

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

May 5, 1999

LB 44

laws, so that brings us to another question. Are people who take an oath, people in public positions, expected and obliged to honor those oaths? Apparently not. When all of that activity around President Clinton was going forth, the public was given to believe that it had something to do with nobody being above the law. People argued that even the President is not above the law. But when those who enforce the law want to elevate themselves above the law, something is terribly wrong. Who watches the watchers? Who polices the police? Who prosecutes the prosecutors? The prosecutors, they're out of this issue now. The police say, well, if you don't let us keep this money, it hinders what we want to do. Drug dealers make the same argument when you take their money from them. So here's the riddle that I give to you today, what is the difference between drug dealers and law enforcement officers? Drug dealers don't take an oath to uphold the constitution and laws. That's the only difference, because both are engaged in violating and circumventing the law. This Legislature had some serious discussions about that proposal before it was put on the ballot. I was strongly opposed to it, because I don't believe in this confiscation of people's goods. But it won in the Legislature and it got on the ballot. One of the provisos was that part of that money would go to the schools. But law enforcement said, we're going to tap the till of the schools, and we're going to pick the pockets of the children. Don't we spend a lot of time talking about messages being sent by various people in positions? When law enforcement can brazenly declare that they are violating the constitution and laws and then try to justify it, what kind of message is being sent? If you're the one to enforce the law, you don't have to abide by the law. One of the most reprehensible aspects of funneling this activity through the federal system is the following: under Nebraska law there must be proof by the state beyond a reasonable doubt that money or conveyances, as they're called, were used in violation of the drug laws, proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Under the federal system all there has to be is probable cause to believe that that happened, then the burden shifts to the one whose property is taken on the basis of a probable cause belief. And at that point the burden shifts to the one who has lost his or her property to prove that it was not used in an illegitimate manner. You cannot prove a negative. What the government has done, and it's done all over the country, is to take sums of