

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

March 8, 2000

LB 1004

and are apprehended in that condition, given a fair trial and convicted, should not be able to escape the consequences of that conduct if they persist in it. The enhancement occurs for those who repeat the offense. I can agree with every thing that the various senators have said about not wanting Nebraska to be a haven for those who engage in this conduct on a repeated basis. But I believe that before the law either convicts a person or if after convicting enhances a punishment for that person, the law should be fair and it should be properly administered. There's a point in St. (sic) Thomas More's life where this guy, who was a spy for maybe Cromwell, or even the king, wanted to get the goods on Sir Thomas More because he wouldn't agree that the king should be able to divorce one woman and marry another one. So when this guy left Sir Thomas More's house and Sir Thomas More was the chief legal officer in England at that time, the wife said, arrest that man, and Thomas More wouldn't do it. The daughter said, arrest him, and Thomas More said, why, what law has he broken? She said, he has broken God's law, and Thomas More said, then let God arrest him. And so the young man that she was going to marry said, you would give him benefit of the law knowing he is a spy. Thomas More said, I would give the devil benefit of the law. This man said, you'd give the devil benefit of the law? Then Thomas More gave him a little lecture on the purpose of the law, how England has grown thick with laws from border to border, and would you cut down all those laws to pursue the devil? He said, yes, I'd cut down every law in England. And Sir Thomas More said, and when all those laws are lying flat and the devil turned on you, what would you do then? Yes, I would give the devil benefit of the law for my own sake. I want the laws to be fair for my own sake. Unlike my colleagues, I cannot say that I will never have a charge brought against me, a serious charge, not just speeding. And if such should happen, I would want the law to be administered in a fair way, and I would want the law, which is being administered, to be fair in its terminology. This law I do not think is fair. I think it is diluted by our allowing the use of convictions under city and village ordinances in other states to be used to enhance an offense in this state. Consider what we're looking at. If a person has violated...is caught driving under the influence, it is likely that that person will be charged under the state law because the city cannot impose a stricter punishment than the state. So if you leave the state law, and