

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

February 1, 2005 LB 89

come from Nebraska dentists. However, to cover the dentists that would come from Kansas and other states, as I understand the program, they would go back through the same process as physicians and others go through in that they have to clearly demonstrate not only to their home state officials regarding these credentials and their ability to have insurance to cover the type of problems that have been alluded to here this morning, but that these would be acceptable and comparable to those here in Nebraska. So, in closing, I think one of the things that we want to do is let's keep an open mind about this of what the intent is. I certainly respect what Senator Chambers is talking about, is let's not create a nice charitable program and then have it as a means for a few that might sneak under the guise of a good program to decrease or destroy the quality of dentistry in this state. The one question I'd have, and if Senator Chambers would educate me on this, is that it would seem to me that, in suing the state, would you be suing the right person in this instance as opposed to suing the dentist?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, would you respond?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That is a very good and appropriate question. In putting the amendment up, I wanted to have the essence of it before the body, and I believe language can be crafted which would point out that, since the state is authorizing this program, the state is waiving its immunity. And if a person suffers harm, the state would be the one for that person to go to, to obtain redress. Yes, I believe the Legislature can authorize...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...suits against the state wherever it chooses to do so.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I meant within constitutional limits, of course.