

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

May 14, 2003

LB 46, 407

We have discussion in here that goes for eight hours that, with all due respect, sometimes doesn't do much, and it doesn't become a subject of talk radio or newspapers or whatever. I haven't read the papers, but I understand they're going to be fun to read tonight. I read the papers at night. I understand there's actually something in them worth reading. Good. I understand that what we did was a subject of talk radio. I'm glad. Because this (inaudible) of the public, where they just...where they never ask any questions, they don't have an understanding of what we're doing or why we're doing it, even when we're reversing course, has got to end. I'm very appreciative of what the written media did with regard to the Community Corrections Working Group effort. And more than appreciative, just plain thankful for what this body has done in response to LB 46. And we've had the support of the administration too. Many of the issues that are here are what we're driving at in what is already going to go over to Final Reading in LB 46, the community corrections work. It's not like we're not...one of the issues I raised last night were the fact...I pointed out, and I think Senator Dwite Pedersen agrees with it, these statistics are not static. You know, there were 1,194 people who jammed their sentences last year. There were 772 people paroled. So it's not like parole has ground to a complete halt. I agree that there needs to be change. And if you look at LB 46, there's some real concentrated effort there to try and change, in a managed and studied way, how we handle parole in this state. But the more public discussion we have of it, the better. And you know what? I respectfully suggest that if corrections had grown from \$60 million in spending to...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...\$120 million in spending, as it did, over a six-year period, and we were sitting here in the boom nineties, we wouldn't be having this discussion. There is, as Senator Beutler says, a convergence of events. I'm not certain it makes a difference whether we reconsider this bill, so I'm ambivalent on it, whether that's satisfactory to you or not. I don't know what I'd do in terms of the amendment. Because it is the kind of dramatic gesture that has created a great deal of focus. And while I regret, as Senator Beutler has stated, the