

limit the number of pretrial diversions that you may have. It does not say in the bill if these are limited to only in the State of Nebraska, they can have a pretrial diversion program in Nebraska, one in Kansas, one in Maine, whatever. This is going to limit the number of pretrial diversions that they may have. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Hudkins. Senator Hall. Senator Lindsay. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature, Senator Hudkins, just so I get on the record straight, how are we going to know if they've had pretrial diversions in other states?

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Hudkins..

SENATOR HUDKINS: Yes, that's the problem, we don't know.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, so I mean that's a good idea, but I think that what you point out here is true is that these pretrial diversions are loosey-goosey things that are handled rather informally and that you're never going to have a handle and that's the reason you have convictions that go on records and you keep track of them. And this might be a good amendment, I just don't think that you'll ever be able to keep track of pretrial diversions in any other states and I think that points out the weakness of any pretrial diversion.

SENATOR HUDKINS: I would agree with you there. There is a weakness in pretrial diversion programs. I guess what we're trying to get across is that once you have a pretrial diversion, you are no longer available for any other pretrial diversions in the State of Nebraska, at least in the next eight years.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Does anyone else wish to speak to the amendment? Seeing none, do you have closing, Senator Hudkins? Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Sorry, I had my light on, but...I have no objection to this amendment. The amendment that the State Patrol brought to me is the same thing. I've had that filed and I'll just withdraw it when we get to that, but I have no