⁶⁹

On October 23rd, the Senate received a message from the House of Representatives that articles of impeachment had been prepared and adopted against Walton. The Senate suspended Walton immediately.⁷⁰

Walton's trial began November 1, 1923 and lasted 12 calendar days. There were 22 articles of impeachment (enclosure 12) drawn against Walton that charged him with: unlawful appointment of officers, padding the payrolls, using the pardon power to defraud, accepting money from people who had business transactions with boards of which Walton was a member, illegal and unwarranted use of the military, unconstitutional suspension of the right of habeas corpus, suppression of a legally instituted grand jury, and general incompetence.⁷¹ Article 19, which charged abuse of pardoning power, passed, and Walton was removed from office. Ten other charges passed, and all other counts against Walton were dropped.⁷²

**James Ferguson
(Texas, 1917)
Convicted**

Governor James Ferguson (D) and the University of Texas disagreed about University funding and spending, and the confirmation of members of the University Board of Regents. In early February, 1917, Senator Latimore presented a memorial, asking that "a sufficient investigation be made to remove from the University any suspicion or distrust that may have been aroused from a recent controversy."⁷³ He also presented a resolution, asking for the appointment of a committee of five to investigate the Governor's nominees to the University's Board of Regents, "to determine

if any such appointees have committed themselves to or for the retention or dismissal of any members of the faculty” The resolution went on to say that at least some of the nominees “have already committed themselves to the policy of the dismissal of members of the faculty whose removal was demanded by the Governor, and others because of personal dislike.” The motion was referred to a committee to determine whether the resolution should be adopted.⁷⁴ Four days later, the committee considering whether the Governor’s nominees should be investigated began holding hearings.⁷⁵

In mid-February, Senator Johnson introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of the Governor. He made 6 specific charges against the Governor:

- (1) That the Governor had for his own use made illegal expenditures of public funds;
- (2) That he dominated, or was seeking to dominate, the governing boards of the state’s educational institutions by removal and intimidation;
- (3) That he borrowed from the Temple State Bank, and now owed, a sum in excess of that permitted by state law, an “over-loan”;
- (4) That his campaign expenses had been paid by “special interests,” and not by himself, as he claimed;
- (5) That excessive commissions were paid to attorneys; and
- (6) That he removed from interest-bearing accounts state money and deposited it into the Temple State Bank without interest.

The Governor gave a speech on the floor defending his actions. The resolution was tabled, on the point of order that it was equivalent to the beginning of impeachment proceedings, which had to begin in the House.⁷⁶ The next day, Senator Lattimore presented a resolution, proposing to refer to the House the Johnson resolution asking for an investigation of the Governor. It was tabled for later consideration.⁷⁷

Meanwhile, the Senate committee which had been investigating the Governor’s nominees reported that the question of whether the investigation should be ordered was so important that the committee could not assume the responsibility of making a recommendation.⁷⁸

On February 17th, Representative O’Banion introduced a resolution incorporating the substance of the Johnson resolution, calling for an investigation of the Governor. It added a charge that the Governor had caused the State Banking Commissioner to violate his oath of office by inducing him to help the Governor in the over-loan from Temple State Bank.⁷⁹

The O’Banion resolution came up for discussion 2 days later in the House. Representative O’Banion explained that he did not make the charges (he hoped they were not true), but that the charges had been made by Senator Johnson and he thought they should be investigated. The Governor gave a

speech on the floor defending his actions, and the resolution was tabled by a vote of 104-31 because it did not present sworn charges looking toward impeachment. Without this, the House could not properly take time from public legislation to investigate the truth of the charges.⁸⁰

The following day, Senator Lattimore called up his resolution calling for an investigation of the Governor. Senator Dayton offered a substitute for the first part of the resolution, which would show support for an investigation by the University's Board of Regents. The substitute was adopted.

The Senate stopped consideration of investigation when Representative Davis offered a House resolution preferring charges against the Governor and looking toward impeachment.⁸¹

Representative Davis's resolution (enclosure 13), offered in early March, made 10 charges against the Governor.⁸² It called for a committee to investigate the charges, and included an appendix with testimony from H. C. Poe, former president of the Temple State Bank (previously read into the House record by Rep. O'Banion), supporting his charges.⁸³ Two days later a point of order was raised that the resolution contained the same substance as a resolution previously acted on and defeated by the House. The point of order was overruled by a vote of 64-66.⁸⁴ A motion was made to postpone further consideration of the resolution indefinitely. It was defeated 54-76.⁸⁵

Representative Bigby offered an amendment to the resolution, including further details on procedure for the committee. The amendment was amended to have 9 members (rather than 7 in the original resolution or 12 in the original amendment) on the committee. The amendment (as amended) was adopted, and the resolution was adopted, 87-40.⁸⁶ Members were appointed to the committee.⁸⁷

On March 7th the House committee to investigate charges against the Governor began hearings. The committee held hearings from the 7th to the 13th.⁸⁸ On the last day of hearings, Representative Rogers offered a resolution in the House that the committee hear the final arguments of the attorneys in the House chamber, "that all members of the House may have an opportunity to hear it." It was tabled, 57-54.⁸⁹

On the 15th, the Report of the Investigating Committee (enclosure 14) was presented to the House. The report found sufficient evidence for 5 of the 10 charges (mostly the minor charges). The report noted that the committee was "of the opinion that said transactions are not sufficient to justify the filing of impeachment proceedings."⁹⁰

Senator Dayton's resolution (substituting for Sen. Lattimore's), calling for an investigation of the Governor, was unanimously adopted on March 17th after the House did not impeach the Governor.⁹¹

On June 3, 1917, Governor Ferguson vetoed the University's budget.⁹² The next month, the Speaker of the House (Representative F. O. Fuller) issued a call to the House of Representatives to meet at the Capitol on August 1st to consider impeachment charges. Three reasons were given:

- (1) The Governor's violation of the Constitution and the statutes in his dealings with the University;
- (2) The Governor's refusal to reconvene the board that had selected the Abilene location of West Texas A&M College, despite the fact that the selection had been found to be fraudulent;
- (3) The Governor's failure to fulfill his promise made under oath to the House's investigating committee in March to repay the public funds illegally spent for the use of himself and his family.

The Speaker said other charges would be filed when the House assembled.⁹³

On July 26th a group of lawyers, headed by a former Texas Supreme Court justice, published in newspapers an opinion upholding the right of the House to consider impeachment without the call of the governor.⁹⁴ The next day, a grand jury indicted the Governor and 4 of his appointees on 9 charges: 7 for misapplication, 1 for embezzlement, and 1 for diversion of public funds. The charges against Governor Ferguson concerned mainly the illegal use of public funds disclosed by the legislative investigation in March.⁹⁵

On July 30th the press reported that the Attorney General would, when requested, give an opinion sustaining the opinion published in newspapers regarding the right of the House to convene without the call of the Governor.⁹⁶ At about 10 p.m., the Governor issued a call for a special session (to assemble at the same time the Speaker had previously announced) to consider and make additional appropriations for the University of Texas (he had vetoed the "main part" of the appropriation).⁹⁷

The House passed Articles of Impeachment (enclosure 15) on August 24th, and sent them to the Senate.⁹⁸ The same day, the Senate took several actions to prepare for the trial:

- (1) Simple Resolution 35, to inform the House that the Senate had received the message and to call the Senate to convene on Aug. 29th at 10 a.m. for the trial of the Governor, was adopted.⁹⁹
- (2) Simple Resolution 36, to request that the Honorable Nelson Phillips, or one of the associate justices of the Supreme Court of Texas, appear before the Senate to administer the oath to each Senator in the trial, was adopted.¹⁰⁰
- (3) A point of order was made and sustained that the oath cannot be administered until the Senate has resolved itself into a court of impeachment. Simple Resolution 36 was rescinded.¹⁰¹
- (4) The House officially presented the Senate with the articles of impeachment, requested the Senate set a time for the trial to begin, and informed the Senate that a Board of Managers had been appointed to conduct the prosecution.¹⁰²
- (5) Simple Resolution 37, to appoint stenographers, was adopted.¹⁰³

- (6) Private counsel for the Governor was given floor privileges.¹⁰⁴
- (7) Simple Resolution 38, to inform the Governor and Secretary of State that impeachment charges had been passed by the House and filed in the Senate and that the trial in the Senate would begin on August 29th at 10 a.m. and to summon the Governor to appear at that time, was passed. The House was notified that the summons had been issued.¹⁰⁵
- (8) Simple Resolution 39, to create a special committee of three to prepare, by the 28th, rules of procedure for the Senate, was adopted, and the committee was appointed.¹⁰⁶
- (9) The Articles of Impeachment of Governor Ferguson were read by the Secretary of the Senate.¹⁰⁷

Soon thereafter, the Senate received the answer of Governor Ferguson to the impeachment charges (enclosure 16).¹⁰⁸

On August 28th, the special Senate committee to formulate rules of procedure made its report. The committee proposed 29 rules, and the committee report was adopted.¹⁰⁹ Simple Resolution 40, to provide the form of subpoena to be used for witnesses in the state whose testimony may be desired and the form of direction for service and to provide that witnesses would receive \$2.50 for each day required to be in attendance plus 3¢ per mile of travel, was approved.¹¹⁰

The next day, Acting Governor W. P. Hobby issued an executive order calling the legislature to a special session for several purposes, one of which was: "To facilitate a fair and impartial trial of the articles of impeachment preferred by the House of Representatives against the Governor of Texas."¹¹¹

On September 22nd, after all testimony had been heard, the Senate Committee on Rules proposed Senate Special Rule No. 1 to direct the Senate to conduct a roll call vote on each article (after each Counsel had concluded and the Chair announced the Senate was ready to vote on the articles) and to direct the Chair to appoint a committee to formulate and present a formal judgment to be entered in the Journal. It was objected to and withdrawn.¹¹²

The Senate voted on each of the 21 articles of impeachment, sustaining charges on 10 of the 21 articles.¹¹³ It passed Simple Resolution 23, to have (on Sept. 25th) the Senate, sitting as the Court of Impeachment, pronounce judgment on Governor Ferguson.¹¹⁴

The Committee on Civil Jurisprudence, on September 24th, submitted to the Senate a report containing the articles that had been sustained. The report included this conclusion:

Now, therefore, it is adjudged by the Senate of the State of Texas sitting as a Court of Impeachment, at their chamber, in the city of Austin, that the said James E. Ferguson be and he is hereby removed from the office of

Governor and be disqualified to hold any office of honor, trust or profit under the State of Texas. It is further ordered that a copy of this judgment be enrolled and certified by the President Pro Tem. of this Senate as presiding officer, and the Secretary of the Senate, and that such certified copy be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State of the State of Texas, and be printed in the Senate Journal.¹¹⁵

The minority report described disagreements related to disqualification for holding office.¹¹⁶ The next day, Simple Resolution 26 was adopted, resolving that the judgment be ratified.¹¹⁷

William Sulzer
(New York,
1913)
Convicted

Problems in William Sulzer's (D) term stemmed from his actions during his campaign. On June 25, 1913, a concurrent resolution was adopted, instructing a committee to investigate campaign expenditures and finance statements in the 1912 election.¹¹⁸ On the eve of the investigation, legislative leaders said that they had information that the Governor had received many contributions from prominent people and businesses that had not been legally recorded and that he had promised favors in return for campaign financing to at least one contributor.¹¹⁹ The investigation on Governor Sulzer's official conduct began July 17th.

Sulzer's impeachment trial began September 18th. He was charged with 8 articles of impeachment (enclosure 17): 2 charges of filing a false statement of campaign expenses, and one charge each of bribing witnesses, suppressing evidence, suppressing testimony, grand larceny,¹²⁰ corrupt use of power, and corrupt use of his position.¹²¹ Sulzer resigned on September 24th.¹²²

On October 16th, the Governor was found guilty of three of the eight charges: filing a false statement of campaign expenses, perjury, and suppression of testimony. He was acquitted of the remaining charges the next day.¹²³

William Kellogg
(Louisiana,
1876)
Acquitted

The William Kellogg (R) administration was plagued by insurrection on the part of those who did not acknowledge his election in 1872. Tensions between radical Republicans and Democrats continued to fester until September 14, 1874, when a popular uprising seized control of New Orleans.¹²⁴ President Grant's administration moved swiftly to suppress the insurrection (which surrendered peaceably) and reinstall Kellogg as governor.

The legislative elections later that year were fraught with charges of fraud on all sides; when Democratic House members attempted, by parliamentary maneuvering, to seize the speakership and swear in five Democrats whose election was questioned (thus giving them a majority), federal troops entered the chamber and removed the five representatives in question at bayonet-point. Such heavy-handedness ignited a firestorm of criticism throughout Louisiana and the country at large, which saw the federal troops' behavior as a concerning symptom of President Grant's contempt for his political opponents.¹²⁵

After several months of tension, the parties reached a compromise under which the Democrats agreed to support the Kellogg administration in

maintaining law and order and would not impeach him for any offenses prior to the agreement in exchange for a majority in the House. This compromise lasted until 1876, when the Democratic House, arguing that Kellogg had committed impeachable offenses since the agreement had taken place, moved to impeach him.

A committee of seven was appointed to investigate the charges against the Governor, and resolutions were passed on February 28, 1876 (enclosure 18) to impeach the Governor. The Senate immediately met to acquit Kellogg of any charges the House might bring, and adjourned. The House, nevertheless, adopted 14 articles of impeachment, only to be informed of the Senate's adjournment as a court.¹²⁶

The House then passed a series of resolutions, declaring the Senate disqualified from sitting in judgment on the trial and calling on citizens to consider the matter. No further actions were taken.¹²⁷

Adelbert Ames
(Mississippi,
1876)
Resigned

On January 6, 1876, the House passed a resolution to investigate the conduct of Governor Ames (R) to determine whether grounds for impeachment existed.¹²⁸ The following day a resolution was passed to also investigate charges leveled at the Lieutenant Governor A. K. Davis.¹²⁹ The next month, five articles of impeachment (enclosure 19) were adopted by the House against Lieutenant Governor A. K. Davis.¹³⁰

Two days later, the Senate convened a court of impeachment for the Lieutenant Governor.¹³¹ Stemming from testimony in that impeachment trial, the House adopted 21 articles of impeachment against Governor Ames.¹³² On March 16, 1876 the Senate convened an impeachment trial of the Governor.¹³³ The Lieutenant Governor was convicted.¹³⁴ On March 29, 1876, Governor Ames resigned from office, and the House passed a resolution dismissing the articles of impeachment against him. The Senate also dismissed the charges and adjourned on the sixth day of the trial.¹³⁵ The Senate President became Governor.¹³⁶

Harrison Reed
(Florida, 1872
and 1868)
Acquitted Twice

Harrison Reed (R) was impeached twice, and was acquitted both times. After the House impeached him on November 6, 1868,¹³⁷ the Florida Supreme Court ruled the impeachment invalid due to a lack of consent of both houses to hold a special session for impeachment.¹³⁸

On February 7, 1872, the House formed a committee to draft articles of impeachment against Governor Reed.¹³⁹ The House adopted the articles of impeachment (enclosure 20) on February 15, 1872, and the Senate began the impeachment trial.¹⁴⁰ The impeachment charges ranged from taking bribes to using proceeds from state bonds for private gain. The Senate adjourned 4 days later without convicting or acquitting the Governor.¹⁴¹ In April of 1872, the Florida Supreme Court determined that the impeachment trial was still pending,¹⁴² and the next month the Senate acquitted the Governor.¹⁴³

Henry Warmoth
(Louisiana,
1872)
Term Ended

Henry Warmoth (R) was an Illinois native and Civil War veteran who set up a law practice in New Orleans after his regiment was disbanded there in 1864. After he and several other Northern transplants (also known as carpetbaggers) seized control of the newly-revived state Republican party, he became a leading voice for the enfranchisement of African-Americans, and became governor in 1868 at the age of 26.¹⁴⁴ During the course of his term, intra-party divisions over his alleged corrupt conduct in office led to a party split. In the 1872 presidential election, Warmoth supported Horace Greeley, who was backed by Republicans appalled by the excesses of the Grant administration. After many in Warmoth's faction were prevented by federal troops from taking their seats in the legislature, they joined forces with Democrats to support a slate opposing his Republican rivals.

The 1872 election was plagued by voting irregularities and competition between rival election boards (each picking a different winner). The Warmoth-controlled election board said that Greeley won Louisiana's presidential election, that the Warmoth-backed Democratic candidate for governor had been elected, and that the new legislature contained a majority of "Fusionists"—the coalition of Democrats and anti-Grant Republicans. The Republican-controlled election board awarded the presidential electors to Grant (who won handily even though Louisiana's electoral votes ended up being thrown out due to the election's irregularities), the Governor's office to the Republican candidate, William P. Kellogg, and control of the legislature to the Republicans.

When the federal government went with the anti-Warmoth Republicans, the newly-installed Republican House immediately voted to impeach Warmoth and inform the Senate of his impeachment. Because Louisiana law requires that an impeached official be suspended from his office until the Senate votes to acquit, Warmoth was promptly removed from office (though he continued to claim to be acting as Governor and denounced the impeachment vote as an attempted anti-democratic coup).¹⁴⁵ Only later did the House actually draw up formal articles of impeachment (enclosure 21).

Warmoth submitted a letter of resignation to the Fusionist legislature (which had organized in defiance of the federal preference for its Republican rival), which did not accept the resignation. Refusing to acknowledge that the other legislature had impeached him, Warmoth reiterated his determination to serve out his term until the Democratic governor-elect could be installed and denounce those who threatened to replace him prematurely. The stalemate between Warmoth and his lieutenant governor-turned-acting-governor (Pinckney B. S. Pinchback, who became the first African-American governor in U.S. history) divided the state militia and motivated both sides to send delegations to Washington appealing to the federal government to take their side. The Grant administration took the side of the Republicans and federal troops disarmed the state militia members loyal to Warmoth, thus ending the standoff and making Warmoth's removal from office (35 days before his term would have ended) indisputable.

Because Warmoth's opponents did not think that they had enough votes to actually convict him, they had no incentive to conduct the trial quickly and risk returning him to office; they had enough votes in the Senate, however, to keep the charges from being dismissed, so they allowed his term to expire without bringing the charges to trial—thus effectively removing him.¹⁴⁶

**David Butler
(Nebraska, 1871)
Convicted**

On March 6, 1871, the House approved 11 articles of impeachment (enclosure 22) against Governor Butler (R).¹⁴⁷ The Senate convened a court of impeachment the following week.¹⁴⁸ At the beginning of June, Butler was found guilty on one article of impeachment that he had appropriated about \$17,000¹⁴⁹ for his own use.¹⁵⁰

Some of Governor Butler's personal property was taken to pay for the debt he owed, but he was not otherwise punished. He later returned to politics, serving as a state senator and made another unsuccessful campaign for Governor.¹⁵¹

**Powell Clayton
(Arkansas, 1871)
Acquitted**

In January 1871, the Arkansas Senate elected Governor Clayton (R) to the U.S. Senate, but he refused the seat. He thought his appointment had less to do with his merit and qualifications, and was more out of a desire of a faction of the Republican party to "pursue policy adverse to the wishes of a large majority of the Republican party."¹⁵²

The next month, the House introduced six articles of impeachment (enclosure 23) against Governor Clayton, and voted to appoint managers to convey these grounds for impeachment to the Senate. The vote brought a narrow victory for those in favor of impeachment, 42-38. Several members strongly objected to the motion of impeachment, demanding the charges be investigated; others commented on their belief of the charges being "fraudulent" and only for "political purposes."¹⁵³

On February 20, 1871 the managers in the House notified the Senate of the impeachment of Clayton Powell. (It took three separate visits to the Senate before the managers were recognized and heard by the Senate.)¹⁵⁴ On March 1, 1871 the managers reported to the House that since the Senate had been apprised of the House's motion to impeach Governor Clayton the majority of the Senators had "absented themselves from their places in the Senate, for several successive days, without leave, or sufficient excuse, with the intention, as we believe, of defeating or retarding the actions of this house"¹⁵⁵

The next day, new managers were appointed in the House to appear before the Senate and demand that the Senate summon the Governor. They informed the Senate that the House would soon present articles of impeachment "and make them good."¹⁵⁶

On March 4, 1871 the managers of impeachment in the House informed their chamber that, upon further investigation, no witnesses or records reviewed by the managers as a committee sustained any grounds for impeachment against the Governor. The managers moved that further proceedings in the impeachment of Powell Clayton be dropped and that Senate to be notified accordingly. The resolution was adopted.¹⁵⁷

Later in March 1871, Clayton was again elected by the Arkansas Senate to the U.S. Senate; this time Clayton accepted the position.¹⁵⁸ Once in the U.S. Senate Clayton was accused of corruption surrounding his nomination to the U.S. Senate and for issuing an illegal certificate of election to an Arkansas Congressman during his time as Governor. These charges were not sustained.¹⁵⁹

**William Holden
(North Carolina,
1870)
Convicted**

A House resolution to impeach Governor Holden (R) was referred to the House Judiciary Committee on December 9, 1870,¹⁶⁰ and the Judiciary Committee adopted the resolution 5 days later.¹⁶¹ On December 19, 1870, the House adopted eight articles of impeachment (enclosure 24) against the Governor,¹⁶² and the following day the Senate passed a resolution for a court of impeachment.¹⁶³ The Senate's impeachment trial lasted for almost three months, resulting in a conviction on six of eight articles of impeachment.¹⁶⁴

**Charles
Robinson
(Kansas, 1862)
Acquitted**

The Kansas House formed a committee to investigate the sale of state bonds.¹⁶⁵ On February 13, 1862, the committee recommended impeachment of Governor Robinson (R), the Secretary of State, and the State Auditor.¹⁶⁶ The next day, the House unanimously voted to impeach all three,¹⁶⁷ and adopted five articles of impeachment (enclosure 25) against the Governor 12 days later.¹⁶⁸

The Senate held the impeachment trial in one day on June 16, 1862, and acquitted the Governor on all articles of impeachment.¹⁶⁹

**1970 Con-
stitutional
Convention
Debate of
Impeachment
Provision**

There was little discussion of impeachment on the floor of the 1970 constitutional convention. Almost all of what the delegates said on that topic was occasioned by the Illinois Supreme Court's holding the preceding year in *Cusack v. Howlett*¹⁷⁰ that the House of Representatives could not investigate possible grounds for impeachment without starting actual impeachment proceedings. The delegates to the convention disagreed with that holding and wanted to overrule it in the proposed 1970 Constitution.

Provisions on impeachment were in the draft articles on the legislature,¹⁷¹ executive,¹⁷² and judiciary.¹⁷³ But the delegates apparently decided to have only one section on impeachment and to put it in the legislative article.¹⁷⁴ That provision, as initially proposed by the Legislative Committee, said in part:

The House of Representatives, by a majority of all the members elected, has the sole power to impeach all Executive and Judicial officers. The House of Representatives shall have power to investigate to determine if cause for impeachment exists. . . .¹⁷⁵

The second sentence of that draft had no counterpart in the 1870 Constitution.¹⁷⁶ The Committee's explanation said the only reason for changing that section was that "a need exists to make indelibly clear that the right to investigate the sufficiency of cause prior to impeachment shall not be impaired. . . . The *Cusack v. Howlett* case (44 Ill. 2d 233) casts a lingering

and flickering shadow of doubt on the power of the House of Representatives to investigate prior to impeachment. The purpose of the proposed additional sentence is to erase this lingering and flickering doubt. . . .”¹⁷⁷

That section was presented to the full convention on July 15, 1970 by Delegate John Knuppel, a member of the Committee. His brief description of the provision focused entirely on the *Cusack* case; there were no questions from delegates.¹⁷⁸ A few days later, Delegate Knuppel moved that proposed section 13 be approved on First Reading and referred to the Style and Drafting Committee, which was done by vote of 65-1.¹⁷⁹

The Committee on Style, Drafting and Submission or “SDS” (as it was by then called) rearranged the section somewhat (and renumbered it as section 14) but made little if any substantive change in it. The Committee’s version began with a sentence designed to overrule *Cusack v. Howlett*:

The House of Representatives has the sole power to conduct legislative investigations to determine the existence of cause for impeachment and, by vote of a majority of the members elected, to impeach Executive and Judicial officers. . . .¹⁸⁰

The Committee’s explanation of its revision said this in its entirety: “The separate sentence on investigations has been combined with the impeachment sentence. Insertion of ‘legislative’ in front of [‘investigations’] makes it clear that the Senate cannot conduct such an investigation but other bodies, such as the Judicial Inquiry Board, could conduct an investigation which might lead to impeachment.”¹⁸¹

The proposed section 14 was not debated on Second Reading, and was passed on Second Reading along with all other sections from 4 to 16 by vote of 94-0.¹⁸² Impeachment was not mentioned when the Legislative article was debated on Third Reading.¹⁸³ The section as proposed to the voters, and later ratified, was identical to the SDS Committee’s redraft of it. The convention’s “Official Text With Explanation” of the impeachment section said in its entirety:

This changes Article IV, Section 24 of the 1870 Constitution. It clearly establishes the power of the House of Representatives to conduct investigations to determine if cause exists for impeachment. The procedure for impeachment remains unchanged.¹⁸⁴

It thus appears that the only change the convention wanted to make in the 1870 impeachment provision was to assert the authority of the House of Representatives, at any time, to investigate the possibility of cause for impeachment.

Enclosures

1. Arizona Legislative Council and Arizona House of Representatives, "Report on Impeachment of Public Officers" (Nov. 1987).
2. "Proposed Rules for the Special House Select Committee" (resolution of the Special House Select Committee to investigate Governor Evan Mecham).
3. Ariz. House Resolution 2002 (1988).
4. "Report of the House Managers in the Matter of the Impeachment of the Honorable Evan Mecham, Governor of the State of Arizona," Feb. 8, 1988.
5. "Rules of Procedure of the Court of Impeachment" (Arizona Senate's Rules of Procedure in Mecham impeachment trial).
6. *Mecham v. Gordon and Members of the Senate*, 156 Ariz. 297, 751 P.2d 957 (1988).
7. "Journal of the Court of Impeachment," Arizona State Senate (1988), pp. 967-974, faxed from Ken Behringer, General Counsel, Arizona Legislative Council, Phoenix, May 14, 2008.
8. Louisiana House Journal (Apr. 4, 1929), pp. 145-147.
9. "House Resolutions Relative to Impeachment," Louisiana House Calendar (1929).
10. Louisiana House Journal (Apr. 1, 1929), pp. 71-72.
11. "Transcript of Proceedings, Court of Impeachment" (Jan. 30, 1929, transcripts of the Oklahoma Senate).
12. "Transcripts of Proceeding of the Senate of the Ninth Legislature" (Nov. 20, 1923, transcripts of Oklahoma Senate).
13. "Investigation by Committee of Thirty-Fifth Legislature into Charges Against Governor James E. Ferguson," Mar. 3, 1917.
14. "Report of the Investigating Committee," *House Journal*, Mar. 15, 1917, pp. 385-390.
15. Texas Senate, *Record of Proceedings of the High Court of Impeachment on the Trial of Hon. James E. Ferguson, Governor* (1918), pp. 854-868.
16. *Record of Proceedings of the High Court of Impeachment on the Trial of Hon. James E. Ferguson*, "Answer of Governor Ferguson," pp. 16-26.
17. Friedman, *The Impeachment of Governor William Sulzer* (1968), pp. 393-395.
18. "Statement of the Proceedings Had in the Louisiana Legislature, 1876, In Relation to the Impeachment of Governor W.P. Kellogg" (1876), pp. 20-26.
19. "Impeachment Trial of Adelbert Ames, Governor of the State of Mississippi," *The Journal of The Senate of the State of Mississippi* (1876), pp. 1-27, 51-53.
20. *Assembly Journal: A Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of the State of Florida at its Fifth Session*, "Articles of Impeachment" (1872), pp. 257-265, 275-277, and 303-305.
21. "Proceedings of the Senate Sitting as a Court of Impeachment, in the Case of The State of Louisiana Versus Henry C. Warmoth" (1873).
22. "Impeachment Trial of David Butler, Governor of Nebraska" (1871).
23. Arkansas House of Representatives, proceedings on Feb. 16, 1871, pp. 3-7.

24. "Transactions of the House of Representatives, in Connection with the Measures of Impeachment of William W. Holden, Governor of North Carolina" (1871).
25. Kansas House of Representatives, "Proceedings in the Cases of Impeachment of Charles Robinson, Governor; John W. Robinson, Secretary of State; George S. Hillyer, Auditor of the State, of Kansas" (1862), pp. 66-68.

Notes

1. Glennon, "Impeachment: Lessons From the Mecham Experience," *Arizona Law Review*, vol. 30, no. 3 (1988), pp. 371-411, at 375.
2. Buerkle et al., "Our hero the buffoon: contradictory and concurrent Burkean framing of Arizona Governor Evan Mecham," *Western Journal of Communication*, vol. 67, no. 2 (Mar. 22, 2003).
3. "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 376-377.
4. "Our hero the buffoon . . ."
5. "Our hero the buffoon . . ."
6. "Goldwater Says Mecham Should Resign," Associated Press (Oct. 9, 1987).
7. Weinraub, Grand jury subpoena for Arizona Governor," United Press International (Oct. 23, 1987); "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 377.
8. Ronald J. Watkins, *High Crimes and Misdemeanors: The Term and Trials of Former Governor Evan Mecham* (1990), p. 177.
9. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 178.
10. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 179.
11. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 181-182.
12. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 183.
13. "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 377-378.
14. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 226.
15. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 214.
16. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 226.
17. "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 378.
18. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 251-252.
19. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 261.
20. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 253.
21. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 254.
22. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 264-265; "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 382.
23. "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 382; "Resolution of Special House Select Committee."
24. "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 383.
25. "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 379; Chronology of Mecham Administration," Associated Press, Feb. 6, 1988
26. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 276; "Chronology of Mecham Administration."
27. "Chronology of Mecham Administration."
28. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 276-280; "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 383.
29. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 280-281.
30. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 282-294.
31. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 299-301; "Impeachment: Lessons . . ." at 383; Ariz. House Resolution 2002 (1988).

32. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 307-308; “Report of the House Managers in the Matter of the Impeachment of the Honorable Evan Mecham, Governor of the State of Arizona” (Feb. 8, 1988).
33. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 310-312; “Impeachment: Lessons . . .” at 384-385; “Rules of Procedure of the Court of Impeachment.”
34. “Impeachment: Lessons . . .” at 384.
35. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 320; “Impeachment: Lessons . . .” at 389.
36. *Mecham v. Gordon and Members of the Senate*, 156 Ariz. 297, 751 P.2d 957 (1988).
37. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 333-339.
38. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 342.
39. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 343.
40. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 345-346; “Impeachment: Lessons . . .” at 392-393.
41. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 346.
42. *High Crimes and Misdemeanors* . . . at 352-357; “Impeachment: Lessons . . .” at 396-397.
43. Williams, *Huey Long* (1969), p. 352.
44. La. House Journal, Mar. 25, 1929, pp. 26-27; Opotowsky, *The Longs of Louisiana* (1960), pp. 46-48.
45. La. House Journal, Mar. 27, 1929, p. 40.
46. Article V, section 14 of the Louisiana constitution stated that The power to legislate, under the penalty of nullity, shall be limited to the objects specifically enumerated in the Proclamation of the Governor, or petition and notice convening such extraordinary session, and the session shall be limited to the time named therein, which shall never exceed thirty days. La. Const., art. V, sec. 14 (qtd. in La. House Journal, Mar. 27, 1929, p. 51).
47. La. House Journal, Mar. 27, 1929, p. 51.
48. La. House Journal, Mar. 28, 1929, p. 63.
49. La. House Journal, Apr. 3, 1929, p. 92.
50. Qtd. in Williams, *Huey Long* (1969), p. 365.
51. La. House Journal, Apr. 6, 1929, p. 296.
52. *Huey Long* at 400.
53. *Huey Long* at 400-404.
54. *Huey Long* at 409-410.
55. Long, *Every Man a King: The Autobiography of Huey P. Long* (1933), p. 182.
56. “Biographical Note: Governor Henry Johnston” (downloaded May 15, 2008 from the Oklahoma Department of Libraries Internet site).
57. “Biographical Note: Governor Henry Johnston.”
58. Gibson, *Oklahoma, A History of Five Centuries* (1981), p. 220.
59. *Oklahoma, A History of Five Centuries* at 220.
60. Ewing, “Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors,” *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 24, no. 3, (Aug. 1930), p. 651.
61. *Oklahoma, A History of Five Centuries* at 220.
62. “Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors” at 651.
63. “Oklahoma Incompetence,” *Time Magazine*, Apr. 1, 1929 (downloaded from *Time Magazine* Internet site).

64. Oklahoma Department of Libraries, "Governor Henry S. Johnston" (downloaded June 26, 2008 from Oklahoma Department of Libraries Internet site).
65. Grossman, *Political Corruption in America: An Encyclopedia of Scandals, Power, and Greed* (2003), p. 356.
66. "Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors" at 648.
67. "Biographical Note: John Walton," p. 2 (downloaded May 15, 2008 from Oklahoma Department of Libraries Internet site); *Political Corruption in America* at p. 356.
68. "Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors" at 649.
69. *Political Corruption in America* at 356
70. "Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors" at 649.
71. "Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors" at 649-650.
72. "Impeachment of Oklahoma Governors" at 650.
73. Ex-Students Association of the University of Texas, *Ferguson's War on the University of Texas: A Chronological Outline, Jan. 12, 1915, to July 31, 1917, Inclusive* (1917), p. 11.
74. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 11-12.
75. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 12.
76. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 12-13.
77. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 15.
78. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 15.
79. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 16.
80. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 16-17.
81. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 18.
82. Texas Legislature, *Proceedings, Investigation Committee, House of Representatives, Thirty-fifth Legislature, Charges Against Governor James E. Ferguson, Together with Findings of Committee and Action of House with Prefatory Statement and Index to Proceedings* (1917), p. 3.
83. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 3-15.
84. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 17.
85. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 18-19.
86. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 20-23.
87. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 23.
88. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 24-382.
89. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 383.
90. *Proceedings, Investigation Committee* . . . at 384-390.
91. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 20.
92. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 24.
93. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 43-44.
94. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 46.
95. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 46.
96. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 46.
97. *Ferguson's War* . . . at 46-47.
98. Texas Senate, *Record of Proceedings of the High Court of Impeachment on the Trial of Hon. James E. Ferguson, Governor* (1918), p. 855.
99. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 855.
100. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 855.
101. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 855.
102. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 856.
103. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 856.
104. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 856.
105. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 856.

106. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 857.
107. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 857.
108. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 16.
109. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 857-859.
110. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 860.
111. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 861.
112. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 861-862.
113. Texas Senate, *Senate Journal, Thirty-fifth Legislature—Third Called Session* (Sept. 22, 1917), pp. 891-918.
114. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 862.
115. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 865.
116. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 862-865.
117. *Record of Proceedings* . . . at 865.
118. Friedman, *The Impeachment of Governor William Sulzer* (1968), p. 125.
119. *The Impeachment of Governor William Sulzer* at 126.
120. *The Impeachment of Governor William Sulzer* at 235.
121. Forrest, *Tammany's Treason: Impeachment of Governor Sulzer* (1913), p. 383.
122. "Record of Current Events," *The American Review of Reviews*, (July-Dec., 1913), p. 551.
123. *The Impeachment of Governor William Sulzer* at 235.
124. Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868* (1918), p. 273.
125. *Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868* at 303.
126. *Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868* at 396-397.
127. *Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868* at 396-397.
128. DeSoto, Hernando et al., *A History of Mississippi* (1891), p. 405.
129. *A History of Mississippi* at 406.
130. "Impeachment Trial of Alexander K. Davis, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Mississippi," *The Journal of The Senate of the State of Mississippi* (1876), p. 3.
131. "Impeachment Trial of Alexander K. Davis, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Mississippi," at 9.
132. "Impeachment Trial of Adelbert Ames, Governor of the State of Mississippi," *The Journal of The Senate of the State of Mississippi* (1876), p. 27.
133. "Impeachment Trial of Adelbert Ames, Governor of the State of Mississippi" at 2.
134. "Impeachment Trial of Alexander K. Davis, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Mississippi" at 119.
135. "Impeachment Trial of Adelbert Ames, Governor of the State of Mississippi" at 59-62.
136. *A History of Mississippi* at 413.
137. *The American Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1868*, Vol. VIII, "Florida" (1869), p. 273.
138. *The American Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1868* . . . at 275.
139. *Assembly Journal: A Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of the State of Florida at its Fifth Session*, "Articles of Impeachment" (1872), p. 263.
140. *Senate Journal: A Journal of the Proceedings of the Senate of the State of Florida at the Fifth Session of the Legislature* (1872), p. 304.
141. *Senate Journal: A Journal of the Proceedings of the Senate of the State of Florida at the Fifth Session of the Legislature* at 390-391.

142. Cocke, *Reports of the Cases Argued and Adjudged in the Supreme Court of Florida at Terms Held in 1871-'2-'3-'4*, Vol. XIV, (1874), pp. 308-309.
143. "Acquittal of Gov. Reed by the High Court of Impeachment," *The New York Times* (May 5, 1862).
144. Dawson, pp. 165-6.
145. *Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868* at 105, note 5.
146. *Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868* at 224-225.
147. Creigh, *Nebraska: A Bicentennial History* (1977), p. 83.
148. Nebraska House of Representatives, "Impeachment Trial of David Butler, Governor of Nebraska" (1871), p. 38.
149. "Impeachment Trial of David Butler, Governor of Nebraska" at 14-15.
150. "Impeachment Trial of David Butler, Governor of Nebraska" at 381-382.
151. *Nebraska: A Bicentennial History* at 83.
152. Arkansas House of Representatives, "Proceedings in the House of Representatives of Arkansas in the Case of the Impeachment of Powell Clayton" (1871), pp. 33-35; "Powell Clayton," *The Encyclopedia of Arkansas History and Culture*, Feb. 21, 2008, (downloaded from Encyclopedia of Arkansas Internet site).
153. *Proceedings in the House of Representatives of Arkansas in the Case of the Impeachment of Powell Clayton* at 2-15.
154. *Proceedings in the House of Representatives of Arkansas in the Case of the Impeachment of Powell Clayton* at 18-21.
155. *Proceedings in the House of Representatives of Arkansas in the Case of the Impeachment of Powell Clayton* at 22.
156. *Proceedings in the House of Representatives of Arkansas in the Case of the Impeachment of Powell Clayton* at 28.
157. *Proceedings in the House of Representatives of Arkansas in the Case of the Impeachment of Powell Clayton* at 28-31.
158. "Powell Clayton."
159. "Arkansas Investigation: Report of the Senate Committee—The Charges Against Gov. Clayton not Sustained," *The New York Times*, Feb. 27, 1873 (downloaded from NY Times Internet site).
160. North Carolina Senate, *Trial of William W. Holden, Governor of North Carolina, Before the Senate of North Carolina, on Impeachment by the House of Representatives, For High Crimes and Misdemeanors*, "Transactions of the House of Representatives, in Connection with the Measures of Impeachment of William W. Holden, Governor of North Carolina" (1871), p. 1.
161. *Trial of William W. Holden . . .* at 1-2.
162. *Trial of William W. Holden . . .* at 4.
163. *Trial of William W. Holden . . .* at 18-19.
164. *Trial of William W. Holden . . .* at 20-2564
165. *Proceedings in the Cases of Impeachment of Charles Robinson, Governor; John W. Robinson, Secretary of State; George S. Hillyer, Auditor of the State, of Kansas: Proceedings in the House*, "Articles of Impeachment" (1862), p. 3.
166. *Proceedings in the Cases of Impeachment of Charles Robinson, Governor . . .* at 4.
167. *Proceedings in the Cases of Impeachment of Charles Robinson, Governor . . .* at 84.

168. *Proceedings in the Cases of Impeachment of Charles Robinson, Governor . . .* at 86.
169. *Proceedings in the Cases of Impeachment of Charles Robinson, Governor; John W. Robinson, Secretary of State; George S. Hillyer, Auditor of the State, of Kansas: Proceedings in the Senate* (1862), p. 397.
170. *Cusack v. Howlett*, 44 Ill. 2d 233, 254 N.E.2d 506 (1969).
171. Record of Proceedings, Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention, vol. VI, pp. 1396-97 (Legislative Committee Proposal 1, section 13).
172. Record of Proceedings, vol. VI, p. 378 (Executive Committee Proposal 1, section 13).
173. Record of Proceedings, vol. VI, pp. 804-05 (initial partial draft of Judiciary Committee Proposal 1, section 18).
174. See Record of Proceedings, vol. III, p. 1311 (remarks of Delegates Ronald Smith and George Lewis).
175. Record of Proceedings, vol. VI, p. 1315 (Legislative Committee Proposal 1, section 13, first two sentences).
176. See Ill. Const. 1870, Art. 4, sec. 24.
177. Record of Proceedings, vol. VI, pp. 1396-97 (explanation of Legislative Committee Proposal 1, section 13).
178. Record of Proceedings, vol. IV, p. 2709 (remarks of Delegate Knuppel).
179. Record of Proceedings, vol. IV, p. 2897.
180. Record of Proceedings, vol. VI, p. 1518 (Style, Drafting and Submission (SDS) Committee Proposal 10, section 14).
181. Record of Proceedings, vol. VI, p. 1559 (explanation of SDS Committee Proposal 10, section 14).
182. Record of Proceedings, vol. V, p. 4106.
183. Based on computer search of transcript of debate, beginning with the Aug. 28, 1970 session, for "impeach".
184. Record of Proceedings, vol. VII, p. 2704 (Official Text With Explanation of Article, 4, section 14 of proposed 1970 Constitution).

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors

Articles of impeachment against governors are summarized below, with the governors' names and article numbers in parentheses. Governors were convicted of the articles in bold.

Financial Malfeasance (69 total, with 17 convictions)

Knowingly obtained monies for private purposes by trick, scheme, and/or converting monies or improperly expending monies raised by campaign committee. (Mecham, 2.B)

Knowingly used and authorized the use of state property for purposes other than for promoting the interests of the state. (**Mecham, 3.A**)

Misused funds, violating his oath of office. (**Mecham, 3.A-3.D**)

Did not account for money appropriated for conference. (Long, 3)

Spent money appropriated for maintenance of state mansion for other purposes. (Long, 5)

Purchased with state money a private law library. (Long, 6)

Allowed a construction company to build defective culverts with state money. (Long, 7)

Diverted state funds to pay someone who represented him. (Johnston, 2)

Issued unlawful deficiency certificates to create certain positions not authorized by law, and when no emergency existed. (Johnston, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, and 12)

Entered into a corrupt agreement with another state officer to divert state appropriations for his personal use. (**Walton, 2**)

Accepted money from someone who had business transactions with the State Board of Equalization. (Walton, 4)

Issued an unlawful deficiency certificate when no emergency existed. (**Walton, 15 and 21**)

Solicited and accepted gifts from those desiring favors. (**Walton, 20**)

Transferred money from adjutant general's department fund to a school's fund, and appropriated for his own use \$5,000 of the school's fund. (**Ferguson, 1 and 12**)

Deposited state money for personal gain into banks of which he was a stockholder. (**Ferguson 2, 6, 7, 9**)

Sought to have state departments deposit their funds in banks of which he was a stockholder. (Ferguson, 8)

Refused to disclose to the legislature the source of money he received from specified parties. (**Ferguson, 11**)

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors (cont'd)

Financial Malfeasance (cont'd)

Failed to reimburse state treasury for personal expenses not justifiable under gubernatorial mansion maintenance fund. (Ferguson, 13)

Induced a bank to lend him money in excess of limit. (Ferguson, 14)

Attempted to veto appropriations to university, violating a constitutional provision for the maintenance of a state university. (Ferguson, 15)

Used influence to affect prices of securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange. (Sulzer, 8)

Paid an excessive fee to an accountant hired to inspect the State Auditor's account. (Kellogg, 6)

Knowingly approved a defective bond of State Treasurer. (Ames, 3-4)

Defrauded the state by using prison labor for private purposes. (Ames, 6- 7)

Issued bonds in excess of amount authorized to be issued. (Reed, 1)

Issued and used proceeds of bonds for private gain. (Reed, 2-7, 9, 10)

Unlawfully appropriated state money for his own benefit. (Reed, 13-15)

Used public funds and lands for his own benefit. (Butler, 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12)

Unlawfully gave state land to railroad companies. (Butler, 9)

Issued bonds for private gain. (Clayton, 4-5)

Used public funds, without legislative authority and against judicial injunctions, to support illegally organized bands of desperados to control citizens. (Holden 7-8)

Borrowed more money on behalf of the state than authorized by the legislature. (Robinson, 1)

Sold bonds more cheaply than authorized by the legislature, and below market value. (Robinson 2 and 3)

Consented to illegal bond-selling schemes. (Robinson, 5)

Committed conspiracy to defraud the state. (Robinson 4)

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors (cont'd)

Abuse of Power (46 total, with 14 convictions)

Acted in reprisal against a public employee who disclosed information. (**Mecham, 1.F**)

Attempted to intimidate and blackmail a hostile newspaper editor. (Long, 1)

Illegally interfered with the state colony and training school. (Long, 4)

Forced appointees to sign undated resignations, appointed corrupt parole officer, and inappropriately discharged a college president. (Long, 8)

Pardoned and restored citizenship to an inmate who had plead guilty to murder. (Johnston, 1)

Appointed a House member as a district judge. (Walton, 1)

Unlawfully used military force to prevent a grand jury from meeting. (**Walton, 3**)

Claimed martial law and ordered the military to detain citizens. (**Walton, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11**)

Fixed the date of a special election, and then attempted to prevent the election. (**Walton, 12**)

Appointed political friends to lucrative state positions. (**Walton, 13**)

Commuted death sentences, and pardoned or paroled people before they were sentenced. (**Walton, 14 and 19**).

Prevented newspapers from publishing articles he found objectionable. (Walton, 16)

Sought to have members of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas expelled after they were exonerated by the Board. (**Ferguson, 16, 17, 18, 19**)

Allowed a labor commissioner who had not been confirmed by the Senate to remain in office an unreasonable amount of time after a replacement had been confirmed. (Ferguson, 21)

Replaced without cause an official with a supporter who had made a fraudulent census return. (Kellogg, 2)

Removed city police commissioner without cause and appointed another in his place. (Kellogg, 9)

Unlawfully removed and replaced a judge. (Kellogg, 10)

Appointed election officials who did not live in the correct parish. (Kellogg, 1)

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors (cont'd)

Abuse of Power (cont'd)

Unlawfully removed acting sheriff. (Ames, 5)

Helped two state officials “swap” positions. (Ames, 8)

Incited racial violence. (Ames, 16-21)

Misrepresented official acts to benefit some. (Reed, 16)

Unlawfully removed another constitutional officer. (Warmoth, 1)

Commissioned officials as newly elected and put their opponents out of office before voting returns had been certified. (Warmoth, 3)

Continued exercising functions of governorship after having been impeached. (Warmoth, 6)

Conspired with members of State Supreme Court to deprive Lieutenant Governor of his office. (Clayton, 1)

Unlawfully removed a county officer. (Clayton, 2)

Used false reports of insurrection to seize emergency powers. (Holden, 1-2)

Unlawfully arrested, imprisoned, and hung individuals. (**Holden, 3-7**)

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors (cont'd)

Interference with Other Branches of Government (21 total, with 1 conviction)

Tried to bribe legislators. (Long, 2)

Unlawfully used military to prevent the legislature from meeting. (Johnston, 8)

Prevented the legislature from assembling. (Walton, 7)

Sought to influence judges by vetoing a bill to raise judicial salaries and by refusing to endorse a judge who had decided a case against him. (Ferguson, 20)

Suppressed evidence and prevented a witness from going before a legislative committee investigating campaign expenditures. (**Sulzer, 4 and 5**)

Threatened to use his authority to affect votes of legislators. (Sulzer, 7)

Sent police into State House, violating legislative privilege. (Kellogg, 7)

Allowed judge to remain in office despite Senate's failure to confirm him. (Kellogg, 8)

Illegally interfered with a judge, attempting to destroy the independence of the judiciary. (Kellogg, 12)

Replaced judge with a replacement who would be less likely to rule against the State Auditor in his embezzlement trial. (Kellogg, 13)

While House was investigating him, called extra session of the Senate without calling the House too, thus violating the Constitution. (Kellogg, 14)

Appointed judges for political purposes. (Ames, 2)

Filled appointments without Senate approval. (Ames, 9)

Tried to interfere in court cases. (Ames, 10 and 11)

Unlawfully removed judges. (Ames, 12-14)

Conspired to influence a judge. (Reed, 11)

Made a recess appointment of an official previously rejected by Senate. (Warmoth, 2)

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors (cont'd)

Bribery (9 total, with no convictions)

Demanded a bribe of a man who wanted to serve as an attorney for the State Banking Board. (Johnston, 5)

Required citizens to pay money in return for approval of appropriations to a school. (Walton, 5)

Bribed witnesses before a legislative committee investigating campaign expenditures. (Sulzer, 3)

Attempted to bribe the Lieutenant Governor with \$50,000 and patronage powers in exchange for organizing Senate according to his wishes. (Warmoth, 4)

Took money to pardon a man who had been convicted of raping a child. (Ames, 22-23)

Took bribes to influence official action relating to railroads. (Reed, 8 and 12)

Accepted bribes from contractors building state university building, persons wishing to lease and buy state lands, and persons wishing to be appointed to boards. (Butler, 2)

Dereliction of Duties (9 total, with no convictions)

Appointed disreputable people to commissions. (Walton, 17)

Failed to appoint a competent accountant to audit the State Treasurer. (Kellogg, 4-5)

Refused to appoint a temporary replacement for the State Auditor after he was impeached. (Kellogg, 3)

Failed to suspend a sheriff and tax collector who had been keeping public funds for himself. (Ames, 1)

Appointed judges who were incompetent, immoral, and dishonest. (Ames, 15)

Entered contracts at prices above what was appropriated. (Butler, 4-5)

Made loans recklessly. (Butler, 7)

False Reporting (9 total, with 3 convictions)

Falsely reported source of funds used for campaign. (Mecham, 2.A and 2.C)

Falsely reported repayment of campaign funds. (Mecham, 2.D-2.E)

Signed financial statements he knew to be false. (Mecham, 2.F to 2.I)

Deceived electors by evading campaign finance disclosure laws. (Walton, 18)

Knowingly signed a false campaign finance statement. (Sulzer, 1-2)

Appendix A: Articles of Impeachment Against Governors (cont'd)

Other Crimes (5 total, with no convictions)

Libeled and slandered the state and a state institution. (Ferguson, 18)

Committed election registration fraud. (Warmoth, 4-5)

Encouraged and aided in frauds in legislative elections. (Clayton, 3)

Was guilty of other misconduct and malfeasance in office, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. (Clayton, 6)

Obstruction of Justice (7 total, with 7 convictions)

Obstructed a criminal investigation by misrepresentation or intimidation. (**Mecham, 1.A**)

Attempted to influence a witness by a threat. (**Mecham, 1.B**)

Attempted to tamper with a witness. (**Mecham, 1.C**)

Attempted to hinder a prosecution. (**Mecham, 1.D**)

Solicited the influencing of or tampering with witnesses. (**Mecham, 1.E**)

Violated oath of office and committed crimes by obstructing or attempting to obstruct justice. (**Mecham, 1.G-1.H**)

Perjury (4 total, with no convictions)

Made false sworn statements relating to official filings. (Mecham, 2)

Testified before a House investigating committee that he was not indebted to a state bank, when he was so indebted, and concealed this fact by transferring notes to a different bank during the investigation and returning them after the investigation was complete. (Ferguson, 3 and 5)

Falsely testified before legislative committee about the diversion of state money for paying police. (Kellogg, 11)

Incompetence (2 total, with 2 convictions)

Acted in his official capacity unmindful of his duties and oath, and knowingly demonstrated incompetency to hold the office. (**Johnston, 13**)

Was unmindful of his duties and oath, and purposefully demonstrated incompetency to hold office. (**Walton, 22**)

Appendix B: States' Impeachment Procedures

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief Justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Alabama	majority	-	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ala. Const., art. 7, sec. 173
Alaska ¹	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Alaska Const., art. 2, sec. 20
Arizona	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ariz. Const., art. 8, pt. 2, secs. 1 and 2
Arkansas	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ark. Const., art. 15, sec. 2
California	-	2/3 majority	-	Cal. Const., art. 4, subsec. 18(a)
Colorado	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Colo. Const., art. 13, sec. 1
Connecticut	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Conn. Const., art. 9, secs. 1 and 2
Delaware	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Del. Const., art. 6, secs. 1 and 2
Florida	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fla. Const., art. 3, sec. 17
Georgia	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ga. Const., art. 3, sec. 7
Hawaii	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Haw. Const., art. 3, sec. 19
Idaho	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Idaho Const., art. 5, sec. 4
Illinois	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Ill. Const., art. 4, sec. 14
Indiana	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Ind. Const., art. 6, sec. 7
Iowa	-	2/3 majority	-	Iowa Const., art. 3, sec. 19

Appendix B: States' Impeachment Procedures (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Kansas	-	2/3 majority	-	Kan. Const., art. 2, sec. 27
Kentucky	-	2/3 majority	-	Ky. Const., pt. 1, secs. 66 and 67
Louisiana	-	2/3 majority	-	La. Const., art. 10, subsec. 24(B)
Maine	-	2/3 majority	-	Me. Const., art. 9, sec. 5
Maryland	majority	2/3 majority	-	Md. Const., art. 2, sec. 26
Massachusetts	-	-	-	Mass. Const., pt. 2, ch. 1, sec. 2, art. 8
Michigan	majority	2/3 majority	☐	Mich. Const., art. 12, secs. 1 and 2
Minnesota	majority	2/3 majority	-	Minn. Const., art. 8 sec. 1
Mississippi	2/3 majority	-	-	Miss. Const., art. 4, sec. 49
Missouri ³	-	-	-	Mo. Const., art. 7, sec. 2
Montana	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Mont. Const., art. 5, sec. 13
Nebraska ⁴	-	majority	-	Neb. Const., art. 3, sec. 17
Nevada	majority	2/3 majority	☐	Nev. Const., art. 7, sec. 1
New Hampshire	-	-	-	N.H. Const., pt. 2, arts. 17 and 38

Appendix B: States' Impeachment Procedures (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
New Jersey	majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	N.J. Const., art. 7, sec. 3
New Mexico	majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	N.M. Const., art. 4, sec. 35
New York	majority	2/3 majority ⁵	-	N.Y. Const., art. 6, sec. 24
North Carolina	-	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	N.C. Const., art. 4, sec. 4
North Dakota	majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	N.D. Const., art. 11, secs. 8 and 9
Ohio	majority	2/3 majority	-	Ohio Const., art. 2, sec. 23
Oklahoma	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Okla. Const., art. 8
Oregon ⁶	-	-	-	Ore. Const., art. 7, sec. 6
Pennsylvania	-	2/3 majority	-	Pa. Const., art. 6, secs. 4 and 5
Rhode Island	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	R.I. Const., art. 11, secs. 1 and 2
South Carolina	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	S.C. Const., art. 15, secs. 1 and 2
South Dakota	majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	S.D. Const., art. 16, secs. 1 and 2
Tennessee	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tenn. Const., art. 5, secs. 1 and 2
Texas	-	2/3 majority	-	Tex. Const., art. 15, secs. 1 to 3
Utah	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	Utah Const., art. 6, secs. 17 and 18

Appendix B: States' Impeachment Procedures (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Vermont	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Vt. Const., ch. 2, secs. 57 and 58
Virginia	-	2/3 majority	-	Va. Const., art. 4, sec. 17
Washington	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Wash. Const., art. 5, sec. 1
West Virginia	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	W.V. Const., art. 4, sec. 9
Wisconsin	majority	2/3 majority	-	Wis. Const., art. 7, sec. 1
Wyoming	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Wyo. Const., art. 3, sec. 17
Totals	18 require majority	43 require 2/3 majority	15 Chief Justice presides at governor's impeachment trial	
	11 require 2/3 majority	1 requires majority	11 Chief Justice presides over all impeachment trials	
	21 silent	6 silent	24 silent	

Notes

1. In Alaska, the Senate holds the power of impeachment, the House conducts the impeachment trial, and a Supreme Court justice designated by the Court presides over the trial.
2. The Chief Justice presides when the Governor is on trial.
3. Impeachments are tried before the Supreme Court, except that the Governor or a member of the Supreme Court is tried before a special commission of seven judges elected by the Senate. A majority of five is needed for conviction.
4. Nebraska has a unicameral legislature. Members use title "senator." A 2/3 majority vote of a court of impeachment is needed for conviction. The court of impeachment is composed of seven district court judges, appointed by Chief Justice of Supreme Court.
5. Judgment is made by a court for the trial of impeachments, which is made up of the senate and appellate court judges.
6. Public officials are not impeached, but incompetency, corruption, malfeasance, or delinquency in office can be tried in criminal court, and courts may dismiss officials from positions.

Appendix C: States' Impeachment Procedures, Arranged by Similar Provisions

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief Justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Arkansas	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ark. Const., art. 15, sec. 2
Michigan	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mich. Const., art. 12, secs. 1 and 2
Nevada	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nev. Const., art. 7, sec. 1
Colorado	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Colo. Const., art. 13, sec. 1
Illinois	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Ill. Const., art. 4, sec. 14
New Jersey	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	N.J. Const., art. 7, sec. 3
New Mexico	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	N.M. Const., art. 4, sec. 35
North Dakota	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	N.D. Const., art. 11, secs. 8 and 9
South Dakota	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	S.D. Const., art. 16, secs. 1 and 2
Washington	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Wash. Const., art. 5, sec. 1
Wyoming	majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Wyo. Const., art. 3, sec. 17
Maryland	majority	2/3 majority	-	Md. Const., art. 2, sec. 26
Minnesota	majority	2/3 majority	-	Minn. Const., art. 8 sec. 1
New York	majority	2/3 majority ⁵	-	N.Y. Const., art. 6, sec. 24
Ohio	majority	2/3 majority	-	Ohio Const., art. 2, sec. 23
Wisconsin	majority	2/3 majority	-	Wis. Const., art. 7, sec. 1

Appendix C: States' Impeachment Procedures, Arranged by Similar Provisions (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Arizona	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ariz. Const., art. 8, pt. 2, secs. 1 and 2
Florida	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fla. Const., art. 3, sec. 17
Delaware	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Del. Const., art. 6, secs. 1 and 2
Rhode Island	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	R.I. Const., art. 11, secs. 1 and 2
South Carolina	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	S.C. Const., art. 15, secs. 1 and 2
Utah	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Utah Const., art. 6, secs. 17 and 18
Alaska ¹	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Alaska Const., art. 2, sec. 20
Indiana	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Ind. Const., art. 6, sec. 7
Montana	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Mont. Const., art. 5, sec. 13
Vermont	2/3 majority	2/3 majority	-	Vt. Const., ch. 2, secs. 57 and 58
Georgia	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ga. Const., art. 3, sec. 7
Hawaii	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Haw. Const., art. 3, sec. 19
Oklahoma	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Okla. Const., art. 8
Tennessee	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tenn. Const., art. 5, secs. 1 and 2
West Virginia	-	2/3 majority	<input type="checkbox"/>	W.V. Const., art. 4, sec. 9

Appendix C: States' Impeachment Procedures, Arranged by Similar Provisions (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Connecticut	majority	2/3 majority	☐ ²	Conn. Const., art. 9, secs. 1 and 2
Idaho	-	2/3 majority	☐ ²	Idaho Const., art. 5, sec. 4
North Carolina	-	2/3 majority	☐ ²	N.C. Const., art. 4, sec. 4
California	-	2/3 majority	-	Cal. Const., art. 4, subsec. 18(a)
Iowa	-	2/3 majority	-	Iowa Const., art. 3, sec. 19
Kansas	-	2/3 majority	-	Kan. Const., art. 2, sec. 27
Kentucky	-	2/3 majority	-	Ky. Const., pt. 1, secs. 66 and 67
Louisiana	-	2/3 majority	-	La. Const., art. 10, subsec. 24(B)
Maine	-	2/3 majority	-	Me. Const., art. 9, sec. 5
Pennsylvania	-	2/3 majority	-	Pa. Const., art. 6, secs. 4 and 5
Texas	-	2/3 majority	-	Tex. Const., art. 15, secs. 1 to 3
Virginia	-	2/3 majority	-	Va. Const., art. 4, sec. 17
Alabama	majority	-	☐	Ala. Const., art. 7, sec. 173
Mississippi	2/3 majority	-	-	Miss. Const., art. 4, sec. 49
Nebraska ⁴	-	majority	-	Neb. Const., art. 3, sec. 17

Appendix C: States' Impeachment Procedures, Arranged by Similar Provisions (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>House vote required for impeachment</i>	<i>Senate vote required for conviction</i>	<i>Chief justice presides at trial</i>	<i>Citation</i>
New Hampshire	-	-	-	N.H. Const., pt. 2, arts. 17 and 38
Missouri ³	-	-	-	Mo. Const., art. 7, sec. 2
Massachusetts	-	-	-	Mass. Const., pt. 2, ch. 1, sec. 2, art. 8
Oregon ⁶	-	-	-	Ore. Const., art. 7, sec. 6
Totals	18 require majority	43 require 2/3 majority	15 Chief Justice presides at governor's impeachment trial	
	11 require 2/3 majority	1 requires majority	11 Chief Justice presides over all impeachment trials	
	21 silent	6 silent	24 silent	

Notes

1. In Alaska, the Senate holds the power of impeachment, the House conducts the impeachment trial, and a Supreme Court justice designated by the Court presides over the trial.
2. The Chief Justice presides when the Governor is on trial.
3. Impeachments are tried before the Supreme Court, except that the Governor or a member of the Supreme Court is tried before a special commission of seven judges elected by the Senate. A majority of five is needed for conviction.
4. Nebraska has a unicameral legislature. Members use title "senator." A 2/3 majority vote of a court of impeachment is needed for conviction. The court of impeachment is composed of seven district court judges, appointed by Chief Justice of Supreme Court.
5. Judgment is made by a court for the trial of impeachments, which is made up of the senate and appellate court judges.
6. Public officials are not impeached, but incompetency, corruption, malfeasance, or delinquency in office can be tried in criminal court, and courts may dismiss officials from positions.

Appendix D: States' Constitutional Grounds for Impeachment

<i>State</i>	<i>Grounds for Impeachment</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Alabama	Willful neglect of duty, corruption in office, incompetency, intemperance, or offense of moral turpitude in office.	Ala. Const., art. 7, sec. 173
Alaska	None listed, but a motion for impeachment must list the basis for the proceeding.	Alaska Const, art. 2, sec. 20
Arizona	High crimes, misdemeanors, or malfeasance in office.	Ariz. Const., art. 8, pt. 2, sec. 2
Arkansas	High crimes, misdemeanors, or gross misconduct in office.	Ark. Const., art. 15, sec. 1
California	Misconduct in office.	Cal. Const., art. 4, subsec. 18(b)
Colorado	High crimes, misdemeanors, or malfeasance in office.	Colo. Const., art. 13, sec. 2
Connecticut	None listed.	-
Delaware	High crimes, misdemeanors, treason, or bribery.	Del. Const., art. 6, sec. 2
Florida	Misdemeanor in office.	Fla. Const., art. 3, subsec. 17(a)
Georgia	None listed.	-
Hawaii	"For causes that may be provided by law"	Haw. Const., art. 3, sec. 19
Idaho	None listed.	-
Illinois	Legislative investigation to determine cause for impeachment.	Ill. Const., art. 4, sec. 14
Indiana	Crime, incapacity, or negligence.	Ind. Const., art. 6, sec. 7
Iowa	Misdemeanor or malfeasance in office.	Iowa Const., art. 3, sec. 20
Kansas	Treason, bribery, or any other high crime or misdemeanor.	Kan. Const, art. 2, sec. 28
Kentucky	Misdemeanor in office.	Ky. Const., pt. 1, sec. 68

Appendix D: States' Grounds for Impeachment (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>Grounds for Impeachment</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Louisiana	Felony, or malfeasance or gross misconduct in office.	La. Const., art. 10, subsec. 24(A)
Maine	Misdemeanor in office.	Me. Const., art. 9, sec. 5
Maryland	None listed.	-
Massachusetts	Misconduct or maladministration in office.	Mass. Const., pt. 2, ch. 1, sec. 2, art. 8
Michigan	Corrupt conduct in office, or crimes or misdemeanors.	Mich. Const., art. 12, sec. 1
Minnesota	Corrupt conduct in office, or crimes or misdemeanors.	Minn. Const., art 8, sec. 2
Mississippi	Treason, bribery, or any high crime or misdemeanor in office.	Miss. Const., art. 4, sec. 50
Missouri	Crimes, misconduct, habitual drunkenness, willful neglect of duty, corruption in office, incompetency, or any offense involving moral turpitude or oppression in office.	Mo. Const., art. 7, sec. 1
Montana	None listed, but legislature is to determine causes, manner, and impeachment procedure.	Mont. Const., art. 5, sec. 13
Nebraska	Misdemeanor in office.	Neb. Const., art. 4, sec. 5
Nevada	Misdemeanor or malfeasance in office.	Nev. Const., art. 7, sec. 2
New Hampshire	Bribery, corruption, malpractice, or maladministration in office.	N.H. Const., pt. 2, sec. 38
New Jersey	Misdemeanor in office.	N.J. Const., art. 7, sec. 3
New Mexico	Crimes, misdemeanors, and malfeasance in office.	N.M. Const., art. 4, sec. 36
New York	None listed.	-
North Carolina	None listed.	-
North Dakota	Habitual drunkenness, crimes, corrupt conduct, or malfeasance or misdemeanor in office.	N.D. Const., art. 11, sec. 10

Appendix D: States' Grounds for Impeachment (cont'd)

<i>State</i>	<i>Grounds for Impeachment</i>	<i>Citation</i>
Ohio	Misdemeanor in office.	Ohio Const., art. 2, sec. 24
Oklahoma	Willful neglect of duty, corruption in office, habitual drunkenness, incompetency, or moral turpitude in office.	Okla. Const., art. 8, sec. 1
Oregon	Public officials are not impeached, but incompetency, corruption, malfeasance, or delinquency in office can be tried in criminal court, and courts may dismiss officials from positions.	Ore. Const., art. 7, sec. 6
Pennsylvania	Any misbehavior in office.	Pa. Const., art. 6, sec. 6
Rhode Island	Felony, crime of moral turpitude, misfeasance or malfeasance in office, or found to be incapacitated.	R.I. Const., art. 11, sec. 3
South Carolina	Serious crimes or serious misconduct in office.	S.C. Const., art 15, sec. 1
South Dakota	Drunkenness, crimes, corrupt conduct, or malfeasance or misdemeanor in office.	S.D. Const., art 16, sec. 3
Tennessee	Crime in their official capacity.	Tenn. Const., art. 5, sec. 4
Texas	None listed.	-
Utah	High crimes, misdemeanors, or malfeasance in office.	Utah Const., art. 6, sec. 19
Vermont	None listed.	-
Virginia	Malfeasance in office, corruption, neglect of duty, or other high crime or misdemeanor.	Va. Const., art. 4, sec. 17
Washington	High crimes or misdemeanors, or malfeasance in office.	Wash. Const., art. 5, sec. 2
West Virginia	Maladministration, corruption, incompetency, gross immorality, neglect of duty, or any high crime or misdemeanor.	W.V. Const., art. 4, sec. 9
Wisconsin	Corrupt conduct in office, or crimes and misdemeanors.	Wis. Const., art. 7, sec. 1
Wyoming	High crimes and misdemeanors, or malfeasance in office.	Wyo. Const., art. 3, sec. 18

Appendix E: Timelines of Governors' Impeachments

<i>Governor</i>	<i>Articles introduced</i>	<i>Days between</i>	<i>Articles adopted</i>	<i>Days between</i>	<i>Trial started</i>	<i>Days between</i>	<i>Convicted, acquitted, or other</i>	<i>Total duration</i>
Evan Mecham	Feb. 5, 1988	3	Feb. 8, 1988	3	Feb. 11, 1988	53	Apr. 4, 1988	59 days
Huey Long	Mar. 28, 1929	9	Apr. 6, 1929	38	May 14, 1929	2	May 16, 1929	49 days
Henry Johnston	early Jan. 1929	-	Jan. 21, 1929	12	Feb. 2, 1929	46	Mar. 20, 1929	58 days ¹
Henry Johnston	Dec. 13, 1927	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
John Walton	Oct. 17, 1923	6	Oct. 23, 1923	9	Nov. 1, 1923	18	Nov. 19, 1923	33 days
James Ferguson	-	-	Aug. 24, 1917	6	Aug. 30, 1917	29	Sept. 22, 1917	35 days ¹
William Sulzer	Aug. 13, 1913	0	Aug. 13, 1913	36	Sept. 18, 1913	28	Oct. 16, 1913	64 days
William Kellogg	Feb. 28, 1876	0	Feb. 28, 1876	0	Feb. 28, 1876	0	Feb. 28, 1876	1 day
Adelbert Ames	Mar. 13, 1876	0	Mar. 13, 1876	3	Mar. 16, 1876	13	Mar. 29, 1876 ²	16 days
Harrison Reed	-	-	Feb. 15, 1872	0	Feb. 15, 1872	79	May 4, 1872	79 days ¹
Henry Warmoth	Dec. 9, 1872	5	Dec. 14, 1872	2	Dec. 16, 1872	18	Jan. 13, 1873 ³	25 days
David Butler	Mar. 6, 1871	0	Mar. 6, 1871	8	Mar. 14, 1871	80	June 2, 1871	88 days
Powell Clayton	Feb. 16, 1871	0	Feb. 16, 1871	-	-	-	-	-
William Holden	Dec. 9, 1870	10	Dec. 19, 1870	4	Dec. 23, 1870	89	Mar. 22, 1871	103 days
Harrison Reed	-	-	Nov. 6, 1868	-	-	-	Jan. 5, 1869	60 days ¹
Charles Robinson	Feb. 13, 1862	13	Feb. 26, 1862	110	June 16, 1862	0	June 16, 1862	123 days
Averages		4		18		35		57 days

Notes

Governors' names in bold indicate those convicted.

1. This is a minimum number of days based on known dates.
2. Adelbert Ames resigned March 29, 1876.
3. Henry Warmoth's term ended January 13, 1873.

Appendix F: Timelines of Governors' Impeachments, From Longest to Shortest Duration

<i>Governor</i>	<i>Articles introduced</i>	<i>Days between</i>	<i>Articles adopted</i>	<i>Days between</i>	<i>Trial started</i>	<i>Days between</i>	<i>Convicted, acquitted, or other</i>	<i>Total duration</i>
Charles Robinson	Feb. 13, 1862	13	Feb. 26, 1862	110	June 16, 1862	0	June 16, 1862	123 days
William Holden	Dec. 9, 1870	10	Dec. 19, 1870	4	Dec. 23, 1870	89	Mar. 22, 1871	103 days
David Butler	Mar. 6, 1871	0	Mar. 6, 1871	8	Mar. 14, 1871	80	June 2, 1871	88 days
Harrison Reed	-	-	Feb. 15, 1872	0	Feb. 15, 1872	79	May 4, 1872	79 days ¹
William Sulzer	Aug. 13, 1913	0	Aug. 13, 1913	36	Sept. 18, 1913	28	Oct. 16, 1913	64 days
Harrison Reed	-	-	Nov. 6, 1868	-	-	-	Jan. 5, 1869	60 days ¹
Evan Mecham	Feb. 5, 1988	3	Feb. 8, 1988	3	Feb. 11, 1988	53	Apr. 4, 1988	59 days
Henry Johnston	early Jan. 1929	-	Jan. 21, 1929	12	Feb. 2, 1929	46	Mar. 20, 1929	58 days ¹
Huey Long	Mar. 28, 1929	9	Apr. 6, 1929	38	May 14, 1929	2	May 16, 1929	49 days
James Ferguson	-	-	Aug. 24, 1917	6	Aug. 30, 1917	29	Sept. 22, 1917	35 days ¹
John Walton	Oct. 17, 1923	6	Oct. 23, 1923	9	Nov. 1, 1923	18	Nov. 19, 1923	33 days
Henry Warmoth	Dec. 9, 1872	5	Dec. 14, 1872	2	Dec. 16, 1872	18	Jan. 13, 1873 ²	25 days
Adelbert Ames	Mar. 13, 1876	0	Mar. 13, 1876	3	Mar. 16, 1876	13	Mar. 29, 1876 ³	16 days
William Kellogg	Feb. 28, 1876	0	Feb. 28, 1876	0	Feb. 28, 1876	0	Feb. 28, 1876	1 day
Henry Johnston	Dec. 13, 1927	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Powell Clayton	Feb. 16, 1871	0	Feb. 16, 1871	-	-	-	-	-
Averages		4		18		35		57 days

Notes

Governors' names in bold indicate those convicted.

1. This is a minimum number of days based on known dates.
2. Henry Warmoth's term ended on Jan. 13, 1873.
3. Adelbert Ames resigned on Mar. 29, 1876.