

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

April 8, 2004

LB 958

brought under this act. The statute that lays out the duty of a prosecutor declares that the prosecutor must have sufficient evidence to believe not only that a crime was committed, but that a prosecution can result in a conviction. So let's say you have the zygote, and if any of you all want to see what these various terms mean that from time to time I make reference to, I didn't want you to be without a reference point so you would know what I'm talking about. My FA1635, which is on the gadget, defines various terms that will be a part of the discussion as we go along throughout the day. Not only should the Legislature not enact a bill like this, period, but if it's going to enact it, it should not have it framed in such a way that it is impossible to be enforced, impossible to be executed. My view against the death penalty is pure and less motivated by pragmatism and politics than is the view of my good friend Senator Maxwell, in talking about protecting all human beings, and Senator Foley, who takes the same view. I am categorically against the state killing anybody under any circumstances, regardless of whom the perpetrator is or the victim or how the crime was committed, no matter how heinous, no matter how torturous, no matter how barbaric. Because of what I believe the state ought to be in terms of setting the tone, my belief is that the state should execute nobody, and I've spent my time in the Legislature trying to achieve that. I've had people ask me, why don't you bring a bill that says the death penalty will be abolished unless a crime is committed by somebody in prison serving a life sentence, a murder that is, and I tell them, no, even the convicted murderer remains a human being and I am opposed to anybody being killed by the state. But my colleagues, who are more religious than I am, I acknowledge that, who have a more religion-oriented world view than I have, and I acknowledge that, who have a greater degree of religious faith, and I acknowledge that because I have none whatsoever, yet they, with all of their faith and their belief, will not go the logical step in what they say is driving this whole effort relative to, quote, unborn child or unborn children, unquote. They do not want to try to protect every, quote, unborn child, unquote. They do not want to protect every innocent vulnerable human being, as they define the term. They feel that the only time a vulnerable human being of the kind they're talking about should be protected is dependent on where that human being