

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 27, 1999 LB 880

here is going to test our credibility, I know that. I can tell you that right now. I'm sure there are phone calls galore coming in. So with that, I'm going to oppose the Brown amendment and hope that other folks do too. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Baker. Senator Brown, followed by Don Pederson, Beutler and Schimek. Senator Brown waives. Senator Don Pederson.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the body, some people have asked me, when they saw my light on, what am I going to say, and I really haven't known for sure what I was going to say, but will just start in and I'll give you my feelings. Why did we have a bill for a work camp in the first place? We had a group of younger people generally who would have otherwise gone to a penitentiary, but the work camp gave them an opportunity to go into a situation where, if we were calling them very young people, very adolescent people, we'd call it early intervention, and that's what we were trying to do, was to prevent these people from going into the...into the penal system. This is a diversion away from going into the correctional complex. So it gave the first-time offenders the opportunity not to become hardened criminals. And, generally, I think the study showed that most of these people either had an alcohol problem or some...some substance abuse problem, and it gave an opportunity to analyze what that problem was and to attempt to get them some treatment. So that's the reason why I was supporting the work camp. I think that it's a concept that they can get some early attention that they're obviously not getting before they go into that situation. Now, as far as the amendment is concerned, I think that undoubtedly we do need additional facilities for Geneva and Kearney. I would rather have seen that come up as a separate request for funds because I think these are not necessarily the same thing, and I've seen it happen here this year, several times, where there's a sum of money and we think, well, rather than spend it for that, let's spend it for this. We're diverting funds and I don't think that's an appropriate way to view things. Simply because you have money available doesn't mean that you should take it from program and put it into another. Everything should be based upon its own merit, and that's why I think this has merit, I think it should have been presented as a separate bill and, in