

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

March 25, 2004      LB 139

test was the basis of such accusation of wrongdoing." Now here's the two aspects that concern me with that. I think this is saying that there's a mix-up in the identify between the sample and the person. If it comes back that the sample says it's not the person, that...I would understand why you would want to vitiate those results as having any significance for the person because it wouldn't be the right...wouldn't be the right sample. And what this says is, you'd be cleared of any accusation of wrongdoing. One of the things that doesn't indicate is whether or not the person submitted the wrong sample on purpose, for example, if it was a urine test and you were able to get a different source of urine. You might remember in the movie, Alice's Restaurant, Arlo Guthrie is in there and they're getting the...taking their urine samples to get ready for their Vietnam army test and he complains that he's just not capable of doing it on the spot and asks if there are any volunteers around who might offer something to help comply with the urine test. In other words, you could have a wrong...if I get the language right, you could have a wrongdoer who knowingly submits the wrong test, get the test proven to be the wrong test and then is vitiating of all wrongdoing even though they were the malefactor themselves. That's one aspect of the language that makes me uncomfortable. There is a second aspect, and that is if the identify was wrong, if there was a screwup in the identity, then you vitiate all claims of wrongdoing. No, I think that means do the test again with the right person, doesn't it? Get the right data to see whether there was wrongdoing or not as opposed to there was a mistake in the lab and, therefore, there was no wrongdoing. That, to me, isn't logical. It seems to me that I'm concerned that those two things are the same, that we link a mistaken identity charge, or a mistaken identity problem with the clearing of an accusation of wrongdoing. There might be a good reason to clear for the wrongdoing, but I'm not so sure that the error in the lab means that the employer has to forego any accusation of wrongdoing when an accurate test might provide evidence that there was wrongdoing. There's a last aspect to this language is somewhat of a concern to me, and that is that you could have two sources of information. Let's say that we had an eye witness claiming that dope was smoked, and there was a DNA test which was mistakenly credited to the accused individual. That would be a