

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

February 10, 2004 LB 139A

She was covering herself up and hugging herself. He said, woman, I'm a burglar, not a rapist. And he would have added, don't nobody even want you. I am not in favor of lumping every criminal with every other criminal. That is a general term. It applies to everybody from Lorelee Byrd to Charles Starkweather. Now, I think Byrd got a break. She's a "Repelican," the Governor is a "Repelican," Lieutenant Governor is a "Repelican," the Attorney General is a "Repelican," so they gave her a break, and we're still suffering for what she did, got some equipment that you can't dump. But, nevertheless, they didn't give her any jail time, didn't make her pay a fine, gave her community service, and she could determine what that would be, and they said it would probably be working in some store. But, anyway, we have developed in this Legislature a tendency to be influenced by companies that say, you can make your law enforcement more efficient if you do something in the law that will let my company make money. There are companies that have been sending me information. I'm sure they've sent it to other senators, because it's addressed to "Dear Legislator." And they want everybody charged with a crime--in some cases, not tried, not convicted, but just charged with a crime--to have to give DNA samples. And this company will make more money if that is done. So I think there's going to be a continuing effort to require more people to be documented, if you want to call it that, branded, which is what I want to call it, by the state through the taking of bodily substances and creating a database. I, had I been here the day that the bill came up, would have opposed the bill. However, since it moved, I'm not going to try to undo what was done that day. I'm not going to try to do after the fact what has already been done. I will be more resourceful, and try to make sure that I'm here if another bill of this kind comes before us, and I will oppose it. I do not think it is a good thing. I do not think it's going to do what Senator Johnson told us it would do. The only time DNA evidence is even in the picture is if there is biological evidence left at the scene, something biological associated with the perpetrator. So if there is nothing that leaves DNA, I don't care how thorough a database you have, it means nothing. DNA has been of value in acquitting people who had been convicted falsely. It has resulted in the removal from death row of people convicted falsely and inappropriately sentenced to die.