

May 27, 1981

LB 213

will commit. Iowa, dangerous to public peace and safety is their standard. Committed to security hospital until, one, no longer considered so dangerous and, two, demonstrates good mental health. Kansas, finding of not guilty by reason of insanity is that person committed act, lacked criminal intent and the Supreme Court decision in Kansas said that dangerousness is legal, not a medical decision. That was a landmark case. Louisiana, automatic commitment in capital cases. In other felonies hold hearing to determine if can be released without danger to others or self.

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: I could go on. In New Jersey they undergo psychiatric examination and danger to community or self treated after commitment. I could go on and on. As I say there are thirty states who do have some kind of jurisdiction and those who I read you have other standards than the civil commitment standards. This is nothing new, well, actually, since our civil mental health commitment landmark case in '73 which said that no one could be held unless they were dangerous, and that was a standard that was added, this is where the problem has arisen. It used to be a much tougher punishment to be found not guilty by reason of insanity and since that landmark decision in the early '70s more and more advantage is being taken with that plea. I think it is good sense for Nebraska to make that change and I urge you to not adopt Senator Nichol' amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would relinquish my time to Senator Hoagland if he should desire it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Hoagland, will you respond.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Yes, I would like, Mr. President, if I might, to use just a minute or two of Senator Cope's time.

PRESIDENT: Continue.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: In order to kind of complete and round out the remarks that all of us are making in behalf of the bill I think Senator Pirsch also, as did Senator Cullan, has made an excellent legal record pointing out that a number of other states have different standards that they apply to people that have been through the criminal process and people that have not and I think the standards that she cited and the states which have those standards which have