

April 1, 1981

LB 113A, 179, 292, 292A,
317, 327, 479.

amendments; 113A, Select File; 327, Select File; 317, Select File; 292, Select File with amendments; 292A, Select File; 479, Select File. All signed by Senator Kilgarin as Chair, Mr. President. (See pages 1235 through 1238 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER MARVEL: The next order of business is Final Reading, item #4. All legislators will please take your seats so we can proceed with Final Reading. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The first bill on Final Reading is LB 179E. Senator Koch, your light is on, did you wish to be recognized? Okay. LB 179E.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on the desk. Senator Hoagland moves to return LB 179 to Select File for a specific amendment, and there are copies that have been distributed, Mr. President.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we had intended to have this printed in the Journal but we adjourned abruptly enough yesterday so it was not done, and I apologize for that. I would ask you to turn to page 19 of the bill. This is an amendment which is of a technical nature basically, in my opinion, and I apologize for holding up final passage of a bill as long as this to get this change made or to seek this change made but I think it is important enough to do it. If you turn to page 19 and review Section 12 of the bill, there is an inference there in that section that if there is a lawsuit filed against a public employee or public official and that lawsuit is successful, why then the public official or public employee has to pay the entire damages out of his own pocket if the jury in that lawsuit or the court in that lawsuit finds that his action was not reasonable or that his action was not in good faith. Now, what the amendment would provide is that the political subdivision that he is working for will pay the judgment against him as long as he operated...let me get the language here, within the scope of his office or employment. The amendment goes on to provide that there is nothing that should be construed to prevent the discipline of an employee or an official who does not act reasonably and in good faith in the performance of his duties. Now the reason I think this is important is because if this particular provision stays in the law, in my opinion it is going to scare the living daylights out of a lot of public officials and a lot of public employees and they are not going to execute their statutory functions as they should. Now let me try and give you two examples of why I think this could have a detrimental