

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

March 15, 2005 LB 206

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...being harmed and they can't help themselves. Did you say time?

SENATOR CUDABACK: I did, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bourne, followed by Senators Byars and Beutler.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I just kind of want to redirect the debate so that everybody kind of understands what we're talking about. The original version of the bill had an absolute immunity provision. And again what we're talking about is an individual who has been diagnosed as developmentally disabled. If they do something that would require the police to be called, way it works now, as I understand it, is that individual is arrested and can be placed in jail. And what Senator Byars is proposing is that individual would be...still could be arrested, but would be taken to the least restrictive means of confinement, which could often be a facility. And so, to boil it all down, in Senator Beutler's (sic) original version of the bill, he had an absolute immunity provision. The committee amendment is what I felt was a compromise. We had a...we had the hearing, of course. And quite honestly, in the hearing Senator Chambers expressed the exact concern that he's raising today, and we attempted to address that in the committee amendment. Now, what Senator Chambers is proposing is to eliminate the immunity provision in the committee amendment, as well as the immunity provision in the green copy of the bill, and set forth, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, and set forth a general negligence standard. And what that means is that that facility would owe a duty to the developmentally disabled person. That duty was breached, that person was hurt, and...or damaged, and the cause of the damage was due to the breach of the duty that the facility owed to the individual. I, like Senator Beutler, intend to support the bill whether Senator Chambers' amendment is adopted or not. I do think it's a good piece of legislation. My only concern is, is that these facilities might not accept these individuals. And I