

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

March 31, 2003 LB 265

In the bill, we're talking about just the direct cost of that check as being part of the fiscal note. But there are processing costs, time that it takes to run these, that are probably a separate issue. But one of the things that came up in those discussions dealing with a lot of other issues that happen whenever you're sitting around for a full day once a month kicking things around were, what is available publicly, or what is available to law enforcement, dealing with mental history records? And so, Senator Tyson, did I hear you say that it's your understanding that law enforcement has access to aspects of mental health commitment, or a person adjudged mentally incompetent? Senator Tyson, would you be willing to answer?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Tyson, would you...?

SENATOR TYSON: I believe that that is available to them, yes.

SENATOR THOMPSON: Well, some...I'm going to...thank you, Senator Tyson. I'm getting conflicting information on this. And so I'm going to spend a little more time on that particular issue of what is public information. But I also think that we need the regulations to define sections of this. For example, this says the sheriff shouldn't issue if the person is currently adjudged mentally incompetent. Now, I don't know who determines that. I'm assuming they're talking about a court. I don't know how that's determined. And I think that's important if we're going to pass this legislation, that that needs to be clarified. Also "or a similar law of another jurisdiction," I don't know how a local sheriff is going to know what similar laws they should be looking at besides the Nebraska Mental Health Commitment Act. I think that's a little vague. And that's the reason that we have our departments issue rules and regulations, so that we set some standards, and also guide the people in the field who are supposed to be upholding the laws that we enact. I think that's a pretty serious obligation we have, regardless of how you feel about the whole issue. If this is going to pass, it's got to be workable for the people in our communities that have to carry it out. When you say "Is not habitually in an intoxicated or drugged condition," I think there should be some definition to that, so that there's consistency throughout