

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

March 9, 1999 . LB 126

believe, has agreed with this amendment, I have to make some comments now beyond just what I'm attempting to do. Senator Landis has stated a position that I'm going to take, which is to vote against the committee amendments. However, because that vote may not be successful, I want to remove as much that is objectionable from the committee amendments as I possibly can. I am not one of those willing to join in the war being waged against our young people across the board. This so-called assault against crime of every variety started at the federal level because there were people running for Congress who had to get on the anticrime bandwagon and they criminalize every thing imaginable. They were criminalizing state offenses. The Chief Justice of the United States pleaded with Congress not to do this anymore and chastised them for having done so. Congress has created so many new federal crimes that the federal courts are now inundated with what, in effect, are state offenses, but because these venal politicians had criminalized every thing with even the slightest aroma or odor of a federal offense, they had to now go into the fertile field of state offenses. Naturally, that attitude had to embrace young people because they are now the only large group left whose conduct can be criminalized. Black people have been shot through the grease even without positive laws being enactments to deprive us of various rights and privileges guaranteed by the US Constitution, the state constitution, and enacted by Congress and the State Legislature. Women have not been victimized to the same extent, but in the civil realm, they have been deprived of many rights and privileges available to white males. When we come to young people, we're going to have to find ways to make them criminals. Take conduct, which is not criminal, criminalize it, and by so doing create a brand new large harvest of young criminals. To show how irrational this is, and I've given this example in various forms, if an adult is charged with a crime, but in the process of handling that situation, the adult is found to have the mentality of a 13- or 14-year-old child, the adult will be considered to have diminished capacity and not found guilty because he or she cannot form the requisite criminal intent. But when you get to a teenager who is 13 or 14, every thing is turned on its head and these teenagers are to be deemed adults and charged and tried as adults, and, if convicted, sentenced as adults. But not so with an adult who has the mentality or mental capacity of a 13- or 14-year-old child. How much sense