

March 20, 1973

child in most every case. Now you must treat children fairly. As an old school teacher, I tell you if you don't treat a child fairly and give him a fair trial, a fair day in court, you are in real trouble, and if you break down the dignity and the pride of these children by parading them up and down the streets with a shovel, you might harden their thoughts and they may become an enemy of society. So, I think we have all the laws we need now as far as tin cans is concerned. You know what happens when you throw a tin can out of the window of a car and you get caught at it. There is a pretty stiff fine. And another thing from a psychological standpoint, you shouldn't correct your children in the presence of the public. I don't think it's good. I think, again, it breaks down their pride and their dignity and some of those things you damage their hearts for life concerning being a friend of society. I think it's not too good a bill. I think we have plenty of laws now, so I would certainly hope that we would definitely postpone this bill.

PRESIDENT: Still speaking on the motion to indefinitely postpone. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: As a member of the Committee, I would like to speak to the specific intent that this young lady had and I think it has been missed. This was not meant to be a universal punishment for all minors in possession. She specifically made mention of the fact of a widow with a son she could no longer handle who was a repeated offender and have left her the choice of paying his fine or letting him go to jail while he continued to abuse her. This would give the judge the privilege on a second or third or fourth offense to assign this man a work-detail publicly for the very purpose of humiliation and to take the burden off of, in most instances, an unfortunate family, maybe a father involved but certainly a mother involved. This was not a recommended first offense penalty.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp. We are debating the motion to indefinitely postpone.

SENATOR DeCAMP: I am not speaking for or against. I just have a question. I am wondering if this was brought up in the Committee or at any time and that is this. If we implemented this law, do we run into a problem where it could end up costing more than it would any other way. In other words, if you put them to work will the Court deem that to be the equivalent of a jail sentence and then under Supreme Court rulings are you back at the point where you have to have a Court appointed attorney, in most cases paid for by the state, so you end up paying \$500 or whatever dollars for an attorney so you can sentence the kid to five or ten days of work, and I am wondering...was this problem or potential problem brought up in Committee and does anybody else think it is a problem.

PRESIDENT: Well, Senator Luedtke, do you care to respond?

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Mr. President, my Committee did not hear this. However, it is a problem. It is a distinct problem and I asked that question of Senator Carstens whether or not they would be kept in jail? I think this is a penal act which would be interpreted as punishment under...similar to a jail sentence. It is almost in the nature of a work release. I would also like to say, Mr. President, with regard to Senator Whitney's statement that this would be a good way to get ride of the tin cans and this is a way of doing it. Yes, it's a way of doing it but we don't need this law to do it, as we pointed out before in debate on the bill proper. Also, as far as Senator Murphy's point, when it was brought to the Committee's attention that this individual