

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

May 14, 2003

LB 407

programs that we have in place for drug rehabilitation and for sex offender programs and so forth, what exactly we wanted to keep if we lost LCC. But if you kept everything, let's say that you decided to keep all these counseling programs, et cetera, et cetera, the number moves down considerably. It could move down to as low as \$2 million. Nobody knows that for sure. But that is a best guess estimate, and it's as good as anybody else's estimate. In addition to that, you also have the \$1 million that has to be used for parole supervision. So I just want to tell you, if money is what's driving this...and I think it is and isn't. I think people are concerned about more than the money, but initially I think it may have started off for the money. I'm not sure the savings is going to be that great. And you're going to compound our problems when you...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...have the overcrowding that you're going to have at some of the other facilities who have only so many medium- and maximum-security beds. And something is going to have to give. I passed around the sheet that showed what the capacity rate could become, not the first year, when you release those 500, but the second year. And you could be as high as 178 percent at the Penitentiary, and as high as 111 percent at Tecumseh. And it's my understanding that those rooms at Tecumseh were built to hold two beds, and they really can't hold much more. And when you start putting a lot of people in there who are serious offenders, and you make it an overcrowded situation, other kinds of problems arise because of it. I would once again argue in favor of reconsidering this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Maxwell.

SENATOR MAXWELL: Mr. President, I did not vote for this proposal last night. I was glad to learn that Senator Schimek filed a motion to reconsider. But I must tell you the truth, there is a temptation gnawing at me. What we did here was we took a line item in the budget, we reduced its funding to zero in the second year of the budget. And has been pointed out, if we later decide it's a bad idea, we can undo it and restore the