

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

May 3, 1999

LB 355

important. For the purposes that...the first two years, we're simply going to use a list of conditions, and those are schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, delusional disorder, bipolar affective disorder, major depression, and obsessive-compulsive disorder. That's to tell the world, that's the list of serious mental illnesses that we think this bill covers. After two years, after we've told the world what we think, we adopt basically a definition from South Dakota that says, serious mental illness is any mental health condition that requires medical science...that medical science affirms is caused by a biological disorder of the brain and that substantially limits the life activities of the person with the serious mental illness. Serious mental illness includes...and here is some new ideas...but is not limited to schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, delusional disorder...in other words, the same six things that we listed before. Why the difference? The difference is this. We want science to be able to grow. And as science confirms serious mental illnesses, at the other end of this process we want them to be able to be defined into a definition that would accept them. We do not want providers to ratchet up existing mental illnesses that are regarded as significant but not as serious as these, to try to ratchet them up to coverage in this bill. We're trying to say, look, it's...these are six things, and then when science confirms that there's a seventh, we'll add that at the other end of the four years. We do not want, for example, depression which is not major depression to be ratcheted up to the serious mental illness coverage. So that's the first thing. I want you to know that there's a definition that works for two years, and then a broader definition that kicks in after those two years and for times thereafter. The second thing I wanted you to know was that there is an informal understanding, and that is that the proponents of this measure will not bring a measure that substantially broadens this for four years, that as we get into this system, as we transition into these definitions, we're going to give this a try and see what it does. Now, there is some understanding that if there are unintended consequences, we will meet, confer, and consider amendments. But to come back next year with a wide-open mandate would be a violation of the informal understandings. And I'm just reporting that to the floor so you'll know that that exists. As I said, Senator Robak gave a good, thorough explanation of the committee amendments,