

per Parole Officer. In some instances the case load per officer is as much as 150 or 60 individuals. I think you will find that it is impossible for any individual to supervise that number of persons. We have been faced with the necessity of looking at the crowded conditions in our Penal Complex, and only yesterday I believe it was the courts have ordered the neighboring State of Iowa to reduce their prison population. This amendment will do a little bit of good in that area. I would hope that you would view it in the context which is offered. It is offered in good faith. I do not think that the present system can function with the reduced staff. They need to have additional staff. I have agreed with the administration for some time on this, and I know that there are a variety of opinions, but I want to say that at this time, in my opinion, the amendment is a valid one and one which deserves your support. I want to say again, it costs about \$128 per individual to supervise a person who is on parole. It costs many, many times that to have an individual confined in the Penal Complex. There is very little rehabilitation that takes place in the Penal Complex. If rehabilitation occurs, it takes place outside of that complex. But rehabilitation will not occur unless proper supervision is given. It is absolutely impossible to parole an individual and not give that person the proper supervision. So, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I ask your support of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner, do you wish to discuss the matter?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, briefly to rise to oppose the amendment and explain the committee's action and the reasons for it. It's quite obvious, Senator Schmit, that there has been increase in case load, and that is correct. The statistics that we looked at and were furnished also would indicate that. In the process of reviewing this, the request for five additional probation officers and three clerks was included on our sheets of what we call priority 1, the first time going through the total budgets. This particular amount was finally eliminated, however, at about one of the subsequent times going through trying to get a budget that was within the goals for total recommended level of expenditures that the committee was going to submit to the Legislature. To give you a couple of other things that would have been factors that we considered, one would be the fact that these additional officers were not in the Governor's budget. It was true that last year we added two which were subsequently vetoed out. Then we did move as a committee at that time to override that veto and add them back in which was not successful, as I recall. Then there is another factor that