

has to have a title; it has a title. It's been complied with. Third, the substance, certainly a title cannot invalidate the substance of the bill. And I have read and read and read Section 45 over and over and over and it simply doesn't do what, in my opinion, what some would suggest. Any firefighter in the state of Nebraska, full-time paid firefighter, who has the unfortunate illness of cancer is going to bring a claim against the appropriate authorities. Pension officials and everyone else can count that now. Every firefighter who qualifies, with or without this section, will bring a claim. It's actuarially predictable in some statistical sense. All this bill says is that each individual firefighter, by themselves, linked up with a lawyer does not have to go out and find all of the expert technical assistance necessary to make the...the initial case in chief. Rather, the firefighters can come, if they qualify under the preconditions of this section, they can assert they...I'm trying to think of the word, caught cancer, they have cancer by reason of their service, and then each of the cities involved can have one lawyer on their staff dealing with one constant expert who becomes trained and very knowledgeable in the defenses of cancer claims, can deal efficiently and effectively with regard to those claims. This doesn't change the process. Doesn't change the making of the claim. Doesn't change the fact that you'll have to...it'll have to go to an adjudicated result unless it can be compromised or settled efficiently and effectively. This truly, I believe, is a, is a tempest in a teapot or an unnecessary firestorm. I just don't think we ought to discredit ourselves by throwing this out now just because there's a lot of language flowing around. I respectfully urge the defeat of the motion.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Brashear. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President and members of the body. Senator Brashear basically said what I was going to say so I'll be brief. I do think that he's absolutely correct in the, in the respect that the legislative intent is entirely clear, that the language is clear, that this is prima facie evidence. All the debate will demonstrate that. Any court that's looking at this is going to look at the, at the debate and the pure language of the statute, not the title of the bill. The title of the bill is not going to cause a rebuttable presumption to be built into the law. That's extraordinarily clear as far as I'm concerned. The only other comment I would