

May 7, 1981

LB 95

the complete proceedings done. They may say they are going to revoke it, but I don't think it would be effective. I think they would have to go through the mental health proceedings. And so I would urge you to strike the section unless Senator Cullan or some of the others have some compelling reason to keep it in or think it will work, because I do believe if you will check with the Attorney General maybe or analyze it yourselves, you will find it probably is unconstitutional and I think it might jeopardize the rest of the bill. So I urge you to at least examine it. I will only offer the amendment if you feel comfortable with it. If you don't, I will withdraw it and let you check it out yourself, whatever you think is right, but I think it's got a problem there. I had a lot better explanation for this but it's kind of complicated.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, I, as always of course, appreciate Senator DeCamp's help, but being the inquisitive sort of person I am and not as well educated in the law and so forth as some people might be, I would appreciate, even though it may take a couple minutes, a more detailed explanation from Senator DeCamp as to what the constitutional problems with Section 44 might be. And so, Senator DeCamp, I would like to yield to you for a second, at least, some time so that you could educate me on what the real constitutional problems with this are.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Okay, I'll tell you what, give me five minutes and I will get it in terms that I can kind of explain it so it's something I could understand if it were explained to me, and I will do that if you will let me rest for five minutes and meditate.

SENATOR CULLAN: Well....(interruption).

SENATOR DeCAMP: Is that okay?

SENATOR CULLAN: Well, maybe you can visit with me about it later, but I am familiar with the....I guess I am going to rise at this point in time to ask you to oppose the DeCamp amendment. There is a potential for some discussion and some debate as to whether or not this particular section will withstand scrutiny. I think it will. I think it is clear that it will. This statute is based on a hybrid of the Illinois statute which provides for conditional release. It is different in