

not similar enough to admit it in this case. No, it is not relevant. It is too prejudicial. It is going to try to convince that jury because something bad happened 20 years ago it happened again, that's not fair. It is too prejudicial. The judge will not admit it, if you let the judge have that chance before it goes to the jury. If you adopt the amendment, you will have that opportunity, and if this means that we have to look at LB 430, I am not sure anyone told all of us that when 430 comes up we are supposed to vote yea on it and not ask any questions about it. You know, if that was the arrangement, maybe we should have had these put in one bill and done them together. I didn't know that was the bargain. I didn't know that's the way the system worked. I thought we were supposed to look at these bills and see whether they were valid or not valid. And if the County Attorneys Association made an agreement on this bill with LB 430 and I've tipped the apple cart up on that, I am sorry, but I'm not sorry for the amendment. I think it's a good amendment. I think it's a fair amendment. And I think it substantially improves this bill and I'd urge the body to adopt it.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hohenstein. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members, I just thought it was time for a nonattorney to get into the debate here. I am a noncounty attorney, a nonattorney. I am not an excounty attorney, not a former county attorney and I don't belong to the County Attorneys Association. I just wanted to say I was listening carefully to decide what to do as the rest of the jury listens carefully to the attorney's. After yesterday and today, I thought I'd just bring that up. Thanks.

SPEAKER BAACK: It was nice to hear your voice, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members. Again, I am not an attorney so I'd like to speak on this issue as well. The issue that Senator Hohenstein talks about as rarely happening, there are two cases, and I'm pulling them out of the old file on this from 1991, that in the last three years, I believe it was, that the Supreme Court in Nebraska, I mentioned them in my opening, allowed the prosecutor to go back 20 years in one case and I think it was over 30 in another. And so to say that...and those were appealed. They were appealed to the