

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

March 8, 2000

LB 1004

in Nebraska. If you're going to bring a prosecution under a city ordinance, then you've got to put in evidence that ordinance. You have to prove that ordinance's existence and validity just as you would any other piece of evidence that you want admitted. If you fail to plead and prove the ordinance, then any conviction based on that would be thrown out because you did not have admissible evidence of sufficient weight to justify conviction. And crucial to the case would be proof of the ordinance that the conviction is based on. So in Nebraska, there are some protections. In other states, I don't know whether they require the proof of an ordinance or not, but how would you go about proving in this state an ordinance in another state, what the requirements are, what the standard of conducting a trial on an ordinance would be in another state. We have no way of knowing. If you are going to try to use the conviction under another state's statute, that is a horse of a different color. See, a chestnut horse is different from a horse chestnut. The chestnut horse is what I'm not worried about dealing with, the state law, but the horse chestnut, which is the city ordinance, is what I don't want anything to do with. So if you have any questions about what I'm trying to do with this amendment, I will answer them. I'm not even trying to slow down the bill just to slow it down, but I think we do need to discuss, at least, the point that Senator Hilgert raised about which persons are likely to have their background checked to see whether they have these other convictions. What would trigger that kind of search? Suppose, I have always lived in Nebraska, but suppose I do a lot of traveling around the country in other states, and I've gotten convicted. Well, if I'm black, then they'd probably check every thing they could, but let's say an upstanding young white fellow, like Senator Hilgert, who they are not suspicious of, what would make them decide they are going to check every state to see if he has been convicted in any other state? What means does the state court system have to make such a check? How do we know that every state would have that information available? There are those kind of questions that I think we need to discuss but, first, I would like to try to get the bill in a form where if we agree on that form, then we can get to the philosophy. And I realize that the amendment that I'm offering does border on the philosophical but not really. Consider whether or not you would want to be charged or have a punishment enhanced, not just for DW...DUI, because you