

# LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

## Impeachment in Wisconsin

Richard A. Champagne

director

Madeline Kasper, MPA, MPH

managing legislative analyst



© 2023 Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau  
One East Main Street, Suite 200, Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
<http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lrb> • 608-504-5801

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.  
To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to  
Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

In recent months, the Legislative Reference Bureau has received a number of inquiries regarding impeachment from legislators, government officials, state and national press, and the general public. Questions have centered on the constitutional sources of the legislature’s impeachment powers, impeachment proceedings in Wisconsin history, and the current impeachment process. This publication gathers the information and research on impeachment in Wisconsin that we have provided to many legislative offices. The publication presents a brief overview of impeachment history, law, and processes in Wisconsin. The aim of the publication is to make this information widely available to all who are interested in this important topic.

## Article VII, section 1, of the Wisconsin Constitution

Article VII, section 1, of the Wisconsin Constitution provides that “the assembly shall have the power of impeaching all civil officers of this state for corrupt conduct in office, or for crimes and misdemeanors.”<sup>1</sup> The assembly can impeach a civil officer by a majority vote of members elected. If there are no assembly vacancies, the impeachment of a civil officer of the state requires the concurrence of 50 representatives to the assembly. The provision also states that the senate is the court for impeachment trials and that conviction of a civil officer requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the senators present. Hence, the assembly adopts and presents to the senate the articles of impeachment and the senate conducts the impeachment trial. A conviction can result either in a civil officer’s “removal from office, or removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, profit or trust under the state.”<sup>2</sup> The latter result bars a convicted officer from holding any civil office for life. It is entirely a senate decision as to which result follows from a conviction.

The constitutional provision does not define “civil officers” or “corrupt conduct in office” and likewise does not specify which “crimes and misdemeanors” constitute grounds for impeachment. Moreover, Wisconsin courts have not opined on which public officials are subject to impeachment, nor the lawful grounds for impeachment. The only Wisconsin Supreme Court decision that addresses who is a “civil officer” for impeachment purposes is *State ex. rel. Zimmerman v. Dammann*, a case in which the court noted that legislators are not civil officers for purposes of Wis. Const. art. VII, § 1.<sup>3</sup>

Article VII, section 1, however, does refer specifically to the governor, lieutenant governor, and judges as impeachable officers; therefore, they are civil officers of the state under this provision. Similarly situated state elected officials would also include

---

1. Wis. Const. [art. VII, § 1](#). Also see Wis. Stat. § [17.06](#), which incorporates this provision into the Wisconsin Statutes.

2. Wis. Const. art. VII, § 1.

3. 201 Wis. 84, 89, 228 N.W. 593 (1930). Legislators are subject to removal from office under Wis. Const. [art. IV, § 8](#), which requires two-thirds concurrence of all members elected.

the attorney general, state treasurer, secretary of state, and superintendent of public instruction. Although not stated in the constitution or case law, it seems that all executive branch appointed officers, especially those requiring senate confirmation, would be considered “civil officers of the state.” This includes heads of state departments and agencies and members of commissions, boards, and councils. The strongest case for arguing that these nonelected state officers are subject to impeachment is that Wis. Const. art. VII, § 1, does not limit its application solely to elected state officers, but instead to “civil officers of the state.” Other than elected state officials and appointed state officers, the state government positions subject to impeachment are less clear.

In terms of what constitutes “corrupt conduct in office” or which crimes and misdemeanors warrant impeachment, the constitution is silent. However, in 1929, Attorney General John Reynolds advised Assembly Speaker Charles Perry not to begin impeachment proceedings against a state officer because the “so-called charges . . . are too vague to enlighten the accused official as to the nature of the offenses charged so as to enable him to prepare an adequate defense.”<sup>4</sup> Also, in 1968, Attorney General Bronson La Follette advised Speaker Allen Busby that an impeachment petition submitted to the assembly must allege conduct that would rise to the level of corrupt conduct in office.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, it would appear that grounds for impeachment, especially for “corrupt conduct in office,” must specify offenses that could give rise to corrupt conduct in office and offenses with elements that the accused state officer can present evidence about, rebut, and defend against. Also, there is no guidance in the constitution or statutes on which crimes or misdemeanors constitute impeachable offenses. That determination seems left to the legislature, with the assembly controlling the charging decision as to whether to adopt articles of impeachment and the senate having the power to conduct the impeachment trial and convict.

## Impeachment in Wisconsin history

There has been only one assembly impeachment in Wisconsin history, and it did not result in a senate conviction. In 1853, Circuit Judge Levi Hubbell was impeached by the assembly and tried before the senate; he was ultimately acquitted on all charges.

The attempted removal began on January 26, 1853, when William K. Wilson presented a communication to the Speaker of the assembly that was signed by “a citizen and elector of the state” and charged Judge Hubbell with high crimes, misdemeanors, and malfeasances in office.<sup>6</sup> The communication further demanded an investigation to determine

---

4. 18 Wis. Op. Att’y Gen. 121.

5. Letter to Speaker Allen Busby from Attorney General Bronson La Follette, May 21, 1968. On file at the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau.

6. Wis. Assembly Journal (1853) 98–99. *Trial of Impeachment of Levi Hubbell, Judge of the Second Judicial Circuit, by the*

“whether or not the constitutional power of the assembly ought to be exercised.” Months earlier, Wilson had served as a jury foreman in a high-profile murder trial presided over by Judge Hubbell. When a not guilty verdict was returned in that trial, Judge Hubbell had exclaimed to the jury: “May God have mercy on your consciences!”<sup>7</sup>

The assembly voted to refer the communication to a select committee made up of five representatives.<sup>8</sup> The committee received permission to send for persons, papers, and records, and the Speaker was authorized to issue subpoenas “as might be required by the committee.”<sup>9</sup>

On February 23, the committee reported that they found Judge Hubbell “guilty of divers[e] acts of corruption and malfeasance in the discharge of duties of his said office” and recommended that he be removed from office through address, as provided under Wis. Cons. art. VII, § 13.<sup>10</sup> The assembly met in multiple private sessions to consider the committee’s gathered testimony and evidence. On March 3, in a 48–27 vote, the assembly adopted a resolution to impeach Judge Hubbell for “corruption and malfeasance in office.”<sup>11</sup> A committee of five representatives was chosen to prepare the articles of impeachment and to serve as the assembly’s managers to conduct the impeachment trial with the help of outside counsel.<sup>12</sup>

On March 22, the committee filed with the senate 11 general impeachment charges with 70 specifications, all of which had been unanimously agreed to by the assembly.<sup>13</sup> These charges accused Judge Hubbell of such offenses as accepting bribes, adjudicating cases in which he had a personal interest in the outcome, immoral conduct, making personal use of money deposited with his court, and imposing criminal sentences that were less than allowed by law.<sup>14</sup> Hubbell entered a plea of not guilty.<sup>15</sup>

The day after the charges were filed, the senate adopted a resolution establishing a committee to prepare “forms and rules of proceedings to be observed in cases of impeachment.”<sup>16</sup> The resulting rules laid out the process for the impeachment trial, such as

---

*Senate of the State of Wisconsin, June 1853* (Madison, WI: 1853), 3.

7. John Bell Sanborn, “Impeachment of Levi Hubbell,” *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (1905), 197–98.

8. Wis. Assembly Journal (1853) [98–99](#). A motion was initially made to send the charges to the judiciary committee, but that motion failed 13–63.

9. Wis. Assembly Journal (1853) [98](#), [110](#), [118](#).

10. Wis. Assembly Journal (1853) [300–1](#). At that time, Wis. Const. art. VII, § 13, provided that “Any judge of the supreme or circuit court may be removed from office by address of both houses of the legislature, if two-thirds of the members elected to each house concur therein . . .”

11. Wis. Assembly Journal (1853) [376–77](#).

12. *Trial of Impeachment of Levi Hubbell*, 4.

13. Wis. Assembly Journal (1853) [566](#).

14. *Articles of Impeachment against Levi Hubbell and the Rules of the Court for the Trial of Impeachments* (Madison, WI: 1853).

15. *Articles of Impeachment against Levi Hubbell*, [27](#).

16. Wis. Senate Journal (1853) [576](#).

to provide that the doors of the senate chamber would remain open, as well as to specify the wording of oaths to be given by various actors, including each senator.

The impeachment trial before the senate began on June 13, 1853, and lasted roughly a month. Judge Hubbell retained counsel, though he spoke in his own defense at times.<sup>17</sup> The newspapers “eagerly followed the high drama” of the trial, which attracted wide attention, not only because it was the first impeachment trial in the state, but also because it was the first time in the United States that a popularly elected judge had been impeached.<sup>18</sup>

Ultimately, the senate voted for acquittal on 56 of the specifications presented; 19 of these votes were unanimous, and for the other 37 votes, between 1 and 12 senators out of a total of 24 senators present voted guilty.<sup>19</sup> The prosecution abandoned the remaining 14 specifications of the original 70.

Throughout Wisconsin’s history, there have been a few other committees ordered to investigate whether to pursue an impeachment. In 1875, four “citizens and electors of the state of Wisconsin” submitted a petition to the assembly Speaker charging Circuit Judge David W. Small and Court Commissioner Jared Thompson Jr. of high crimes, misdemeanors, and malfeasance.<sup>20</sup> The petition was referred to the judiciary committee, and the assembly adopted a resolution providing the committee with the authority to send for relevant “persons and papers” and to “compel the attendance of the persons before the committee.”<sup>21</sup> The committee did not permit Judge Small or Commissioner Thompson or their counsel to participate in the investigation, stating that it was not “in conformity to precedent” to do so.<sup>22</sup> The committee also advised the assembly not to employ counsel until the “evidence taken shall show a prima facie case, or one which would make it the duty of the assembly to put the parties accused on trial.” The assembly met in “secret session” to consider the committee’s final report, which declared that there was no ground for further proceedings.<sup>23</sup> The assembly ultimately adopted the committee’s report in a 51–20 vote.<sup>24</sup>

During the 1929 session, in a 72–7 vote, the assembly adopted a resolution directing the judiciary committee to “investigate the conduct of” Circuit Judge E. B. Belden in response to charges that had been submitted to the assembly by a Kenosha County

---

17. Marilyn Grant, “Judge Levi Hubbell: A Man Impeached,” *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 64, no. 1 (Autumn 1980): 37.

18. “Notes,” *Monthly Law Reporter* 16, no. 11 (March 1854): 601. Grant, *Judge Levi Hubbell: A Man Impeached*, 37.

19. *Trial of Impeachment of Levi Hubbell*, 790–819.

20. Wis. Assembly Journal (1875) [166](#).

21. Wis. Assembly Journal (1875) [193](#) and [259–60](#).

22. Wis. Assembly Journal (1875) [290–91](#).

23. Wis. Assembly Journal (1875) [590](#).

24. “Wisconsin Legislature” *Mineral Point Tribune*, March 11, 1875.

supervisor.<sup>25</sup> The most serious charge related to evidence that Judge Belden had never paid back a loan from the president of a company and then later presided over a lawsuit involving that company.<sup>26</sup> The assembly resolution referring the matter to the judiciary committee provided the committee with the authority to compel the attendance of witnesses by subpoena. The committee hearings lasted two months; the judge and his attorneys were present for the committee investigation, and the judge testified on several occasions.<sup>27</sup> The committee's majority report found that there was not sufficient ground for impeachment or removal and instead recommended that the judge resign and that the bar commission investigate the case to determine if the judge should continue as a member of the bar.<sup>28</sup> The assembly did not take action on the committee report.<sup>29</sup>

Similarly, in 1945, the assembly judiciary committee considered two different petitions filed against Circuit Judge Gustav Gehrz. The committee held public hearings on the matter and reported findings recommending the dismissal of both petitions. The assembly adopted both committee reports on a voice vote.<sup>30</sup>

There have been other impeachment petitions filed with the legislature that have not resulted in a committee investigation.<sup>31</sup> It appears that the most recent of these petitions was filed with the senate in 1995. In that petition, 648 "residents of the state of Wisconsin" demanded the "resignation or impeachment of Governor Tommy G. Thompson and Secretary of the Department of Administration, James Klauser."<sup>32</sup> The petition was referred to the Senate Committee on State Government Operations and Corrections, which took no further action.

## The impeachment process in the assembly

The constitution does not specify a process in the assembly for impeaching a civil officer other than to require that a majority of members elected concur in the impeachment. Moreover, the Wisconsin Statutes and legislative rules also do not mandate any process in the assembly for commencing or conducting an impeachment investigation or even for requiring an investigation at all. There is the historical example of the 1853 impeachment proceedings against Judge Hubbell, in which a select committee was created to conduct an investigation to determine whether articles of impeachment were warranted.

---

25. 1929 Wis. AR 30; Wis. Assembly Journal (1929) [782](#) and [895](#).

26. "Demand Belden's Resignation as Circuit Judge," *Stevens Point Daily Journal*, August 9, 1929.

27. *Id.* See also *Impeachment proceedings in Wisconsin* (Madison, WI: Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library, June 7, 1957), 4.

28. Wis. Assembly Journal (1929) [2381](#).

29. Wis. Assembly Journal (1931) [274](#).

30. Wis. Assembly Journal (1945) [1346](#) and [1622](#).

31. For example, see Wis. Assembly Journal (1957) [665](#), showing a petition filed to request impeachment proceedings against Francis X. Swietlik.

32. Wis. Senate Journal (1995) [229](#).

Although the committee recommended removal of Judge Hubbell by address, the assembly nevertheless chose to impeach him and voted on and adopted articles of impeachment. In other instances, standing committees were directed to conduct impeachment investigations.

If the assembly chooses to impeach a civil officer for crimes or misdemeanors for which the officer has already been tried and convicted, an assembly investigation may not be warranted. The articles of impeachment could simply restate the crimes or misdemeanors for which the officer has been convicted, and the assembly could then vote on the articles of impeachment. However, if the charges are for corrupt conduct in office or for possible crimes or misdemeanors for which the officer has not been convicted, an investigation is warranted to identify the grounds for impeachment with such specificity, as the 1929 attorney general opinion noted, “to enlighten the accused official as to the nature of the offenses.”<sup>33</sup> The most likely actor to conduct this investigation is an assembly committee.

The constitution does not limit the ways in which a select committee could be created or a standing committee charged with conducting an impeachment investigation. That is an internal matter of the assembly.<sup>34</sup> The assembly could adopt a resolution to create a select committee or direct an existing standing committee to begin impeachment investigations against a civil officer and determine whether articles of impeachment should be adopted. Also, the Speaker, pursuant to [Assembly Rule 10](#), could create a special committee to conduct an investigation and determine whether articles of impeachment are warranted. Another way is for a majority of assembly members to file a petition requesting, not commanding, that the Speaker create a special committee or that an existing standing committee commence an investigation.<sup>35</sup> Finally, a standing committee could commence an impeachment investigation on its own initiative. But it is unclear if any standing committee in the assembly has the authority under assembly rules to conduct an impeachment investigation, absent adoption of a resolution requiring the committee to investigate or a petition requesting an investigation.<sup>36</sup>

Once a committee is authorized to conduct an impeachment investigation, the committee may use current law powers to ensure the attendance of witnesses before the

---

33. [18 Wis. Op. Att’y Gen. 121](#).

34. There is no Wisconsin case law on the process that the assembly must use to conduct an impeachment investigation or that the senate must use for an impeachment trial. Interestingly, in the federal context, in *Nixon v. U.S.*, 506 U.S. 224, 234–35 (1993), a case involving a challenge to the impeachment process used in the United States Senate, a unanimous Supreme Court held that the issue was not “justiciable” and that judicial involvement in impeachment proceedings is “inconsistent with the Framers’ insistence that our system be one of checks and balances” and that “[j]udicial involvement in impeachment proceedings, even if only for purposes of judicial review is counterintuitive because it would eviscerate the ‘important constitutional check’ placed on the Judiciary by the Framers.”

35. [Assembly Rules 37](#) and [95 \(55\)](#).

36. As the leadership committee of the assembly, and the committee responsible for the general operations of the assembly, the Committee on Assembly Organization may have within its jurisdiction the power to authorize or commence an impeachment investigation. The committee has never claimed or exercised this power.



committee, the production of documents, and access to books, records, and other information in the possession of state agencies.<sup>37</sup> This is the committee's general investigatory authority. The committee could adopt procedures relating to subpoenas, depositions, the taking of oaths, and the manner in which hearings will be conducted; whether the officer may be represented by counsel; the process for examining witnesses; and other usual aspects of committee investigations. These matters could also be specified through adoption of an assembly resolution or amendment of assembly rules.

After the committee has completed its investigation, prepared articles of impeachment, and recommended adoption of the articles of impeachment, the articles are presented in the form of an assembly resolution. The resolution consists of the impeachable offenses, accompanied by a brief narrative of the evidence supporting each offense. If a majority of assembly members elected adopts the resolution, the civil officer is impeached and the assembly's action is messaged to the senate.

It should be noted that if the impeached civil officer is a judicial officer, the constitution provides specifically that “[n]o judicial officer shall exercise his office, after he shall have been impeached, until his acquittal.” In other words, if the impeached official is a judge or justice, the official may not participate in judicial proceedings until acquittal.<sup>38</sup>

## The impeachment trial in the senate

The constitution does not provide a process in the senate for conducting an impeachment trial other than to require that two-thirds of senators present concur in the conviction. The two-thirds present standard in the senate is different from the majority of members elected standard in the assembly. In the senate, assuming a quorum is present, conviction requires only two-thirds of senators present that session day. If fewer than 33 senators are present, conviction may require fewer than 22 senators. Legislative rules are also silent on impeachment trial processes and procedures, though the Wisconsin Statutes do specify a rudimentary roadmap for an impeachment trial. Wis. Stat. § [750.01](#) authorizes the senate president and the chief clerk to administer oaths and affirmations to members and other persons in the trial proceedings. Section [750.02](#) of the Wisconsin Statutes authorizes the impeachment court, which is the senate per Wis. Const. art. VII, §1, to

[I]ssue, and enforce obedience to, any summons, subpoena or other process necessary to the exercise of its powers and authority; to provide in what form the same shall be issued, by whom and in what manner it shall be signed and attested, by whom it shall be executed and in what form return thereof shall be made; and make such further provisions and rules as may be necessary or convenient for the discharge of its functions or duties.

---

37. Wis. Stat. §§ [13.31](#) and [13.45 \(7\)](#).

38. Wis. Const. [art. VII, § 1](#).

Both of these statutes can be traced back to the 1853 legislative session; the legislature created this statutory language just before Judge Hubbell’s impeachment trial was set to begin.<sup>39</sup>

Although there are no legislative rules governing the conduct of an impeachment trial, the senate could adopt a resolution or amend senate rules to provide for procedures regulating the trial, as happened in the impeachment trial of Judge Hubbell. (A copy of these rules for the Judge Hubbell impeachment trial is provided in the Appendix.) In this way, the impeached public officer will have notice of how the trial will be conducted and whether counsel will be allowed to participate at trial and represent the officer. The impeached public officer will also be aware of all rights and obligations at trial and will know of the opportunities and manner in which the officer may conduct a defense.

Once the impeachment trial is concluded, the matter is presented to the senate for vote. The senate is required to vote on each article of impeachment, including any specifications under an article. Presumably, each article and specification vote will be presented as a motion. If an impeached officer is convicted, the senate will also need to vote on the consequences of conviction—whether to remove the impeached officer from office or to remove from office and disqualify the officer from holding “any office of honor, profit or trust under the state.”<sup>40</sup>

## Conclusion

Impeachment is a constitutional power reserved to the legislature to remove civil officers of this state for corrupt conduct in office and for crimes and misdemeanors. It is a power reserved to the legislature alone, but seldom used. The 1853 impeachment of Judge Hubbell is the sole instance in state history of the legislature impeaching a public officer. Impeachment requires action by the assembly and conviction by the senate. As we have discussed, Wisconsin law does not provide the details for an impeachment process or procedures for the conduct of an impeachment trial. The constitution requires only that a majority of assembly members elected must concur in the impeachment of a civil officer and that two-thirds of senate members present must vote to convict. For that reason, each house of the legislature may determine its own impeachment processes and procedures. ■

---

39. [Ch. 22](#), Laws of 1853.

40. Wis. Const. art. VII, § 1.

# RULES OF THE COURT FOR THE TRIAL OF IMPEACHMENTS.

---

The committee appointed under a resolution of the Senate, to arrange and report Rules of proceeding in cases of *Impeachment*, having considered the subject referred, respectfully report the following *Rules* :—

1. Whensoever the Senate shall receive notice from the Assembly that managers are appointed on their part to conduct an Impeachment against any person, and are directed to carry such Articles of Impeachment to the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate shall immediately inform the Assembly, that the Senate is ready to receive the managers for the purpose of exhibiting such Articles of Impeachment, agreeably to the said notice.

2. When the managers of an Impeachment shall be introduced to the Bar of the Senate, and shall signify that they are ready to exhibit articles of impeachment against any person, the President of the Senate shall direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to make proclamation who shall, after making proclamation, repeat the following words: "All persons are commanded to keep silence on pain of imprisonment, while the Grand Inquest of the State of Wisconsin is exhibiting to the Senate of the State, Articles of Impeachment against ———; After which, the articles shall be exhibited, and then the President of the Senate shall inform the managers that the Senate will take proper order on the subject of the Impeachment, of which due notice shall be given to the Assembly.

3. A Summons shall issue, directed to the person impeached, in the following form :

“THE STATE OF WISCONSIN, Ss.,

*The Senate of the State of Wisconsin to ————, Greeting:*

Whereas, the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin did on the 22nd day of March, inst., exhibit to the Senate, Articles of Impeachment against you, the said ————, in the words following:

[Here insert the Articles.]

And did demand that you, the said ————, should be put to answer the accusations as set forth in said Articles, and that such proceedings, examinations, trials and judgments, might be thereupon had as are agreeable to law and justice: You, the said ————, are therefore hereby summoned to be and appear before the Senate of the State of Wisconsin, at their Chamber in Madison, on the 6th [Monday] day of June next, then and there to answer to the said Articles of Impeachment, and then and there to abide by, obey, and perform such orders and judgments as the Senate of the State shall make in the premises, according to the Constitution and Laws of the State of Wisconsin,

Hereof you are not to fail.

WITNESS ————, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and President of the Senate thereof, at Madison this — day of ———, in the year of our Lord ———, and of the Independence of the United States the ———.”

Which Summons shall be signed by the Chief Clerk of the Senate, (and sealed with their seals, and served by the Sergeant-at-Arms to the Senate,) or by such other persons as the Senate shall specially appoint for that purpose, who shall serve the same pursuant to the directions given in the form next following:

4. A precept shall be endorsed on said writ of Summons in the form following:

“STATE OF WISCONSIN, Ss.,

*The Senate of the State of Wisconsin to ————, Greeting:*

You are hereby commanded to deliver to, and leave with ———, if to be found, a true and attested copy of the within writ of sum-

mons, together with a copy of this precept, showing him both; or in case he cannot with convenience be found, you are to leave true and attested copies of the said summons and precept at his usual place of residence, and in whichsoever way you perform the service, let it be done at least — days before the appearance day mentioned in said writ of summons. Fail not; and make return of this writ of summons and precept, with your proceedings there on endorsed, on or before the appearance day mentioned in said writ of summons.

WITNESS —, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and President of the Senate thereof, at Madison, this — day of —, in the year of our Lord —, and of the Independence of the United States the —.”

Which precept shall be signed by the Chief Clerk of the Senate and sealed with their seal.

5. Subpœnas shall be issued by the Chief Clerk of the Senate, upon the application of the managers of the Impeachment, or of the party impeached, or of his counsel, returnable on the return day of the said writ of summons provided in the third rule, if issued before said return day, and if issued after, to be made returnable, at such time during the progress of the trial, as the said managers or party impeached may designate. A subpœna issued as herein provided shall be in the form following :

“STATE OF WISCONSIN, Ss.,

*The Senate of the State of Wisconsin to ———, Greeting:*

You and each of you are hereby commanded to appear before the Senate of the State of Wisconsin, on the — day of —, at the Senate Chamber in Madison, then and there to testify your knowledge in the cause which is before the Senate, in which the Assembly have impeached ———. Fail not.

Witness —, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and President of the Senate thereof, at Madison, this — day of —, in the year of our Lord —, and of the Independence of the United States the —.”

Which shall be signed by the Chief Clerk of the Senate and sealed with their seal, which subpoenas shall be directed, in every case, to \_\_\_\_\_ to serve and return.

6. The form of direction to the \_\_\_\_\_, for service of a subpoena, shall be as follows:

“STATE OF WISCONSIN, Ss.,

*To the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate:*

You are hereby commanded to serve and return the within subpoena according to law. Dated at Madison, this — day of —, in the year of our Lord —, and of the Independence of the United States the —

\_\_\_\_\_ Chief Clerk of the Senate.

7. The President of the Senate shall direct all necessary preparation in the Senate Chamber, and all the forms of proceeding while the Senate are sitting for the purpose of trying an Impeachment, and all forms, during the trial, not otherwise specially provided for by the Senate.

8. He shall be authorized to direct the employment of assistants to the Sergeant-at-Arms, or any other persons, during the trial, to discharge such duties as may be prescribed by him.

9. At 12 o'clock of the day appointed for the return of the summons against the person impeached, the legislative and executive business of the Senate shall be suspended, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate shall administer an oath to the returning officer in the form following. viz:

“I \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear that the return made and subscribed by me upon the process issued on the — day of —, by the Senate of the State of Wisconsin, against \_\_\_\_\_, is truly made, and that I have performed said services as therein described, So help me God.”

Which oath shall be entered at large on the records.

10. The person impeached shall then be called to appear and answer the articles of impeachment against him. If he appears, or any person for him, the appearance shall be recorded, stating

particularly if by himself, or by agent or attorney; naming the person appearing, and the capacity in which he appears. If he does not appear, either personally or by agent or attorney, the same shall be recorded.

11. At 12 o'clock of the day appointed for the trial of an impeachment, the legislative and executive business of the Senate shall be postponed. The Chief Clerk of the Senate shall then administer the following oath or affirmation to the President.

“You solemnly swear (or affirm) that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of ———, you will truly and impartially try the impeachment according to evidence.”

12. And the President shall administer the said oath or affirmation to each Senator present.

The Chief Clerk of the Senate shall then give notice to the Assembly that the Senate is ready to proceed upon the impeachment of ———, in the Senate Chamber, which Chamber is prepared with accommodations for the reception of the Assembly.

13. Counsel for the party impeached shall be admitted to appear, and be heard upon an impeachment.

14. All motions made by the parties, or their counsel shall be addressed to the President of the Senate, and if he shall require it, shall be in writing and read at the table of the Chief Clerk; and all decisions shall be had by ayes and noes, and without debate, which shall be entered on the records.

15. Witnesses shall be sworn in the following form, to wit:

“You ———, do swear (or affirm) that the evidence you shall give in the case now depending between the State of Wisconsin and ———, shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God.”

Which oath shall be administered by the Chief Clerk.

16. Witnesses shall be examined by the party producing them, and then cross-examined in the usual form.

17. If a Senator is called as a witness, he shall be sworn and give his testimony standing in his place.

18. If a Senator wishes a question to be put to a witness, it shall be reduced to writing and put by the President.

19. At all times, while the Senate is sitting upon the trial of an impeachment, the doors of the Senate Chamber shall be kept open.

CHAS. DUNN,

J. T. LEWIS,

ALVA STUART.

J. T. J. T. LE