

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

March 25, 2004 LB 139

many tests are to be conducted. But you have to start with enough material to generate additional copies of that material. So the law says that even though DNA testing may have been used at an earlier date and was the basis for a conviction, or the conclusion was inconclusive, more sophisticated testing can be done, and that sophisticated testing can produce a result which will either overturn or undermine the first test and additional legal proceedings will be justified. So because Senator Brown has a limited view of what...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time. Further discussion on the motion to return LB 139 to Select File for a specific amendment, being FA1608, on with discussion, Senator Landis. Senator Landis, if you wish to speak.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I think actually there would be an area of agreement that Senator Chambers and I could, I think we'd probably get to the same place, and that is that a mistaken test of body fluids should not serve as a basis for a finding of wrongdoing. I agree to that idea. I think that's simple basic justice. You can't use a mistaken test as a basis for a finding of wrongdoing. I buy that. I think the language has some variation from that because when it says here, "to the extent to which such body fluid test was the basis of an accusation" you got two different meanings. One, was it the sole basis? And I think that's...I would understand the "the" to mean, look, if the only thing you've got is this test and the test is wrong, you don't have a basis for an accusation. The accusation should be vitiated. If it is one of several sources, it is sort of like a basis, the word "the" still covers the "a" basis situation, but if you have multiple sources, it's the inaccurate DNA test or body fluid test that should not count. It shouldn't be there until at such time as it is accurate, and then you should be able to consider it. You should not be able to consider a mistaken test. Got it. Fair. Simple justice. I buy that. I'm not sure the language comports to that standard, from my reading of it. I'm not trying to be obstructionist but I will say I think it's simple fairness to say, you got a wrong test, you can't use it, as a basis for finding of wrongdoing. It should not be part of the mix of the evidence taken into account to find that wrongdoing has