

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

January 14, 2004 LB 270

issue at this point the same way he does, but the items that he discussed articulated the reason why I changed my view on this legislation. Senator Foley is right. I was in the troglodyte position, where he finds himself now, several years ago, but my mind was not like a piece of concrete which could not be penetrated by evidence and information. When I saw the numbers of people who were attacked one way or another, and their property, because of what we have designated as hate crimes, I realized that when there is an evil in society the job of lawmakers is to fashion legislation aimed at eradicating or addressing that evil. When I became convinced that the evil was there, I changed my position. And if you read some of the statements I made against hate crimes legislation, based on the view people have of me, you would say he will never depart from that position. Brothers and sisters, I don't care how strongly I advocate a position, if I become aware that I'm wrong, I'm not interested in maintaining a wrong position, I will change in what they call a New York minute, but based on new technology, a nanosecond. Senator Foley and Senator Smith ask questions based on what is in a person's mind, which indicates, and this is not said pejoratively because it applies to most nonlawyers, they don't understand the criminal justice system. Unless an individual confesses to a crime, the vast majority of crimes are handled on the basis of circumstantial evidence. There is not direct concrete evidence to show that this person committed the crime. So what the courts have done down through the ages, even before America was a country, was to determine a person's motive from the surrounding circumstances associated with the act that was committed. If...and the law makes these distinctions. If Senator Friend and I got into one of our discussions and I said something that just made him snap, that I said he loved General Patton instead of having properly quoted him where he said General Patton said he loves something else, and it bothered him so much that he ran over here and bashed me upside the head with a book and I died, well, he would get a reward, but let's say he didn't, they would charge him with manslaughter because that would be an act committed upon a sudden quarrel. Something happened that made him snap. The act was the same, an act of homicide. The result obviously was the same. I died. But if I made the comment and Senator Friend sat there like he is now but he started twiddling his thumbs and he thought and he thought