

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

February 10, 2004 LB 139A

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Johnson. Senator Chambers. And this will be your third time, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. I have no opposition to the use of DNA to establish innocence, to establish paternity, and to do any of a number of other possible wholesome things. However, this bill will have nothing to do with the establishment of paternity. You do not go to a database. You take the samples from the putative father and the child. You don't go to a database. You have, in that set of circumstances, a closed circle of individuals who will be involved, and you take samples from them and make a determination. You can exclude an accused person as the father. You can include and establish to a virtual certainty that a person indeed is the father. That activity has nothing to do with the bill before us. This bill adds another item that will be attached to somebody convicted of one of these crimes. I'd like to ask Senator Johnson a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Johnson, would you yield to a question from Senator Chambers?

SENATOR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Johnson, do you believe it is possible that a person could be unjustly convicted of burglary? And what's the other offense that this bill deals with?

SENATOR JOHNSON: Robbery.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Or robbery? Do you think a person could be unjustly convicted of either or both of those offenses?

SENATOR JOHNSON: I'm sure it would be possible, if they...particularly if there is no evidence there. And I guess there would always be the chance that false DNA evidence could be planted, just like planting any other evidence.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Or if there's no DNA evidence, an eye witness can make a mistake. And it's been established that eye witness testimony is probably the most unreliable of all. But however