

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

February 1, 2005 LB 175

of assisting in causing." And this is what would be left, and this is in existing language: "such dosage is not administered for the purpose of causing death for any reason," and then you continue, "and so long as it conforms to policies and guidelines for the treatment of pain" and so forth. So I think the language I'm striking is surplusage. It brings...it raises an issue which does not have to be raised. If medication, a drug, or whatever the term is that would be applied, is administered for the purpose of causing death, that person who administered it is culpable, will be held liable. On the other hand, if the dosage is administered and death results, but it was not administered for the purpose of causing death, there is no criminal or other culpability. Purpose goes to knowledge and intent. You have to know that what you're doing is going to bring about a result, and you have to intend that it bring about that result. So it would not be enough to convict a person to say that this dosage was given, the individual receiving it died, and it can be shown that the dosage caused the death. That is not enough. You have to go into the mind of the person who administered the dosage and consider what was in that person's mind at the time the dosage was administered. This other language that I'm striking, "or the purpose of assisting in causing," I think that would be virtually impossible of proof. But it could create a gray area where a person who otherwise would not be held culpable could be. It doesn't say, as I read it, that a death results. So you have two steps. No death resulted, but somebody might say, well, I don't like that doctor. I have watched him treat...the way he treated my relative--by that I meant the medical treatment accorded--and it's clear that he or she couldn't care less about the welfare of my relative. So I think that this dosage was given in order to assist my relative in dying before he or she would. And therefore, I'm moving to strike the language. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Jensen.

SENATOR JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. And, Senator Chambers, in response to your amendment, I guess where I would like to have you think about a little bit, first of all, at this point in time, I don't have a problem with that. And we could