May 20, 1981

written requests for interviews regarding his status to both Warden Parratt and Acting Deputy Warden Nance. Deputy Warden Nance was also contacted on behalf of the plaintiff by an inmate legal advisor. The court finds that the plaintiff has established both Warden Parratt and Deputy Warden Nance knew of the complaint. I, too, want protection for a state employee who is doing his or her job and expecting to have support from the state. I do not expect to pick up legal fees when someone has deliberately disregarded the rules of an institution and knowingly continues over a period of days and weeks to continue in that stance. In no way should we be picking this up. I personally am very disappointed to find that our Attorney General brought this in after the public hearing. I do not like that. I do not like the implication it makes to this kind of legislation when there is a public hearing where the facts can be brought out. Senator Johnson has brought to us this court case which is from federal court. As I said, I expected to vote against it until I learned what the true facts were. I urge you to join me in supporting Senator Johnson's amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: As we proceed, may I once again alert you to the fact that we are going to move through Select File today and we've got several of these bills that are quite voluminous so anything you can do to speed up the process the better it will be for everyone. Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The previous question has been called for. Do I see five hands? Let's try it again. Are there five hands? Okay. Shall debate cease? Okay, record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Debate is ceased. The Chair recognizes Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I know the time is short so I am going to be very quick in closing. All this amendment does simply is it strips away the claim of Warden Parratt and Deputy Warden Nance for some \$3,000 to, in a sense, exonerate them or hold them harmless or reimburse them for judgement that was taken against them when they were sued by a prison inmate because in the eyes of the court they had been willfully indifferent, or I should say, deliberately indifferent to the rights of that inmate. This particular amendment reflects a very serious policy question for the State of Nebraska and the question is this. To what extent will we hold our employees harmless for their misconduct? I have

5424