

tion in our law now and it has been on our books since 1973 and has been working well in the State of Nebraska for the protection of the children and the adults who currently are covered.

SENATOR KAHLE: Let me ask you this question then. If we do not pass your amendment, do they lose that immunity?

SENATOR MARSH: No, the law will continue as it is if the amendment is not adopted. Thank you.

SENATOR KAHLE: Okay, thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I'm going to support the amendment. It is my understanding Senator Marsh is opposed, she is offering but you are opposed. Okay, and I say, what I am going to say next in all sincerity, I believe if you don't adopt the amendment you will have effectively have killed the bill. And I say that having talked to different groups both in this Legislature and outside they will do everything they can to kill the bill. There are certain things held sacred by certain people, priests, the Catholic secret of the confessional, whatever you want to call it, the lawyer-client privilege, so on and so forth. I believe that the old story you should take the first step instead of trying to run the whole mile. You want to set up a system to start dealing with abuse of the elderly and the legislation can do that and to Senator Kahle, I would urge you to read the language which says, "...blah, blah, blah, any person shall report." There is no "mays", there is no anything. The burden is imposed upon people to actually call if they suspect. If Senator Higgins, and it is kind of vague in a certain sense because it is subjective. It is what she, Senator Higgins, may determine in her own mind to be abuse but she is obligated under the new law you would be passing to call, to report, to accuse in essence. Okay. So you have established that precedent and that standard in the law and I think you'd better be acceptable or satisfied with that. You will not get the rest. Now some of the lawyers representing the Bar Association, I'll read you the note so you'd...no big secret here. They made a point to clear up something. Professional immunity is not the issue. The issue is the confidentiality of communications from a person needing counselling to a lawyer, doctor or priest. And so Senator John needing to go to confession, let's say, which of course is a rare event but, I mean just accepting the possibility. He needs to know that confidentiality exists. Boy, you better believe he needs to know that. Anyway, that is the reason for the