

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

March 15, 2005      LB 206

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I think Senator Byars gave a good explanation of the situation with regard to those who may do harm to themselves. And I think it's important that we understand, if I understand him correctly, that we've left a large measure of responsibility here in the guardians and in the caretakers, and they're not absolved from responsibility in any way and have a specially serious responsibility with regard to particular individuals who may have a tendency to harm themselves. The second and last question, Senator Byars, that I would like to have a short discussion with you on is the age limit in the bill. As I understand the bill, it applies, or can be applied, to individuals who are 18 and older. Is that correct?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Byars.

SENATOR BYARS: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. As you know, in the criminal justice system and at least in the mental health act, I didn't see any age limitation there either. And in the criminal justice system, we may treat those who are younger differently but they're still taken into the system and dealt with in some comprehensive fashion. I'm not altogether sure I feel comfortable with a strict age limit, but maybe I would. In any event, give us the rationale for why this bill would have a strict 18 age limit when...and remembering now that we're talking about the bill itself which only applies to harm to others. So if we're talking about individuals, those very few individuals in the system who might have that potential, might not that potential exist before age 18, and should this not...should not this bill comprehend that possibility and allow in some way for the system to engage those people rather than what I presume to be the alternative that the system may simply throw those people in jail, for example, if they weren't satisfied with what the guardian was wanting to do? In other words, aren't we arguably better off allowing this piece of legislation to create a new situation, even for people that are younger than 18, than to endure the old system in the case of those under 18? That's my question, if I haven't made it too complicated.