

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

April 27, 1999      LB 880

further away, so that you can break old habits. We should decide the location of the work camp based on what's the best location for the programmatic content of a work camp. It's not that every location is exactly the same, because not every location has the same proximity to community, to community services, to health services, to education, or to any other support circumstances that you might want to have in a work camp. My suggestion, our budgeting priorities, it seems to me, is to do Geneva and Kearney, that's what we ought to do. If we need to delay the work camp we can. But those are the most crying needs we have--do Geneva, do Kearney. Work camp is needed, but I think the threshold or the period of time when we need to do that is down the road. I also think that a review of the existing plan for the work camp location is legitimate. I wouldn't substitute the Legislature's judgment for where it should be. I do think it's something that probably could be done across legislative and executive branch lines. I do think a reconsideration is reasonable, but I think the goal should be where would you put a work camp so that it had the most likely chance of success for affecting young people positively and deterring crime. And where that location winds up being, that's where we should put the work camp. Geneva first, Kearney second, work camp third, and analyze the work camp in terms of where, programmatically, it should be best located. And that's how I'd try to get out of this mess.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Don Pederson, on the Brown amendment.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Mr. President, members of the body, I would like to reiterate something that Senator Wehrbein said just a little while ago. The matters that we're talking about with Senator Thompson's bill was not presented to the Appropriations Committee. We did not consider that. I would look at it in this fashion--this bill was referenced to the Judiciary Committee, not to the Appropriations Committee. And had it come to the Appropriations Committee, we would have been able to view it in connection with the total budget involving health and human services and the matters that are affected by that. But we did not have that opportunity. So it isn't as if something was presented to the Appropriations Committee which they turned down. It simply was not brought to our attention,