

I'm sorry I didn't hear all of what you said, but what I did...I did hear I understood and appreciate what you are saying. The...I am going to, maybe we won't get to the next section, so I am going to speak about it just a little bit, and one of the reasons that I think it is important that we adopt that section is that there are some concerns about the changes in the good-time provisions and how they will affect inmates and how they will affect the administering of the law at the penitentiary, and I think there needs to be a little bit of time to see how that...see how that could be structured, and if the law isn't worded quite the way it should be, it does give us an opportunity next January to come back, hopefully, and clean it up if it needs cleaning up. So the operative date changes from January 1 to July 1 I think are relatively important. Although I think it's real important that we get those provisions into the law, and I guess, Senator Chambers, I would like to ask you a question if you would yield to a question.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, I would.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Yield, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR BROMM: From a philosophical standpoint or from your view in terms of how we handle prisoners and that sort of thing, do you feel it is a positive step that we are taking with the modifications we are making in good time, in other words, the personalized program plans for people and requiring them to participate in education and that kind of thing in order to qualify for additional...I mean from...would you just comment how you feel about that. I really haven't heard you say. Maybe I've just missed it but I haven't really heard it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Although I think this area needs some tightening up as it exists in the bill now, I think it is a positive step in the right direction beyond question.

SENATOR BROMM: In my view, finally it gets to trying to do something with people while they are there in terms of some positive steps and giving them an incentive to participate in bettering themselves, giving them an incentive that maybe has been there to some extent, but certainly hasn't been as clear as it is in this...in this law. Would you...would you agree with that?