

will occur, and I would provide this analysis for you to consider. Why would the director think that we would provide additional buildings for programming when we won't even fund the basic need of housing? So it appears to me to be purely logical, although this is pure speculation on my part, that it makes more sense to come in and acquire these buildings on a temporary basis because of the crisis that's now before us even though it's existed for a number of years, then go ahead and at a later time promote the development of the permanent facility and then also as an outcome have these facilities for the program use that more than likely the Legislature wouldn't fund without this particular scenario before us. You know, I think it's evident that none of us on the Appropriations Committee reached their independent decisions without a great deal of thought and study, and I certainly understand the pressure from the Governor to do something now. However, I think those of us that are in this for the long term should address this with the long-term view. And I believe that is going ahead and building the permanent facility that's been out there for a number of years. I think that we need to in fact do what Senator Chambers is somewhat discussing in that we ought to try to show true leadership and avoid the easy way out. To recap some of my comments, I think this is a critical decision. I believe that if this amendment is adopted it will only delay the building of the permanent facility. I certainly think that having the plans in place to do something next year is certainly better than what we have had the last couple of years, which is no plan at all. So I contend that the courts would in fact recognize this. But also more importantly, I think we need to be concerned based upon...

SENATOR COORDSEN: One minute.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...the director's testimony about the correction officers, about the offenders because I think that is in fact a real problem and could create definite financial considerations down the road. So I hope that the membership understands the issue that these are in fact only intended to be used on a temporary basis to house inmates, then to be used for programming. Under that scenario, they might be able to last 30 or 40 years, but housing inmates on a continual basis they will not last that long based upon the...what has occurred in other states. So I oppose the amendment and urge the membership to reject it.