

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

March 16, 2004 LB 1084

duty to do, but you don't do it. So if you commit a violation through negligence, why should you not be punished, but somebody who has...who is in a state of deliberate ignorance of the truth is punished? The negligent person knows his or her duty, or should know it, and does not carry it out. But that person is not punished. Isn't that true?

SENATOR ERDMAN: There is the exemption. And I do agree that...if I made the comment that Senator Beutler's example was a mistake, that was obviously not my intent. But, yeah, the individual that created...did it by mistake or mere negligence would not be covered under this act; but an individual who deliberately acted in ignorance...or had deliberate ignorance or reckless regard would be. And the language that's there, as far as "no proof of specific intent to defraud is required," was also some of the language that we agreed upon when working with the hospitals and others that testified in opposition as far as who or who would not be covered under this act.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If you...oh, and I'm past that "mistake" thing. I was just mentioning that those are exemptions. If a person has actual knowledge of the information, what information is that talking about?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: One minute.

SENATOR ERDMAN: If you could tell me where you're reading from?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, okay, in line 10.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Line 10.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: On page 3.

SENATOR ERDMAN: "Has actual knowledge of the information." The information generally would refer to the claim or the act that was committed, or, excuse me, the false claim that was committed.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would the person have knowledge that the information is false? I mean, are we talking about the