

times that it seems to come back to me. I have done some checking in my area and with the sheriffs that are affected in my district, and it seems that their opinion is why change it, we just kind of got used to the change a couple of years ago, it's working. We have work release for many prisoners. The average sentence is 30 days. You know, if you're going to cut it in half, pretty soon why bother. They're generally not in favor of it. Now, I understand from Senator Chambers' statements, or maybe Senator Lindsay's, that when we changed the good time provisions for the State Penitentiary, the correctional officials brought the bill, the Governor brought the bill, and they were very supportive of it, and probably for economic and disciplinary reasons, and it probably made a lot of sense. I'm asking, who's bringing the bill here? Where is the crying need to do this? The county sheriffs are meeting tomorrow or very soon and they'll take a position on this. My feeling is, from the ones I've talked to, they will not be in favor. Those are the people in charge of the jails. If there's a great overcrowding condition and economic problem, folks, we should be hearing from the county officials, we should be hearing from the county sheriffs. We're not. Where is the data? Is this a Lancaster County problem? Is it a Douglas County problem? If it is, let us know the extent of the problem, where are the facts, where's the data, where is the people to back up the fact that we need to change the law? Now, this might be a nice idea. It might make it uniform, that's not enough. This is too serious of a problem to do it just to make it uniform or because it fits nicely in the law to do it. So, therefore, at this point, I have to stand opposed to it for the reasons that I've stated. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. The Chair recognizes Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. Again, I rise in support of the advancement of LB 234. Senator Witek asked if someone from the committee would address what Diane Riebe, who represented MADD, spoke to. She stated that she was in opposition to the bill because she felt that it meant that individuals who were sentenced to 48 hours in jail would only have to serve half that time. It was explained that that was not the case, as it's been explained on the floor here today. And then she, on two different occasions, said that the people have spoken. And after the second time I asked the question, well, what did the people say? And the question...or the