

March 20, 1973

bill can be fended...be defended. It's the kind of thing which a group of people with different opinions from different parts of the country felt might be a bases for writing a bill or several bills. As it turned out, the way you read it a lot of different...lot of different kind of elements came into this one bill. It is totally indefensible and the Attorney General is in a political position. He must be in favor of the death penalty. He must produce a bill. Not only is this Senator Rasmussen's bill because his name is on it, but I think it is the Governor's bill and the Attorney General's bill. Primarily, the Governor, the Attorney General as his legal arm, had to put something together. It was gotten together by the Attorneys General Convention and that is what the state of Nebraska is being asked to pass. A bill which should not even be considered a bill. It might be a statement of opinion, a summary of the discussions that occurred and the various elements that were considered as relating to what would be involved in the death penalty bill, but you should certainly never take these contradictory factors and put them in one bill and pass them.

PRESIDENT: Is there any, now, any further discussion of the DeCamp amendment? We are trying to focus attention on those, so we can dispatch these. There are other amendments to this bill. If there is no further debate on the DeCamp amendments, then Senator DeCamp, you may close on your amendments. Senator DeCamp is closing. The chair will not allow questions other than for order.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, the main argument against my amendment by the two main speakers against them, Senator Carpenter and Senator Rasmussen, is the Attorney General said this. Now if we are going to go strictly by what the Attorney General said on everything, then we can go home and come, maybe, one day a month, collect what the Attorney General says for us to do, and do that. I don't think that's what we want to do, but since they did refer to the Hearing and what the Attorney General said, I think it's important that I clarify this for you. The Attorney General said and the testimony at the Hearing was to the effect that he was trying to draft a bill that would get through the Constitutional challenges and second would get through the Legislature. The indication was that they thought if they made it absolutely mandatory, it would never get through the Legislature. Constitutionally, I think it would be more defensible that way but the arguments and the feeling were the Legislature would never have the, you might say, courage to go ahead and say these crimes deserve the death penalty. This is what we are going to do, so we came up with this bill which is nothing more than, I think Senator Carstens used the word, hoax. It says its a death penalty bill and then it has three pages of ways to get out of ever implementing or imposing the death penalty in Nebraska. It's kind of like sitting on your davenport watching television and seeing the Indians fall off their horses or the cowboys, seeing them die on the television and going home saying, well they killed 104 Indians and 27 cowboys today. It didn't happen, but you saw it. Well, that's what this bill gets down to. We aren't passing a death penalty but it says this and it happened in the Nebraska Legislature but it is not any more a death penalty than the man in the moon. If we are going to pass a death penalty, let me get down to the final point. Let us make it a death penalty. Now the idea of the state killing another human or another, excuse me, or another human killing another human, it's totally repugnant to me. I recognize, however, that we are of a mind to pass a death penalty, point number one, and, point number two, our penal system at this point in time in Nebraska and the United States has not reached the point where citizens feel the death penalty can be abandoned. With these two things in mind and the realization that we want, supposedly