

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

March 26, 2003 LB 46

However, I want it clear on the record and to those who support these aspects of the bill to know that we've got a lot of work to do and we can eliminate a lot of this surplusage without hurting the bill at all, in my opinion. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Beutler, on the Brashear amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Brashear, since we're focusing on this probation officer discretion provision on page 19 and the related definitions and that whole concept, let me take this a little further and inquire on a couple other things, and also give you the opportunity to explain what that whole provision is about, what we're trying to do there. And...well, and perhaps I would just open with that. Maybe would you care to explain a little bit what the general idea is that we're trying to do with this provision that's helpful to the system?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you respond, Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Beutler. Yes, I'd be pleased to respond and endeavor to. We are confronted with a system now in which statutorily we do not allow any of the discretion which we're attempting to create here, so that if a probation officer is confronted by somebody...let's understand probation is the suspension of further or worse punishment. It's granting somebody an intermediate sanction in the hope that they will not need incarceration.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Clarify for me, under the current law, if there's a violation of probation, the only prerogative of the probation officer is to seek revocation of probation with the judge? Is that...tell us a little more what current law is.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Revocation or discipline from the court, which would require going back to the court and having a hearing and having a decision, and that's what I referred to earlier. Whenever we're saving court and prosecutorial and defense time, we call that judicial economy because we're not further