

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

February 3, 1999 LB 46

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm not opposed to this bill at all, in fact I think its general thrust is a wholesome one. But I did not vote to send it out because...and I didn't resist its coming out, but I am kind of in that area where Senator Beutler's question went. In a way, we allow, to use Senator Beutler's language, the question to be begged. Maybe the autopsies' purpose is to determine whether there was anything suspicious. But that puts you in a circular argument because somebody might say, well there would have to be something suspicious to cause you to do it, so that's what triggers the autopsy. So it's one of those close questions that makes it difficult to articulate, but I'm sure everybody, in listening to the discussion, will get the sense of what it is that Senator Beutler and which I am interested in trying to be clear about in terms of how the bill will operate. I do not think that the bill, by being passed even in its current form, will be a basis for covering up suspicious deaths. I think with the passage of it there may be more care, at least in some counties, in making sure that there are no strange or unusual circumstances. So this is one of those that I'm going to have to, more or less, accept on faith, because I'm not sure what language could be put in that would completely resolve the difficulties that I see with the bill. One thing that does help this amendment that the committee added and that's all three of these, or however many elements there are, must be present. The "and" is a connector of suspicious circumstances to the trauma or the accident. The mere fact that it looks like an accident is not enough to do away with an autopsy, the mere fact that there was trauma, or even apparently a recognizable disease, if there is something suspicious then the autopsy should take place. And I'd like to ask Senator Brashear something for the record, in case anybody wants to refer to it.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, is it your understanding, and do you think it was the understanding of the committee, from the discussions that we had, that "suspicious" is prob...the use of that word is probably the lowest threshold that you could