

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

April 20, 1999 LB 76

to study all criminal homicides is because there are circumstances that would merit the charging of first degree murder and it is not. It is not charged. So when you look at the circumstances and determine that in some cases the charge is not even laid that ought to be laid, based on the law, you see a disparity and you have to look for the reason. In other instances, first degree murder is charged, but a plea bargain will result in it being dropped to a lesser offense so the person will plead guilty. That person charged with first degree murder may have been death penalty eligible. There will be other first degree murder cases where there were not aggravating circumstances so no death penalty will have been imposed, but you look at what was alleged and argued during the sentencing phase to see if, in other cases where similar allegations were made, an aggravating circumstance was nevertheless found to exist justifying the death penalty. This matter is not nearly as simplistic as some people would suggest who have not studied it, and that's why we usually hear those who favor the death penalty arguing in the way that Senator Bruning did. Instead of calling his a caveman attitude, I had said I may have the little caveman person, his is what I would call a visceral response--an eye for an eye. But even when it came to that, and the Hebrew nation was the one supposedly that originated that idea, they got away from that and substituted damages. They said if we literally are going to apply an eye for an eye, if "A" takes the eye of "B", how do we know that "A"...the eye of "A" and the eye of "B" have the same acuity? One is weaker; one is stronger. So we will be enforcing the law in name only, but in substance it is not in fact an eye for an eye because the two things are not the same. And many times when people quote from what they call the Hebrew law, they don't know how it, in fact, was carried out. Many of those death sentences that were available, like putting a child to death for picking up sticks on the Sabbath, those things were not carried out as far as death sentences. And at some point maybe I'll have the opportunity to show all of the things built into the law of Israel that made it a practical impossibility to carry out a death sentence. When they said you have to have a certain number of witnesses, you could not have them all testify at the same time. They had to testify separately. One could not hear the others. And if one deviated in any way from what the others said, you did not have the requisite number of witnesses; a death penalty could not be