

have to offer fair trials and if we don't give fair trials appellate courts reverse convictions. With this bill we set a standard. Every district court in the state then knows what that standard is. Without having that standard at least one prosecutor whom I think is respected says, I fear we're going to have some reversals of convictions. And you all know what kind of outcry we will get when at least the high profile convictions are reversed. And you know that crime victims then have to testify again and they have to go through everything that we don't like to see them go through in the first place, but that's what happens when we get reversals of convictions because we're not being proactive on this. And I'm not familiar enough with the area to say what my opinion would be on whether we'll get reversals, but I'm willing to rely on what Mr. Cooper has said. Bottom line is, this is good policy. There may be disagreements on it, but the bottom line is we ought to have a standard, this is a good standard to have. Second issue, and I think the bill does stand on its merits, but if there is any other questions, let's look back at what kind of an agreement was cut on it. The Criminal Attorneys Association and the Criminal Defense Attorney, or excuse me, the County Prosecutors Association and the Criminal Defense Attorneys Association said, got together and a couple of them said yeah, this will work. Now if we don't want to accept that as Senator Robinson suggested earlier, we're not bound by that and I agree, I agree 100 percent. We're not bound by that. And if that's the case, let's just be consistent on it. We have heard about a delicate balance on another bill...

SPEAKER BAACK PRESIDING

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...that we can't amend that bill because the parties have cut the deal and we can't touch it. Fine. Let's let both of those bills stand on their merits. This bill has merit. This bill has a good policy reason for existing. We...and if we're going to say hands off on them, that's fine, and I would agree that that's not good policy for us to not take a look at those. Bottom line on this, it is supported by prosecutors, it is supported by those who are some of the best prosecutors in the state, those people who get convictions, who put away some of these high profile people that we read about. They think it's good legislation. I would concur. I will be voting to advance LB 598.