

in the Nebraska State Bar Association position paper that I have before me, that...it says some Nebraska attorneys who have studied LB 183 have raised additional concern that a shifting of the burden of proof to the defendant would result in the possibility of jury confusion. Good night! If we have not had jury confusion in the past over trying to determine whether insanity was involved or not, I don't know what we have had. So I certainly feel that the confusion has existed before, and hopefully this bill and this decision would take away some of that indecision, and not put that burden on the jurors to the effect that it has in the past. I, personally, believe that we are all insane to a degree at certain times in our lives. I think that if you lose your temper occasionally or if you can't control your emotions at times, I used to throw hammers when I got angry, until I broke the handle out of one one day and decided it was foolish. But I think that in a fit of anger, and also many other times that people lose their reasoning. It doesn't mean they shouldn't be responsible for their actions. You know I broke the handle out of that hammer. That was certainly my fault. There wasn't anybody else made me do it. So I favor the bill that Senator Pirsch and Senator Hefner have brought before us. I was rather surprised that the Governor vetoed it. I think it would be a step forward in determining cases that are witnessed, even been on television, of a murder committed, and yet the person involved gets off with a rather light sentence because of the plea of insanity. If that is justice, then I wonder what justice really means to us. Therefore, rather than make a long speech, I'm going pretty good, I could go on forever, but I think we should, this morning, stand up and be counted and back Senator Pirsch and Senator Hefner on their override attempt. Thank you.

**SPEAKER NICHOL:** Senator Harold Sieck.

**SENATOR SIECK:** Mr. President, members of the body, I have a lot of emotions on this particular issue. I don't want to open the law, and that's what it looks like we're doing. I just feel that, with the speeches that were given the other day, this sets a precedent. I feel by changing this law it really isn't going to make a lot of difference. If I look