

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

January 26, 2004 LB 139

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. Let me ask you this. So if the bill as amended, or as proposed to be amended, happened, would Nebraska then be one of the states on here that is shaded black?

SENATOR JOHNSON: No, we would go from white to gray, I guess might be the way I would put it. But what we are trying to do is to pick out the ones where you get the biggest bang for your money and that is adding robbery and burglary.

SENATOR RAIKES: And so, by doing that, you would...you would not add which ones that other states have added?

SENATOR JOHNSON: Yes, one of the common ones and Louisiana has done this, for instance, is to put all felons on the list. Then there would be variations between those two. But basically, it goes to the basic that we're going to add...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR JOHNSON: ...for the jump to all felons.

SENATOR RAIKES: One more question: Is there a reason to have a uniformity in categories of offenders or maybe in other respects across states for purposes of using this information?

SENATOR JOHNSON: Oh, I think that definitely is the case. For instance, Virginia, now they've had theirs in place for about 20 years, and they now have what's called a cold hit just about every day. In other words, they find or take the DNA sample, compare it with their database, and they say, oh, Joe Jones again. So this...I was glad I didn't say Senator Jim Jones, by the way. But, at any rate, why, so there's no question that the bigger the base the better it will work.

SPEAKER BROMM: Time.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. Thank you, Senator Johnson.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Raikes and Senator Johnson.  
Senator Stuhr.