

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

March 26, 2003 LB 46

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Mr. President, members of the body. And Senator Synowiecki, I also understand that you had a commitment, and thank you for bringing it. We all have those kinds of commitments. And thank you for bringing the amendment, and thank you for the discussion. And thank you for the indication of willingness to work it out. We must resolve this in the interest of all the people, and we will. So I'm not...I heard you say that you would consider withdrawing the amendment, and you will work with us. And I pledge to work with you. So I just want to continue the dialogue, because there's...you're absolutely right. In some instances, we're getting exactly what we're trying to put in statute. And so your question is fair, why should we put it in statute? The problem is that the testimony in the record before the working group is not that we're getting it uniformly in all instances everywhere. I suspect that in your...you have great statewide experience, but I think your...you've specifically referenced your Douglas County experience. I think in Douglas County it may well be happening. And it's happening because we have a statute...I'm looking at it, 29-2266...which specifically gives the court the discretion. And if I might just read from a portion: the court, the court may, on the basis of such report and such further investigation as it may deem appropriate, suspend any further proceedings, instruct the probation officer to handle the matter informally without instituting formal revocation procedures, or refer the matter to the county attorney. The court may. We are simply trying to move down to the front line that same kind of discretion to the people who are in a position on the most timely and efficient basis to make a decision within the parameters that we establish as a matter of public policy, as opposed to these broad discretions which now reside with the court and the court only. Admittedly, some courts are delegating it. Some courts are not. Some courts are telling a probation officer to do what's best. They're specifying it within an order. Some courts are not. We're trying to make uniform the policy. We're trying to practice judicial economy. And at least in part, we're motivated by a belief that the people on the front line who are dealing with the probationers are in the best position to exercise appropriate discretion. So that's the positive side of the motivation behind the effort.