

May 11, 1981

LB 548

in court but I wasn't able to clarify the record at that time.

SENATOR NICHOL: Okay, thank you, Senator Maresh. Mr. Chairman, the only point I want to make and I feel so strongly about this point, more strongly than any bill we have passed up to now, as to what we have done today, not because I begrudge the man any money, whatever he can get is fine, but the precedent we have established today I feel is a very serious one, and regardless of what treatment we give to inmates of our institutions or clients of our institutions or clients of anything that this state or counties or cities run from now on, whether the treatment is right or wrong and whether or not the treatment is found out to be wrong ten years later, they have a claim in this Legislature. I think it is very serious and I cannot vote for this bill as long as that stays in it. I hope that some of us realize what we have done before this bill passes. I really think we have made a bad mistake.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I rise in support of this bill for opposite reasons that Senator Nichol gave. I feel that we are establishing a very good precedent. I want you to think for a moment the type of precedent that we are setting. We are addressing, in particular I am referring to the Soukup case, the problem of the man that spent the greater portion of his life in an institution, not by his own volition but because the institution wished and desired to keep him there, not only to confine and take care of him in the personal way that institutions do so but also to experiment upon this individual with a dozen or more electroshock therapy treatments and the use of LSD, LSD in an experimental fashion. I am not worried about the precedent that we are setting here if it leads to justice, if it stops this type of incarceration and mistreatment of people who are being serviced by our institutions. I think it is the proper way to go about it. It is not really penalizing the state. It is not really penalizing the taxpayers of Nebraska but it is allowing this person not to receive a full measure of the grievances that have been dished out to him but it is a means where this man can conduct the rest of his life with some financial security, not a giveaway program where we are giving a large sum to him to use at his own pleasure, but setting up a trust fund for him where interest accrued on the fund may be dished out in payments together with his social security payments