

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

February 8, 2005 LB 53

SENATOR SCHIMEK: You're the lawyer, Senator Beutler; I'm not. But from a layman's point of view, I don't think so.

SENATOR BEUTLER: No difference in meaning was intended,...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: No,...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...anyway?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...I don't think so. And it could be that we just relied on some existing language, and that's all it is.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Then, under 112, the new language you put in includes the statement, "the disqualification is automatically removed" at such time. Do you see that sentence?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, I do.

SENATOR BEUTLER: In the next statute, that applies to other states, that sentence is not included. Is there any reason why that same sentence, alerting the public to the intent of the statute, shouldn't apply to convictions for felonies under the laws of other states? In other words, when they're two years past their completion date of their sentence, we want that to automatically pertain, whether it's our state or another state, do we not?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I'm sorry, Senator Beutler. I missed your question.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. There is a sentence in the statute that applies to felonies committed under our own laws in this state. It says, "the disqualification is automatically removed" at such time, so that no further action is necessary, and they know they can vote when two years is up. Then in the next statute, which applies to the laws of other states, that is, convictions of felonies under the laws of other states, that sentence is omitted. But I'm assuming that the intent is the same, that it is desired that it be automatic.