

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

May 13, 1999

LB 76

change, Parole Boards change. Those people may get out. Or Senator Hudkins mentioned one of these people given life without parole may kill again. The death penalty is one of the few incentives to stop them from killing again when they're in prison. See, you're protecting innocent lives with the death penalty, innocent guards. Would you want to be a guard protecting one of these people, life without parole, when there's no death penalty? What do they have to lose? What else you going to do to them? So they kill a couple guards. What's the difference? They still have life without parole. They kill a couple more guards, life without parole. The death penalty is incentive to stop these people, it is a deterrent. And I didn't argue deterrence as strongly as I should have. I did the research between now...or between then and now. And deterrent really is an effective reason to have the death penalty. Let's talk a little bit about deterrence. Economist Isaac Erlich (phonetic), "American Economic Review", 1975, and this was the study, incidentally, that was used by solicitor General Bork (phonetic), arguing in front of the Supreme Court, back in the seventies, when the Supreme Court was deciding whether to extend its moratorium on the death penalty at that time. I think it was two years at the time they stopped the death penalty. Isaac Erlich (phonetic) said that his studies showed, and this is a guy, by the way, that is an opponent of the death penalty. His study showed the death penalty had a significant deterrent effect. His study showed that each execution between 1933 and 1969 prevented eight homicides, eight. Person against the death penalty, this is what his study showed. And his studies were criticized by opponents of the death penalty. Erlich's (phonetic) student, Steven Lacey (phonetic), University of North Carolina, 1985, carried on his study. What did he say? Every execution averaged 18 murders deterred. It's a death penalty deterrent, that seems fairly conclusive to me. Now how can we tell? It's one of those debates where it's hard to tell whether it's a deterrent. Got a poem here from Hiam Barshay (phonetic), it said it very well. I'm not a poet myself, but I thought this said it well. The death penalty is a warning, just like a lighthouse throwing beams out to sea. We hear about shipwrecks, but we so not hear about the ships the lighthouse guided safety on their way. We do not have proof of the number of ships it saves, but we do not tear the lighthouse down. I think that says it very well. You can't tell the deterrent