

February 23, 1973

(Start Belt #10)

not as a board, not as a political subdivision, but as an individual. When we are dealing with school boards, particularly we are dealing with people who serve because they are interested in serving their community on this board without pay, and therefore it seems unfair to impose upon this individual, the further liability of having his property, his estate get with a clouding of title and everything else with a law suit, and then not know for sure whether or not there is authority under the law to have the school board or the other political subdivision in the case of these other boards and committees to pay for such liability insurance. This is what we could call an act of indemnification of these individuals. Again I stated it is not over and against the individual employee, the amendments as Senator Carstens said were only for clarification, because the employees can already be covered by an insurance policy. So this only applies to the individual board member and his or her personal liability.

SPEAKER: Are there any amendments to the bill? The Chair recognizes Senator Carpenter.

SENATOR CARPENTER: Now, Mr. President, I think you ought to read this bill, and this has been too long in coming, and it shouldn't be permissive. This bill says the governing body of any political subdivision in this state. It says may, I propose to strike may, and insert the word shall, provide it's members with personal liability insurance, covers insuring against liability and claim arising by the reason of any act or mission in any manner relating to the performance, to the performance, attempted performance, or fair performance of the official duties as such member shall authorize, may authorize the payment of the premium cost. We have had, as I recall in the past, a lot of employees, who unless they carry this insurance themselves, were open to law suits and many of them were because they didn't know that and maybe if they did know it, they couldn't have carried the insurance. Now this is why, as I understand it, if I'm incorrect I hope Senator Luedtke will bring it out, this is in the performance of their duties working for a subdivision of Government. Now it seems to me when they are working for the Government, the Government ought to protect them from the liability, which this bill attempts to do, and if it's good for one, it's good for all of them. Why should we give them the choice of whether to do it or whether they don't, if you are out here driving a tractor or something for the state highway department, and you're not covered because the department hasn't made the choice, of doing it, it's not much of a remedy to you. Now I'm not trying, I don't think this should be a controversial bill, I don't think my amendment should be controversial either, maybe it is, but somewhere along the line, these things I think and the way we live and the fact we have many people who live on law suits like this and I wouldn't take that privilege away from them, but you know the courts they are giving the awards and damages that go into a lot of money, and you can not cover a man and the performance of his public duty in the area in which he is employed, and you could ruin him for life insofar as his financial situation is concerned. All I'm saying, if it is good to put the may in there, then it's better to make them do it and that's the only purpose and I presume that if you adopt this amendment you'd also have to strike the other place where I authorize the amendment from may to shall, and I'd like to get anybody's reaction to this. This is a great bill, and it's too long in coming, and it won't cost a lot of money because a lot of people are going to be insured that are not now insured, and because of that fact, because of the large amount, why of course the payment goes down based upon the limitation and this doesn't say what the coverage should be, they might cover these people for a million dollars for example, maybe a reasonable