

make that characterization that there was a deal struck. That might have been some of the intention of the committee, but I don't think that that's probably something that ought to be binding on us here, and I would agree, as I said earlier, I just think the easiest thing to do with this bill is to vote no, and keep the law as it is, and certainly you are not going to have a lot of people prejudiced by the fact of keeping the law the way it has always been. If it was so terrible, they'd be in the Supreme Court and have it overturned and thrown out by now, and that just isn't the case. Again, I think this is just not a good bill at this point in time and you should vote against it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: I am curious about something. I didn't vote for the Hohenstein amendment and the reason I didn't, I will share a little story with you. Know some people whose son has been convicted of rape. He is now in jail. The lady that accused him of rape accused two other people of the same thing within two years before he was convicted, before he was accused of rape. The judge, I guess, using whatever exists in the law, made the decision that they would not permit the evidence that she had accused two other people within two years before this accusation, would not allow that into evidence. That was mystifying to me. I couldn't understand that, especially as I hear all this debate today about how prosecutors should have the right to use whatever prior evidence exists. It is possible that a lady like that, who cries wolf, could be raped. But on the other hand, don't you think...I think that that experience should have been entered into evidence in defense of this kid, who had 20 witnesses that he wasn't there. What makes it even worse is within eight months after that conviction, she accused somebody else down in Kansas of the same thing. Do you know what? She was walking her dog outside of her apartment in a park. Three times she has been walking her dog in a park next to her apartment, been raped, four times including the one that the poor soul was convicted for. So if you are really concerned, all you lawyers, about making sure you convict somebody by using prior evidence, why don't you do something to put something in the law that would force the judges to also enter into evidence those things that are significant about the person who is accusing somebody of a crime, in this case obviously a very serious one. So that's why I can't take seriously the lawyers on the floor who talk in this case about