

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

April 28, 1999 LB 882

this brought to an end. So, by my offering the amendment and arguing for it, I don't want you to think I'm discounting what you said or the validity of what you said. Things cause pain to people. People in pain do not have the complete freedom of will in making a choice that somebody not suffering pain would have. For your will to be free, there must be no outside coercion or pressure of a kind that would affect you in such a way that you will go left, because of that pressure, rather than right, which is the way you would have gone without it. And in this instance people can be worn down, they can be worn out, they can be depressed, they can be disheartened. And this is a lot of times the reason a person gets a counselor, a lawyer, or some other person to stand in for that individual. The one standing in may be ever so sympathetic and empathetic, but that person has a degree of detachment and objectivity which is necessary, especially when you're dealing with a highly emotional situation. That person who stands in must have a degree of detachment. I'm sure that if Senator Redfield was going to get an operation she would want the doctor to be empathetic and sympathetic, as well as highly competent, but she wouldn't want that doctor to be so sympathetic and empathetic that as soon as he made an incision and saw blood, he would scream and faint. That's not what you want from the doctor. So in this instance what I'm offering is what I think would be fair for the family. Now if research, which is being undertaken, establishes that we cannot raise a claim, raise the amount of it, increase the amount of it, I will drop the amendment immediately. But I'm still not sure I would support paying the claim. To not pay the claim is not to deny recovery to the family. What it may do is send the Attorney General back with his incompetent self and offer this family a greater amount by way of a settlement. There are a number of ways to skin a cat. I was discussing this with Senator Schimek just the other day. And if you just want to take two ways, Senator Byars, to do it easy, you can skin it from the tail to the head, or you can skin it from the head to the tail. Either way you start, the result is the same. If you want to get very exotic, you can cut the feet off and skin it from the feet up, but you'd have to make some cuts in the pelt. There is always more than one way to do a thing. Maybe my colleagues think that this amount that is in the claim is fair. Maybe they share the opinion which I expressed very directly, and the opinion that the Speaker more delicately and