

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

May 27, 1999

LB 76

a guy out here who in a drunken rage killed his wife and got six months. We have a guy out here who went to another jurisdiction and poached an elk and he got 10 years. As we go forward into the interim, I want to urge you to believe that the people of the state of Nebraska, at any and all levels, in each and every walk of life, are perfectly capable of understanding justice. And they do expect us, as guardians whom they send here, to do something about the problems that we know are broad in our society, and when we start, let's be controversial, but when we start, you know, putting people who premeditate the death of their father on work release so they can go...preserve their scholarship to go to school, and other people, maybe of a different color, spend 20 years in prison for killing their father or the same crime, this is the place where we need to talk about and think about those issues. It is still, today, as it was yesterday, the statutory law of the state of Nebraska that the death penalty shall be applied in the most scrupulous, fair manner possible. It is still today the law of the state of Nebraska by this body that it should be applied uniformly, and it is still the law of this state today, as it was yesterday, that charges, similar crimes and similar charges should be punished similarly, and that's what the issue of proportionality is all about. The statistics are the same. I don't want to belabor them with you because you so patiently and thoughtfully listened to them the first time. But I do want to urge that if you have the time over the interim that you read, and I'd be happy to share the citations, the five Nebraska Supreme Court cases in which our court has said we can't, we won't, we won't be able to, we shouldn't, it isn't lawful for us to deal with this issue. Would the Legislature please do something? Because I don't hear much convers...I hear conversation here, thoughtful conversation here, I don't hear much coming from other branches of government, and I want to suggest to you that we don't do what we ought to do in support of other branches when the only way the Supreme Court has to communicate with us is in an opinion and we don't react. We just figure we'll wait for them. It's not helpful, in my personal judgment, speaking for no one else, you know, when leading newspapers say let the courts take care of it, and then the courts have to wonder, yeah, but what kind of a recall try or whatever else will you mount if you don't like our results, whether you understand it or not. So I think the interim is a great good time to really test the