

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

March 25, 2004      LB 139

mistake, and I think that would trigger the first part of this which says the report concludes that the initial body fluids were not those of the person. There was a laboratory error. Two sources of information; an eyewitness and the lab screws up with the report by getting the wrong person. What this says is even though there were two bases upon which the accusation was made, I think you could argue that the language says to the extent to which such body fluid...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...was the basis of such accusation--that doesn't mean that it was the only basis, it just means that it was...it could mean that it was part of the basis--that you could ignore the eyewitness phenomenon and then hang the hat on the fact that the lab made a mistake in getting the right DNA. Look, if the lab made a mistake with the wrong DNA, I understand the notion that you shouldn't take action until you have the right DNA. Got it. But this says that you vitiate the accusation of wrongdoing. It doesn't make any provision for retesting. It doesn't make any provision for getting the right test. It identifies a fair problem. I think it's a legitimate problem and I agree that the problem is there. Errors are made. But it links that with a somewhat different result than I think makes sense. I'm not sure. I offer those suggestions to the body saying that at this late date...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...the examination of the language is pretty hard to do.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: But those are my reactions. I find three problems with that section.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. (Visitors announced.) Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, I will withdraw that amendment