

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

February 9, 2005 LB 53

that does open up the system for fraud, I still did support that, because I think it was a good thing to do. However, I think this is very reasonable. And this is not just tacking on something. And while I can't cite the name of anyone who committed voter fraud, this is about prevention. And this is very reasonable. And I think that it's...and very relevant. It's very relevant to have this. And certainly, I would urge its favorable adoption. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Smith. On with discussion of the Smith amendment to the committee amendments to LB 53. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I'm going to vote against the Smith amendment. I side with Senator Schimek and Senator Chambers here, that going back and forth between trying to pick those offenses that should have an automatic restoration and those that shouldn't, on a piecemeal basis, doesn't make sense. Let me tell you that I'm going to vote for LB 53. But it's not because I am enamored of LB 53 on its own, but it's because, oddly enough, we continue to have the death penalty in this state. From my perspective, the loss of liberty is the most powerful thing that the state has to give and has to take back. It has what it contributes to the process of a criminal's life--because we create the conditions for liberty; we do not create the conditions for life. And the loss of liberty, I think, is a profound punishment, a profound punishment. If it was my preference, my preference would be that we do not take life as a state, that we be in the business of choosing the life sentence to be...I mean, I'm sorry, the death penalty, to be carried out, and that we play in that arena. Not that we don't have the constitutional power to. We just shouldn't. We just should eschew that penalty. In the event we were to eschew that penalty, I then think that it would be important for us to consider the quality and nature, the vitality, of the liberty that we take, the length, the profoundness of that deprivation, and the clawing back into acceptance by society from a state of an absence of freedom, as in incarceration. Under those circumstances, I do think that giving back the privileges of sharing an unfettered, free existence would be open to discussion, open to some weighing,