

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

March 3, 2005

LB 53

the other stages, and I still think that there's problems with it. I think it's probably a good idea, up to a point. I still have a problem with the privileges of the victims in here. We can have someone that's committed murder, get out in a matter of years, sometimes as little as five years. They're back out. They can go right ahead and spend in their time and get their voting privilege back. I think there should be different categories on who can vote and what crimes can be committed, what class of felonies. You have some of these people, and you have them right here in Lincoln, that have got away with huge sums of money in some of the savings and loans, the insurance businesses, and a few other trusts, be committed of felonies. Those people got away with a bunch of that money. They put many people into the poor house by taking their money out of your savings and loan. And yet, in a matter of time you allow them to come back and vote. I'm not against the bill. I don't think it has anything to do with whether we're Christians or not, and forgiveness, or anything like that. I think this is a matter of decency and common sense. Somebody has to remember what the victim's rights were. When someone has been murdered, their right to vote doesn't get brought back to them in a matter of years. It's never brought back to them. I think there's cases like that for capital crimes that the process is already in place to restore voting rights for something like that. And I think that's...that probably should continue. There are some of these minor felonies. If you notice in your bill, if you happen to try to vote too soon before you...done jump through all the hoops, why, it's a Class IV felony again, so it puts you right back in...under parole, so you can turn around and wait a couple of years, I suppose, and try and vote again. The bill designates that if you don't follow the rules, why, you're convicted of a Class IV felony. I think this was probably a good idea. I think it's been brought forward too fast. I don't think there's been enough study done on that. When we look at some of the circulars that are going around that talk about 44,000 felons in Nebraska and 343 of them got their votes restored, now, are you trying to tell me that all 44,000 of these people were trying to get their votes restored anyway? So there are ways that it can be done. And that's the reason it does...is the stringent test to go through to get it done, and it's...so that people aren't running around and committing