

decides it's different. That's an option for anybody to consider, but I wanted people like myself who will definitely be voting against this bill, and people who I've talked to saying, well, you know, there's some problems with talking to different people about maybe some of the prisons or jails, jails, I'll use this correctly, some of the jails may need to have these provisions and some already are very happy with the two for one. So what I thought to do was allow the sentencing judge to determine at the time that he sentences the individual. Some of these crimes, I think, are worth keeping an individual incarcerated for their full sentence, except for the good time that we already have, which is two for one, so they're going to get two for one anyway. But some of these, like assaults and motor vehicle homicide, some of these things, I think, we should consider that six months is not a very long time to serve for some of these crimes and that we should let that stand. I want to let that stand, but if there's people who want to lower the good time but don't want to make it mandatory and a blanket good time to include everybody who is sentenced to a city or county jail for whatever crime, whether it would be a very violent crime, what I would consider a very violent crime, or a nonviolent crime. We make no discretion in this bill and we haven't made any discretion at any time on discussions of good time since I've been here. I think it's time we start considering making a change. If you want to allow good time, acknowledge that there is a difference in some of these crimes, in some of these individuals who are being sentenced. A sentencing judge would be right there able to determine the differences of the crime that was committed of the individual on whether it was a second offense or a third offense and we would leave that up to that sentencing judge to determine whether that individual would be allowed to have good time applied to his sentence. There is no mechanism in statute to deny good time, once you put this in like this, for city and county there is nothing there that says that they won't get their good time. If they follow these rules of behavior, they're going to get their good...well, what they do is they get the good time and then if they're bad, then they get them taken away, is what I understand. You can correct me if I'm wrong. So what I'm saying is this is an opportunity, if you adopt this amendment, to make...make it at the discretion of the sentencing judge to determine, at that time, whether that individual will be eligible or not for good time. And I'm talking about if you want to put the one for one in, you go right ahead and do that if you've got the majority vote. I'm very happy with the way