

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

January 29, 2004 LB 172

the only state. One of the bills which is in law and has been law for over a decade says that if an innocent third party is injured as a result of a police chase, then the political subdivision or the state, which hires that law enforcement officer, will make that innocent third party whole by responding in damages. Unfortunately, there is another provision of law that limits the recovery. So there are people who have been injured and the maximum recovery allowed under the general law of the state did not permit that family to recover the total cost of medical bills. But Nebraska is the only state with a law such as that and it has been discussed in academic circles, in legal circles, in legislative circles, but I would never say, throw that aside because other states don't do the same thing. When I am confronted with a piece of legislation that is on the books from another state and somebody wanting that to be put into law in Nebraska comes to me and says 19, 20, or however many other states have enacted this exact language into law, why not Nebraska? I'd say, because I don't believe that the law is prudent. And they ask me, why do I think these other states adopted it? Instead of saying I think they're rubber stamps and they're dumb because all of their laws have the same language, I just tell them it's because those legislatures lack a person such as myself who will weed this stuff out and fight it and keep their law books from being cluttered with nonsensical, unconstitutional legislation. In the case before us, we have a proposition that has been in the law for a good number of years. It has not caused any problem of any significance. When Senator Withem carried a bill that Senator Foley talked about, Senator Withem was probably carrying water for the school institution, the schools. Whatever they can get out of doing, they probably would like to. I don't carry water for any of those groups or any special interest group when they are trying to take something away that I believe the people who benefit from that something need it. I believe young women in the category bracketed by the existing law within the years, the grade levels of the existing law, need this information. They are entitled to the information. I believe they ought to continue to have access to it. Nobody has ever shown or attempted to show that as a result of this information being available abortion had been advocated and somebody who would not have gotten an abortion otherwise got it because this information persuaded her