

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

May 4, 1999

LB 880

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a...I have a priority motion. Senator Bohlke would move to reconsider the vote on Senator Wehrbein's amendment, AM1613.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Bohlke, you're recognized to open on your motion to reconsider.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I don't do this very often, but I clearly did not understand fully what...the implications of the vote we made. As I indicated to you, I had some communication from constituents who had gotten some, I guess it's called technical assistance money, Senator Pedersen told me, that would lay the groundwork to get the grant under the Office of Community Justice. What we're talking about are...the people that contacted me is that they were looking at beginning the electronic monitoring that we have for some prisoners who do not need to be incarcerated, some other rehabilitation programs that then do not require prisoners to actually, for those nonviolent crimes, to be incarcerated. It seemed to me that it was pretty much the direction that I had heard Senator Pedersen talk about, that...the direction we should move. And so that's why I was confused when I originally came in. I think that it's important. I think that we have 12 counties, the counties here are Lincoln, Adams, Douglas, Lancaster, Dakota, Sherman, Thurston, Cheyenne, Dawson, Sarpy, Washington, those are all counties that have already gone ahead getting ready for the implementation and have done the work. It seems to me that to now say that was not necessary, we're not going to go ahead with this not only causes those counties some real heartburn, but truly the direction they were moving in looking at ways for addressing rehabilitation of criminals certainly was one that I thought that many of us had...had decided was the direction we should be moving if we're looking at prison space and who actually needs to be in prison and who does not and what are alternatives to going that direction. So that is the reason I filed the reconsideration and if there are any of the rest of you who did not understand the implications of that last vote, I believe there were 21 votes in order to put the wording back in that would allow the process to go forward.