

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

March 30, 2004      LB 1089

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I was joking with Senator Pedersen that we're going to start calling the Appropriations Committee the band of brothers plus one sister, for Senator Thompson, and then Senator Synowiecki is going to be the lone...the lone wolf, I guess, because he's breaking ranks. But as I'm sitting here listening to Senator Synowiecki, who is...who has been a probation officer for 12 years, and Senator Dwite Pedersen, who's worked pretty much most of his life in this area, and then I listen to other people make comments and it's like nobody is even listening to what these two people, who I...whose opinions I really respect, are even saying. And Senator Baker will talk about how the Work Ethic Camp, they don't give them tobacco or caffeine. That could very well be and it probably is a tough program. But what Senator Synowiecki and Senator Pedersen are saying is that look at the numbers. To stay at the Work Ethic Camp, it's \$1,239 per month; to invest this money in intensive supervision, it's \$131 a month. Look at the numbers. You're going to save \$1,100 a month. That's what the issue is here, in my opinion. And when a 12-year probation officer and a person who's spent most of his life in this area say this is an idea that merits some consideration, I'm going to listen. How many of us, if we could go back, would change a decision that we have made here on the floor? I would imagine some of the members that were here when we put the new...voted for the new prison in Tecumseh could...wish they could revisit that decision. I would imagine some folks who voted for the Work Ethic Camp could rethink that decision. I would imagine our whole school aid formula there's a number of us in here that could or would like to rethink that particular vote or decision. And what Senator Synowiecki is offering us is a way to rethink a decision to make a long-term structural change that's going to save, and again I mean it's going to save a significant amount of money. It's efficient. It makes sense. I don't see why we wouldn't do this. And I'm going to support the amendment. My guess is it doesn't have the votes, but again, we're going to do this either now or we're going to do it when we set our budget next year. Because again, if you look at the out years, there's no way that we're going to be able to raise revenue by \$300 million or more. It just isn't going to happen. And I know we've been...a lot of us have been talking about this for years, you know, a year, a year and a