

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

January 26, 2004 LB 139

was just one a couple of days ago, I was going to bring it this morning and forgot to, of someone that had been incarcerated for 16 years and then the DNA evidence was supplied and he was released. So it's really one of the exciting things to me that it really does protect the innocent. But if I might just talk for just one second about that, one of the things that we have is this. I don't think that anybody in this Chamber would agree...or disagree with the statement that the poor and the minorities are more apt to be innocent and both arrested and convicted. I think this is maybe the greatest protection for that group of people that there is available.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Johnson. He pointed that out. I think he's probably correct. I hate to say this, maybe the poor are picked on a little more when it comes to that. They can't hire the high-powered attorneys to defend them. I think it's a good thing, Mr. Speaker, members. Well, Senator Johnson, that's good enough for me. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Senator Johnson.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Well, I think what I want to do is this; is just to summarize where we're going with this bill. Nebraska is way behind other states, as you see from the map that we've provided that we are still back in stage one. This is an important section, but it is still just stage one. We have, particularly because of our problems last year in particular with trying to make up \$800 million in our budget, we shied away from just about any form of extra expense, but if you look at this in the long run, I don't think there's any question this saves a lot of money. We talked about the paternity suits, that trials have just disappeared. The other thing that happens is, by the judges and prosecutors and defense attorneys that I've talked to, is that this eliminates a lot of trials. I can tell you that there is going to be further legislation discussed in this Chamber where our judicial system, particularly in my own area, is overworked. They are at 1,000 cases a year, whereas the recommended number is 500. So this is the type of thing where there is savings on the side as well; is that there won't be as many trials. The parties will agree on either innocence or conviction and will be able to avoid that aspect. One of the